

Appendix B

Response to Council Submissions



Table B1.1 Responses to Council submissions

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
Liverpool City Council	General	States that the EIS fails to adequately assess the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures.	<p>Chapter 28 – <i>Environmental management framework</i> of the EIS assesses the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures. As noted in section 28.3 of Chapter 28 – <i>Environmental management framework</i> of the EIS, predicated effectiveness was assessed qualitatively using the following definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• High predicted effectiveness – high likelihood that potential risk/impact can be mitigated based on proven experience on other similar projects and/or specialist knowledge.• Medium predicted effectiveness – medium likelihood that potential risk/impact can be mitigated based on proven experience on other similar projects and/or specialist knowledge.• Low predicted effectiveness – low likelihood that potential risk/impact can be mitigated based on proven experience on other similar projects and/or specialist knowledge. <p>Impacts have been assessed qualitatively at this stage, which is appropriate for a Stage 1 SSD concept EIS and is consistent with the NSW Secretary’s Environmental Assessment Requirements (NSW SEARs) and the Commonwealth DOE EIS Guidelines, However more detailed quantitative assessments would be undertaken during detailed design, once the final layout of the Project has been confirmed. Mitigation measures would be tailored to reflect the final design of the Project and the expected impacts. MIC considers the EIS does assess the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures, recognising that these measures would be further assessed and reviewed as part of the Stage 2 SSD applications.</p>
		Concerned with traffic congestion and associated impacts on amenity due to additional vehicles on the network.	<p>MIC recognises there are existing traffic congestion issues along some of the local roads and regional arterials within the vicinity of the Project. As explained within Chapter 11 – <i>Traffic, transport and access</i> of the EIS, the Project is predicted to result in reductions in vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) on the Sydney regional road network. By transferring freight movements to the Project site by rail for distribution, the regional network would experience reductions of approximately 56,125 truck VKTs a day and 1265 truck vehicle hours travelled a day. This is also expected to contribute to reducing heavy vehicle-related crashes.</p> <p>This issue would be further considered in detail during the Stage 2 SSD application, once the detailed design of the Project is known. A mesoscopic model would be used to assess the impacts.</p>
		Concerned with noise and vibration impacts associated with site construction and operation, and vehicle movements beyond the site.	<p>MIC acknowledges that a number of residents live close to the Project site and there are concerns regarding exceedance of noise assessment criteria and the impacts this has on health and lifestyle. Noise from the construction and operation of the Project would be regulated through the Project approvals (Stage 1 and Stage 2 SSD approvals) and in accordance with relevant acoustic legislation, policy and guidelines (including the NSW <i>Industrial Noise Policy</i>, the NSW <i>Road Noise Policy</i> and the <i>Interim Construction Noise Guideline</i>).</p> <p>To minimise noise emissions and comply with the Project approval (Stage 1 and Stage 2 SSD approvals) and regulations, the Project would be designed and constructed with reasonable and feasible noise mitigation measures to control noise emissions within the surrounding communities. A number of noise mitigation measures were presented in the EIS (see section 12.4 of Chapter 12 – <i>Noise and vibration</i> of the EIS).</p>
		Concerned with air quality impacts associated primarily with vehicle movements beyond the site, as well as site construction and operation.	<p>The Local Air Quality Impact Assessment (LAQIA) (Technical Paper 7 – <i>Local air quality impact assessment</i> in Volume 6 of the EIS) includes the assessment of the following air pollutants: particulate matter (including TSP, particulate matter less than 10 microns (PM₁₀) and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), carbon monoxide (CO), sulphur dioxide (SO₂), benzene, toluene, xylenes, 1,3-butadine, formaldehyde, acetaldehyde and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs).</p> <p>Model predictions of air quality impacts were made over a 7 km by 7 km area centred on the proposed Project. Ground-level concentrations arising from emissions released at the Project site were predicted across this domain to assess the potential impact to health and well-being. Additionally, 38 individual receptor locations, representative of the greater community, were included for detailed model result analysis.</p> <p>The results of the dispersion modelling highlight that adverse impacts to the surrounding environment are not predicted for any modelling scenario (Project development phase) or pollutant. The air quality impact associated with the emissions generated by the construction and operational phases of the Project is therefore predicted to be low.</p>
		Concerned with hazard and risks both within the site and beyond the site boundary associated with the transport network.	<p>MIC recognises there are concerns regarding the trucks ‘weaving’ onto and off the M5 Motorway causing potential safety issues. As illustrated in Figure 6.6 and Figure 6.7 of <i>Technical Paper 1 – Traffic, Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment</i> (EIS Volume 3), it is anticipated that around 65% of the truck traffic from the Project would use the M5 Motorway to the west of Moorebank Avenue. MIC recognises that this part of the M5 Motorway is forecast to experience congestion resulting from the inadequate weave distance between Moorebank Avenue and the Hume Highway without the presence of Project traffic. More sophisticated modelling is being planned to explore this issue in greater detail and MIC is currently in discussions with Transport for NSW and RMS to identify solutions to the issue. Potential solutions range from the provision of additional motorway capacity to avoiding the M5 Motorway during peak periods; these will be explored during Stage 2 SSD applications. This more sophisticated approach would enable the identification and mitigation of other potential hazardous conditions such as queues blocking intersections or conflicts between traffic movements.</p> <p>In terms of local road safety issues, the indicative IMT layout provides a truck parking and holding area on site to accommodate up to 25 trucks, to serve as a layover facility for trucks that arrive early and need to wait for their allocated time slot. This would avoid the need for trucks to queue on Moorebank Avenue. For truck traffic, MIC is proposing to introduce a ban on heavy vehicles using the eastern section of Anzac Road as a through route, details of the form of this control are yet to be confirmed and would need to be discussed with LCC, RMS and Transport for NSW.</p> <p>The details of the internal site operation are yet to be finalised but where possible truck and car movements will be separated. Detailed operational procedures will be developed for all traffic movements within the site.</p>

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
		Concerned with human health impacts resulting from a reduced level of amenity within the Project located in a heavily populated area.	<p>Chapter 25 – <i>Human health risks and impacts</i> of the EIS provides an overview of the findings of the assessments in relation to the potential health impacts associated with the Project. The health impacts are addressed in more detail in in Technical Paper 15 (EIS Volume 9) – <i>Human health risk assessment</i> (HHRA), and Technical Paper 16 – <i>Health impact assessment</i> (HIA). The HIA and HHRA considers a number of risks and impacts that may arise including changes in the natural and built environment, such as ambient noise levels, air quality, or traffic and transport networks, as well as through changes in socio-economic conditions.</p> <p>The calculations presented in the HHRA do not indicate that the Project would result in any significant impact on the existing health of the population. Nonetheless, a range of mitigate measures are proposed minimise community exposures. This includes the mitigation measures associated with traffic, noise and air (which are detailed in the mitigation sections of Chapter 11 – <i>Traffic, transport and access</i>, Chapter 12 – <i>Nosie and vibration</i> and Chapter 17 – <i>Local air quality</i> of the EIS).</p>
		<p>States that the EIS lacks consideration of the strategic context and broader regional and local planning issues including Council's vision for an expansion of the Liverpool CBD eastwards across the Georges River.</p> <p>Submission states the Project is inconsistent with Council's vision for the Riverfront lands. Submission argues that Council supports alternative development options for the precinct to the north of the M5 Motorway fronting Moorebank Road and the Georges River, which take advantage of the riverfront location and proximity to the Liverpool CBD.</p> <p>Submission states that Council's vision for that area is:</p> <p><i>'To create a unique place that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>extends Liverpool CBD across the river as a 'river city'</i><i>optimises the natural beauty of the area</i><i>provides a range of uses</i><i>provides high quality urban living, working and recreation environment</i><i>embodies the principles of sustainable development'</i> (Cardno 2014, page 31).	<p>Chapter 3 – <i>Strategic context and need for the Project</i> of the EIS outlines the objectives for the Project and provides an assessment of the Project against the key Australian and NSW government policies and publications. The Project is consistent with, and assists in meeting the key objectives of a number key policies including the <i>National Land Freight Network Strategy</i>, <i>National Ports Strategy</i>, <i>National Infrastructure Priorities – Infrastructure for an economically, socially and environmentally sustainable future</i>, <i>NSW 2021</i>, <i>State Infrastructure Strategy</i>, <i>NSW Long Term Transport Master Plan</i>, <i>Draft Sydney Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney to 2031</i>, <i>Railing Port Botany's Containers</i>, <i>South West Subregion: Draft Subregional Strategy</i> and <i>NSW Ports and Freight Strategy</i>. Refer to section 3.6 of Chapter 3 – <i>Strategic context and need for the Project</i> for a detailed discussion.</p> <p>In terms of local strategies, the Liverpool Industrial Land Strategy (Liverpool City Council 2007) identifies Moorebank as a suitable location for future industrial development, owing to its advantageous location, proximity to labour markets and access to key infrastructure including the CBD and Sydney airport. The Moorebank, Warwick Farm and Prestons areas are identified in the Liverpool Industrial Land Strategy as LCC's preferred location for a business park that restricts unsightly or unpleasant operations; however, the strategy also acknowledges the strategic need for a future key freight sector strategy to increase handling of freight by rail.</p> <p>In terms of the comment regarding LCC's vision for expansion of the Liverpool CBD across the Georges River, MIC is not aware of any strategic policies/plans that document this vision and LCCs submission does not refer to or reference any policies or plans where this vision is defined.</p>
		Commitments made throughout the EIS are vague and non-binding and there is a lack of certainty that the measures would be implemented. Recommends that a Statement of Commitments be provided as part of the EIS.	<p>Statement of Commitments is a requirement of the old Part 3A planning process under the EP&A Act. As outlined in Chapter 4 – <i>Planning and Statutory Requirements</i> of the EIS, the project is being assessed under Part 4, Division 4.1 of the EP&A Act as a State Significant Development (SSD) application. Formal statement of commitments is not required under the Part 4 SSD requirements.</p> <p>In Chapter 28 – <i>Environmental management framework</i> of the EIS, a list of environmental management and mitigation measures for the Project have been provided. This list includes measures which are mandatory and are firm mitigation commitments as well as those that are subject to review during the Stage 2 SSD approvals and/or detailed design. During detailed design, further assessments would be undertaken and a more refined statement of commitments would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD application.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the IMT operator to undertake construction and operation of the IMT in accordance with the Project approvals (Stage 1 and Stage 2 SSD approvals) (stated mitigations) and any conditions of approval.</p>
		Alternatives have not be adequately been considered, including expansion of existing facilities (Chullora, Enfield and other smaller IMT sites) or greenfield site development.	<p>The Moorebank site was selected due to its strategic positioning, with good access to existing major freight and rail corridors (Southern Sydney Fright Line (SSFL), the M5 Motorway and near to the M7 Motorway and Hume Highway), and it being centrally located relative to major freight markets in the west and south west of Sydney. The size of the site was also a significant factor in site selection, with the requirement to accommodate interstate trains which can be up to 1,800 m long and the need for the site to be large enough to handle the number of containers expected (a total throughput capacity of 1.55 million TEU a year including up to 1.05 million TEU a year of IMEX).</p> <p>The MIC notes that Badgerys Creek has been suggested by many community members as a suitable alternative site for the IMT, with many arguments for locating an IMT at this location. However, this site would be located too far west of current Sydney freight markets to be commercially viable as an intermodal facility and does not currently have adequate road or rail supporting infrastructure. While some submissions suggest that infrastructure provided for the airport could be utilised for an IMT, MIC is not aware of any plans to extend freight lines to this location as part of infrastructure upgrades for the proposed airport. The Commonwealth Government is currently undertaking a planning study for the Badgerys Creek Western Sydney Airport site; however, MIC is not aware of any existing Commonwealth land in the vicinity of Badgerys Creek that is currently suitable for an intermodal facility.</p> <p>Predicted demand in containerised goods suggests that a number of intermodal facilities will be required and that Eastern Creek and Badgerys Creek may be suitable future intermodal sites. However, given the demand for a western Sydney intermodal exists now, the Moorebank IMT site is considered the most appropriate site for an intermodal facility, as described in Chapter 6 – <i>Project development and alternatives</i> of the EIS.</p> <p>Other alternative sites suggested in community submissions include Chullora, Eastern Creek and Enfield. As noted in section 3.1.1 in Chapter 3 – <i>Strategic context and need for the Project</i> of the EIS, there is an estimated shortage of IMEX and interstate capacity at existing and other planned IMTs in Sydney, even with these other facilities operating. Table 3.1 in section 3.1.2 in Chapter 3 – <i>Strategic context and need for the Project</i>, illustrates that there would be a shortfall in IMEX capacity of more than one million TEUs a year, at 2025. This takes into account existing capacity at Yennora, Minto, Villawood and Enfield and planned expansions at Chullora. There would also be shortfall in interstate capacity, of approximately of 328,000 TEU a year at 2030 (volumes going directly to and from Sydney) growing to 363,000 by 2040. As such, an additional IMT facility is required to meet these shortfalls.</p>

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
		Lack of certainty around rail access, site layouts and monitoring regimes creating ambiguity in terms of the Project impacts. It is recommended that a preferred option be identified, together with a site layout and supporting assessment.	Since exhibition of the EIS, in-principle agreement has been reached between MIC and SIMTA, whereby SIMTA would become the future developer and operator of a precinct-wide intermodal facility and associated warehousing across both the MIC and SIMTA sites. A preferred site layout and the southern rail access option has been selected for the combined precinct and is described in section 7.4 of the Response to Submissions Report. The indicative layout would be further developed during detailed design and details would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD applications. The Response to Submissions Report will be exhibited for the public to review and make further submissions prior to NSW DP&E approval of the Stage 1 SSD approval for the Project. Council and the community will also have the opportunity to provide further comment during the Stage 2 SSD application process.
		Recommends that international best practice be considered for the IMT concept design and facility operation.	The implementation of best practice management practices for the construction and operation of the IMT facility would be investigated during the detailed design phase, assuming approval of the Stage 1 SSD application. Management measures including international best practice would be included in the mitigations proposed as part of the Stage 2 SSD application. MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.
		Recommends a number of additional mitigation and management measures for the Project.	MIC recognises the importance of mitigation and provides a comprehensive list of all proposed environmental management and mitigation measures for the Project (refer to Chapter 28 – <i>Environmental management framework</i> of the EIS). This list includes measures which are mandatory and are firm mitigation commitments as well as those that are subject to review during the Stage 2 SSD approvals and/or detailed design. During detailed design, further assessments would be undertaken and a more refined statement of commitments would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD.
		Recommends that a combined master planning process be undertaken for the SIMTA site and the Project site.	As noted in the response above, this Response to Submission Report contains a preferred Project design (proposed amendments to the development) which details the proposed layout and associated impacts of a precinct-wide intermodal facility. The PPR will be exhibited for the public to review and make further submissions prior to NSW DP&E approval of the Stage 1 SSD approval for the Project.
		Recommends a number of draft terms of approval for the Project.	MIC acknowledges the draft terms of approval presented in the LCC submission. MIC has specifically addressed the recommended approval conditions as they relate to technical areas, throughout this table. As indicated, MIC is prepared to receive conditions of approval, based on some, but not all of the Councils recommendations. Further justification for this is presented throughout the table and within the Response to Submission report.
		Suggests that the IMT be located at Badgerys Creek.	The MIC notes that Badgerys Creek has been suggested by many community members and LCC as a suitable alternative site for the IMT, with many arguments for locating an IMT at this location. However, this site would be located too far west of current Sydney freight markets to be commercially viable as an intermodal facility and does not currently have adequate road or rail supporting infrastructure. While some submissions suggest that infrastructure provided for the airport could be utilised for an IMT, MIC is not aware of any plans to extend freight lines to this location as part of infrastructure upgrades for the proposed airport. The Commonwealth Government is currently undertaking a planning study for the Badgerys Creek Western Sydney Airport site; however, MIC is not aware of any existing Commonwealth land in the vicinity of Badgerys Creek that is currently suitable for an intermodal facility. Predicted demand in containerised goods suggests that a number of intermodal facilities will be required and that Eastern Creek and Badgerys Creek may be suitable future intermodal sites. However, given the demand for a western Sydney intermodal exists now, the Moorebank IMT site is considered the most appropriate site for an intermodal facility, as described in Chapter 6 – <i>Project development and alternatives</i> .
		Recommends that the SME site be developed as a residential and mixed use precinct.	While MIC acknowledges the suggestions for alternative uses of the Project site, these alternatives have not been assessed in any level of detail for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none">As detailed in Chapter 15 – <i>Contamination and soil</i> of the EIS, the site is contaminated and is not suitable for sensitive land development (such as residential development). With the current levels of contamination, the site is only suitable for industrial or commercial land uses. While former Defence land has in the past been remediated for residential development (e.g. at Wattle Grove), the cost of doing so is substantial and would affect the value of the land, were it sold for residential development.Development for residential purposes could house more than 40,000 people in 16,500 dwellings, which could generate around 3,154 passenger vehicle trips (inbound and outbound) in the morning peak hour (based on RMS methodology (refer to section 4.4 in Technical Paper 1 – <i>Traffic, Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment</i> of the EIS). This compares to the Project which, at full capacity, would generate around 422 vehicle trips (inbound and outbound) in the morning peak hour. Traffic generated by the terminal during peak hours would be a fraction of the traffic that would be generated by a residential development. This proportion would be higher at other times of the day (because the intermodal terminal spreads heavy vehicle traffic across the day, while residential traffic is focused on the peak hours).A detailed assessment of alternative land uses is outside of the scope of this Project (i.e. the uses do not address the objective to address Sydney’s freight demands).

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
		Concerned the infrastructure upgrades required to support the development have not been adequately addressed/considered. Suggests that MIC enter into a Voluntary Planning Agreement with Council and the RMS regarding the delivery of infrastructure to support the Project.	<p>As per all projects that seek approval from NSW DP&E, conditions of approval include measures to mitigate the impacts, including impacts on roads. The determining authority for this is Transport for NSW (through NSW DP&E). The process has been used on previous projects and involves modelling of the traffic impacts with the review and agreement of Transport for NSW and RMS. Any traffic impact on local roads caused by the Project is to be mitigated so the impact is eliminated or minimised. An agreement with Transport for NSW will detail the agreed road/transport infrastructure upgrades required to mitigate the impacts of the development of the state transport network and the timing of their delivery.</p> <p>As noted in the planning proposal (exhibited at the same time as the EIS), it is proposed to insert a clause into the <i>Liverpool Local Environment Plan 2008</i> (LLEP) which requires satisfactory arrangements to be made for the provision of regional transport infrastructure required as required by the IMT, prior to consent being granted for approval of the Planning Proposal to rezone the land for the IMT. The proposed wording to be inserted into the LLEP includes:</p> <p><u>7.36 Arrangements for regional transport infrastructure for certain land at Moorebank</u></p> <p><i>(1) The objective of this clause is to require satisfactory arrangements to be made for the provision of regional transport infrastructure required as a result of the Moorebank Intermodal Terminal (IMT).</i></p> <p><i>(2) This clause applies to land shown on the Key Sites Map.</i></p> <p><i>(3) Despite any other provision of this Plan, the consent authority must not consent to development for the purposes of the IMT on land to which this clause applies unless the Secretary for NSW DP&E has certified in writing to the consent authority that satisfactory arrangements have been made to contribute to the provision of improvements to regional transport infrastructure and services reasonably required as a result of the development and operation of the IMT.</i></p> <p>MIC is prepared to enter into a voluntary planning agreement with DP&E and TfNSW/RMS, but does not consider it necessary to also enter into a voluntary planning agreement with council.</p>
	Traffic, transport and access	EIS lacks consideration of State and local traffic networks and intersections.	<p>The traffic impacts of the Project have been assessed as detailed in Chapter 11 – <i>Traffic, transport and access</i> of the EIS and <i>Technical Paper 1 – Traffic, Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment</i>. Traffic impacts on the wider network, including local roads have been assessed using intersection performance modelling software (Signalised and unsignalised Intersection Design and Research Aid (SIDRA)) for a number of intersections within and surrounding the Project site including the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hume Highway and Orange Grove Road;• Hume Highway and Elizabeth Drive;• Hume Highway and Memorial Avenue;• Hume Highway, Hoxton Park Road and Macquarie Street;• Hume Highway and Reilly Street;• Moorebank Avenue and Newbridge Road;• Moorebank Avenue and Heathcote Road;• Moorebank Avenue and Industrial Park Access;• Moorebank Avenue and Church Road;• Heathcote Road, Wattle Grove Road and Nuwarra Road;• Newbridge Road and Nuwarra Road;• Newbridge Road, Governor Macquarie Drive and Brickmakers Drive;• Moorebank Avenue and M5 Motorway interchange; > Hume Highway and M5 Motorway interchange;• Cambridge Avenue, Canterbury Road, Glenfield Road and Railway Parade;• Moorebank Avenue and Bapaume Road;• Moorebank Avenue and Anzac Road;• Moorebank Avenue and Defence Support access;• Moorebank Avenue and Defence National Storage and Distribution Centre (DNSDC) access;• Moorebank Avenue and Chatham Avenue; and• Moorebank Avenue and proposed Moorebank IMT accesses. <p>Investigations are currently being undertaken to identify measures required to mitigate the impact of traffic generated from the Project on intersections in the surrounding area. These investigations aim to ensure the intersections would operate no worse than they would without the Project. Should the intersections require extra mitigation measures to resolve congestion, then MIC will discuss these with TfNSW and RMS and if agreed will contribute to the cost of these upgrades (in proportion to the extent that the Project contributes to the traffic through that intersection).</p>

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
		<p>Submission challenges the appropriateness of the assumptions made in the traffic impact assessment including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the assumption that semi-trailers would carrying freight as opposed to a range of vehicle sizes; the assumption that 10% of construction staff are likely to use alternative means of transportation; the assumption that 30% of light vehicles would use Cambridge Avenue and Moorebank Avenue to access the IMT; and assumptions underlying the phasing of the Moorebank Avenue signalised intersections. 	<p>A key determinant of the traffic impacts is the nature of the proposed onsite warehousing. The proposed warehousing would have direct access to the IMT facility and it is expected that this facility would be attractive to major distribution centres such as the Big W distribution at Hoxton Park. These major distribution warehouses are not associated with the movement of small vans etc. as they deal in the bulk movement of freight across their distribution chain. Therefore, the assumed daily trip generation from the Project warehouses is similar to the generation rates observed at the Big W distribution centre at Hoxton Park. The goods are exclusively moved by rigid or articulated vehicles only.</p> <p>The construction and operational staff are not major sources of traffic for the Project. Minor changes to their number or distribution are unlikely to significantly impact on the intersection operation. It is expected that the majority of staff would arrive and depart outside the peak AM and PM periods on the road network, as movements would primarily occur during the shift changeover (at 6.00 am, 2.00 pm and 10.00 pm).</p> <p>Signal phasing used in the SIDRA analysis is based on the provided cycle time from RMS, a conservative approach was taken to model all future year cycle times with their observed duration. It is possible that RMS will extend the cycle time in the future, but our assessment has limited our future year analysis to a consideration of modifying the individual phasing of the intersection within the observed cycle time. The catchment area for potential staff walking to site is limited to the north of the M5 Motorway, any demand from this area would probably be catered for within the modelling pedestrian phases.</p>
		Need for a more refined assessment of the surrounding road network especially for the M5 Motorway/Moorebank Avenue intersection, Cambridge Avenue (explored as an alternative route to alleviate congestion), Cambridge Avenue/Canterbury Road intersection, Helles Avenue/Moorebank Avenue intersection, Hume Highway/Macquarie Street intersection; Hume Highway/ Graham Avenue intersection and Heathcote Road/M5 Motorway intersection.	More extensive modelling is currently being planned (to be undertaken and reported as part of the Stage 2 SSD application) to assess the impact of Project traffic on the wider Liverpool area. A wide ranging mesoscopic modelling will be conducted, with microsimulation of key elements such as the M5 Motorway over the Georges River. These new AM and PM models will be based 24 hour traffic data collection.
		The traffic impacts during the construction stage for both the SIMTA project and the Moorebank project needs to be investigated.	MIC acknowledges this comment from LCC and agrees that traffic impacts from both project need to be assessed. The cumulative scenario in the EIS attempted to assess the impacts of the combined sites. Since the exhibition of the EIS an in–principle agreement has now been reached between MIC and SIMTA and the indicative site layout plan of the Moorebank IMT has changed to reflect the likely combination of the two sites. An assessment of the potential traffic impacts (during construction and operation) of this modified precinct would be undertaken as part of the Stage 2 SSD. This modelling will be undertaken using a combination of mesoscopic and microsimulation with an extended geographic coverage.
		Rail capacity impacts and flow on effects on other railway operators need to be further considered.	<p>As noted in section 1.6.2 of Chapter 1 – <i>Introduction</i> of the EIS, the SSFL has capacity to accommodate the proposed freight movements from the Project. In order to better understand the capacity of the MFN (Metropolitan Freight Network) and the SSFL, MIC commissioned a rail capacity assessment in 2014 to consider the impact of the additional freight generated by the Project on the capacity of the Metropolitan Freight Network (MFN)/SSFL, between Moorebank and Port Botany and the wider metropolitan shared railway. The assessment was completed by specialist rail consultants and involved detailed modelling of the current and future timetable on existing and future infrastructure. The capacity assessment was also done in consultation with the ARTC and TfNSW.</p> <p>The assessment concluded that the major constraint on capacity is the single line section of track on the SSFL between Moorebank and Sefton Park Junction where it joins the MFN. The MFN between Sefton Park Junction and Cooks River is double track and is therefore not capacity constrained. The line between Cooks River and Port Botany comprises both single and double track sections and ARTC has commissioned a feasibility study to determine the locations where duplication works or other upgrading work should be completed.</p> <p>The capacity assessment completed by MIC considered forecast port container and all other traffic including interstate and intrastate and were sourced from ARTC and TfNSW. The capacity assessment determined that 36 train paths each way per day on the SSFL and the MFN would provide adequate track space to carry the forecast intrastate and interstate traffic including the additional trains generated by the establishment of the Project. This included consideration of the needs of the line section between Enfield and Port Botany and the implications of the South Coast traffic and Marrickville Junction.</p>
		Traffic safety issues for cyclists and pedestrians along Moorebank Avenue need to be considered. It is not clear if bicycle facilities are to be on-road or separate.	Shared pedestrian cycle/pedestrian paths are proposed as part of the Project and all proposed signalised crossings have a pedestrian phased light for crossing. This is consistent with other local roads in the area.
		Costs of road network infrastructure upgrades need to be considered and assessed as part of the proposal.	Work is currently being undertaken to identify the measures required to mitigate the impact of Project traffic on intersections in the surrounding area. This work will ensure the intersections will operate with Project traffic no worse than they would without Project traffic. Should the intersections require extra mitigation measures to resolve congestion, then MIC will discuss these with TfNSW and RMS and if agreed will contribute to the cost of these upgrades (in proportion to the extent that the Project contributes to the traffic through that intersection).
		The impacts on public transport services during construction and operation of the IMT need to be considered.	This issue would be considered in detail during the Stage 2 SSD application, once the detailed design of the Project is known. A mesoscopic model would be used to assess the impacts.
		Traffic safety issues including weaving on the M5 Motorway need to be investigated and the impacts on traffic flow.	The Project would result in an increase in trucks travelling along the M5 Motorway during both construction and operation. As illustrated in Figure 6.6 and Figure 6.7 of <i>Technical Paper 1 – Traffic, Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment</i> (EIS Volume 3), it is anticipated that around 65% of the truck traffic from the Project would use the M5 Motorway to the west of Moorebank Avenue. MIC recognises this part of the M5 Motorway is forecast to experience congestion resulting from background traffic growth and the inadequate weave distance between Moorebank Avenue and the Hume Highway without the presence of Project traffic. MIC is cooperating with TfNSW in its consideration of potential solutions to this and other regional traffic issues caused by growth in traffic. More sophisticated traffic modelling is being prepared to investigate this issue in greater detail. This further analysis would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD application.

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
	Social and economic impacts	The EIS does not adequately consider the impacts on the Casula Powerhouse including visual impacts, access and user amenity.	The impacts on the Casula Powerhouse Arts Centre has been considered and assessed in section 24.3.4 of Chapter 24 – <i>Social and economic impacts</i> of the EIS and section 23.2.3 and section 23.2.4 of Chapter 23 – <i>Property and infrastructure</i> of the EIS. The Casula Powerhouse Arts Centre could experience visual, noise and air amenity impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Project, as described in Chapter 11 – <i>Traffic, transport and access</i> , Chapter 12 – <i>Noise and vibration</i> , Chapter 17 – <i>Local air quality</i> and Chapter 22 – <i>Visual and urban design</i> of the EIS. The impacts on the Casula Powerhouse Arts Centre as a result of the northern rail access option and the central rail access option are greater than those anticipated from the southern rail access option. This is due to the distance of the southern rail access option from the Casula Powerhouse Arts Centre. Since exhibition of the EIS, MIC has selected the southern rail access option as its preferred option. Therefore, the impacts to the Casula Powerhouse are expected to be minimal.
	Noise and vibration impacts	Noise monitoring locations and microphone positions should be included in the EIS.	Details of the noise monitoring locations including microphone heights are provided in section 3.2.1 of Technical Report 2 – <i>Noise and Vibration Assessment</i> (EIS Volume 3).
		Noise predictions do not provide an indication of the worst case scenario. Submission argues that of concern are the noise predictions for onsite activities which are based on ideal design and management outcomes and therefore do not provide an indicative worst case scenario.	As stated in section 4.1 of Technical Paper 2 – <i>Noise and Vibration Assessment</i> (EIS Volume 3), the noise predications for each phase of development are based on the capacity of the IMT at that time. This is representative of the progressive development of the IMT, which would occur as demand for IMEX and interstate capacity increases. Potential noise levels were assessed the year 2015, 2018, 2025 and 2030 (including simultaneous construction and operation). These scenarios are representative of the worst case (peak) noise generating operations and construction works for each phase of development. Potential noise levels associated with the proposed operation of the Project were assessed based on an unmitigated Project concept, i.e. with no operational noise mitigation in place. As a result, the assessment, which investigated maximum and peak operating conditions, has identified that potential worst case noise levels within the localised environment may exceed the adopted noise goals. Therefore, this approach is considered appropriate to demonstrate impacts at the ‘worst case’ scenario.
		The assessment of sleep disturbance should be based on the World Health Organisation <i>Guidelines for Community Noise</i> (WHO 1999). States the noise impacts of containers dropping and rail movements require assessment against the sleep disturbance criteria and under temperature inversion conditions as per the NSW <i>Industrial Noise Policy</i> .	An assessment of potential sleep disturbance noise impacts for the night-time was undertaken in accordance with NSW EPA guidelines and the NSW <i>Industrial Noise Policy</i> EPA which recommend the application of an initial screening criterion of background noise level plus 15 dB (as described in the Application Notes to the NSW <i>Industrial Noise Policy</i>). The assessment in the EIS is a screening exercise to identify the potential for sleep disturbance impacts. As stated in Technical Paper 2 – <i>Noise and Vibration Assessment</i> , further analysis of potential sleep disturbance impacts will be required during detailed design. This is expected to include further prediction of maximum noise levels during neutral and adverse weather conditions for transient and high noise events such as container handling and rail freight operations. The assessment of noise has been undertaken in accordance with the NSW Secretary’s Environmental Assessment Requirements (NSW SEARs) and the Commonwealth DOE EIS Guidelines, which requires assessment against the NSW <i>Industrial Noise Policy</i> , the NSW <i>Road Noise Policy</i> and the <i>Interim Construction Noise Guideline</i> . The World Health Organisation <i>Guidelines for Community Noise</i> (WHO 1999) referred to in the LCC submission, are not commonly applied in NSW as a measurement of noise impacts from industrial activities. The EIS considers noise from IMT operations on the Project site, including the potential noise from unloading/loading and movements of containers and the breaking and shunting of trains. Events such as breaking and shunting of trains and dropping of containers would occur intermittently and are not expected to be a significant contribution above all other operational noise sources. As described above, the impact of this noise source has been undertaken in accordance with the NSW <i>Industrial Noise Policy</i> .
		Low frequency, tonal and impulse corrections have not been applied to predicted levels. This may be required for noise emissions from alarms and reverse beepers.	<i>Noise and vibration</i> recommends the use of broadband reversing alarms instead of tonal reversing alarms and one-way routes to reduce the need for vehicles to reverse. These measures would be considered during the planning and design of the IMT and will be assessed further during the Stage 2 SSD application.
		Concerns with regards to some of the data, calculations and assumptions in the noise and vibration assessment. Areas of concern include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">only minor differences in noise levels between phases B to full development;predicted noise levels under adverse conditions in some cases being better than neutral conditions;discrepancies between the number of modelled interstate trains for the Full Build phase; andunexplained discrepancies in the road traffic volume data, noting that the contributions to road traffic volumes at Phase C appear to be greater than for Full Build.	As stated in section 11.3 of Technical Paper 2 – <i>Noise and Vibration Assessment</i> of the EIS, the predicted noise levels at some receptors are reduced or remain the same as the development progresses to Full Build. This is due to the screening effect from the development of on-site buildings and structures. In terms of the comment regarding the predicted noise levels under adverse conditions in some cases being better than neutral conditions, this is due to the prevailing west-south-west (WSW) wind direction which has been applied to the modelling of adverse conditions. Analysis of the meteorological data determined the WSW wind direction was in occurrence for the majority of the winter period, as such the modelled scenario is representative of local weather conditions. A number of modelled noise scenarios were considered for interstate trains for the Full Build phase. The modelling of noise emissions on the access tracks has assumed a total of three trains per 24 hour period. The modelling of interstate trains assumed two trains to be idling within the site at the same time as one train is arriving/departing. The assessment of road traffic noise levels has been based on road traffic volumes for each phase of development. The traffic volumes presented in Table 45 and 46 of Technical Paper 2 – <i>Noise and Vibration Assessment</i> of the EIS show the total road traffic volumes, including the construction and operation traffic. For Phase C, the totals include construction traffic, whereas for Full Build, this only includes operational traffic as construction is complete. As such, the contribution to total traffic volumes during Phase C is greater than for when compared with Full Build.
		Seeks confirmation that all residential receptors and new land release areas have been included in the noise assessment.	The long term noise monitoring locations used for the noise impact assessment were selected after an initial site visit to identify areas within Casula, Wattle Grove and Glenfield that were representative of the quiet noise environments and where noise from the surrounding road and rail networks was not a significant influence to the measured background noise levels. The selection of monitoring sites included consideration of all known residential receptors and all new land release areas. The results of the long term noise monitoring are available via MICs website (www.micl.com.au). By measuring noise levels at the quietest noise environments, the noise assessment criteria and the assessment of potential impacts are considered to be representative for the most sensitive surrounding communities. The noise monitoring survey measured noise levels within areas representative of the sensitive receivers (e.g. Buckland Road, Casula) and as such multiple monitoring locations

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
			<p>with each suburb was not necessary to define background noise levels.</p> <p>The noise impacts of the Project were assessed at the nearest residential communities. Impacts from the Project site will decrease with increased distance from the site. Therefore an assessment of the noise impacts at the closest receivers provides a conservative assessment of impacts further away. The noise mitigation measures have been identified to mitigate noise at the nearest residential receivers and therefore would also mitigate noise further afield.</p>
		Recommends additional noise monitoring is required at Leacocks Lane in Casula as this residential area may have a lower background noise level than those assessed.	<p>Noise monitoring locations in Technical Paper 2 – <i>Noise and Vibration Assessment</i> of the EIS were selected to be representative of residential areas with low background noise levels. The measured background noise levels have established conservative noise criteria for the assessment.</p> <p>The measurement completed at Buckland Road is approximately 350m from the Hume Highway and well mitigated from road traffic noise from this road. The measurement position is adjacent to residential properties which screen the potential noise from the intermittent train passby events. The Rating Background Level (RBL) allocated from this measurement location ranges from 33 to 39 dBA. RBL's are based on the L90 noise descriptor which is only triggered by events that occur more than 90% of the time, of which rail movements do not.</p> <p>The RBLs are based on continuous noise monitoring under taken 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for a 2 year period. As such the RBLs account for any fluctuation in background noise during the daytime, evening and night-time periods as well as the long term noise environment.</p> <p>An alternative measurement location (such as that suggested at Leacocks Lane) is likely to provide a negligible difference in noise level and as such applying RBLs from an alternative location would not change the assessment outcomes. Therefore MIC does not agree with Councils recommendation.</p>
		Recommends a number of commitments that should be made to ensure off-site impacts are mitigated.	<p>MIC recognises the importance of mitigation and provides a comprehensive list of all proposed environmental management and mitigation measures for the Project (refer to Chapter 28 – <i>Environmental management framework</i>). This list includes measures which are mandatory and are firm mitigation commitments as well as those that are subject to review during the Stage 2 SSD approvals and/or detailed design. During detailed design, further assessments would be undertaken and a more refined mitigation measures would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
	Local air quality impacts	Key assumptions of the air quality assessment should be identified including vehicle movements, operating hours, fuel sources and environmental performance.	Technical Paper 7 (EIS Volume 6) – <i>Local air quality impact assessment</i> was based on a number of operational assumptions associated with the indicative layout for the Project and indicative Project phasing. These assumptions would be refined during the detailed design phase of the Project and further details provided in the Stage 2 SSD application. Appendix B of the LAQIA contains a Project emissions inventory and a list of construction phase and operational phase assumptions.
		The air quality assessment should be revised based on a reviewed/revised traffic impacts assessment (as recommended above).	As discussed in the traffic section above, a revised assessment of the potential traffic impacts (during construction and operation) of the combined Moorebank and SIMTA precinct has been undertaken, with details provided in section 7.9 of the Response to Submissions Report. In addition, a revised local air quality assessment has been prepared for the combined Moorebank and SIMTA precinct, with results provided in section 7.9 of the Response to Submissions Report. Further assessment of the air quality impacts would be undertaken as part of the Stage 2 SSD application, once the detailed of the layout, phasing and design of the Project are known.
		The air quality assessment should include sensitive receptors to the south or south-west of the facility as IMT impacts may limit the potential development options for this land.	No explicit sensitive receptor locations were selected for the land to the south. This is because land to the south consists largely of the Holsworthy Military Reserve and the future development of the area is unknown. While no sensitive receptor locations south of the Project boundary were expressly included in the LAQIA, the 200 m resolution dispersion modelling grid did cover this area for model predictions. Analysis of the prediction contour plots of ground level concentrations highlight that impacts in the area associated with the Project are very low. For example, for the indicative site layout associated with the southern rail access option, the maximum predicted 24-hour average PM ₁₀ concentration beyond the southern site boundary is less than 0.5 µg/m ³ . Further analysis would be undertaken during the Stage 2 SSD application process.
		Need for a continuous improvement program to be put in place to make progressive reductions in emissions including best practice measures and the use of cleaner technologies.	MIC acknowledges and agrees with this point. As discussed in section 17.4 of Chapter 17 – <i>Local air quality</i> , proposals to implement the use of cleaner fuels and technologies would be investigated at detailed design stage.
		Recommends he Project approval place restrictions on the future use of land at Receptor 33 (R33), given the predicted air quality exceedances at this location.	Receptor R33 falls within the proposed SIMTA facility site boundary, and as discussed in section 7.3, MIC has reached an in-principle agreement with SIMTA to develop an IMT across both sites. An indicative site layout showing the IMT on both sites is provided in section 7.4 of the Response to Submissions Report. Therefore, restrictions on the future use of land at Receptor R33 are not considered necessary on the basis that this land would likely be part of the IMT facility.
		No consideration has been given to odorous material handled during operation.	<p>Potential odorous goods and materials are considered unlikely to be handled at the Project site. However, management practices of potential odorous materials would be integrated into the operational air quality management plan for the Project.</p> <p>As noted in section 17.4.2 of Chapter 17 – <i>Local air quality</i> of the EIS, odour emissions associated with the sewage treatment plant would be controlled through the implementation of best management practice, including the following mitigation measures and safeguards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• providing covering for inlet works;• extraction of inlet works foul air gases to a soil bed filter for treatment; and• contingencies for potential loss of aeration (e.g. backup generator for power supply and storage of lime for dosing to the process units, if anaerobic conditions occur).

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
		There is no mention of any refrigerated storage facilities within the warehouses and the associated impacts.	Emissions from gas-fired heating and cooling of warehousing were incorporated in the LAQIA (refer to section 8.3 of the LAQIA). While not explicitly stated within the report, these emissions did account for energy consumption associated with refrigeration storage within the warehousing. Relative to other emission sources at the Project site, emissions from warehousing heating and cooling were a minor source of air pollutants.
		Recommends that operational monitoring be undertaken including air quality verification reports.	As noted in section 17.4.3 of Chapter 17 – <i>Local air quality</i> , ambient air quality monitoring is currently being conducted (to establish a baseline dataset) and will continue be undertaken as part of the Project's construction phase and through to operation. The requirements for monitoring will be determined during subsequent Stage 2 SSD applications and detailed commitments would be developed at this stage. The results of the long term noise monitoring are available via MICs website (www.micl.com.au). MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.
	Cumulative impacts	Need for a revised cumulative assessment considering the SIMTA site (approved capacity) and the Moorebank IMT at full capacity. The growth in container freight as identified by the NSW <i>Freight and Ports Strategy</i> illustrates that both IMTs could operate at full capacity to meet demand.	Prior to the EIS exhibition, the MIC proposal was being developed as a stand-alone project and it was therefore necessary to assess the environmental impacts independently of the SIMTA project. Chapter 27 – <i>Cumulative impacts</i> of the EIS assesses the cumulative impact of both the Moorebank IMT in conjunction with the SIMTA IMT and other planned or proposed developments in the local area. The cumulative scenarios assessed in the EIS were developed through discussions with NSW DP&E and consideration of the capacity of the SSFL and the freight demands. As discussed in Chapter 3 – <i>Strategic context and need for the Project</i> , the freight catchment demand is not likely to exceed 1.05 million TEU a year, plus 500,000 TEU of interstate freight. This conclusion was based on demand studies undertaken by Deloitte in 2014. In addition, there is insufficient capacity on the SSFL (even assuming that future upgrades are made to the SSFL), to accommodate a throughput of more than 1.55 million TEU per year (1.05 million TEU per year IMEX and 500,000 TEU interstate) to Moorebank. Accordingly, there is no prospect of both the Moorebank IMT and the SIMTA IMT projects operating jointly in their full capacity. Since the exhibition of the EIS an in-principle agreement has now been reached between MIC and SIMTA and the indicative site layout plan of the Moorebank IMT has changed to reflect the likely combination of the two sites. A preferred Project design (proposed amendments to the development) has been prepared which outlines the details of the proposed change to the Moorebank IMT concept layout. Section 7.10 of the Response to Submissions Report assesses the cumulative impacts of the modified precinct IMT.
		No consideration is given to any other potential developments in the region, including future residential growth.	Section 27.2.3 provides an assessment of the Project against other potential developments in the region including transport projects, defence projects, future land development projects (i.e. South West Growth Centre, Heathcote Ridge West Menai) and other developments.
		Suggests the same levels of performance should be applied to the SIMTA site and the Moorebank IMT. This may require modifications to SIMTA conditions.	See response above, the Moorebank IMT and SIMTA IMT project have been assessed as stand-alone projects. MIC is unable to comment on conditions of approval placed on the SIMTA project concept design, However, both projects are subject to Stage 2 SSD applications and therefore there is opportunity to streamline the conditions in the future.
	Hazards and risks	Concerns about the impact of the Fuel Management Plan on the conservation zone and associated ecological values.	As identified in section 14.6.2 of Chapter 14 – <i>Hazards and risks</i> of the EIS, the aims and objectives of the <i>Planning for bushfire protection guidelines</i> (RFS 2006) would be further considered and consultation with the RFS would continue during detailed design. A more detailed bushfire risk assessment would be undertaken following finalisation of the design and layout. Requirements in terms of setbacks would be assessed during detailed design and would inform the layout of the Project. Vegetation in the conservation zone (E3 zone) would not be cleared to provide for bushfire buffers (APZs), but rather the IMT site would be designed to meet the aims and objectives of the guidelines. Therefore, the ecological values of the conservation zone would not be compromised by the requirement for APZs.
		The 'hierarchy of controls' for risk during design, construction and operations should be applied to eliminate risks and to manage health and safety.	Further assessment of risk and health and safety issues would be undertaken as part of the Stage 2 SSD application, including consideration of the hierarchy of risk, including elimination of risks and impacts where possible.
		The likelihood of encountering UXO or munitions has not been identified in the PRA.	The likelihood of, and potential impacts of encountering unexploded ordnance (UXO) and explosive ordnance waste (EOW) has been considered as detailed in section 15.3 of Chapter 15 – <i>Contamination and soils</i> (with more detailed information provided in the <i>Preliminary Remediation Action Plan</i> (included as part of Technical Paper 5 (EIS Volume 5a) – <i>Environmental Site Assessment</i>)).
		No reference to world's best practice for hazard and risk avoidance or management.	The implementation of best practice management practices for the construction and operation of the IMT facility would be investigated during the detailed design phase, assuming approval of the Stage 1 SSD application. Management measures including international best practice would be included in the mitigations proposed as part of the Stage 2 SSD application.
	Contamination and soils	Recommends undertaking a detailed site walkover of all three rail access options and update the Phase 1 ESAs.	Since the public exhibition of the EIS, MIC has selected the southern rail access option as its preferred option. MIC recognises that further investigation of the southern rail access option alignment is required including targeted intrusive investigation to gather data on soils and groundwater quality so that the suitability of development on this site from a contamination perspective can be confirmed and the management and/or remediation options can be identified. These investigations will be undertaken as part of Stage 2 SSD applications. MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.
		Recommends preparing the CEMP, UXO and EOW plans prior to the commencement of construction activities.	As noted in section 15.5.1 of Chapter 15 – <i>Contamination and soils</i> of the EIS, investigation and removal (if required) of EOW and UXO is to be undertaken during the Early Works development phase. However, before the Early Works phase, and in accordance with the requirements of the Remediation Action Plan (RAP), a UXO management plan would be developed for the Project site. This plan would detail a framework for addressing the discovery of UXO or EOW. In addition, section 15.5.1 states that before construction commences, and in accordance with the remediation goals and strategy outlined in the RAP, a remediation program would be prepared and implemented. This includes a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) which would be prepared by the contractor for all excavation and remediation works and would include requirements for decontamination facilities at the site. MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
		Limited information on the ecological and human health risk associated with offsite migration of impacted groundwater.	<p>Section 15.4.1 of Chapter 15 – <i>Contamination and soils</i> of the EIS identifies the need for further testing of groundwater to be undertaken beneath the north-western area of the IMT, adjacent to the ABB site. The EIS recommends that further testing be undertaken, in order to evaluate the current concentrations of chlorinated hydrocarbon compounds and evaluate if additional action is likely to be required to manage contaminated groundwater in this area (refer to section 15.5 of Chapter 15 – <i>Contamination and soils</i> of the EIS).</p> <p>MIC is currently conducting further site contamination testing which will result in an update of the RAP.</p>
		The ASC NEPM amendments includes changes which have not been fully captured in the ESA assessments including hydrocarbon health screening levels and associated laboratory analysis.	<p>The majority of the contaminated site investigation works were completed prior to the National Environment Protection (Assessment of Site Contamination) Measure (ASC NEPM) amendments and therefore the hydrocarbon health screening levels and associated laboratory analysis have changed since the original testing was conducted.</p> <p>As stated above, MIC is currently conducting further site contamination testing which will implement these new screening and laboratory techniques. The results from these investigations will be provided as part of Stage 2 SSD applications.</p>
		Remediation options for sediment and groundwater contamination have not been provided.	As noted above, further groundwater testing is currently being conducted, once the results of these investigations are finalised, management measures would be confirmed. The <i>Preliminary Remediation Action Plan</i> (RAP) included in Technical Paper 5 (EIS Volume 5a) – <i>Environmental Site Assessment</i> identifies specific areas of soil contamination requiring remediation as part of Project works. The RAP is provisional and the final RAP would be developed by the Project contractor prior to construction.
		Suggests that contamination remediation works on the site would trigger requirements for licensing from the EPA.	As identified in section 4.4 of Chapter 4 – <i>Planning and statutory requirements</i> of the EIS, a preliminary assessment of the Project against the activities listed in Schedule 1 of The EPA has determined the Project is not a scheduled activity under Schedule 1 of the (NSW) <i>Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997</i> and therefore no Environment Protection Licence is required for the Project. However, once the design and operation of the Project has been further developed, licensing requirements (for example a licence for chemical storage) for the Project would be reassessed to confirm if additional approvals are necessary.
	Hydrology, groundwater and water quality	Recommends that a revised flood impacts assessment be carried out to address inconsistencies and inadequacies in the flood model.	<p>The modelling of the Georges River was based on cross sections from the MIKE-11 model built for the 1999 Flood study. No additional hydrographic survey was collected for this stage of assessment; however, a 2 dimensional hydraulic model would be completed in preparation of the Stage 2 SSD application to provide a more thorough understanding of flood behaviour. At Cambridge Avenue, the MIKE11 model included twin culverts. These culverts were also included in the modelling for the Stage 1 SSD assessment. At this time, measures to reduce afflux (afflux refers to the increase in flood level as a result of a structure (such as a bridge) in a river or waterway) upstream of the Project area (including at Cambridge Avenue) will be further investigated as necessary.</p> <p>This level of assessment is considered appropriate for a Stage 1 SSD application and meets the SEARs and DoE EIS guidelines. MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on these recommendations.</p>
		Undertake a more detailed review of flood impacts upstream of and on Cambridge Avenue.	
		Provide more detailed impacts due to climate change.	
	Human health risks and impacts	Aspects of the Project that have the potential increase stress and anxiety need to be considered and scrutinized more closely given the already very high stress levels in the community.	As discussed throughout the <i>Health Impact Assessment</i> (HIA) (Technical Paper 16 (EIS Volume 9) – <i>Health Impact Assessment</i>) any changes in a community and environment may result in increased levels of stress and anxiety amongst community members. The HIA acknowledges that the local community already has a very high psychological distress level (refer to section 3.5 of the HIA). The impact of changes would differ for different people, depending on their ability to adapt to and manage change. A range of mitigation measures are proposed (as detailed in Chapter 28 - <i>Environmental management framework</i>) which would assist in avoiding and minimising the impacts on the health of the local population.
		Impacts on recreational facilities should be further investigated and appropriately offset with additional facilities.	<p>As outlined in Chapter 23 – <i>Property and infrastructure</i> and Chapter 24 – <i>Social and economic impacts</i> of the EIS, some impacts on recreational facilities may occur during construction (and can be managed). Other long term impacts relate to changes in landscape character and mitigation measures as proposed in Chapter 22 – <i>Visual and urban design</i> of the EIS to reduce these impacts.</p> <p>MIC has selected the southern rail access option as its preferred option. Ongoing access and use of the Northern Powerhouse Land and the Casula Powerhouse Arts Centre C recreational areas would not be affected by the Project with the use of the southern rail access option. Therefore, no change in health benefits from access to or use of recreational facilities is expected as a result of the Project.</p>
		The EIS should identify a range of commitments to address health risks with performance targets.	<p>A Statement of Commitments is a requirement of the old Part 3A planning process under the EP&A Act. As outlined in Chapter 4 – <i>Planning and Statutory Requirements</i> of the EIS, the Project is being assessed under Part 4, Division 4.1 of the EP&A Act as a SSD application. Formal statement of commitments is not required under the Part 4 SSD requirements.</p> <p>In Chapter 28 – <i>Environmental management framework</i>, a list of environmental management and mitigation measures for the Project have been provided. This list includes measures which are mandatory and are firm mitigation commitments as well as those that are subject to review during the Stage 2 SSD approvals and/or detailed design. During detailed design, further assessments would be undertaken and a more refined statement of commitments would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD application.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
		Argues the screening level HIA should have identified green space, landscape character and recreation as requiring more detailed assessment in the HIA. These elements provide health benefits to the community.	<p>It is noted that the screening stage of the <i>Health Impact Assessment</i> (HIA) (Technical Paper 16 – <i>Health Impact Assessment</i> of the EIS) was undertaken in consultation with the HIA Reference Group which included LCC.</p> <p>The key issues identified and addressed in detail within the HIA are those that were agreed within the HIA Reference Group. The screening level evaluation of green space and ecology is presented in section 4.4.6 of the HIA (Technical Paper 16 – <i>Health Impact Assessment</i>) where the potential for impacts identified related to the change in landscape character from open/vegetated land to a mix of a built and vegetated environment. Landscape character and visual impacts have been further assessed in section 4.4.7 of the HIA. Impacts on recreational uses in the surrounding areas have been assessed in section 4.8.1 of the HIA. The Project involves some improvement of vegetated areas along the Georges River and changes to the remainder of the Project site. Moderate to high visual</p>

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
			impacts have been identified for a few areas within Casula where the built part of the site is visible. These impacts were identified as both positive and negative and are largely based on different levels of perception from the community (where the site is visible). The HIA identified mitigation measures that can be implemented to minimise visual impacts for the local community. These aspects are to be addressed in more detail in the detailed design phase.
		The proponent should commit to providing a financial and physical assistance package to NSW Health to implement a range of public health initiatives. In particular, recommends that a detailed communications strategy (including aspects of prevention, treatment and management of respiratory issues) in conjunction with the Sydney South West Area Heath Service targets the community as well as health professionals, rather than relying solely on GPs to manage the issue.	The calculations presented in the HHRA show the Project would not result in any significant impact on the existing health of the local population. Developing a communications strategy around treatment and management of respiratory issues would imply that the project was contributing detrimentally to health conditions of the local population, which is not the case. Therefore MIC does not consider the recommended strategy is required.
	Community consultation	<p>Community consultation process has been inadequate and has failed to attract significant community interest. Key concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> consultation has not adequately engaged with community members from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds; no use of creation or rigorous engagement strategies; and only limited to adjoining suburbs; has had a low response rate. 	<p>Community consultation for the Project began in 2010 and has been ongoing since that time. MIC (and before MIC was established, the Commonwealth Department of Finance) has provided community members with information about the Project via its website, community newsletters and in community information sessions held in 2012, 2013 and 2014.</p> <p>MIC has met regularly with relevant stakeholders, including Liverpool City Council, and MIC has presented to the Council's No Intermodal Committee, among other community and special interest groups. MIC has also met one-on-one with some highly engaged community members. Community awareness of the Project is high and public discourse about it has been wide and undertaken over a significant period of time. This is reflected in the coverage of the Project in the local media, with 114 news articles and 48 letters to the editor published in local papers since July 2013 when MIC began monitoring the media.</p> <p>MIC's community consultation on the EIS has exceeded the requirements set out in NSW DP&E's <i>Guidelines for Major Project Community Consultation</i>, October 2007. MIC's community consultation about the EIS, the exhibition and submission process has included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a community brochure (delivered to over 12,000 homes in Wattle Grove, Moorebank and Casula); the MIC website (which recorded 2,733 views and 1,780 new users during the exhibition period); a 24-page EIS booklet (available at libraries and other community spaces with the EIS, and community information sessions); and three community information sessions (attended by 74 community members). <p>As well as traditional engagement methods, MIC adopted some innovative approaches to engage members of the local community, including through a Citizens' Jury. The Citizens' Jury was formed to develop a public benefits package containing measures chosen by local community members. The Citizens' Jury also represented an innovative approach to raising awareness of the Project and its benefits, and to promoting understanding of the Project's impacts among a representative sample of community members.</p> <p>Interpreting services are available to community members and these services were specifically advertised during the EIS exhibition via the MIC website and a brochure that was distributed to 12,000 local homes. The MIC website also has a 'Google Translate' function. That said, information from the bureau of statistics indicates that, although a significant proportion of the local community is from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds, English literacy levels are strong. This is supported by the fact that the translate function on the MIC website was not used during the exhibition period and the interpreting service was used once in 2014. This demonstrates there was not a significant need to provide additional services for people from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds.</p> <p>In addition to the consultation undertaken with the local community, communication with the broader community about the EIS was undertaken. Advertisements about the EIS were published in The <i>Daily Telegraph</i>, The <i>Liverpool Leader</i> and The <i>Liverpool Champion</i>, on the NSW DP&E website and via the Project website. A media release was issued at the start of the exhibition, which generated news articles in the local papers notifying readers about the EIS exhibition, the information session times and details on how to make a submission.</p>
	Greenhouse gas	The EIS has played down the significance of impact by comparing the number with state and national emission calculations, however no comparison between other development of similar size has been made.	<p>The assessment of greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the Project was undertaken to meet the NSW Sectary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (NSW SEARs) and the Commonwealth DOE EIS Guidelines. The NSW and Commonwealth requirements relevant to the greenhouse gas assessment are identified in Table 19.1 of Chapter 19 – <i>Greenhouse gas assessment</i> of the EIS.</p> <p>Prior to going on exhibition the EIS was reviewed by NSW DP&E and DoE for adequacy against the NSW SEARs and the Commonwealth EIS guidelines.</p>
		Lacks details on mitigations and commitments. World's best practice measures should be proposed.	<p>The implementation of best practice management practices for the construction and operation of the IMT facility would be investigated during the detailed design phase, assuming approval of the Stage 1 SSD application. Management measures including international best practice would be included in the mitigations proposed as part of the Stage 2 SSD application.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
		Cumulative greenhouse gas emissions with the SIMTA site have not been considered.	An initial assessment of the cumulative greenhouse gas emission impacts from the Moorebank IMT and the SIMTA project has been undertaken and discussed in section 27.2.3 of Chapter 27 – <i>Cumulative impacts</i> of the EIS. A more detailed assessment would be undertaken during detailed design and the assessment provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD application.
		The greenhouse gas assessment does not mention the <i>Approved Methods for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants</i> in NSW (DEC 2005), the <i>National Environmental Protection Measures for Ambient Air Quality</i> (National Protection Council) and the <i>Environmental Health Risk Assessment: Guidelines</i> for assessing human health risks from environmental hazards (enHealth, 2012). This is a requirement of SEARs.	The requirements of the SEARs is addressed in section 17.1.1 of Chapter 17 <i>Local air quality</i> and sections 5, 6 and 9 of Technical Paper 7 (EIS Volume 6) – <i>Local air quality impact assessment</i> in Volume 6 of this EIS with respect to the <i>Approved Methods for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants</i> in NSW (DEC 2005), the <i>National Environmental Protection Measures for Ambient Air Quality</i> (National Protection Council) The Australian Greenhouse Office (AGO 2006) reference is relevant to the greenhouse gas assessment in Chapter 19 – <i>Greenhouse gas assessment</i> . The enHealth reference is relevant to Chapter 25 – <i>Human health risks and impacts</i> .

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
			Prior to going on exhibition the EIS was reviewed by NSW DP&E and DoE for adequacy against the NSW SEARs and the Commonwealth EIS guidelines.
		Assessment does not address life-of-project in regards to sourcing of materials and GHG impacts.	<p>The life of the Project including construction and operational phases was assessed in the Greenhouse Gas Assessment as part of the EIS (refer to Technical Paper 9 (EIS Volume 6) – <i>Greenhouse Gas Assessment</i>). This consisted of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope 1 emissions – direct emissions from sources within the boundaries of Project operations such as fuel combustion within vehicles, plant and equipment; and • Scope 2 emissions – indirect emissions through the generation of purchased/consumed electricity, heat or steam greenhouse gas emissions that would potentially be generated on an annual basis. <p>The Greenhouse Gas Assessment did not include Scope 3 emissions as part of the Project's life (indirect emissions that are not directly sourced, owned or controlled by the Project, i.e. sourcing of materials) because they do not require mandatory reporting under the <i>National Greenhouse Accounts Factors 2014</i>).</p>
	Biodiversity	Argues that aquatic ecology field surveys should be undertaken to substantiate claims that there are no species currently listed under the NSW Fisheries Management Act 1994 recorded in the catchment and that none are likely to occur in the affected stretch of the Georges River. This should include targeted searches for Macquarie Perch in accordance with the relevant guidelines.	<p>The <i>Ecological Impact Assessment</i> was prepared in accordance with NSW Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) guidelines and incorporated previous detailed aquatic surveys from the Georges river and adjoining in the site (Gehrke et al. 2004, Hyder Consulting 2012). This level of assessment is considered appropriate for a Stage 1 SSD and meets the requirements of the SEARs and DoE EIS guidelines.</p> <p>Further detailed studies will be undertaken as part of Stage 2 SSD applications.</p>
		The assessment of significance should be revised to not only include an assessment against the relevant legislation but also to consider the proposed clearing of <i>Grevillea parviflora subsp. parviflora</i> and <i>Persoonia nutans</i> in accumulation with the proposed clearing in the neighbouring SIMTA project.	<p>The impacts of the proposed development on <i>Persoonia nutans</i> and <i>Grevillea parviflora subsp. parviflora</i> have been assessed in the <i>Ecological Impact Assessment</i> (Technical Paper 3 (EIS Volume 4) – <i>Ecological Impact Assessment</i>) against relevant state and federal legislation. The potential impacts on these species have been proposed to be offset as outlined in the Biodiversity Offset Strategy. The strategy identifies that the proposed offsets are proportional to the impacts on these species in both size and scale.</p> <p>An assessment of significance is presented in section 4.5 and Table 4.4 of the ecological impact assessment (EIS Volume 3), this assessment has included the Project cumulative impacts with the adjoining SIMTA site, including the potential habitat loss and impacts for locally occurring threatened species, <i>Grevillea parviflora subsp. parviflora</i> and <i>Persoonia nutans</i>. While there is a loss of these locally occurring threatened species, MIC is only responsible for offsetting the loss associated with the Moorebank Project. The loss associated with the SIMTA project will need to be addressed separately.</p>
		The Biodiversity Offset Strategy should be revised in accordance with the most relevant standard and guidelines.	An updated biodiversity offsets strategy (BOS) prepared in accordance with the NSW Biodiversity Offset Policy for Major Projects 2014 (Offset Policy 2014), NSW Framework for Biodiversity Assessment 2014 (FBA) and with regard to OEH comments from the EIS submission has been included in Chapter 8 of this Response to Submissions PPR. The updated BOS will specifically address the requirements of the Offsets Policy 2014 to locate like for like offsets. All residual offset components will be met in accordance with the reasonable steps outlined in this policy.
		Mitigation measures should be revised to provide a greater level of detail and commitment to guide the level of ecological protection across the site during future stages.	<p>Mitigation measures are proposed for all project phases including Early Works, construction and operational phases. In Chapter 28 – <i>Environmental management framework</i>, a list of environmental management and mitigation measures for the Project have been provided. This list includes measures which are mandatory and are firm mitigation commitments as well as those that are subject to review during the Stage 2 SSD approvals and/or detailed design. During detailed design, further assessments would be undertaken and a more refined statement of commitments would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD application.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
	European heritage	Supplementary research should be undertaken to determine further archaeological investigation and salvage is warranted for MAPAD2 Units 1 and 2.	<p>As stated in section 13.1.6 of the <i>European Heritage Impact Assessment</i> (Technical Paper 11 (EIS Volume 8) – <i>European Heritage Impact Assessment</i>), detail on the recommendations for the mitigation and investigation of Units 1 and 2 at MAPAD2 is provided in the Northern Powerhouse Land Addendum Report. Section 14.1.4 of the Northern Powerhouse Land Addendum Report (provided as Appendix 10 of the Aboriginal Heritage Assessment (Technical Paper 10(EIS Volume 7) – <i>Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment</i>) sets out a staged approach to further investigate and define the sequence of deposits at MAPAD2. This work has been further documented in section 7 of this Response to Submissions Report.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
		Significance assessment for the Moorebank Cultural Landscape understates the significance of the landscape and contributing heritage items.	The intangible values are considered to have been addressed sufficiently in the EIS; particularly given that the primary loss of such values is attributable to a separate project – the Moorebank Units Relocation (MUR). As such, the assessable impacts associated with the IMT are the remnant aspects of the landscape only (after the MUR project), which are discussed in section 21.1.4 of Chapter 21 – <i>European heritage</i> .
		Additional investigations required for the rail access options to determine the impacts.	<p>Table 11.1, Figures 11.1a–c and section 11.3 of Technical Paper 11 (EIS Volume 8) – <i>European Heritage Impact Assessment</i> provides details of the impacts associated with the rail access options. This level of details is appropriate for a Stage 1 SSD application and is consistent with the NSW Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (NSW SEARs) and the Commonwealth DOE EIS Guidelines. Further review of impacts would be undertaken as part of the Stage 2 SSD application.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
		Clarification on the relationship with the Liverpool Weir should be made.	The Northern Powerhouse Land Addendum Report provided as Appendix 10 of the Aboriginal Heritage Assessment (Technical Paper 10 (EIS Volume 7) – <i>Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment</i>) presents the research and hypothesis regarding the relationship between the river terrace deposits and the construction of the Liverpool Weir.
		A review of Parish Maps, Crown Plans and NSW LPI data should be undertaken.	Section 3 and section 4 of Technical Paper 11 (EIS Volume 8) – <i>European Heritage Impact Assessment</i> provides a review of, and details of the Parish Maps, Crown Plans and NSW Land and Property Information.

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
	Indigenous heritage	A clearer impact assessment and route comparison listing for the three options and associated mitigation measures.	Section 13 of Technical Paper 10 (EIS Volume 7) – <i>Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment</i> discusses the impacts of the three rail access options. This level of details is appropriate for a Stage 1 SSD application and is consistent with the NSW Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (NSW SEARs) and the Commonwealth DOE EIS Guidelines. Further review of impacts would be undertaken as part of the Stage 2 SSD.
		Mitigation measures are currently listed for the site, although these are not delineated for the separated route options. Consequently, the requirements for each route option are not clear.	Mitigation measures for all three rail access options are defined in Chapter 14 – <i>Aboriginal heritage impact assessment</i> of the EIS (refer Figure 14.1 and Figures 13 a to c for spatial representation of values). As stated in the section 14.1.9 of Technical Paper 10 – <i>Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment</i> (EIS Volume 7), additional investigation is required to assess the impacts of the southern rail access option, through a combined archaeological and geotechnical program. This level of details is appropriate for a Stage 1 SSD application and is consistent with the NSW Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (NSW SEARs) and the Commonwealth DOE EIS Guidelines.
		There are a number of listed Aboriginal sites which have been identified by existing heritage reports and the AHIMS register in the area. The rationale for not assessing these sites should be discussed or alternatively reviewed.	The details provided in Technical Paper 10 (EIS Volume 7) – <i>Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment</i> of the EIS on Aboriginal sites shows the features/sites identified through the work conducted for the Project EIS (investigations) and other features/sites registered with AHIMS. The features correspond to sites MA1, MA2, MA8, MA5, MA3, MA2, MA6, MA7 and MA10, running south to north. Given that these sites were identified through the EIS studies, it is considered that the EIS work is 'adequate' and that no further work, other than that already identified in the EIS as being required for further investigating or mitigating these sites is required for the Stage 1 SSD approval.
	Property and infrastructure	The preferred rail access option should be determined to allow more targeted assessment.	As noted above, a preferred site layout and the southern rail access option has been selected for the combined precinct and is described in section 7.4 of the Response to Submissions Report. The indicative layout would be further developed during detailed design and details would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD applications.
		Further detail on capacity of utility services should be provided in light of upgrades required.	As discussed in Chapter 24 – <i>Property and infrastructure</i> of the EIS, ongoing consultation with utility asset owners and road and rail authorities would occur during the detailed design and construction phases of the Project. During detailed design an assessment of infrastructure capacity would be undertaken and infrastructure service arrangements and the requirement for any upgrades would be confirmed.
	Social and economic impacts	The decision on the preferred rail access option should be based upon the best social outcomes and community views.	The EIS considered three rail access options and presented management and mitigation measures for each option, so that the best social outcomes were achieved (through mitigation) and community views were considered. As noted above, the preferred Project concept, which includes a combined Moorebank IMT and SIMTA precinct, includes the use of the southern rail access option. This connection would provide access to both the SIMTA site and the Moorebank IMT site, allowing for the development of a combined IMT precinct across both sites.
		Need for a Statement of commitments detailing mitigation including a detailed consultation program.	A Statement of Commitments is a requirement of the old Part 3A planning process under the EP&A Act. As outlined in Chapter 4 – <i>Planning and Statutory Requirements</i> of the EIS, the project is being assessed under Part 4, Division 4.1 of the EP&A Act as a State significant development (SSD) application. Formal statement of commitments is not required under the Part 4 SSD requirements. In Chapter 28 – <i>Environmental management framework</i> of the EIS, a list of environmental management and mitigation measures for the Project have been provided. This list includes measures which are mandatory and are firm mitigation commitments as well as those that are subject to review during the Stage 2 SSD approvals and/or detailed design. During detailed design, further assessments would be undertaken and a more refined statement of commitments would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD application. It will be a requirement of the IMT operator to undertake construction and operation of the IMT in accordance with the Project approvals (Stage 1 and Stage 2 SSD approvals) (stated mitigations) and any conditions of approval. MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.
		Explore opportunities to encourage the development of construction courses in Macquarie Field TAFE Campus and the Bankstown Campus.	The provision of construction courses at education facilities is outside of the scope and jurisdiction of MIC.
		Net benefits for the Liverpool LGA should be estimated including costs from increased congestion, road maintenance, air pollution, environmental, social impacts.	As outlined in the EIS, the Project will have economic, social and environmental benefits through improved productivity, reduced costs of road damage, congestion and accidents and better environmental outcomes. The benefits of the Project are detailed in section 3.2 of Chapter 3 – <i>Strategic context and need for the Project</i> of the EIS. MIC recognises there are also a number of environmental impacts as a result of the project, these impacts related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> traffic congestion along some of the local roads and regional arterials within the vicinity of the Project; exceedance of noise assessment criteria and the impacts this has on health and lifestyle; the potential for local air quality impacts due to diesel trains and trucks in the local environment; and visual amenity Impacts have been assessed qualitatively at this stage, which is appropriate for a Stage 1 SSD concept EIS and is consistent with the NSW Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (NSW SEARs) and the Commonwealth EIS Guidelines, However more detailed quantitative assessments would be undertaken during detailed design, once the final layout of the Project has been confirmed. Mitigation measures would be tailored to reflect the final design of the Project and the expected impacts. MIC considers the EIS does assess the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures, recognising that these measures would be further assessed and reviewed as part of the Stage 2 SSD applications.
	Sustainability	Need for a defined commitment which ensures the utilisation of ESD principles through design, construction and operational phases.	A Statement of Commitments is a requirement of the old Part 3A planning process under the EP&A Act. As outlined in Chapter 4 – <i>Planning and Statutory Requirements</i> of the EIS, the project is being assessed under Part 4, Division 4.1 of the EP&A Act as a State Significant Development (SSD) application. Formal statement of commitments is not required under the Part 4 SSD requirements. In Chapter 28 – <i>Environmental management framework</i> , a list of environmental management and mitigation measures for the Project have been provided. This list includes measures which are mandatory and are firm mitigation commitments as well as those that are

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
			<p>subject to review during the Stage 2 SSD approvals and/or detailed design. During detailed design, further assessments would be undertaken and a more refined statement of commitments would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD application.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the IMT operator to undertake construction and operation of the IMT in accordance with the Project approval (stated mitigations) and any conditions of approval.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
	Waste	Recommends that a Waste Management Strategy be provided for each stage of the project.	<p>Noted. Section 26.3.3 of Chapter 26 – <i>Waste and resource management</i> of the EIS details the mitigation and management measures that have been adopted for the Project and which would be integrated into the Early Works, construction, operation and detailed design processes. The contractor responsible for the construction and operation of the IMT would be required to develop a strategy which is in accordance with these mitigation measures.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
		Further quantitative information required on the potential impact of the Project to generate waste streams.	<p>Further quantitative information on waste generation would be undertaken once the design and layout of the Project has been confirmed. This would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD documentation.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
		Commitment should be made to develop site treatment facilities for sewerage treatment and grey water recycling.	<p>As identified in section 7.11.4 of Chapter 7 – <i>Project built form and operations</i> of the EIS, an onsite treatment option may be provided and would include using a packaged sewage treatment plant (STP), which could be developed to service the IMEX and interstate terminal buildings, administration buildings and maintenance and repair buildings of the Project. The requirement for and feasibility of providing an STP would be assessed at detailed design.</p> <p>As identified in section 9.4 of Chapter 9 – <i>Project sustainability</i> of the EIS, where possible, rainwater harvesting and surface water runoff management would be utilised for watering of gardens and landscaping to minimise water impacts on the natural environment. In addition, where possible, rainwater could be captured from roofed areas, treated through adequate first-flush treatments, and directed to holding tanks for re-use in toilet flushing or process water.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation, based on the requirement to undertake a feasibility assessment of the site treatment facilities and if appropriate adopt a sewerage treatment and grey water recycling program.</p>
		Relevant guidelines and standards are absent and should be reviewed.	Chapter 9 – <i>Project sustainably</i> of the EIS identifies the standards and guidelines applicable to the concept of sustainability, which includes waste minimisation. This includes both Australian and NSW guidelines and relevant policies and rating tools.
	Environmental Management Framework	The Independent Environmental Audit and Annual Environmental Management Reports should be disclosed on MIC website.	<p>MIC has been collecting data about the existing environmental conditions at various locations near the Project site since August 2012. This includes information on noise, air and water quality. This information provides a baseline against which the Project's impacts are being assessed and it will also be used to monitor the terminal's impacts once it is operating.</p> <p>This noise, air and water quality monitoring data – including raw data and graphs of key results have been available on the MIC website since January 2014 and is updated monthly (http://www.micl.com.au/environment/monitoring-results.aspx).</p> <p>Any future reporting (including Annual Environmental Management Reports) if a requirement of project approval will be made available at the appropriate time.</p>
		Need for immediate public notification of any breaches of standards or incidents which have the potential to harm human health or cause significant environmental damage.	<p>The IMT operator will adopt a notification process to respond to, in a timely manner, any breaches of standards or incidents. This system will operate during both construction and operation of the terminal.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
		Consult with the community and Council regarding the future Environmental Management Framework.	Further consultation with the community and LCC would be undertaken as part of the Stage 2 SSD application.
		Provide firm commitments on mitigation measures.	<p>A Statement of Commitments is a requirement of the old Part 3A planning process under the EP&A Act. As outlined in Chapter 4 – <i>Planning and Statutory Requirements</i> of the EIS, the project is being assessed under Part 4, Division 4.1 of the EP&A Act as a State Significant Development (SSD) application. Formal statement of commitments is not required under the Part 4 SSD requirements.</p> <p>In Chapter 28 – <i>Environmental management framework</i> of the EIS, a list of environmental management and mitigation measures for the Project have been provided. This list includes measures which are mandatory and are firm mitigation commitments as well as those that are subject to review during the Stage 2 SSD approvals and/or detailed design. During detailed design, further assessments would be undertaken and a more refined statement of commitments would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD application.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the IMT operator to undertake construction and operation of the IMT in accordance with the Project approval (Stage 1 and Stage 2 SSD approvals) (stated mitigations) and any conditions of approval.</p>
	Visual and urban design	Recommends that a site specific Development Control Plan be prepared for the site as part of the planning proposal process.	<p>MIC has lodged a planning proposal with NSW DP&E to amend the <i>Liverpool Local Environment Plan 2008</i> (exhibited concurrently with the EIS). The proposed zoning is detailed in Chapter 23 – <i>Property and infrastructure</i> of the EIS. In addition, the planning proposal seeks to introduce planning controls including height and floor area ratio restrictions to the main IMT site, which are consistent with development controls for the IN1 General Industrial zone.</p> <p>Further details on the proposed planning controls are provided in section 7.4 of Chapter 7 – <i>Project built form and operations</i> of the EIS.</p>
		Recommends a more detailed assessment of visual impacts is required, including the rail accesses, impacts on the Casual Powerhouse and parklands and impacts on potential residential/mixed use development sites surrounding the subject site.	<p>The design and layout of the Project is yet to be confirmed. Therefore, once the design is confirmed a more detailed assessment of impacts can be undertaken, which will be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD application.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
		A lighting regime is required to illustrate compliance with AS 4282 - 1997 Control of the obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting.	The lighting design would be determined by the layout of the Project, which would be confirmed at detailed design and assessed as part of the Stage 2 SSD application. Mitigation measures to be considered during detailed design include designing lighting to minimise light spill; the use of shields on luminaires to minimise brightness effects; and low reflection pavement surfaces.
Hurstville City Council	Hydrology, groundwater and water quality	Concerned with impacts on the Georges River.	<p>As discussed in section 16.2 of Chapter 16 – <i>Hydrology, groundwater and water quality</i> of the EIS, water quality of the Georges River has been identified as an important issue for the management of the Project. Further investigations would be undertaken as part of the Stage 2 SSD application and this would include detailed modelling and subsequent management of stormwater quality to ensure there is no impact to the Georges River and Anzac Creek waterways.</p> <p>An area of high flood risk is identified along the lower terraces of the Georges River where there is significant riparian vegetation. This area exceeds the 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) for a significant flood event. As such, no development is proposed in this area and the area will be retained as a ‘conservation area’. No vegetation clearing in this area is proposed.</p>
	Biodiversity	Concerned with impacts on flora and fauna.	Chapter 13 – <i>Biodiversity</i> of the EIS provides a summary of the potential impacts of the Project on the existing biodiversity within and surrounding the Project, which is based on the findings of the <i>Ecological Impact Assessment</i> contained in Volume 4. The Project will result in vegetation clearing and habitation disturbance, the impacts of which are irreversible. Table 29.6 in Chapter 29 – <i>Environmental risk analysis</i> of the EIS identifies that without any mitigation the consequence of the impacts are major. However, the impacts are expected to reduce to ‘moderate’ if the mitigation measures as detailed in the EIS are put in place. This includes: retention of the conservation area along the Georges River; measures to minimise the likelihood of flora and fauna injury or mortality and development and implementation of a biodiversity offset strategy. An updated biodiversity offsets strategy (BOS) prepared in accordance with the NSW Biodiversity Offset Policy for Major Projects 2014 (Offset Policy 2014), NSW Framework for Biodiversity Assessment 2014 (FBA) and with regard to OEH comments from the EIS submission has been included in Chapter 8 of this Response to Submissions Report.
Campbelltown City Council	General	Lack of a combined master plan for the Moorebank precinct.	Since exhibition of the EIS, an in-principle agreement has been reached between MIC and SIMTA, whereby SIMTA would become the future developer and operator of a precinct-wide intermodal facility and associated warehousing across both the MIC and SIMTA sites. This Response to Submissions report contains a preferred project design (proposed amendments to the development) which details the proposed layout and associated impacts of a precinct-wide intermodal facility. The Response to Submissions report will be exhibited for the public to review and make further submissions prior to NSW DP&E approval of the Stage 1 SSD application.
		Lack of co-ordination between SIMTA and the Moorebank IMT proposal leading to concerns over potential cumulative impacts.	
		Concerned with the lack of certainty around rail access, with three options proposed. Recommends that one option be selected.	A preferred site layout and the southern rail access option has been selected for the combined precinct and is described in section 7.4 of the Response to Submissions report. The indicative layout would be further developed during detailed design and details would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD applications. The Response to Submissions report will be exhibited for the public to review and make further submissions prior to NSW DP&E approval of the Stage 1 SSD application approval for the Project. Campbelltown City Council and the community will also have the opportunity to provide further comment during the Stage 2 SSD application process.
		Concerned with the timing of the rail link and recommends the rail link be operational prior to commencement of terminal operations.	MIC acknowledges this concern from Campbelltown City Council, however the rail link needs to be constructed consecutively with the terminal construction. There is no economic or environmental benefit in building the rail access link in advance of construction for the IMT.

	<p>Lack of certainty regarding road/traffic impacts. Recommends that further investigation be undertaken including impacts on Cambridge Avenue.</p>	<p>The traffic impacts of the Project have been assessed as detailed in Chapter 11 – <i>Traffic, transport and access</i> of the EIS and <i>Technical Paper 1– Traffic, Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment</i> (EIS Volume 3). The traffic study was undertaken in consultation and input from TfNSW and RMS. An independent peer review of Technical Paper 1 – <i>Traffic, Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment</i> of the EIS has been undertaken and a letter endorsing the technical paper and the approach is included in Appendix G (EIS Volume 2) of the EIS.</p> <p>Traffic impacts on the wider network, including local roads have been assessed using intersection performance modelling software (Signalised and unsignalised Intersection Design and Research Aid (SIDRA)) for a number of intersections within and surrounding the Project site.</p> <p>The SIDRA modelling rates intersection performance based on a Level of Service (LoS). Table 1.1 below shows this LoS criteria (also found in Table 11.2 in Chapter 11 – <i>Traffic, transport and access</i> of the EIS.</p> <p>Table 1.1 LoS criteria for intersections</p> <table><tr><th>LoS</th><th>Average delay (seconds per vehicle)</th><th>Traffic signals, roundabout</th><th>Give-way and stop signs</th></tr><tr><td>A</td><td>Less than 14</td><td>Good operation.</td><td>Good operation.</td></tr><tr><td>B</td><td>15 to 28</td><td>Good with acceptable delays and spare capacity.</td><td>Acceptable delays and spare capacity.</td></tr><tr><td>C</td><td>29 to 42</td><td>Satisfactory</td><td>Satisfactory, but accident study required.</td></tr><tr><td>D</td><td>43 to 56</td><td>Operating near capacity.</td><td>Near capacity and accident study required.</td></tr><tr><td>E</td><td>57 to 70</td><td>At capacity. At signals, incidents will cause excessive delays; roundabouts require other control mode.</td><td>At capacity; requires other control mode.</td></tr><tr><td>F</td><td>Greater than 71</td><td>Unsatisfactory with excessive queuing.</td><td>Unsatisfactory with excessive queuing; requires other control mode.</td></tr></table> <p>Source: RMS <i>Guide to Traffic Generating Developments</i>, Version 2.2, 2002</p> <p>The results of the modelling are provided in Table 11.16 of Chapter 11 – <i>Traffic, transport and access</i> of the EIS. MIC acknowledges that the traffic modelling show road network upgrades would be required to maintain all intersections in the vicinity of the Project site to an acceptable level of service, except the Hume Highway and Reilly Street intersection and Moorebank Avenue and M5 Motorway interchange. These upgrades are required to accommodate future background traffic growth (without the Project). However, there are no significant changes to intersection performance between the ‘with and ‘without’ Project scenarios as the network in 2030 is predicated to be congested based on background growth projections.</p> <p>Investigations are currently being undertaken to identify measures required to mitigate the impact of traffic generated from the Project on intersections in the surrounding area. These investigations aim to ensure the intersections would operate no worse than they would without the Project.</p> <p>MIC acknowledges the traffic network implications of the Project and the concerns raised by Council and members of the local community, particularly in relation to Cambridge Avenue. The upgrade of Cambridge Avenue is not being considered further because there is an assumption that only light vehicles associated with staff movement would use Cambridge Avenue to access the Moorebank terminal site. The volume of this traffic is predicted to be low and does not trigger a requirement to upgrade Cambridge Avenue. Access into and out of the Moorebank terminal site will be via the intersection of Moorebank Avenue and Anzac Road. The intersection will be signalised with physical barriers to prevent trucks from turning right onto Moorebank Avenue. This will force all vehicles particularly heavy vehicles to turn left onto Moorebank Avenue to access the M5 Motorway/Hume Highway. Similar measures will prevent trucks from entering the site from the south along Moorebank Avenue. Hence trucks associated with the terminal will be unable to access the southern end of Moorebank Avenue and Cambridge Avenue. In the event of an accident on the M5 Motorway/ Moorebank Avenue north of the terminal, the terminal will need to shut down until the traffic is cleared.</p>	LoS	Average delay (seconds per vehicle)	Traffic signals, roundabout	Give-way and stop signs	A	Less than 14	Good operation.	Good operation.	B	15 to 28	Good with acceptable delays and spare capacity.	Acceptable delays and spare capacity.	C	29 to 42	Satisfactory	Satisfactory, but accident study required.	D	43 to 56	Operating near capacity.	Near capacity and accident study required.	E	57 to 70	At capacity. At signals, incidents will cause excessive delays; roundabouts require other control mode.	At capacity; requires other control mode.	F	Greater than 71	Unsatisfactory with excessive queuing.	Unsatisfactory with excessive queuing; requires other control mode.
LoS	Average delay (seconds per vehicle)	Traffic signals, roundabout	Give-way and stop signs																											
A	Less than 14	Good operation.	Good operation.																											
B	15 to 28	Good with acceptable delays and spare capacity.	Acceptable delays and spare capacity.																											
C	29 to 42	Satisfactory	Satisfactory, but accident study required.																											
D	43 to 56	Operating near capacity.	Near capacity and accident study required.																											
E	57 to 70	At capacity. At signals, incidents will cause excessive delays; roundabouts require other control mode.	At capacity; requires other control mode.																											
F	Greater than 71	Unsatisfactory with excessive queuing.	Unsatisfactory with excessive queuing; requires other control mode.																											
	<p>Lack of commitment by the State and Commonwealth Governments to address off site infrastructure needs. Recommends the State Government and MIC enter into a Planning Agreement to upgrade Cambridge Avenue and construct a new link road between Glenfield Road overbridge and Campbelltown Road.</p>	<p>Conditions of approval for the Project will include measures to mitigate the traffic impacts on the surrounding road network. The determining authority for this is Transport for NSW (through NSW DP&E). The process has been used on previous projects and involves modelling of the traffic impacts with the agreement and review of Transport for NSW and RMS. Any traffic impact on local roads caused by the Project is to be mitigated so the impact is eliminated or minimised. An agreement with Transport for NSW will detail the agreed road/transport infrastructure upgrades required to mitigate the impacts of the development of the state transport network and the timing of their delivery.</p> <p>The traffic modelling prepared for the EIS shows road network upgrades would be required to maintain all intersections in the vicinity of the Project site to an acceptable level of service. The traffic impacts of the Project have been assessed as detailed in Chapter 11 of the EIS and <i>Technical Paper 1</i> (EIS Volume 3) – <i>Traffic, Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment</i>. Traffic impacts on the wider network, including local roads have been assessed using intersection performance modelling software (Signalised and unsignalised Intersection Design and Research Aid (SIDRA)) for a number of intersections within and surrounding the Project site.</p> <p>As noted in the planning proposal (exhibited at the same time as the EIS), it is proposed to insert a clause into the <i>Liverpool Local Environment Plan 2008</i> (LLEP) which requires satisfactory arrangements to be made for the provision of regional transport infrastructure required by the IMT, prior to consent being granted for approval of the Planning Proposal to rezone the land for the IMT.</p>																												

			<p>The proposed wording to be inserted into the LLEP includes:</p> <p><u>7.36 Arrangements for regional transport infrastructure for certain land at Moorebank</u></p> <p><i>(1) The objective of this clause is to require satisfactory arrangements to be made for the provision of regional transport infrastructure required as a result of the Moorebank Intermodal Terminal (IMT).</i></p> <p><i>(2) This clause applies to land shown on the Key Sites Map.</i></p> <p><i>(3) Despite any other provision of this Plan, the consent authority must not consent to development for the purposes of the IMT on land to which this clause applies unless the Secretary for NSW DP&E has certified in writing to the consent authority that satisfactory arrangements have been made to contribute to the provision of improvements to regional transport infrastructure and services reasonably required as a result of the development and operation of the IMT.</i></p> <p>A VPA will be negotiated with DP&E, (to the satisfaction of RMS and TfNSW).</p>
		Requests that further discussions be undertaken with Council prior to a decision on the application being made.	<p>Community consultation for the Project began in 2010 and has been ongoing since that time. MIC (and before MIC was established, the Commonwealth Department of Finance) has provided community members and council with information about the Project via its website, community newsletters and in community information sessions held in 2012, 2013 and 2014.</p> <p>A series of meetings were held with elected members and officers of Campbelltown City Council (CCC) prior to and during preparation of the EIS. CCC and was invited to attend the health impact assessment reference group workshop held on 26 July 2012 and 13 December 2012. CCC provided a letter to NSW DP&E commenting on the draft NSW State Director General Requirements (now the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements) and these comments were considered in the preparation of the EIS (refer to Table D3 in the Appendix D (EIS Volume 2) to the EIS which provides a response to the issues raised in the letter.</p> <p>MIC will continue to consult with Campbelltown City Council as the project develops and as part of future Stage 2 SSD applications.</p>
Fairfield City Council	General	<p>Concerns regarding the amenity impacts on Liverpool residents due to increased truck movements as a result of the Project.</p> <p>States that it supports LCC's position regarding the Project.</p>	<p>The impact of the Project on the amenity of the surrounding areas has been discussed in detail throughout the EIS (noise, traffic, air, health etc.). Overall, the EIS that provided the mitigation measures specified in the EIS are applied and effectively implemented during the design, construction and operational phases, the identified environmental impacts on the environment and community would not be significant and were found to be acceptable.</p> <p>MIC's response to LCC's submission is provided in section 5.1 of this Response to Submissions Report.</p>
Bankstown City Council	Traffic and Transport	<p>Heavy vehicle movements generated by the IMT are likely to have an impact on major arterial roads in the Bankstown Local Government Area such as Henry Lawson Drive and Stacey Street.</p> <p>These roads are already operating at capacity and will require significant infrastructure upgrades to accommodate additional traffic. Council requests that along with other proposed traffic mitigation measures that funding to upgrade Henry Lawson Drive (intersection with Milperra Road) and Stacey Street to accommodate increased traffic flow associated the IMT.</p>	<p>The impacts of traffic generated by the Moorebank IMT development have limited impact on the Bankstown Local Government Area. Only traffic associated with warehousing operations is likely to represent a difference in overall traffic impact. This is because containers are already travelling from Port Botany to destinations in the Bankstown local government area on trucks via the Bankstown road network. These containers will continue to be transported to Bankstown LGA, however, with the Moorebank IMT; trucks will travel from Moorebank to their destination in Bankstown instead of from Port Botany to Bankstown. It is anticipated that truck movements along Henry Lawson Drive will decrease between the M5 Motorway and Milperra Road as some container trucks now approach from the west along Newbridge Road/Milperra Road. In the 2030 AM peak hour the project traffic from Moorebank is represented by 37 truck movements approaching this intersection from the west. Of these approximately half is new traffic. Less than 20 trucks per hour are not expected to have an appreciable impact on the operation of the intersection.</p> <p>Stacey Street is a significant distance from Moorebank IMT site, most of the Project traffic is heading to the North West so the impact on Stacey Street would be negligible.</p>
	Water Quality	<p>Concerns relating to management and treatment of stormwater runoff and the impact on water quality in the Georges River.</p>	<p>As discussed on Section 16.2 of Chapter 16 – <i>hydrology, groundwater and water quality</i> of the EIS, water quality has been identified as an important issue for the management of the Project. Further investigations would be undertaken as part of the Stage 2 SSD application and this would include detailed modelling and subsequent management of stormwater quality to ensure there is no impact to Georges River.</p>
		Recognises the need for measures to mitigate the risk of rubbish and litter entering Georges River.	<p>Chapter 26 – <i>Waste and resource management</i> provides an assessment of the waste likely to be generated from the IMT during construction and operation of the Project. This assessment includes litter, paper and food waste generated from a range of sources. Section 26.3 outlines the mitigation measures and the key principles of waste management which includes reduction, re-use, recycling and recovery. Dedicated recycling storage areas and recycling bins would be located throughout the Project site to reduce the amount of rubbish being produced and subsequently entering Georges River.</p> <p>In addition the condition and health of Georges River has been monitored since July 2013, and the water quality monitoring results have been published on the MIC website (http://www.micl.com.au/environment/monitoring-results/water-quality.aspx). This monitoring program is expected to continue throughout the construction and operation of the project.</p>
	Biodiversity	Concerned with the loss of high value and intact vegetation and biodiversity corridors.	<p>Chapter 13 – <i>Biodiversity</i> of the EIS provides a summary of the potential impacts of the Project on the existing biodiversity within and surrounding the Project, which is based on the findings of the <i>Ecological Impact Assessment</i> contained in Volume 4 of the EIS. The Project would result in vegetation clearing and habitation disturbance, the impacts of which are irreversible. Table 29.6 in Chapter 29 – <i>Environmental risk analysis</i> of the EIS identifies that, without mitigation, the consequence of the impacts are major. However, the impacts are expected to reduce to 'moderate' if the mitigation measures as detailed in the EIS are put in place. This includes retention of the conservation area along the Georges River, measures to minimise the likelihood of flora and fauna injury or mortality and development and implementation of a biodiversity offset strategy. A revised biodiversity offset strategy has been developed in accordance with the NSW <i>Biodiversity Offset Policy for Major Projects 2014</i>.</p>

		<p>Concerned with the lack of aquatic habitat and assessment of aquatic threatened species in the EIS.</p>	<p>The biodiversity of the lower reaches of the Georges River has been modified as a result of habitat degradation and changes in abiotic condition such as water flow volumes, velocities, increased nutrients, chemical pollution and invasive species. The degraded condition of this section of the Georges River has led to the presence of disturbance tolerant species which are less sensitive to alternations in environmental conditions. The <i>Ecological Impact Assessment</i> was prepared in accordance with NSW Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) guidelines and the surveys were based on desktop analysis. This approach was endorsed by DP&E and is compliant with the Project SEARs. Detailed surveys of aquatic habitat would be undertaken in preparation of the Stage 2 SSD application(s).</p> <p>Impacts associated with vegetation clearing have been assessed in accordance with state and federal legislation. The Project will be subject to stringent mitigation measures at all stages of development that will include riparian vegetation management and revegetation, bridge design based on NSW Fisheries fish passage requirements for waterway crossings, and appropriately designed stormwater management measures based on further ongoing water quality monitoring. Further extensive biodiversity offsetting in accordance with state and federal guidelines will ensure the Project adequately achieves appropriate biodiversity outcomes.</p>
	Flooding	<p>Concerned with works proposed in high flood risks areas.</p>	<p>As shown on Figure 16.2 in Chapter 16 – <i>Hydrology, groundwater and water quality</i>, the IMT operations on the site will be located out of the high and medium flood risk zones of the Georges River catchment. An area of high flood risk is identified along the lower terraces of the Georges River. This area exceeds the 1% AEP for a significant flood event. As such, no development is proposed in this area and a conservation zone will be developed. Detailed investigation to address any pre-existing flooding issues beyond the site boundary was not required as part of the SEARs for the Stage 1 SSD application process. If required these studies would be considered in further detail as part of the Stage 2 SSD application, once the site layout has been confirmed. Further modelling may also be completed to confirm issues such as flood vulnerability of roads adjacent to the site (including Cambridge Avenue).</p> <p>The internal site drainage system has been designed to convey the 10% AEP flood, in accordance with the LCC Drainage Design Specification Section D5.04. For events above the 10% AEP, the site will be designed to safely convey overland flow to the detention ponds which will be designed to attenuate the runoff from the site to pre-development levels up to the 1% AEP.</p>
	General	<p>Council also requests clear communication channels are established and maintained between Bankstown City Council and MIC throughout construction and operation to the project regarding any impacts the project may have on the Bankstown LGA.</p>	<p>Community consultation for the Project began in 2010 and has been ongoing since that time. MIC (and before MIC was established, the Commonwealth Department of Finance) has provided community members and council with information about the Project via its website, community newsletters and in community information sessions held in 2012, 2013 and 2014.</p> <p>MIC offered EIS briefing sessions to a number of local councils and local members for parliament, including the Bankstown City Council Mayor.</p> <p>MIC will continue to consult with Bankstown City Council as the project develops and as part of future Stage 2 SSD applications.</p>
		<p>Council also requests that air and noise in the surround areas of the project site are closely monitored throughout the construction and operation of the terminal. Request that this information be placed on the website and certified by an independent consultant.</p>	<p>MIC has been monitoring ambient noise and air quality at the site and surrounding areas since March 2014 and the results of this monitoring are available on the MIC Website (http://www.micl.com.au/environment/monitoring-results.aspx). This monitoring program is expected to continue throughout the construction and operation of the project.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive a condition of approval that requires the noise and air quality monitoring results be placed on its website and certified by an independent consultant.</p>

Table B1.2 Responses to key agency submissions

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH)	Biodiversity	Concerned with the loss of threatened ecological communities and threatened species habitats within the Project site.	<p>Chapter 13 – <i>Biodiversity</i> of the EIS provides a summary of the potential impacts on the existing biodiversity within and surrounding the Project, which is based on the findings of the <i>Ecological Impact Assessment</i> contained in Volume 4. The Project will result in vegetation clearing and habitation disturbance, the impacts of which are irreversible. Table 29.6 in Chapter 29 – <i>Environmental risk analysis</i> identifies that without any mitigation the consequence of the impacts are major. However, the impacts are expected to reduce to ‘moderate’ if the mitigation measures as presented in the EIS are implemented. This includes: retention of the conservation area along the Georges River; measures to minimise the likelihood of flora and fauna injury or mortality and development and implementation of a biodiversity offset strategy.</p> <p>Recognising the impact the project will have on biodiversity, section 13.4.2 of Chapter 13 – <i>Biodiversity</i> presents the biodiversity offset strategy which outlines the steps involved with offsetting vegetation loss through a combination of on-site and off-site strategies. An updated biodiversity offsets strategy (BOS) prepared in accordance with the NSW Biodiversity Offset Policy for Major Projects 2014 (Offset Policy 2014), NSW Framework for Biodiversity Assessment 2014 (FBA) and with regard to OEH comments from the EIS submission has been included in Chapter 8 of this Response to Submissions report.</p>
		Concerned with the reliability of the biodiversity assessment of losses and gains.	<p>The Project’s ecological impacts and the proposed biodiversity offsets have been reassessed and quantified using the BioBanking credit calculator and with reference to the Framework for Biodiversity Assessment 2014 and. A revised BOS and summary of the Project’s losses and gains is provided in Chapter 8 of this Response to Submissions report.</p> <p>In relation to the proposed area of rehabilitation, this area adjoins the Georges River and is currently devoid of any native vegetation. The proposed revegetation of this area will strengthen the existing riparian corridor and will contribute to long term ecological gain. To quantify the potential contribution of the proposed rehabilitation areas to the overall offset package these credits have been removed from the calculations, however the BOS has been updated to state that the areas of proposed rehabilitation are likely to provide additional credits and that the quantum will be determined in accordance with the proposed OEH methodology as part of the Biodiversity Offset package and any formal BioBanking agreement.</p>
		Concerned with the level of flexibility proposed in the EIS in regards to proposed offsets and suggests there is a shortfall in offsets for certain vegetation species.	<p>The ecological assessment for the Project (Technical Paper 3 – <i>Ecological Impact Assessment</i>) and the Biodiversity Offset Strategy (refer to Appendix F of the Technical Paper 3 (EIS Volume 4) – <i>Ecological Impact Assessment</i>) both acknowledge that the Project would have a short fall in credits and that MIC is committed to meeting the credit requirements of the FBA.</p> <p>MIC has suggested the riparian forest vegetation which forms part of the same threatened ecological community River-flat eucalypt Forest on Coastal floodplain as the Alluvial woodland vegetation community, as a suitable trade despite the communities not meeting the variation rules within the NSW Framework for Biodiversity Assessment 2014 (FBA). It is acknowledged that OEH has accepted that the Riparian Forest and Alluvial Forest can be considered in the same vegetation formation.</p> <p>A updated BOS will be further developed in accordance with the Offset Policy 2014 FBA and with regard to OEH comments from the EIS submission is included in Chapter 8 of this Response to Submissions report. . This will include a review of the suitability of the Bootland offset and further commitment to meet the residual like for like offset requirements in accordance with the FBA.</p>
		States the boundary of the conservation area does not align with the biodiversity values present within the Project site.	<p>While the boundary of the proposed conservation area incorporates lands covered by the annual exceedance probability (AEP) flood line, this area also corresponds with a significant portion of the ‘High Value’ areas identified by the Ecological integrity classification in Technical Paper 3 (EIS Volume 4) – <i>Ecological Impact Assessment</i> (as shown on Figure 2.3 and discussed in section 2.7 of Technical Paper 3 – <i>Ecological Impact Assessment</i>) and significantly contributes to the conservation and enhancement of the existing riparian areas that are currently restricted in some areas to <20 metres of vegetation. The proposed conservation area will improve on the current minimum width (by a further 10 metres) and will increase the existing vegetated riparian zone, in some areas by >200 m.</p> <p>A revised BOS developed in accordance with the Offset Policy 2014 the FBA and with regard to OEH comments from the EIS submission is included in Chapter 8 of this Response to Submissions report.</p>
		States all attempts need to be made to avoid and minimise impacts on biodiversity.	<p>Additional consideration and discussion of avoidance in accordance with the Offset Policy 2014, the FBA and with regard to OEH comments from the EIS submission is included in Chapter 8 of this Response to Submissions report. Further avoidance and mitigation strategies related to biodiversity would be investigated in more detail during the Stage 2 SSD, once the design for the Project is known.</p>
		States the Ecological Impact Assessment does not meet the Offsets Policy 2014 (with the policy requiring reasonable steps to locate like-for like offsets).	<p>An updated BOS strategy prepared in accordance with the Offset Policy 2014, the FBA and with regard to OEH comments from the EIS submission is included in Chapter 8 of this Response to Submissions report. The updated BOS will specifically address the requirements of the Offsets Policy 2014 to locate like for like offsets. All residual offset components will be met in accordance with the reasonable steps outlined in this policy.</p>
		OEH does not agree to use of a Conservation Agreement under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 as a mechanism to secure the protection of the offset areas.	<p>The biodiversity offset strategy identifies a range of potential in perpetuity conservation outcomes as listed by OEH (http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/cpp/07256conservagreements.pdf) and a preference for BioBanking. The Offsets Policy 2014 identifies BioBanking agreements as a preferred outcome however also acknowledges that through the transition period other options may be considered. An updated BOS strategy prepared in accordance with the Offset Policy 2014, the FBA and with regard to OEH comments from the EIS submission is included in Chapter 8 of this Response to Submissions report. The updated BOS will specifically identify BioBanking as the preferred conservation agreement. MIC are committed to the offsets established in accordance with Principle 5 of the NSW <i>Biodiversity Offset Policy for Major Projects 2014</i> in that it will be enduring, enforceable and auditable and the establishment mechanism will meet the criteria set out in Section 3 of Appendix A of the policy.</p>

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
		Identifies inconsistencies in the extent of the conservation area shown in the EIS and the area shown in the Ecological Impact Assessment. OEH recommends that the 'area available for potential development' not form part of the proposed 'offset area'.	The EIS proposed full build options have identified core conservation and development areas and included an area that is 'available for potential development'. The revised full build scenario presented in the Response to Submissions report (see Chapter 8) has removed the 'area available for potential development' and retains only 'development' and 'conservation/biodiversity offsets'. The majority of the areas previously identified as; 'available for potential development' have been included into the Biodiversity offsets areas. An updated BOS strategy prepared in accordance with the Offset Policy 2014 the FBA and with regard to OEH comments from the EIS submission is included in Chapter 8 of this Response to Submissions report.
		Recommends the use of the E2 Environmental Conservation Zone for land within the defined 'conservation area' as opposed to the proposed E3 Environmental Management.	The proposed conservation area is intended primarily to achieve conservation outcomes. However it is also recognised that some development will be required in the conservation area, being as a minimum the installation of drainage channels from the main IMT portion of the site to the Georges River. This has been taken into consideration in the assessment of the value of the conservation area as an offset site. Furthermore, depending on the outcomes of the community consultation process, consideration would be given to the development of a walking trail and associated facilities in the conservation area. It is recognised that this would reduce the value of the conservation area, and that any reduction in value would need to be offset elsewhere. This matter would be considered further during the Stage 2 SSD application. Taking into consideration these additional objectives of the conservation area, an E3 zone was selected to best address the balance of biodiversity conservation and active social and environmental management outcomes sought by the project. Finally, it is MIC's understanding that the appropriate mechanism for securing offset sites is a BioBanking agreement, and that the zoning of a site in no way influences the effectiveness of a BioBanking agreement or other conservation agreement for an offset site. In other words, the zoning of a site is not a relevant consideration to the establishment of an offset/conservation agreement.
		Recommends addressing further matters in the Ecological Impact Assessment in regards to two threatened flora species (<i>Grevillea parviflora</i> ssp. <i>Parviflora</i> and <i>Persoonia nutans</i>).	The impact of the proposed development on the Georges River riparian zone and the species, <i>Grevillea parviflora</i> ssp. <i>parviflora</i> and <i>Persoonia nutans</i> have been assessed in Technical Paper 3 – <i>Ecological Impact Assessment</i> (EIS Volume 4). The potential impacts on these species and the Georges River are discussed specifically in regards to Section 9.2 of the FBA and with regard to OEH comments from the EIS submission is included in Chapter 8 of this Response to Submissions report. The final biodiversity offset package will ensure that the proposed offsets are proportional to the impacts on these species in both size and scale.
		Recommends that the EIS should address matters related to the impacts on William Howe Regional Park and the Guidelines for developments adjoining land and water managed by DECCW.	As discussed with OEH, the reference to William Howe Regional Park is a typographical error and as such does not require further consideration by MIC. The closest OEH managed lands are Leacock Regional Park that occurs west of the Cumberland and South suburban rail lines and the Georges River Nature Reserve which occurs to the south upstream of the development. The Project site will not directly or indirectly adversely impact on these OEH managed lands.
	Aboriginal and European heritage	Refer to previous comments provided by OEH as part of their review of the EIS during adequacy. Key issues noted at that stage included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> concern regarding the subsurface test excavation program; recommends that options to avoid harm to areas assessed to have high levels of significance should be considered; recommends areas of the 'Georges River Corridor and Terrace' which have been assessed and recommended for conservation should be appropriately nominated for inclusion on the Commonwealth Heritage Listing; recommends that further information be provided on how the perpetual and ongoing protection of any Aboriginal cultural heritage sites cited within the 'conservation zone' will be managed; and recommends any interpretation strategy should integrate the archaeological significance with Aboriginal cultural significance of the lands as well as the geomorphological and non-Indigenous history of the land. 	OEHs comments in relation to Aboriginal and European heritage are noted. These matters would be further assessed during detailed design, once further information on the site layout is known. Information would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD application process. MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on these recommendations. In regards to the comments on the Georges River Corridor Terrace, this matter is outside of the scope of this Project and it is therefore not appropriate for MIC to comment on the significance of the Georges River Corridor and Terraces.
	Hydrology, water quality and groundwater	Refers to previous comments provided by OEH as part of the review of the EIS during adequacy. Key issues noted at that stage included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommends that further investigation be undertaken into potential afflux caused by the bridge structure over Georges River. Argues that there is a need for an emergency management plan.	The modelling of the Georges River was based on cross sections from the MIKE-11 model built for the 1999 Flood study. No additional hydrographic survey was collected for this stage of assessment; however, a two dimensional hydraulic model would be completed in preparation of the Stage 2 SSD application process to provide a more thorough understanding of flood behaviour. At Cambridge Avenue, the MIKE11 model included twin culverts. These culverts were also included in the modelling for the Stage 1 SSD assessment. At this time, measures to reduce afflux (afflux refers to the increase in flood level as a result of a structure (such as a bridge) in a river or waterway) upstream of the Project area (including at Cambridge Avenue) will be further investigated as necessary. This level of assessment is considered appropriate for a Stage 1 SSD application and meets the SEARs and DoE EIS guidelines. In response to the comment on the emergency management plan, mitigation measures included in Chapter 16 – <i>Hydrology, water quality and groundwater</i> of the EIS include the requirement to prepare and implement a flood emergency response and evacuation plan. MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on these recommendations.

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
Environment Protection Authority	General	Does not support a rail link through the Glenfield Landfill unless it can be clearly demonstrated that the rail access would not compromise the effectiveness of the landfill pollution control and monitoring systems. This applies to both the southern and central rail access options.	<p>MIC has selected the southern rail access as the preferred option, and is seeking approval for this rail access option only, as detailed in the Response to Submissions report.</p> <p>MIC recognise that further investigation is required for the southern rail access option, including targeted intrusive investigation to gather data on soils and groundwater quality so that the suitability of development on the Glenfield landfill site from a contamination perspective can be confirmed. Outcomes of the intrusive investigations would determine the management and/or remediation options required.</p> <p>In addition, SIMTA has also received concept approval to also develop the rail link through the Glenfield Landfill. MIC has adopted similar management and mitigation measures for the rail link as presented in the SIMTA concept EIS. As only one rail link will be constructed, the proposed management and mitigation will be based on best practice and the rail link will be constructed in accordance with project approval conditions.</p>
		No objections to the northern rail access option as long as wastes are managed in accordance with the Protection of the <i>Environment Operations Act 1997 (NSW) and Waste Regulation</i> .	As noted above, MIC has selected the southern rail access option as this would provide access to the combined Moorebank IMT and SIMTA IMT. Construction of the rail link will be based on best practice in accordance with the project approval conditions and will also consider the Protection of the <i>Environment Operations Act 2014 (NSW) and Waste Regulations</i> , which supersedes the 1997 guidelines.
		Recommends that targeted intrusive investigations be undertaken to determine contamination pathways for the central and southern rail access options.	<p>MIC recognise that further investigation is required for the southern rail access option, including targeted intrusive investigation to gather data on soils and groundwater quality so that the suitability of development on the Glenfield landfill site from a contamination perspective can be confirmed. These additional investigations will target soil, groundwater and soil vapour (gas) and will be used to develop a site conceptual model which will confirm contamination pathways within the southern rail access area. Outcomes of the intrusive investigations would determine the management and/or remediation options required.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation, with the emphasis being on the requirement to undertake additional investigation along the southern rail access option.</p>
		Recommends additional information be provided if the central or the southern rail access options are selected.	MIC has selected the southern rail access as the preferred option, and is seeking approval for this rail access option only. Detailed design has not yet been undertaken. Subject to approval of the Stage 1 SSD, MIC will engage in further discussions with key agencies, including the EPA when detailed plans of the proposed southern rail access have been developed. Information from the intrusive investigations would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD application. MIC would engage in consultation with the EPA in preparation of the Stage 2 SSD application.
	Local and regional air quality impacts	Identifies inconsistencies in the emission estimates between the regional and local air quality assessments (in relation to emission loads).	There is a difference between the regional and local emission estimates as a result of the emissions being calculated differently. For the regional air inventory only diesel vehicles were included (no petrol vehicles) thus, volatile organic compounds (VOCs) were lower in the regional air quality assessment than for the local air quality assessment. Petrol vehicles (i.e. passenger cars) were not included in the regional assessment as background growth in petrol vehicles would occur in the future regardless of whether the Project proceeds. This approach is appropriate even when considering the scale of the Project, as any increase in petrol vehicles as a result of the Project would not be relevant at the regional scale. The local air quality assessment (which focuses on the site and the immediate environment) did include petrol vehicles as the local air quality assessment needs to consider the impacts at the nearest receivers to the Project, therefore any impacts from passenger vehicles would be relevant.
		States it is unclear if a 'worst case' scenario has been considered when considering cumulative impacts with the SIMTA Project.	<p>Chapter 27 – <i>Cumulative impacts</i> assesses the cumulative impact of both the Moorebank IMT in conjunction with the SIMTA IMT and other planned or proposed developments in the local area. In recognition of community and approval agencies concerns about the prospect of both projects being developed in some way; three scenarios (as detailed in section 27.1), were assessed in the EIS (assuming a combined IMT precinct across both sites). The three cumulative scenarios selected for assessment as part of the EIS were developed in consultation with DP&E and in particular, scenario 3 was considered to be representative of the worst case cumulative scenarios. The EIS was considered by the agencies during adequacy to be compliant with the NSW SEARs and Commonwealth EIS guidelines which included the approach adopted for the cumulative assessment scenario.</p> <p>Since exhibition of the EIS, in-principle agreement has been reached between MIC and SIMTA, whereby SIMTA would become the future developer and operator of a precinct-wide intermodal facility and associated warehousing across both the MIC and SIMTA sites. A preferred site layout and the southern rail access option have been selected for the combined precinct and are described in Chapter 7 of the Response to Submissions report, which also considers the ‘worst case’ scenario when assessing the cumulative impacts.</p>
		Seeks clarification on the exceedance of PM ₁₀ (24-hour average) for the cumulative scenarios (including SIMTA). Notes an inconsistency in the text and tabulated results with exceedances for cumulative scenarios at R37.	NSW EPA correctly states that the additional exceedance is listed as R37 in Appendix E of Technical Paper 7 (EIS Volume 6) – <i>Local air quality impact assessment</i> , rather than R33 in Section 12.2 of the same report. The inconsistency between the main body of the report and Appendix E is a typographical error. The additional exceedance in Table E1 should be associated with R33 (as stated in the report). This typographical error does not have any impact on the outcome of the assessments made for the EIS.
		States the LAQIA contains air quality criteria that differ from the <i>Approved Methods for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in NSW</i> .	All impact assessment criteria in Technical Paper 7 – <i>Local air quality impact assessment</i> (EIS Volume 6) have been taken from the <i>Approved Methods for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in NSW</i> . It is noted that gas volume concentrations for impact assessment criterion listed in Table 7.1 of the Approved Methods, while not stated, are expressed at 0°C and 1 atmosphere (back calculation confirms this). This is in contrast to the impact assessment criteria presented in Table 7.2(a), 7.2(b) and 7.4(a), which are expressed at 25°C and 1 atmosphere. To provide consistency between the two sets of criteria, all applicable criteria adopted from Table 7.2(a), 7.2(b) and 7.4(a) were converted and expressed as 0°C and 1 atmosphere.

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
		Recommends that a detailed ozone assessment be provided as part of the EIS.	<p>There is no regional scale ozone model that is sensitive enough to be capable of modelling any discernible effect arising from the changes that may occur due to the Project (for example a reduction of 0.03% in the emissions of NO_x from trucks and trains spread across the region). The Project would result in only a small differential between the emissions that will occur with or without the Project. This change is far too small to be modelled in regard to ozone chemistry.</p> <p>In addition, it was not a requirement of the NSW SEARs or the DoE EIS Guidelines to undertake a detailed ozone assessment.</p> <p>MIC does not agree with the recommendation to undertake an ozone assessment, and therefore would disagree with the requirement to make this a condition of approval.</p>
		Recommends that further details be provided on the air quality impacts of Early Works.	<p>Section 17.3.1 of Chapter 17 – <i>Local air quality</i> presents the air emission sources anticipated during Early Works. The Early Works phase is likely to generate air quality emissions, primarily particulate matter (TSP, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) through the demolition of structures, localised earthworks in the conservation area and from remediation of contaminated land. Approximately 5,500 m³ of contaminated soil material has been estimated for remediation activities (refer Table 8.2 in Chapter 8 – <i>Project development phasing and construction</i>), as part of early works. Given the expected low magnitude of the earthworks and the short term nature of Early Works, construction and remediation activities, it is considered that the potential air emissions and related impacts from this phase of the Project would be negligible.</p> <p>A preliminary Remediation Action Plan (RAP) has been prepared for the Project and is included in Technical Paper 5 – <i>Environmental Site Assessment</i> (Phase 2) (EIS Volume 5a). The RAP identifies the processes and methods that would be followed during the investigation and remediation of the contaminated material.</p> <p>MIC considers the air quality impacts from early works have been sufficiently covered in the EIS and our response above. Therefore MIC does not agree with a condition of approval to undertake further air quality impacts for early works.</p>
		Recommends that a more refined statement of commitments be developed for the Project.	<p>A Statement of Commitments is a requirement of the old Part 3A planning process under the EP&A Act. As outlined in Chapter 4 – <i>Planning and Statutory Requirements</i> of the EIS, the Project is being assessed under Part 4, Division 4.1 of the EP&A Act as a State Significant Development (SSD) application. Formal statement of commitments is not required under the Part 4 SSD requirements.</p> <p>MIC recognises the importance of mitigation and provides a comprehensive list of all proposed environmental management and mitigation measures for the Project (refer to Chapter 28 – <i>Environmental management framework</i>). This list includes measures which are mandatory and are firm mitigation commitments as well as those that are subject to review during the Stage 2 SSD approvals and/or detailed design. During detailed design, further assessments would be undertaken and a more refined statement of commitments would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD.</p>
	Cumulative impacts	Recommends a revised cumulative assessment considering the SIMTA site (approved capacity) and the Moorebank IMT at full capacity.	Chapter 27 – <i>Cumulative impacts</i> assesses the cumulative impact of both the Moorebank IMT in conjunction with the SIMTA IMT and other planned or proposed developments in the local area. In recognition of the concerns expressed by community and approval agencies regarding the prospect of both projects being developed in some way; three scenarios (as detailed in section 27.1), were assessed in the EIS (assuming a combined IMT precinct across both sites). Since the exhibition of the EIS an in–principle agreement has now been reached between MIC and SIMTA and the indicative site layout plan of the Moorebank IMT has changed to reflect the likely combination of the two sites. A preferred project design (proposed amendments to the development) has been prepared which outlines the details of the proposed change to the Moorebank IMT concept layout. Chapter 7 of the Response to Submissions report assesses the cumulative impacts of the modified precinct IMT. A cumulative scenario that considers the SIMTA IMT at its approved capacity (250,000 TEU IMEX) with the Moorebank IMT at full capacity has also been considered.
	Noise and vibration impacts	<p>Argues that the frequency of occurrence of light winds should have included analysis of day, evening and night-time periods not just seasonal wind conditions.</p> <p>Questions the use of the F stability category in the Noise and Vibration Assessment. The worst case weather scenario in the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment combines F stability category and a 2 m/s gradient wind. This combination may be appropriate for a 2 m/s drainage wind, otherwise it probably should be F stability category without the 2 m/s wind.</p>	Based on the 12 months of weather data for 2013; daytime, evening and night-time wind speed conditions vary between 0 m/s to greater than 6 m/s. Wind speeds of 0 m/s occurred for less than 1% of the daytime, evening or night-time periods. An average wind speed of 1.6 m/s was determined for the winter months when temperature inversion conditions could occur. In comparison to the adverse weather scenario in the <i>Noise and Vibration Assessment</i> (Technical paper 2 (EIS Volume 3) – <i>Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment</i>), a review of modelled noise levels with an F stability category and a 0.5 m/s or a 1 m/s wind speed determined the assessment outcomes (noise criteria compliance) at the surrounding suburbs would not be affected. Consequently, the adverse scenario in the <i>Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment</i> is appropriate to assess compliance to the noise assessment criteria and identify potential requirements for noise mitigation.
		<p>Concern regarding the feasibility and viability of the mitigation measures.</p> <p>Notes that noise barriers appear to be in the SSFL corridor, outside the Project area. Recommends that MIC enter into a contractual arrangement with the rail operator for the installation of noise barriers.</p>	<p>As discussed in the Chapter 12 – <i>Noise and vibration</i> and Technical Paper 2 – <i>Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment</i> (EIS Volume 3), a range of reasonable and feasible noise mitigation measures have been considered to control noise from the Project site and the associated rail accesses. These measures include limiting source noise emissions, impeding the propagation of noise from the site through barriers and addressing specific noise issues such as wheel squeal from freight trains.</p> <p>MIC is committed to providing the mitigation proposed in the EIS, including the provision of noise barriers as required. The location of noise barriers has not yet been confirmed, and would be subject to detailed design and assessment as part of the Stage 2 SSD application. The requirements for the location of the noise barriers would be discussed and agreed with relevant parties as necessary during detailed design.</p>
		Concerned with the level of control of the IMT operation over the rail rolling stock and the use of locomotives that comply with the EPA Railway Systems Activities Licences.	It is anticipated that a contractual arrangement between rail operators and the IMT operator would include a condition for all locomotives to have approval to operate under EPA Railway Systems Activities Licences.

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
		<p>Recommends that additional commitments be provided including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the use of alternatives to tonal movement alarms (e.g. reversing cameras, in-cab proximity alarms); the use of best practice latest technology plant and equipment for container handling impact noise; the use of alternatives to signalling by vehicle horns; and the installation of track lubrication devices if curve squeal becomes an issue. 	<p>Section 12.4 of the EIS recommends the use of non-tonal alarms and reversing beepers for plant and equipment during construction. This recommendation can also be applied to plant and equipment used during operation.</p> <p>The Project will operate, where possible, using modern, best practice technology for all plant and equipment. The EIS assessed the use of rail mounted gantries, side picks and intermodal terminal vehicles for the handling of containers. While MIC is aware of alternative electrified technology, which in some cases may be suitable for use at IMT facilities. For the purpose of assessing the ‘worst case’ noise impact, the EIS did not consider electrified technology, this will allow the future terminal operator the flexibility to implement the required technology to comply with the concept approval conditions. The implementation of best practice technology and plant equipment for the operation of the IMT would be investigated during the detailed design phase, and if appropriate would be proposed as part of the mitigations for the Stage 2 SSD application. Alternatives to vehicle horns would also be discussed at this time.</p> <p>Section 12.4.3 of Chapter 12 – <i>Noise and vibration</i> identifies the use of track greasing systems which would be investigated on curved sections of track to lubricate and reduce friction at the wheel–rail interface.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
		Recommends the site layout maximise forward movements of trucks to minimise beeper noise.	<p>Section 12.4.3 of Chapter 12 – <i>Noise and vibration</i> recommends the implementation of measures such as a one-way internal road system to limit the requirements for reversing. These matters would be further assessed during detailed design, once further information on the site layout is known. Information would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD applications.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
		Recommends limiting construction hours to standard hours, with an exception for activities that need to be completed during a rail or road possession, or works resulting in noise levels not more than 5 dBA above Rating Background Levels.	<p>As noted in section 8.8.5 of Chapter 8 – <i>Project development phasing and construction</i>, the Project would be constructed during the standard construction hours as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monday to Friday – 7.00 am to 6.00 pm Saturday – 8.00 am to 1.00 pm Sunday and Public Holidays – no work. <p>Some construction activities may be required to occur outside these hours, such as work required on public infrastructure, including roads, rail, water, electricity, gas, sewage or drainage. If construction work is required outside standard construction hours to maintain the operational integrity of the infrastructure, local community members will be advised well in advance of the work commencing. For the EIS, a night time noise criteria of background plus 5 dB was adopted to assess night-time noise impacts from construction and operational activities. In practice background noise levels will be monitored before commencement of construction as part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
		Recommends the use of bored or vibratory piling instead of impact piling where practicable.	<p>Section 12.4.1 states that quieter and less vibration-emitting construction methods would be applied where feasible and reasonable during construction. For example, when piling is required, bored piles rather than impact-driven piles would minimise noise and vibration impacts.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
	Contamination and soils	Argues the contamination assessment has not adequately addressed the issue of polychlorinated biphenyls in soils, associated with the site at 1 Bapaume Road, Moorebank (ABB site).	<p>Technical Paper 5 – <i>Environmental Site Assessment</i> (Phase 2 (EIS Volume 5a) tested soil and groundwater samples for a range of chemicals including polychlorinated biphenyls. Section 15.4.1 of Chapter 15 – <i>Contamination and soils</i> identifies the need for further testing of soil and groundwater beneath the north-western area of the Project site adjacent to the ABB site. The EIS recommends that further groundwater monitoring wells be installed along the ABB boundary area (referred to as Area 1 in Figure 15.1 in Chapter 15 – <i>Contamination and soils</i>) in order to evaluate the current concentrations of polychlorinated biphenyls and chlorinated hydrocarbon compounds in soil and groundwater and evaluate if additional action is likely to be required to manage contamination in this area (refer to section 15.5 in Chapter 15).</p> <p>MIC is currently undertaking these additional contaminated site investigation works and the results will be made available during the Stage 2 SSD application process.</p>
		Recommends that a site auditor be engaged to issue a Section A Site Audit Statement for the subject site on the basis that the site has had a range of uses over the years which have resulted in groundwater contamination.	<p>As noted in section 15.2.1 of Chapter 15 – <i>Contamination and soils</i>, the Phase 2 <i>Environmental Site Assessment</i> has been reviewed by an independent site auditor accredited by the NSW EPA under the <i>Contaminated Land Management Act 1997(NSW)</i> to provide certainty in the non-statutory sign off of the Phase 2 ESA and conclusions relating to the feasibility of the proposed future use of the IMT site.</p> <p>This level of assessment and review is considered appropriate for a Stage 1 SSD application.</p>
Transport for NSW	Traffic, transport and access	<p>Concerned that traffic movements to and from the site may not be consistent with those predicted within the EIS (with much of the traffic occurring outside of peak periods).</p> <p>Recommends that any conditions of approval include the requirement to implement a driveway monitoring regime (monitors all vehicle movements into and out of the site) and requirements to adopt shift changeover times outside of AM and PM peak periods.</p>	<p>It is expected that the majority of staff would arrive and depart outside the peak AM and PM periods on the road network, as movements would primarily occur during the shift changeover (at 6.00 am, 2.00 pm and 10.00 pm). Analysis of the traffic profiles indicates the shift change at 2.00 pm occurs when the background traffic is relatively light, therefore the traffic generated when the background traffic is high represents the busiest time on the network, and this has been used as the basis of assessment.</p> <p>MIC acknowledges the request to implement a driveway monitoring regime and this will be considered as part of future assessment for the Stage 2 SSD application.</p>
		<p>Recommends that additional modelling to examine the local and area wide traffic impacts on the greater operation of the strategic road network.</p> <p>Notes that TfNSW and RMS may be undertaking precinct wide modelling of</p>	<p>It is noted that TfNSW and RMS are undertaking precinct wide modelling of the area and MIC is keen to see the results of this assessment in due course. MIC has been liaising with TfNSW/RMS throughout the duration of this project and will continue to do so.</p> <p>MIC is further developing its own model to assess the impact of Project traffic on the wider network. A wide ranging mesoscopic model</p>

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
		the area which may be useful for the assessment.	<p>is planned, with microsimulation of key elements such as the M5 Motorway over the Georges River. New AM and PM models will be based on a new round of 24 hour traffic data collection. MIC will discuss this future modelling with TfNSW and RMS to determine how information can be shared and if there is an opportunity to integrate and coordinate the modelling task.</p> <p>MIC does not agree with the recommendation to undertake an additional local and area wide model, other than the modelling work already agreed and discussed with TfNSW.</p>
		Recommends that a Statement of Commitments be included that identifies the scope and timing of future road infrastructure upgrades.	<p>A Statement of Commitments is a requirement of the old Part 3A planning process under the EP&A Act. As outlined in Chapter 4 – <i>Planning and Statutory Requirements</i> of the EIS, the Project is being assessed under Part 4, Division 4.1 of the EP&A Act as a State Significant Development (SSD) application. Formal statement of commitments is not required under the Part 4 SSD requirements.</p> <p>The traffic impacts of the Project have been assessed as detailed in Chapter 11 of the EIS and <i>Technical Paper 1</i> (EIS Volume 3) – <i>Traffic, Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment</i>. Traffic impacts on the wider network, including local roads have been assessed using intersection performance modelling software (Signalised and unsignalised Intersection Design and Research Aid (SIDRA)) for a number of intersections within and surrounding the Project site. Additional traffic impact assessment is currently being undertaken to identify the measures required to mitigate the traffic impact of Project on intersections in the surrounding area. This assessment will determine whether the intersections will operate with Project traffic no worse than they would without Project traffic. MIC will discuss these with TfNSW and RMS and if agreed will contribute to the cost of these upgrades - in proportion to the extent that the Project contributes to the traffic through that intersection.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
		Recommends that any conditions of approval include the requirement to develop a workplace travel plan for the future operational stages.	<p>MIC acknowledges the request from TfNSW submission regarding implementation of a workplace travel plan. Conditions of approval are a consideration of the approval authorities, which for this project are NSW DP&E and Commonwealth DoE. MIC is unable to make any comment on the draft terms of approval provided.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the IMT operator to undertake workplace travel plans for future construction and operational stages of the IMT in accordance with the Project approval (stated mitigations) and any conditions of approval.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
		Recommends that any conditions of approval include the requirement to provide bus turnaround facilities with direct pedestrian access paths and pedestrian facilities on Moorebank Avenue.	<p>A bus turnaround facility will be considered in detail during the Stage 2 SSD application process, once the detailed design of the Project is known. A mesoscopic model would be used to assess the impacts.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
		Recommends that any conditions of approval state that future road works will not be at the cost of RMS.	<p>Additional technical modelling and assessment is currently being undertaken to identify the measures required to mitigate the impact of Project traffic on intersections in the surrounding area. This assessment will aim to ensure the intersections will operate with Project traffic no worse than they would without Project traffic. MIC will discuss these with TfNSW and RMS and if agreed will contribute to the cost of these upgrades – in proportion to the extent that the Project contributes to the traffic through that intersection.</p> <p>MIC does not agree with a conditional of approval that requires MIC to pay for all road upgrades in the area.</p>
		Recommends that an overall strategic framework be established with a Construction Traffic Management Plan for each stage of the work.	<p>MIC acknowledges this request from TfNSW. It will be a condition of approval that the contactor responsible for the construction of the Project prepares a Construction Traffic Management Plans (TMPs) which meet the overall requirements of the Project approvals (Stage 1 and Stage 2 SSD approvals).</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
		Supports the proposed 'satisfactory arrangements' clause in the Planning Proposal for contributions to be made towards regional transport infrastructure. Recommends that MIC enter into a Planning Agreement with State government for road upgrades.	<p>As stated above, additional traffic impact assessment is currently being undertaken to identify the measures required to mitigate the traffic impact of Project on intersections in the surrounding area. MIC will discuss these with TfNSW and RMS and if agreed will contribute to the cost of these upgrades – in proportion to the extent that the Project contributes to the traffic through that intersection, this will form the basis of a Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA).</p>
		Identifies a typographical error in Chapter 11 in regards to PCU factors. PCU factors for rigid trucks (2.0) and articulated trucks (4.0) are missing from the text (section 11.4.3 (page 11)).	<p>Noted. This is a typographical error which occurred during formatting of the document (numbers the missing in front of the PCU factors. Section 6.2.2.3 of Technical Paper – <i>Traffic, Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment</i> has the correct conversion factors which are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.0 PCUs for cars • 1.2 PCUs for light commercial vehicles (LCV) • 2.0 PCUs for rigid trucks • 4.0 PCUs for articulated trucks. <p>This typographical error does not have any impact on the traffic assessment itself.</p>
		Seeks clarification on some of the assumptions and model validation checks for the traffic assessment.	<p>The strategic modelling adopted the BTS own models. The modelling results and traffic impact assessment (TIA) was technically peer reviewed by an independent expert who agreed with the approach, methodology and findings of the TIA. The statements of peer review are presented in Appendix G (EIS Volume 2) of the EIS.</p>
		Seeks clarification of the assumption of 100% utilisation for the pallets to vehicle conversion for semi-trailers and rigid trucks not listed in the EIS.	<p>The assumptions regarding the terminal and warehouse truck freight compositions are provided in Appendix K of <i>Technical Paper 1</i> (EIS Volume 3) – <i>Traffic, Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment</i>. It was assumed that each TEU when deconsolidated would generate 25 pallets and each semi-trailer would carry 20 pallets and each rigid truck 8 pallets per load. These numbers are below the typical maximum truck capacities of 22 pallets for a semi and 12 pallets for a rigid truck. These loading assumptions are currently</p>

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
			being reviewed and it is likely that revised values will be adopted in the traffic impact assessment conducted for the Stage 2 SSD applications.
		Seeks clarification of the distribution plots in Technical Paper 1 (Appendix J).	The truck distribution figures in Appendix J <i>Technical Paper 1</i> (EIS Volume 3) – <i>Traffic, Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment</i> show the relative distribution across the Sydney region to and from Port Botany. They are intended to show the relative magnitude of demands in 2030 of Port Botany and Moorebank demands. The distribution values in 2030 for Moorebank freight is provided in Table 1 of Appendix K of <i>Technical Paper 1</i> (EIS Volume 3) – <i>Traffic, Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment</i> . The growth in demand to the Blacktown and Penrith areas is forecast to occur in the base case without Moorebank. The impact of this demand on the overall Sydney network was beyond the scope of our analysis.
	Noise and vibration impacts	<p>Recommends conditions of approval include requirements to allow only use of modern rolling stock, a requirement to adopt curve noise countermeasures and effective lubrication techniques, and the requirement to provide a report into the use of hybrid trains for port shuttle operations.</p> <p>Argues that locomotives approved under EPA's licence regime have variable noise performance and alone would not be sufficient to achieve best practice performance in terms of noise.</p>	<p>MIC acknowledges this request from TfNSW, however notes that conditions of approval are a consideration of the approval authorities, As detailed in section 12.4 of Chapter 12 – <i>Noise and vibration impact assessment</i> of the EIS that a range of noise mitigation measures are proposed which aim to limit locomotive noise emission and the design of track systems to control noise emissions. Further mitigations would be considered during detailed design and the assessment undertaken for the Stage 2 SSD application, assuming approval of the Stage 1 SSD application.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on these recommendations.</p>
		Argues that appropriate noise control would need to be examined to ensure the SSFL meets its project approval conditions.	MIC is unable to comment on the proposed mitigation and management for the SSFL operation. We understand the SSFL Project was approved subject to certain mitigation and management, and that the required management has been implemented in order for the project to operate in accordance with its approval conditions.
	Land use and property	Seeks confirmation on the potential impact on the East Hills Railway Line. Notes that landowners consent would be required by Sydney trains if this occurs.	<p>The Project does not impact on the operation of the East Hills Railway Line.</p> <p>As noted in Chapter 23 – <i>Property and Infrastructure</i> of EIS, a small portion of land owned by Sydney Trains (formerly RailCorp) will be impacted as a result of the access requirements into the project site, via the Southern rail access option. As identified in section 23.2.1 of Chapter 23 – <i>Property and Infrastructure</i>, MIC will investigate the most appropriate method of land acquisition or access to easements with the appropriate landholders to authorise the construction and operation of the rail link on private land.</p>
		Recommends that any conditions of approval include a requirement to identify the property requirements to accommodate road infrastructure upgrades.	<p>Conditions of approval are a consideration of the approval authorities, (NSW DP&E and Commonwealth DoE). MIC is unable to make any comment on the draft terms of approval provided.</p> <p>As stated above, additional traffic impact assessment is currently being undertaken to identify the measures required to mitigate the traffic impact of Project on intersections in the surrounding area. MIC will discuss these with TfNSW and RMS and if agreed will contribute to the cost of these upgrades – in proportion to the extent that the Project contributes to the traffic through that intersection. This will include discussions with relevant stakeholders and landholders who may be impacts by future road upgrades. The impact of any future road upgrades will be assessed as part of Stage 2 SSD applications.</p> <p>MIC does not agree with a condition of approval to pay for all road upgrades.</p>
		Recommends that any conditions of approval prohibit access across the northern boundary of Lot 100 DP 1049508 onto the South Western Motorway.	TfNSW point is acknowledged, as noted in Chapter 23 <i>Property and Infrastructure</i> of EIS the land located at Lot 100 DP 1049508 is currently owned by the Commonwealth and is part of the land to be developed for the intermodal facility. MIC will honour the existing access arrangement in place with TfNSW. MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on these recommendations.
		Notes that Interlink Roads Pty Ltd will require maintenance access to the proposed GPT pit in the sliver of land adjacent to Moorebank Avenue (dedicated as public road but not used for road purposes).	As discussed in Chapter 23 – <i>Property and infrastructure</i> , ongoing consultation with utility asset owners and road and rail authorities would occur during the detailed design and construction phases of the Project. MIC will honour the existing access arrangement in place with Interlink and TfNSW.
	Local and regional air quality	Recommends a number of conditions of approval in relation to measures to improve air quality (related to locomotives, vehicle idling, trucks and vehicles).	<p>The implementation of best practice management practices for the construction and operation of the Project would be investigated during the detailed design phase, assuming approval of the Stage 1 SSD application. Management measures including those related to locomotives, vehicle idling, trucks and vehicles would be included in the mitigations proposed as part of the Stage 2 SSD application.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>
Fire and Rescue NSW	Hazards and risks	Argues the EIS does not identify and discuss some types of unplanned incidents which may potentially pose risks (i.e. fire incidents and hazmat incidents).	<p>Chapter 14 – <i>Hazards and Risk</i> of the EIS has been prepared in accordance with the NSW Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (NSW SEARs) and the Commonwealth DOE EIS Guidelines.</p> <p>MIC acknowledges the comment from Fire and Rescue NSW with respect to unplanned incidents and notes an assessment of this risk may be a requirement of future Stage 2 SSD applications.</p> <p>MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.</p>

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
		Identifies additional potential fire hazards including: a) vehicle or train refuelling fire; b) vehicle or train refuelling spill; c) plant and equipment fire; d) stored container fire; e) stored container hazardous materials spill; f) vehicle collision causing a fire or hazardous materials spill; and g) train collision or derailment causing a fire or hazardous materials spill.	Table 14.6 in Chapter 14 – <i>Hazards and Risk</i> identifies the potential hazardous incidents including transportation, spills and on site storage of hazardous materials. Each of the activities presented in the table is assessed based on its potential to involve gas leaks, fuel storage, flammable/combustible liquids and hazardous waste. The hazards identified by Fire and Rescue NSW have been included in the table and assessed accordingly.
		Recommends a number of conditions of approval in relation to hazards and risks.	Conditions of approval are a consideration of the approval authorities, (NSW DP&E and Commonwealth DoE). MIC is unable to make any comment of the draft terms of approval provided.
NSW Rural Fire Service	Hazards and risks	Argue the appropriate bushfire protection issues have been considered.	MIC acknowledges this comment from NSW Rural Fire Service.
		Notes that appropriate asset protection zones would need to be considered in more detail at later stages.	MIC acknowledges this comment from NSW Rural Fire Service and agrees that asset protection zones will be considered as part of the Stage 2 SSD application.
Sydney Catchment Authority	N/A	States the Project is located outside of the Sydney Catchment Authority operational areas and the authority has no comments on the proposal.	MIC acknowledges this comment from Sydney Catchment Authority.
NSW Department of Primary Industries (including comments from NSW Office of Water and Fisheries NSW)	Biodiversity	Notes it is important that fish habitat is maintained during construction.	The biodiversity of the lower reaches of the Georges River has been modified as a result of habitat degradation and changes in abiotic condition such as water flow volumes, velocities, increased nutrients, chemical pollution and invasive species. The degraded condition of this section of the Georges River has led to the presence of disturbance tolerant species which are less sensitive to alternations in environmental conditions. The <i>Ecological Impact Assessment</i> was prepared in accordance with NSW Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) guidelines and the surveys were based on desktop analysis. This approach was endorsed by DP&E and is compliant with the Project SEARs. Detailed surveys of aquatic habitat would be undertaken in preparation of the Stage 2 SSD application(s). Impacts associated with vegetation clearing have been assessed in accordance with state and federal legislation. The Project will be subject to stringent mitigation measures at all stages of development that will include riparian vegetation management and revegetation, bridge design based on NSW Fisheries fish passage requirements for waterway crossings, and appropriately designed stormwater management measures based on further ongoing water quality monitoring. Further extensive biodiversity offsetting in accordance with state and federal guidelines will ensure the Project adequately achieves appropriate biodiversity outcomes.
		Notes the importance of the implementation measures described in Chapter 28, particularly those in regards to erosion and sediment control and clearing of vegetation.	MIC acknowledges this comment from NSW Department of Primary Industries.
		Requests detailed plans of the three rail access options be provided.	Since the exhibition of the EIS, MIC has selected the southern rail access as the preferred option, and is seeking approval for this rail access option only. Subject to approval of the Stage 1 SSD application, MIC will engage in further discussions with key agencies, including the NSW Department of Primary Industries and more detailed plans of the proposed access would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD application.
		States the northern rail access option is preferred on the basis that this is argued to result in minimal loss of riparian vegetation, both in area and length along the river.	As noted above, a preferred site layout and the southern rail access option has been selected for the combined precinct and is described in Chapter 7 of the Response to Submissions report. The indicative layout would be further developed during detailed design and details would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD applications.
		Argues the ecological value of the function of the vegetated riparian zone has been overlooked.	The ecological value of the function of the vegetated riparian zone is considered in detail, particularly in the following sections of the Ecological Impact Assessment report: Section 2 – Scope and methodology; subsection 2.7 – Ecological integrity classification (2.7.1 – High value). Section 3 – Existing environment; particularly paragraph 7, subsection 3.2 (Ecological characteristics of the rail access options) and subsection 3.8 (Terrestrial fauna habitats and threatened animal species). Section 4 – Potential impacts on biodiversity – particularly subsection 4.2.1.1 (Vegetation clearing and habitat loss) and subsection 4.2.2.1 (Fragmentation, isolation and edge effects). Section 6 – management and mitigation; particularly subsection 6.2.2.4 (Fragmentation and connectivity).
		Identifies inconsistencies in regards to the width for the proposed conservation area/riparian area throughout the EIS. Notes that as a minimum the width should be consistent with Office of Water guidelines – which recommend a 40 m wide riparian corridor (measured from top of bank).	While the boundary of the proposed conservation area incorporates lands covered by the annual exceedance probability (AEP) flood line, this area also corresponds with a significant portion of the 'High Value' areas identified by the Ecological integrity classification in Technical Paper 3 (EIS Volume 4) – <i>Ecological Impact Assessment</i> (as shown on Figure 2.3 and discussed in section 2.7 of Technical Paper 3 – <i>Ecological Impact Assessment</i>) and significantly contributes to the conservation and enhancement of the existing riparian areas that are currently restricted in some areas to <20 metres of vegetation. The proposed conservation area will improve on the current minimum width (by a further 10 metres) and will increase the existing vegetated riparian zone, in some areas by >200 m. The EIS proposed full build options have identified core conservation and development areas and included an area that is 'available for potential development'. MIC are committed to the inclusion of some of those areas previously identified as; 'available for potential development' into the Biodiversity offsets areas. A revised biodiversity offset strategy developed in accordance with the NSW Biodiversity Offset Policy for Major Projects 2014, NSW Framework for Biodiversity Assessment 2014 and with regard to OEH

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
			comments will be provided as part of the Response to Submissions report. MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval for a 20 m minimum corridor width.
		States adequate mitigation measures are required to ensure that Anzac Creek downstream of the site is not degraded.	Protection of Anzac Creek from degradation would primarily be achieved through controlling surface water runoff from the site in accordance with a Stormwater Management Plan. Protection of water quality and reduction in the rate of stormwater inflow to the creek would also be achieved through post-construction revegetation at the boundaries between operation areas and riparian habitats.
		Recommends amending the EIS and Management Plan for Restoration of the Riparian Zone of the Georges River to include clarify riparian widths (minimum 40 m).	MIC will seek to retain as large a riparian corridor as practicable throughout the project area. In the event that a 40 m wide riparian corridor (measured from top of bank) cannot be practically achieved throughout the length of the project, the 'averaging rule' will be applied to seek to achieve an average width of the vegetated riparian zone of at least 40 m with a minimum corridor width of 20 m at the narrowest point. This will be reflected in the Response to Submissions report addressing the selection of the preferred southern option.
		Recommends retaining the Amiens wetland.	Due to its location with regard to the planned site layout, retaining the Amiens wetland is unlikely to be practicable. The Amiens wetland is an artificial structure that has been planted with and/or colonised by native aquatic emergent plants and exotic species. While this wetland does provide habitat for native animal species, it is not likely to be important habitat for any threatened species. If retained, it would also be isolated from other retained habitat on site by intervening areas of development. As stated in the Ecological Impact assessment (section 6.2.2.5) the loss of this wetland habitat may be mitigated to some degree as: <i>Opportunities for planting of detention basins with native aquatic emergent plants and fringing trees would be explored in the detailed design of the Project and, if practicable, implemented such that, in the medium term they would provide similar habitat to that lost through the removal of existing basins.</i>
		Recommends that if the southern rail access option is selected, consideration should be given at detailed design to locate the rail access further west, avoiding disturbing remnant vegetation.	As noted above, a preferred site layout and the southern rail access option has been selected for the combined precinct and is described in section 7.4 of the Response to Submissions report. The indicative layout would be further developed during detailed design and details would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD applications. Bridge piles are proposed to be outside the Georges River channel bed. Section 4.2.2.1 of Technical Paper 3– <i>Ecological Impact Assessment</i> (EIS Volume 4) has considered vegetation connectivity and stated: <i>'The Project is not likely to significantly fragment or isolate retained vegetation along the Georges River Corridor. The proposed rail link across the Georges River would create a break in the canopy of the riparian vegetation approximately 50 m in width. However, the detailed design for the rail link and bridge would explore opportunities to create conditions suitable for vegetation to be established underneath the structure and habitat connectivity features (e.g. fauna furniture, rock piles) to provide cover for terrestrial animals and elevated movement pathways for arboreal species'.</i> MIC is unable to move the location of the rail access further west, as this would have additional impacts on land outside of the footprint currently assessed for the EIS.
	General	Recommends only one bridge structure for the SIMTA project and the Moorebank IMT.	As noted above, a preferred site layout and the southern rail access option has been selected for the combined precinct and is described in section 7.4 of the Response to Submissions report. The indicative layout would be further developed during detailed design and details would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD applications. The same rail access will be constructed to access both the Moorebank IMT site and the SIMTA IMT site. MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.
		States that a condition of approval should be to include an assessment of the potential impacts on groundwater and groundwater dependent ecosystems during detailed design.	Section 16.3.4 of Chapter 16 – <i>Hydrology, groundwater and water quality</i> identifies groundwater impacts associated with construction, piling and earthwork activities on the Project site. The potential groundwater impacts identified would be considered during the development of the detailed design and, in most cases would be mitigated at the detailed design phase. MIC would be prepared to receive conditions of approval based on this recommendation.
	Hydrology, water quality and groundwater	Seeks clarification on whether bridge piers would be located within the river channel. Preference for these to be located outside.	As stated above, bridge piles are proposed to be outside the Georges River channel bed.
		Recommends a zoning of E2 – Environmental Conservation for the conservation area, rather than the proposed E3 zoning.	The proposed conservation area is intended primarily to achieve conservation outcomes. However it is also recognised that some development will be required in the conservation area, being as a minimum the installation of drainage channels from the main IMT portion of the site to the Georges River. This has been taken into consideration in the assessment of the value of the conservation area as an offset site. Furthermore, depending on the outcomes of the community consultation process, consideration would be given to the development of a walking trail and associated facilities in the conservation area. It is recognised that this would reduce the value of the conservation area, and that any reduction in value would need to be offset elsewhere. This matter would be considered further during the Stage 2 SSD application. Taking into consideration these additional objectives of the conservation area, an E3 zone was selected to best address the balance of biodiversity conservation and active social and environmental management outcomes sought by the project. Finally, it is MIC's understanding that the appropriate mechanism for securing offset sites is a BioBanking agreement, and that the zoning of a site in no way influences the effectiveness of a BioBanking agreement or other conservation agreement for an offset site. In other words, the zoning of a site is not a relevant consideration to the establishment of an offset/conservation agreement.

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
NSW Health	Human health risks and impacts	Notes the proximity of the IMT to residential housing and states that health effects are plausible.	MIC acknowledge that emissions from combustion engines have been found to be associated with adverse human health effects and, given the proximity of the Project site to surrounding residential areas, an in depth assessment of the potential health impacts of the Project has been conducted for the EIS. Chapter 25 – <i>Human health risks and impacts</i> of the EIS provides an overview of the findings of the assessment in relation to the potential health impact of the Project (as detailed in Technical Paper 15 (EIS Volume 9) – <i>Human Health Risk Assessment</i> (HHRA) and Technical Paper 16 (EIS Volume 9) – <i>Health Impact Assessment</i> (HIA)). The results of the HHRA and the HIA determined that the proposed mitigation measures within the EIS would ensure that any health impacts on the community would be within acceptable levels.
		States that a further Health Impact Assessment could include consideration of creation of employment opportunities and local employment.	The methodology applied to the Health Impact Assessment (HIA) was developed in consultation with the Centre for Health Equity Training, Research and Evaluation (CHETRE) and an established working group which included representatives from NSW Health. MIC considers that the scope and methodology applied to the HIA is appropriate and meets the requirements of the NSW Sectary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (NSW SEARs) and the Commonwealth DOE EIS Guidelines. The provision of construction courses at education facilities is outside of the scope and jurisdiction of MIC.
	Local and regional air quality	Agrees with the basic framework for the assessment of additional air impacts appears to be sound.	Noted.
		Argues the Local Air Quality Assessment only includes vehicle movements on-site and has not taken into account vehicle movements off-site that will be using the terminal. States that truck and vehicle movements along Moorebank and the M5 motorway should be included.	As identified in Appendix B of the <i>Local Air Quality Impact Assessment</i> (LAQIA) (refer to Technical Paper 7 – <i>Local Air Quality Impact Assessment</i> (EIS Volume 6)), all vehicle movements along Moorebank Avenue associated with the Project, in addition to onsite emissions, have been calculated and included in the dispersion modelling (refer to Figure B1 to B12 in the LAQIA). The LAQIA has considered all on-site and off-site vehicles associated with the Project. Emissions from vehicles along the M5 Motorway have not been included in the LAQIA modelling as the cumulative impacts when considering overall emissions on the M5 Motorway would be low. This is supported by the findings of the regional air quality impact assessment (Technical Paper 8 – <i>Regional Air Quality Assessment</i> (EIS Volume 6)), which has determined that there are no substantial regional impacts from the Project.
		Notes it is difficult to find within the EIS the air modelling data and estimated impacts for individual receiver sites.	The EIS has been structured to include individual impact assessment chapters relating to each study (i.e. traffic, noise, air) which summarises the results of the detailed technical papers. Due to the complexity of the Project, the EIS is long, and possibly difficult to navigate. MIC has sought to assist the reader by providing cross references to relevant sections and to separate the document into volumes, so the reader can find which section of the EIS documents they are looking for. With respect to the air modelling data, this information is provided in Appendix B of the <i>Local Air Quality Impact Assessment</i> (LAQIA) (refer to Technical Paper 7 – <i>Local Air Quality Impact Assessment</i> (EIS Volume 6)).
		States that transport refrigeration units (TRUs) need to operate 24 hours a day and if power to these units is from a diesel generator, then the potential impacts could be greater than anticipated in the EIS.	Emissions from TRUs were not incorporated into the LAQIA. This is because, as stated in section 17.3.1 of Technical Paper 7 – <i>Local Air Quality Impact Assessment</i> (EIS Volume 6), while TRUs could be utilised during the operation of the Project, the specific refrigeration requirements are currently unknown. The requirement for and related emissions of air pollutants, would be assessed during detailed design, and the assessment provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD application.
		Generally support the mitigation options proposed in the EIS.	Noted.
	Noise and vibration impacts	Argues there are different limits in the guideline documents (Industrial Noise Policy, Rail Infrastructure Noise Guideline and the Road Noise Policy) create confusion and inadequate accounting for cumulative noise impacts.	The EIS has been undertaken in accordance with the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) which stipulate the applicable legislation, policy and guidelines to be applied in the assessment of potential noise and vibration impacts and this approach has been applied to include the assessment of cumulative noise impacts. Whilst cumulative noise from industrial and transportation sources will occur, the varying characteristics and duration of each of these noise sources is specifically addressed in the individual policy and guidelines which have been applied in the EIS.
		Notes the NSW <i>Industrial Noise Policy</i> provides a guide of a 15 dB exceedance of background noise as a screening tool to trigger a more detailed assessment for possible sleep disturbance. The noise at receivers is just on the threshold (13 db(A)) and argues that a more detailed assessment should be made given that there would be noise impacts from other sources (i.e. the rail access).	Section 12.4.4 of Chapter 12 – <i>Noise and vibration</i> of the EIS identifies that a more detailed assessment of potential sleep disturbance impacts from train movements should be undertaken during the detailed design phase. The outcomes of this further assessment would be included the Stage 2 SSD application.
		Notes that specific mitigation measures may need to be negotiated and made a requirement of consent.	Noted. In Chapter 28 – <i>Environmental management framework</i> , a list of environmental management and mitigation measures for the Project have been provided. This list includes measures which are mandatory and are firm mitigation commitments as well as those that are subject to review during the Stage 2 SSD approvals and/or detailed design. During detailed design, further assessments would be undertaken and a more refined statement of commitments would be provided as part of the Stage 2 SSD application. It will be a requirement of the IMT operator to undertake construction and operation of the IMT in accordance with the Project approval (stated mitigations) and any conditions of approval.

Agency	Theme	Key issues raised	MIC response
NSW Ports	General	Supports the development of an IMT at Moorebank as part of a greater network of intermodal terminals. Notes that a benefit of the Moorebank location is that it is capable of being accessed via the dedicated freight line, which provides a connection between the IMT and Port Botany.	MIC agrees with NSW Ports. As discussed in section 3.3 of Chapter 3 – <i>Strategic context and need for the Project</i> , the Moorebank location has been selected for a number of reasons including its proximity and access to the Southern Sydney Freight Line (SSFL), providing a direct link to Port Botany, with the site at a sufficient distance from Port Botany to make rail a commercially viable alternative.
		Highlights the importance of planning for road and rail connections to and from the Ports well ahead of the demand to that there is sufficient time to gain approvals, secure finance, undertake procurement processes and construct the infrastructure.	MIC agrees with NSW Ports. Analysis of market demand undertaken by KPMG and discussed in Chapter 2 of the Response to Submissions Report has determined there is a shortfall in IMEX capacity of more than one million TEUs a year, at 2025 (even when taking into account the existing capacity at Yennora, Minto, Villawood and Enfield). There would also be shortfall in interstate capacity, of approximately of 328,000 TEU a year at 2030 growing to 363,000 by 2040.
		Emphasises the importance of an intermodal terminal in catering for growth at Port Botany.	MIC agrees with NSW Ports. Section 3.2 of Chapter 3 – <i>Strategic context and need for the Project</i> identifies one of the key benefits of the Project being easing of the Port Botany bottleneck to enable the Port to cope with future growth and provide large scale freight capacity.
		States that Port Botany's total container volumes have doubled over a 10 year period, growing from approximately 1 million TEUs in 2002 to approximately 2 million in 2011. This is an average growth rate of 7.3%. Container volumes are expected to grow and expected to reach nearly 2.9 million TEUs in 2018. Forecasts expect that by 2030, 7 million TUEs could be handled by the Port of Botany.	Noted. This is consistent with figures referenced in the EIS which state that average growth rates in container movements in NSW over the last 15 years has been around 7% per annum (NSW Government 2013).
		Notes that it is NSW Ports' objective to ensure that all rail infrastructure is capable of handling 3 million TEUs over the next 30 years.	Noted. The Moorebank IMT will assist in meeting freight demands and NSW Port's objectives.
		States that the Moorebank IMT is critical to achieve the objective of increasing rail's share of freight distribution and will be required to handle at least 1 million TEUs. Notes that additional terminals are also required at other locations in Sydney, including Eastern Creek.	MIC agrees with NSW Ports. As discussed above, there is shortfall in IMEX capacity even when taking into account the existing capacity at Yennora, Minto, Villawood and Enfield. There would also be shortfall in interstate capacity, of approximately of 328,000 TEU a year at 2030 (volumes going directly to and from Sydney) growing to 363,000 by 2040. As such, an additional IMT facility is required to meet these shortfalls.
		States that the Project would also assist in reducing the growth of truck transport movements to and from Port Botany.	MIC agrees with NSW Ports. As explained within Chapter 11 – <i>Traffic, transport and access</i> of the EIS, the Project is predicted to result in reductions in vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) on the Sydney regional road network. By transferring freight movements to the Project site by rail for distribution, the regional network would experience reductions of approximately 56,125 truck VKT a day and 1,265 truck vehicle hours travelled a day. This is also expected to contribute to reducing heavy vehicle-related crashes.