

Appendix E


Human Health (Centre for Health Equity Training Research and Evaluation)



Centre for Health Equity Training Research and Evaluation
UNSW Australia

Human Health Impacts Peer Review of the Western Sydney Airport Environmental Impact Statement

Commissioned by WSP/PARSONS
BRINCKERHOFF



19 November 2015

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations	2
Executive Summary	3
Methods	3
Limitations	3
Components of Draft EIS Reviewed	3
1 st Stage Airport Findings	4
Long Term Development Findings	8
Key Impacts and Opportunities	8
1. Introduction	9
2. Approach	9
Health Impacts of Airports	9
Table 1 Examples of Key Determinants of Health	10
3. Methods	12
Components of the Draft EIS Considered in the Review	13
Review of Past Airport HIAs	14
Limitations	14
4. Detailed Findings – 1 st Stage Airport	16
Table 2 Compliance of the Report with Draft EIS Guidelines (EPBC Act)	16
Table 3 Health Pathways Included in the Draft EIS - Air Quality	31
Table 4 Health Pathways Included in the Draft EIS - Noise	43
Table 5 Health Pathways Included in the Draft EIS – Water Quality	51
Table 6 Review of Overall Report	56
5. Coverage of Health Topics	64
Table 7 Health Topics Covered in Health Chapter	66
Table 8 Health Topics Not Covered in Health Chapter	68
Important health implications of the determinants of health that have not been fully assessed in the draft EIS	70
Environmental impacts	70
Economic impacts	70
Socio-cultural impacts	71
6. Detailed Findings – Long Term Development	74
Table 9 Long Term Health Impacts Considered in the Draft EIS	74
7. Summary of Key Findings	81
Air Quality	81
Noise	83
8. Opportunities in relation to assessment of health effects	85
Reporting of the identified health impacts	85
Scope of impacts included in the health chapter	86
Mitigation Measures	87
9. Qualifications of the Reviewers	89

List of Abbreviations

CHETRE	Centre for Health Equity Training, Research and Evaluation
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPBC	Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act
HIA	Health Impact Assessment
HRA	Health Risk Assessment
HRAPIE	Health Risks of Air Pollution in Europe
MACROC	Macarthur Regional Organisation of Councils
REVIHAPP	Review of Evidence on Health Aspects of Air Pollution
SES	Socio-Economic Status
SIA	Social Impact Assessment
UNSW	University of New South Wales
WHO	World Health Organisation
WSA	Western Sydney Airport
WSROC	Western Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils

Executive Summary

A peer review of the human health sections of the Western Sydney Airport (WSA) draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was undertaken by a team of international reviewers, led by the Centre for Health Equity Training, Research and Evaluation (CHETRE) at the University of New South Wales (UNSW). This work was commissioned by WSP/Parsons Brinckerhoff on behalf of the Western Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils (WSROC) and the Macarthur Regional Organisation of Councils (MACROC).

Methods

The review team developed a peer review framework based upon existing best practice review guidelines for evaluating health impact assessment (HIA). The framework incorporated key elements, processes, and requirements that should be included in the health assessment of an EIS. Additionally, the review team reviewed existing HIAs of airport developments to establish the range of health effects that are relevant to airport health assessments. This framework allowed the review team to assess the quality of the health assessment that was included in the draft EIS, and also determine important health effects that were not included.

Limitations

The review team were only able to conduct a review of the health impacts included in the health chapters (Human Health Chapter and Community Health Appendix). These were limited to noise, air quality, and water impacts, therefore the review team were not able to further review the assessment of other potential significant health impacts associated with airport development, such as changes to employment, transportation, amenity, and housing.

Although the review team assessed the methods used we were not able to assess the validity of the calculations used in predicting health outcomes. Validity of the findings in the health risk assessment (HRA) were based upon what was included in the health appendix, which did not include all necessary methods and formulas to test the findings. It is assumed that the calculations were carried out correctly.

As there was not a comprehensive HIA included in the draft EIS, the review team were limited in the range of recommendations we could make.

Components of Draft EIS Reviewed

Primary:

- Part D – Human Health Chapter
- Appendix G - Community Health

Secondary:

- Volume 1
 - Executive Summary
 - Part A - Project Background
 - Part B - Airport Plan
- Volume 2
 - Chapter 9 - Approach to Impact Assessment

- Chapter 27 - Cumulative Impact Assessment
- Part E - Environmental Management
- Part F - Conclusions
- Volume 3
 - Chapter 39, Section 8 – Human Health
 - Part H - Conclusion and recommendations
- Volume 4
 - Appendix E - Noise
 - Appendix F – Air quality
 - Appendix P1 – Social impact
 - Appendix P3 – Economic analysis

1st Stage Airport Findings

Compliance with EIS Guidance:

- Overall, the Health Chapters of the draft EIS comply with most of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Guidelines.
- The impacts that are considered in the Health Chapters are those associated with changes in air quality, water quality and noise. Generally, these are assessed in detail in terms of nature and extent of short and long-term impacts.
- Some of the information is presented in a way that makes it difficult for interested stakeholders to fully understand the scope and scale of the potential health impacts. The information provided is not always, clear, succinct and supported by maps or other accessible materials. Technical jargon is generally avoided without losing technical precision or the validity of the statements made. Cross-referencing is used however summaries of the findings of other chapters often do not fully explain key issues. Not all relevant sensitive population sub-groups or receptors have been considered in the areas assessed.
- The rationale and justification for why a HRA has been undertaken rather than an HIA are not discussed. There is national and state level guidance on HIA that should have been consulted in the development of the scope and methodology of the health assessment of the draft EIS. Key guidance documents include Health Impact Assessment Guidelines (enHealth, 2001), and Health Impact Assessment: A practical guide (UNSW and NSWHealth, 2007). Ideally the health assessment would have used an HIA framework incorporating an HRA approach.
- Ecologically sustainable development in relation to health is not considered. EPBC guidance states that ecologically sustainable development should ensure that the *health*, diversity and productivity of the environment is maintained or enhanced for the benefit of future generations.
- Considering the most significant health impacts/effects/risks considered in the draft EIS are those related to changes in air quality, noise and water quality, the level of analysis and detail presented in the Health Chapters is reflective of the potential significance of these descriptors. However, the potential inequality/inequity impacts have not been sufficiently assessed or discussed. This is a significant gap.

Recommendations for the Health Chapters of the draft EIS to better comply with EPBC guidelines are provided:

- The Health Chapters of the draft EIS should assess the health impacts/effects of changes in the full range of environmental and social determinants of health and the potential inequalities/equity issues due to the proposed development. The level of analysis and detail should be reflective of their likely significance. Examples are changes to road traffic movements and their potential health consequences (community severance, risk of road traffic accident and injury), changes in qualities and characteristics of the surrounding areas (including land values and other economic impacts) and changes in recreational use, amenity of natural areas and access to greenspace and nature and their associated health and wellbeing impacts through, for example, changes to levels of physical activity; effects on services and amenities.
- Findings should be presented in a way that helps to communicate the scale of the population affected, by determinant of health, and also what the synergistic (combined) impacts are likely to be to various communities from exposure to the combined hazards.
- Not all unknown variables, assumptions, and limitations are included in the assessment. A specific comment relates to certain health impacts (e.g. air quality-related health impacts on children, other chronic effects such as incidence of chronic bronchitis in adults) known to occur from exposure to air pollution but for which the level (extent/magnitude) of the health impact associated with a certain level of pollution exposure is uncertain or unknown. These additional health impacts, for which quantification is uncertain or unknown, are not discussed. The Health Chapters should consider and discuss health impacts where quantification is not currently recommended by national guidance (e.g. Australian Government *Guidelines for Health Risk Assessment*) such as air quality impacts on children, other chronic effects, and other additional morbidity effects of short-term exposure but for which there is a widely acceptable evidence base supporting their likely occurrence.

Assessment of Air Quality:

- The assessment of air quality-related health impacts follows a health risk assessment approach, focussing on quantification of health endpoints from exposure to a range of air pollutants. The methodology used is adequate. The range of air pollutants addressed is adequate. The range of health endpoints considered is also adequate and follows Australian evidence and guidance.
- However, the range of health endpoints addressed could be expanded to include others for which solid exposure-response coefficients exist, for example, group A coefficients provided in the WHO HRAPIE Project report¹.
- It is also not clear what baseline incidence rates were used (Sydney average or Liverpool/suburb rates). If Sydney rates are used, this may have resulted in a small underestimation of risks.
- Risks are estimated for 2030 and 2063 snapshots and separately for each pollutant. An overview of the expected scale of impacts resulting from the combined effect of all pollutants should be provided to provide a picture of the total risk to the exposed

¹ Table 1. CRFs recommended by the HRAPIE project, p5-11

communities. It would also have been useful to include stage 1 predictions at full capacity (2050).

- Risks could also have been provided for the entire assessment period e.g. 30 years and not just for the snapshots. Discussion of the uncertainty around estimates could be enhanced, for example through the use of the upper and lower 95% confidence interval values of the exposure-response coefficients used. This would provide a better understanding of the likely range of actual impacts (for the worst-case unmitigated scenario).
- A general level of acceptability for estimated risks is used, stated to be accepted by regulatory agencies. This is for a risk between 1×10^{-6} (1 in a million) and 1×10^{-5} (1 in 100,000). The regulatory agencies should be named and references for this statement should be provided. Consideration should also be given to stakeholder perceptions of acceptability of risk.
- There is no discussion of the implication of the distribution of effects for inequality and equity although baseline information on sensitive/vulnerable groups is provided.
- Community feedback and any potential perceptions or concerns of local residents are not discussed. Community feedback on health concerns should be described and how this feedback was considered and addressed in the assessment should be described. Where community comments have not been incorporated or addressed an explanation justifying this should be presented. If there were no specific comments or concerns about health impacts/effects or some determinants of health then this should also be stated explicitly. There should also be a discussion of how communities were consulted in regards to potential impacts on health.
- Perception effects are different from biological or epidemiological risks, can cause stress and anxiety, and should be considered separately from mortality and morbidity effects.
- Mitigation measures are not discussed; readers are cross-referred to the air quality chapter. An outline of proposed measures (i.e. an air quality management framework or plan) should be provided in the health chapter and an explanation provided for how and to what extent these measures will mitigate the identified health impacts.

Assessment of Noise:

- The assessment of noise-related health impacts follows a health risk assessment approach, focussing on quantification of health endpoints from exposure to a range of noise. The quantitative methodology used is adequate. The range of noise metrics used is adequate. The range of health endpoints considered is also adequate and follows Australian and international evidence and guidance, namely the enHealth Guidance *Health Effects of Environmental Noise other than Hearing Loss* (enHealth, 2004). Risks are estimated for 2030, 2050 and 2063 periods for three different operation phase scenarios.
- A qualitative analysis and discussion of impacts/risks/effects on vulnerable/sensitive groups and on health inequality/equity issues has not been undertaken.
- There is no discussion of the implication of the distribution of effects for inequality and equity.
- Community feedback and any potential perceptions or concerns of local residents are not discussed. Community feedback on health concerns should be described and how this feedback was considered and addressed in the assessment should be discussed. Where

community comments have not been incorporated or addressed an explanation justifying this should be presented. If there were no specific comments or concerns about health impacts/effects or some determinants of health then this should also be stated explicitly. There should also be a discussion of how communities were consulted.

- Perception effects are different from biological or epidemiological risks, can cause stress and anxiety and should be considered separately from mortality and morbidity effects.
- Mitigation measures are only discussed in passing and readers are cross-referred to the noise chapter. An outline of proposed measures (i.e. a noise management framework or plan) should be presented in the Health Chapters and an explanation provided for how and to what extent these measures will mitigate the identified health impacts.

Assessment of Water Quality:

A complete health risk assessment is not provided for water quality due to the limitations in water quality sampling (i.e. only 1997 data was available; no new data was collected for this EIS). A more complete assessment is required that includes a clear list of assumptions, a description of population affected, and an assessment of impacts on vulnerable receptor population groups.

Review of Overall Report:

The description of the context and requirements for the HRA are generally sufficient. It would have been advantageous to understand why only an HRA was undertaken and not a full HIA, considering that the Health Chapters recognize the significance of the social determinants of health. The population health profile was very limited in scope and is missing clarification for why only certain information is provided. Consideration of vulnerable populations is based around SEIFA scores only and again, it should be explained why only these scores, and not additional indicators of disadvantage are included. Any further information that is included in other chapters in the draft EIS should be referenced within the Health Chapters.

Coverage of Health Topics:

The health risks described in the Health Chapter (air quality, noise and water) shows that some key determinants of health have been considered in reasonable detail. However, the potential inequality/inequity impacts have not been sufficiently assessed or discussed. This is a significant gap.

Some key determinants either do not seem to have been considered anywhere in the draft EIS or have not been considered and discussed in relation to health impacts in the Human Health Chapter and appendix. The approach taken to considering health impacts in the Health Chapters is narrow and does not take into account the findings of other health-relevant assessments, such as in the social impact assessment (SIA). This has resulted in key environmental and social determinants of health not being considered. The scoping process whereby the decision to focus on air quality, noise and water is unclear so it is not possible to assess whether the narrow focus is justified. However given the current level of evidence on the effects of airports on health as well as the more general evidence base around the social determinants of health, it is likely that relevant health impacts are missing from the Health Chapters. The 'non health' sections of the draft EIS do however contain information about a number of significant impacts on the determinants of health (e.g. housing affordability, visual amenity). The majority of these relevant health determinants are covered within

the SIA. These have not been identified as health impacts and the range and magnitude of potential health outcomes resulting from these impacts have not been assessed.

Long Term Development Findings

The long-term development section (Chapter 39, Section 8) provides a summary of the long term health impacts that are discussed in more detail in the appendix. While the report does, at times, make reference back to the appendix, there is a lot of pertinent detail that is missing that should be referenced to the appendix. This section also lacks core components for clarity – such as discussing the methods used or mitigation measures - that would make this section acceptable as a standalone piece of work without having first read the appendix. This section also misses any discussion of long term cumulative impacts. Cumulative impacts are considered elsewhere in the report however this report does not make clear if the cumulative impact assessments were used in this assessment. It would be particularly relevant to include discussion of cumulative impacts here as there is no mention of health impacts in the cumulative impacts chapter. This section should also provide better characterisation of health impacts or otherwise provide a reference to where it is located in the appendix.

Key Impacts and Opportunities

The Health Chapter contains predictions of the attributable health outcomes from air and noise exposures in communities near the airport. The majority of outcomes for air quality were below accepted thresholds, however there were some exceedances for Particulate Matter 10, Particulate Matter 2.5, and Nitrogen Dioxide. Impacts from noise were also mostly below standards, however, impacts varied widely for different communities, with Luddenham likely to experience the most impacts associated with noise. Sufficient data was not available to conduct a complete HRA for ground water and surface water, therefore there are no predicted health impacts.

The Health Chapter and appendix utilises a Health Risk Assessment approach. This is a quantitative methodology that takes changes to these environmental determinants and estimates their risk to health (i.e. the chances or risk of a disease or fatality occurring). This narrow approach does not address the full range of determinants of health and makes no use of the large evidence base on the association between health determinants, particularly social, and health outcomes.

There are two major weaknesses in relation to the assessment of health impacts that the review team strongly recommend be addressed in order to ensure that health effects are not overlooked or not taken into account when mitigation/enhancement is being considered. These are: the reporting of the identified health impacts; and the scope of the impacts included in the health chapter.

1. Introduction

This report details the findings of a peer review conducted on the Western Sydney Airport (WSA) draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The peer review was commissioned by WSP/Parsons Brinckerhoff to examine the quality of the health and human impacts considered within the draft EIS. The review was conducted by a team of international experts in health impact assessment (HIA) and was led by researchers from the Centre for Health Equity Training, Research and Evaluation (CHETRE) at the University of New South Wales (UNSW). The review was conducted rapidly over 2 weeks in order to fit within the public comment period for the draft EIS. The findings of this review may be used by the consultant to inform the Western Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils (WSROC) and Macarthur Region of Councils (MACROC) in their comments on the draft EIS.

2. Approach

Health Impacts of Airports

Human health is a broad concept that encompasses more than the absence of disease. “Health is a state of complete physical, social and mental wellbeing and not simply the absence of disease or infirmity,”² it is a “resource for everyday life, not the objective of living; it is a positive concept, emphasizing social and personal resources, as well as physical capacities.”³ This understanding recognises that though illness and disease (mortality and morbidity) are useful ways of measuring health, they need to be fitted within a broader understanding of health and wellbeing.

It is important to note that health is influenced by a very broad range of factors – the determinants of health (see figure 1⁴). These can be categorized as inherent factors, lifestyles and behaviours, socio-economic and environmental conditions, and access to services. These determinants are affected by development proposals (policies, plans, programmes and projects) from all sectors of society. Therefore, health is influenced by actions from all sectors and not just the health sector. Infrastructure projects, and airport development in particular, can have a wide range of impacts including on several determinants of health, therefore directly, indirectly, in-combination (synergistically) and cumulatively impacting on health.

Anything which alters a determinant of health, such as those listed in Table 1, may as a consequence, have an impact on health. Impacts on health determinants can be thought of as leading to changes in health outcomes such as communicable diseases, non-communicable diseases, physical injury, mental health and wellbeing, and nutrition-related disorders.

² WHO, 1948. Preamble to the Constitution of the World Health Organization as adopted by the International Health Conference, New York, 19-22 June, 1946; Official Records of the World Health Organization, no. 2, p. 100.

³ WHO Regional Office for Europe, 1984. Health Promotion. Summary report of the Working Group on Concept and Principles of Health Promotion, Copenhagen, 9-13 July 1984

⁴ Barton, H. and Grant, M., 2006. A health map for the local human habitat. *Journal of the Royal Society for the Promotion of Public Health*, 126 (6) pp252-261.

Table 1 Examples of Key Determinants of Health

Fixed	Social and Economic	Lifestyles & Behaviours	Access to Services	Environmental
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genes • Sex • Ageing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poverty • Employment • Social exclusion • Community structure and infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diet • Physical activity • Smoking • Alcohol • Sexual behaviour • Drugs • Coping skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Health services • Social services • Transport • Leisure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe water and clean air • Healthy workspaces • Safe housing

Source: enHealth 2001⁵, Adapted from UK DOH⁶ Inset 1A

Impact assessment, an important decision-support tool, providing information to decision makers on the impacts of proposed action and their management, needs to cover health impacts adequately to be fit-for-purpose. Historically, health impacts within environmental impact assessment (EIA) have been addressed narrowly, assessing only changes to traditional environmental determinants such as air quality, noise or water quality. Health Risk Assessment (HRA) is a quantitative methodology that takes changes to these environmental determinants and estimates their risk to health (i.e. the chances or risk of a disease or fatality occurring). This narrow approach does not address the full range of determinants of health and makes no use of the large evidence base on the association between health determinants, particularly social, and health outcomes. The narrow approach has over the years been found to be of limited use to policy and decision-makers and a fuller, more comprehensive qualitative and quantitative assessment of health impacts is often called for. This has




Figure 1 Determinants of Health (Barton and Grant, 2006)

⁵ Department of Health, UK, 2000. A resource for Health Impact Assessment. <http://www.doh.gov.uk/london/healthia.htm>

occurred internationally as well as in Australia, with guidelines and practical guides published on how to undertake a comprehensive assessment of health impacts^{7 8}.

What is Health Impact Assessment?

The international Gothenburg Consensus definition of HIA is:

“A combination of procedures, methods and tools by which a policy, program or project may be judged as to its potential effects on the health of a population, and the distribution of those effects within the population.”⁹

The more recent International Association for Impact Assessment’s definition of HIA, which updates the earlier Gothenburg Consensus definition, is that HIA is:

“A combination of procedures, methods and tools that systematically judges the potential, and sometimes unintended, effects of a policy, plan, programme or project on the health of a population and the distribution of those effects within the population. HIA identifies appropriate actions to manage those effects.”¹⁰

The aim of HIA is to inform and add value to the decision-making process by providing a systematic analysis of the potential impacts as well as recommending options, where appropriate, for enhancing the positive effects, mitigating the negative ones and reducing health inequities/inequalities. It uses a psycho-social definition of health and considers the full range of environmental and social determinants of health. To do this HIA uses a range of structured and evaluated sources of qualitative and quantitative evidence that includes public and other stakeholders' perceptions and experiences as well as public health, epidemiological, toxicological and medical knowledge. It is the preferred methodology to ensure development proposals are undertaken in a way that safeguards the health and wellbeing of affected communities, promotes health opportunities, reduces health inequalities and promotes health equity. HIA is therefore particularly concerned with the distribution of effects within a population, as different groups are likely to be affected in different ways, and therefore looks at how health and social inequities/inequalities might be reduced or widened by a proposed plan or project.

The World Health Organization (WHO) describes health equity as:

“...the absence of avoidable or remediable differences among groups of people, whether those groups are defined socially, economically, demographically, or geographically. Health inequities therefore involve more than inequality with respect to health determinants and access to the resources needed to improve and maintain

⁷ enHealth, 2001. Health Impact Assessment Guidelines. Australia

⁸ Harris, P., Harris-Roxas, B., Harris, E., & Kemp, L., 2007. Health Impact Assessment: A Practical Guide, Sydney: Centre for Health Equity Training, Research and Evaluation (CHETRE). Part of the UNSW Research Centre for Primary Health Care and Equity, UNSW.

⁹ European Centre for Health Policy, WHO Regional Office for Europe, 1999. Gothenburg Consensus Paper on Health Impact Assessment. Main Concepts and Suggested Approach

¹⁰ Quigley, R., L. den Broeder, P. Furu, A. Bond, B. Cave and R. Bos 2006. Health Impact Assessment International Best Practice Principles. Special Publication Series No. 5. Fargo, USA: International Association for Impact Assessment.

health or health outcomes. They also entail a failure to avoid or overcome inequalities that infringe on fairness and human rights norms.

Reducing health inequities is important because health is a fundamental human right and its progressive realisation will eliminate inequalities that result from differences in health status (such as disease or disability) in the opportunity to enjoy life and pursue one's life plans.

A characteristic common to groups that experience health inequities—such as poor or marginalized persons, racial and ethnic minorities, and women—is lack of political, social or economic power. Thus, to be effective and sustainable, interventions that aim to redress inequities must typically go beyond remedying a particular health inequality and also help empower the group in question through systemic changes, such as law reform or changes in economic or social relationships.”¹¹

Internationally the WHO Commission on the Social Determinants of Health in “Closing the Gap in a Generation” (2008) and the Marmot Review in the UK in “Fair Society, Healthy Lives” (2010) demonstrated and advocated for the importance of considering health inequities and inequalities when assessing the health and wellbeing impacts of policies and projects.^{12 13}

Relevant Determinants of Health for Airport Development

An airport is a large infrastructure project. Like any large infrastructure, a considerable construction phase is anticipated, followed by a very long operation phase. Decommissioning is not always clear and may never occur. As with other infrastructures with a large requirement for land/space, an airport has the potential to affect the full range of health determinants and not just those related to air transport. For example, communities may need to be relocated, greenspace may be lost, employment may be generated and lost, economic development may be fostered or changed, opportunities for learning and education may be provided or disrupted, pollutants may be emitted to the air, water and soil, activities may generate noise, physical barriers may be erected, and traffic patterns may be altered to name just a few. Consequently, a wide range of health impacts can potentially occur. These need to be systematically identified, scoped, analysed and managed as part of comprehensive impact assessment process.

3. Methods

A review framework was developed based on existing guidelines for reviewing assessments and reporting of human health and wellbeing impacts. *A Review Package for Health Impact Assessment Reports of Development Projects* formed the core review framework. This framework has been used

¹¹ World Health Organization (WHO). (2015). Equity. Health systems. Available at <http://www.who.int/healthsystems/topics/equity/en/>

¹² World Health Organization (WHO). (2008). Closing the gap on a generation: Health equity through action on the social determinants of health. Commission on Social Determinants of Health. Available at: <http://www.instituteofhealthequity.org/projects/commission-on-social-determinants-of-health>

¹³ The Marmot Review. (2010). Fair Society, Healthy Lives: Strategic Review of Health Inequalities in England post-2010.

extensively over the last six years,¹⁴ including by the Wales Health Impact Assessment Support Unit, South Cambridgeshire District Council¹⁵ and Bristol City Council in the UK.¹⁶ The Review Package was also used to review an HIA on proposals for expansion at London City Airport for the London Borough of Newham. It has also been used to assess 55 HIAs in both Australia and New Zealand.¹⁷

A Guide for the Evaluation of Health Impact Assessments Carried Out Within the EIA Process,¹⁸ published this year, was also analysed and incorporated into the review package to enhance the peer review framework and methodology described in *A Review Package for Health Impact Assessment Reports of Development Projects*. This Australian guidance was developed at the WHO Collaborating Centre for Environmental Health Impact Assessment.

Lastly, specifications for the draft EIS, the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (EPBC) guidelines, were also taken into account in developing the review framework (See Table 2 for details).

The final review framework considers both the possible and likely health and wellbeing effects as well as the distribution of those impacts and health equity issues, and the fulfilment of draft EIS guidance.

Components of the Draft EIS Considered in the Review

In accordance with the commissioned work, a comprehensive review was conducted on the Community Health Appendix (G) and the Human Health Chapter (Volume 2, Part D) (Health Chapters). In order to complete the review frameworks, the following parts of the EIS were considered although not fully reviewed in detail:

- Volume 1
 - Executive Summary
 - Part A - Project Background
 - Part B - Airport Plan
- Volume 2
 - Chapter 9 - Approach to Impact Assessment
 - Chapter 27 - Cumulative Impact Assessment
 - Part E - Environmental Management
 - Part F - Conclusions
- Volume 3
 - Chapter 39, Section 8 – Human Health
 - Part H - Conclusion and recommendations
- Volume 4

¹⁴ Winge Fredsgaard M, Cave B and Bond A. A review package for Health Impact Assessment reports of development projects. Leeds, UK: Ben Cave Associates Ltd. (2009).

¹⁵ <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/health-impact-assessment-spd>

¹⁶ Bristol City Council. Planning a healthier Bristol: Assessing the health impacts of development. 2013. Bristol City Council. Planning a healthier Bristol: Assessing the health impacts of development. 2013.

¹⁷ Haigh F, et al. "The effectiveness of health impact assessment in influencing decision-making in Australia and New Zealand 2005–2009." *BMC public health* 13.1 (2013): 1188.

¹⁸ Spickett J and Katscherian D, *A Guide for the Evaluation of Health Impact Assessments Carried Out Within the EIA Process*, WHO Collaborating Centre for Environmental Health Impact Assessment, Curtin University.

- Appendix E - Noise
- Appendix F – Air quality
- Appendix P1 – Social impact
- Appendix P3 – Economic analysis

Review of Past Airport HIAs

Prior to beginning the peer review, the review team carried out a review of past airport HIAs in order to identify the existing evidence on the likely and potential health and wellbeing impacts of airports in settings similar to the proposed Western Sydney Airport (WSA).

Criteria for inclusion in the review were:

- Comparability to WSA
- Availability of report
- Recent (<5 years)
- Fulfilled basic quality criteria in terms of reporting (in particular adequate descriptions of methods used and findings)

Exclusion criteria were:

- Health Risk Assessments that only considered a narrow range of impacts (e.g. noise, air quality)

The review team identified 13 Airport HIAs. Three of which satisfied the inclusion criteria:

1. HIA of proposed expansion to Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport
2. HIA of London Luton Airport
3. The Stanstead Generation 2 Project HIA¹⁹

Impacts were categorised according to type of health impact (e.g. environmental, economic, socio-cultural), activity (e.g. air traffic movements, traffic, construction), and the potential health outcome (e.g. respiratory effects, mental health).

An initial review of the Health Chapters was carried out to identify health topics covered. These health impacts were subject to peer review using the peer review framework. This peer review was commissioned to focus on the Health Chapters, however, it became apparent that significant areas of potential health impact were missing from the health chapter and technical report. The review team carried out an additional search of the technical documents within the appendix to identify whether there were relevant health impacts included within the draft EIS that had not been included in relevant health sections. A discussion of the impacts located in sections of the draft EIS outside the Health Chapters is in Section 5 of this report.

Limitations

The framework developed for this peer review enables a comprehensive assessment of the draft EIS Health Chapters, however there are limitations to our review. Primarily, the review team were limited to conducting a review of the health impacts included in the health chapters. Given that

¹⁹ This HIA was outside of the time criteria but is considered an early example of a comprehensive HIA submitted as part of a planning application and alongside an EIS

these were limited to only noise, air quality, and water impacts, the review team were not able to further discuss the potential significant impacts associated with airport development, such as changes to employment, transportation, amenity, and housing. Also, given the significant time restraints of the review, the review team were not able to assess the validity of the calculations used in predicting health outcomes. Validity of the findings in the HRA were based upon what was included in the health appendix, which did not include all necessary methods and formulas to test the findings. The review team were limited to discussing the assumptions used in the methods, any limitations with the methods used, and the presentation of the findings. Furthermore, without a comprehensive health impact assessment included in the draft EIS, the review team were limited in the types of recommendations we could make.

4. Detailed Findings – 1st Stage Airport

This section details the findings of the peer review conducted on the Health Chapters for 1st Stage Airport development. The findings are presented according to different components of the review: compliance of the Health Chapter with draft EIS guidance (Table 2); assessment of health pathways included in the draft EIS – air quality (Table 3), noise (Table 4), water quality (Table 5); and components of the overall report such as the context and baseline health profile (Table 6).

Table 2 Compliance of the Report with Draft EIS Guidelines (EPBC Act)

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
1.1. Reporting		
<p>1.1.1. The draft EIS [health chapters] should enable interested stakeholders and the Minister to understand the environmental consequences of the proposed development. (1 General Content)</p>	<p>The Health Chapters of the draft EIS identify, describe and discuss the health consequences of changes to noise, air quality and the water environment from the proposed development.</p> <p>Some of this information is presented in a way that makes it difficult for interested stakeholders to fully understand the scope and scale of the potential health impacts.</p> <p>Health consequences associated with potential changes in other environmental and social determinants of health are not addressed in the Health Chapters. An example is risk of road traffic accidents and injuries associated with project-induced traffic.</p>	<p>The Health Chapters of the draft EIS should assess the health impacts/effects of changes in the full range of environmental and social determinants of health due to the proposed development.</p> <p>Key additional health consequences and or determinants of health to consider are (not an exhaustive list): effects on services and amenities; traffic and transport, in particular road traffic accidents and injuries; employment (see Table 8 about the main health determinants influenced by airports and airport-related developments).</p> <p>Findings should be presented in a way that helps the reader to understand the scale of</p>

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
	Equally importantly, the potential unequal and inequitable impacts/effects to affected communities and vulnerable/sensitive sub-groups are not analysed or discussed.	the population affected, by determinant of health, and also what the synergistic impacts are likely to be to various communities from exposure to the combined hazards.
1.1.2. Information provided in the draft EIS [health chapters] should be objective, clear, and succinct and, where appropriate, be supported by maps, plans, diagrams or other descriptive detail. (1 General Content)	Health Chapters mostly fulfil this requirement. See 1.1.3.	None at this time.
1.1.3. The body of the draft EIS [health chapters] is to be written in a clear and concise style that is easily understood by the general reader. Technical jargon should be avoided wherever possible. Cross-referencing should be used to avoid unnecessary duplication of text. (1 General Content)	Health chapters mostly fulfil this requirement. One subsection where technical jargon is used without a subsequent description of what it entails is the final paragraph of section 13.8.3: “The health risk assessment predicts an increase in cancer risk attributable to diesel particles ranging from 1.3×10^{-6} to 8.4×10^{-6} per $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. Accordingly, the resultant cancer risk estimates are demonstrated to fall within levels for risk generally considered acceptable to regulators (by two orders of magnitude).”	Make this paragraph more clear and understandable. HRA should use consistent measurements of risk, and detail risk according to the community impacted, in terms of geographic areas and/or by vulnerable/sensitive sub-groups, to allow the audience a quicker and more accessible understanding of the information.

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
	It may be difficult for the general public to understand the magnitude of the risk involved i.e. a low risk.	
1.1.4. The level of analysis and detail in the draft EIS [health chapters] should reflect the level of significance of the expected impacts on the environment. (1 General Content)	<p>Assuming that the most significant health risks are those related to changes in air quality, noise and the water environment, the level of analysis and detail presented in the Health Chapters of the draft EIS is reflective of the potential significance of these determinants of health.</p> <p>However, what has not been considered is the full range of environmental and social determinants of health, related potential health impacts/effects/risks and inequality/equity issues. This is an omission.</p>	The Health Chapters of the draft EIS should address the full range of environmental and social determinants of health, related potential health impacts/effects/risks and inequality/equity issues with a level of analysis and detail reflective of their likely significance.
1.1.5. Any and all unknown variables or assumptions made in the assessment must be clearly stated and discussed. The extent to which the limitations, if any, of available information may influence the conclusions of the environmental assessment should be discussed. (1 General	Not all unknown variables, assumptions, and limitations are included in the assessment. For example, using region level baseline statistics in the HRA calculations introduces errors that affect the precision of the predications stated (e.g. 6 death over 100 years), in that using the central value for the exposure response coefficients is the best “guess” but there is a 95% confidence interval (CI) that should be stated. The predictions should be understood	<p>There should be qualitative discussion and analysis of health impacts/effects where quantification is not currently recommended by national guidance (e.g. Australian Government <i>Guidelines for Health Risk Assessment</i>).</p> <p>Uncertainties should be more clearly discussed including by presenting and discussing confidence intervals.</p>

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
Content)	<p>as a best estimate, recognising there is some variance around the estimate but that the true value (for a worst case unmitigated scenario) is likely to lie within that order of magnitude.</p> <p>The scientific literature shows that the range of health impacts/effects associated with exposure to air pollutants is broader than the range of health impacts/effects for which internationally accepted exposure-response coefficients exists (i.e. where good quality research has identified exposure-response coefficients and there is international scientific consensus). This means that there are health impacts known to occur from exposure to air pollution (e.g. some air quality-related health impacts on children, some chronic effects such as incidence of chronic bronchitis in adults) but the level of health impacts/effects associated with a certain level of pollution exposure is uncertain or unknown.</p> <p>These health impacts/effects and the uncertainty around their extent/magnitude are not considered or discussed.</p>	

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
	The implications of future population growth are also not addressed.	
1.2. Principles of Ecologically Sustainable Development		
Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
<i>The Proponent should ensure that the draft EIS [health chapters] assesses compliance of the action with the principles of Ecologically Sustainable Development:</i>		
1.2.1. Decision-making processes should effectively integrate both long-term and short-term economic, environmental, social and equitable considerations. (1 General Content)	<p>While vulnerable populations are identified e.g. those with high levels of deprivation, health impacts/effects are not assessed for their potentially disproportionate distribution (inequalities/inequity).</p> <p>Health impacts/effects are quantified for 'snapshots' in time and not over the whole life of the project.</p> <p>Synergistic or in-combination impacts/effects are not considered and discussed.</p>	<p>The human health chapter of the draft EIS should assess distribution of potential health impacts and consider assessing health impacts for the entire assessment period, e.g. 60 years, both quantitatively (e.g. report attributable cases for this period) and qualitatively.</p> <p>There should also be discussion of the synergistic or in-combination impacts/effects.</p>
1.2.2. If there are threats of serious or irreversible (health relevant) environmental damage, lack of full scientific certainty should	None at this time.	None at this time.

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent environmental degradation. (Attachment 1 3A(b))		
1.2.3. The principle of inter-generational equity – that the present generation should ensure that the health, diversity and productivity of the environment is maintained or enhanced for the benefit of future generations –should be addressed. (Attachment 1 3A(b))	The Health Chapters do not take into consideration inequality, equity, or intergenerational impacts/effects.	There should be discussion of inequality, equity, or intergenerational impacts/effects.
1.3. Assessment		
Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
1.3.1. A detailed assessment of the nature and extent of the likely short-term and long-term relevant impacts (detailing direct and indirect impacts) is provided. (Relevant Impacts 5(a))	The health impacts that are addressed in the Health Chapters of the draft EIS are described in terms of their characteristics, specific health endpoints (range of mortality and morbidity endpoints) for both the construction and operation phases; and their magnitude/extent. However, as described in 1.1.1 the health impacts/effects associated with potential	The health implications of impacts on social determinants of health currently included in other draft EIS chapters should be addressed and included in the Health Chapters.

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
	changes in environmental (other than noise, air quality and water quality) and social determinants of health are not addressed.	
<p>1.3.2. A statement whether any relevant impacts are likely to be unknown, unpredictable or irreversible is provided. (Relevant Impacts 5(a))</p>	<p>For the impacts discussed, all are considered to be likely for a scenario where mitigation measures are not in place. It is considered that with mitigation in place, impacts are likely to be lower. Unknown, unpredictable or irreversible impacts are not discussed (e.g. relocation of local residents).</p> <p>There is also no discussion of residual impacts/effects after mitigation is in place.</p>	<p>See 1.3.1</p> <p>The significance and implications of the residual impacts/effects should also be addressed.</p>
<p>1.3.3. An analysis of the significance of the relevant impacts is provided. (Relevant Impacts 5(a))</p>	<p>Impacts and effects are discussed in terms of their significance to national and international guidance, standards and thresholds.</p> <p>Significance is assumed to be defined in terms of national and international guidance, standards and thresholds. There is no discussion of the significance of impacts/effects to affected communities i.e. community perception of risks.</p>	<p>Consider including a broader discussion of the significance of the health impacts/effects for affected communities (e.g. community perception of risks).</p>
<p>1.3.4. Any technical data and other information used or needed to make a detailed assessment of</p>	<p>Most underlying technical data regarding the environmental exposures to noise, air or water pollutants is not presented in the</p>	<p>See Air Quality and Noise Review Tables.</p> <p>The actual worked out health impact</p>

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
<p>the relevant impacts are discussed. (Relevant Impacts 5(a))</p>	<p>Health Chapters. There are cross-references to the respective Noise, Air Quality and Water Quality chapters.</p> <p>No exposure-response coefficients for the quantification of health impacts/effects/risks are provided nor are the actual worked out calculations presented.</p> <p>Some key references are also missing from the methods. For example the sources of the exposure response functions for pm10 and pm2.5 (EPHC, 2011; HEI, 2009) are not included in the reference section.</p>	<p>calculations and exposure-response coefficients used should be presented and discussed.</p> <p>All references to enable a review of the methods should be provided.</p>
<p>1.3.5. The draft EIS [health chapters] should identify and address cumulative impacts, where potential project impacts are in addition to existing impacts of other activities (including known potential future expansions or developments by the proponent and other proponents in the region and vicinity). (Relevant Impacts 5(b))</p>	<p>Cumulative impacts from potential future expansions or developments by the proponent and other proponents in the region and vicinity are not discussed.</p> <p>There is a cumulative impact chapter (volume 2 chapter 27) but this does not have a specific section on the implication for health of the cumulative impacts of other projects occurring around the proposed development.</p>	<p>The health impacts/effects/risks of potential cumulative impacts should be discussed in the cumulative impact chapter and the health chapter should reference this and the air quality, noise and other health relevant sections in the cumulative impact chapter.</p>
<p>1.3.6. Aircraft noise and vibration impacts on everyday activities and on sensitive environmental</p>	<p>Vibration and its potential health and wellbeing impacts/effects/risks (e.g. disturbing sleep patterns, annoyance and</p>	<p>There should be discussion and assessment of the health impacts/effects/risks to other sensitive receptors and population sub-</p>

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
<p>receptors (all sensitive receptors within the community and natural environment) are discussed. (Relevant Impacts 5(g))</p>	<p>wellbeing effects) are not discussed.</p> <p>Noise impacts are discussed for learning impairment and interference with sleep (as well as other morbidity endpoints).</p> <p>Noise impacts on schools (sensitive receptors) are discussed. However, sensitive receptors are narrowly scoped to only looking at schools. There is no discussion of other sensitive receptors e.g. hospitals, nursing homes.</p>	<p>groups.</p> <p>There should also be discussion of the health impacts/effects/risks of vibration.</p>
<p>1.3.7. The draft EIS should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noise and vibration from construction activities and machinery • changes in traffic movements during construction and operation (associated with both passenger movements and workers) • changes to air quality during construction and operation (including consideration of seasonal and meteorological variations that influence local air quality) 	<p>Noise from construction activities is considered.</p> <p>Vibration from construction activities and their potential health and wellbeing impacts/effects/risks (e.g. disturbing sleep patterns, annoyance and wellbeing effects) are not discussed.</p> <p>Changes to road traffic movements and their potential health consequences (severance, risk of road traffic accidents and injuries) are not considered except for their noise and air quality implications.</p> <p>Changes to air quality and their health effects</p>	<p>The potential health impacts/effects/risks from road traffic changes e.g. severance and road traffic accidents and injuries (this not an exhaustive list) should be assessed and discussed.</p> <p>The potential health impacts/effects/risks on local communities from changes in the qualities and characteristics of the surrounding areas (including land values and other economic impacts) should also be assessed and discussed.</p> <p>The potential health impacts/effects/risks (e.g. associated with levels of physical activity, access to greenspace and nature) from</p>

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential fuel dumping impacts • lighting impacts on everyday activities and on sensitive environmental receptors (all sensitive receptors within the community and natural environment) • change in qualities and characteristics of the surrounding areas and associated impacts to local communities (including land values and other economic impacts) • Creation of any risks or hazards to people or property that may be associated with any component of the action. • changes in recreational use and amenity of natural areas (Relevant Impacts 5(g)) 	<p>are considered.</p> <p>Potential fuel dumping is considered.</p> <p>The potential health impacts/effects/risks on local communities from changes in the qualities and characteristics of the surrounding areas (including land values and other economic impacts) have not been discussed.</p> <p>The potential health impacts/effects/risks from changes in recreational use and amenity of natural areas have not been discussed.</p> <p>Some health-relevant issues (e.g. traffic, local amenity, visual impacts) are discussed in the social chapter (Volume 2, Chapter 23), but they are not discussed or referenced in the health chapter.</p>	<p>changes in recreational use and amenity of natural areas should also be assessed and discussed.</p> <p>See 1.3.1</p>
<p>1.3.8. Quantification and assessment of impacts should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be against appropriate background/baseline levels 	<p>Quantification of health impacts/effects/risks is in relation to existing rates of disease and existing burden of ill health attributable to air pollution.</p>	<p>The assessment should consider and develop a broader health and wellbeing baseline (taking into account of the full range of environmental and social determinants of</p>

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be prepared according to best practice guidelines and compared to best practice standards • consider seasonal and temporal variations where appropriate (including temporal changes in the sensitivity of the receptor) • be supported by maps, graphs and diagrams as appropriate to ensure information is readily understandable • Guidelines and standards used to quantify baselines and impacts should be explained and justified. (Relevant Impacts 5(g)) 	<p>However, the baseline health conditions are narrowly defined both in terms of scope (a narrow range of health impact/effects/risks and no consideration of wellbeing) and geography (only Liverpool LGA). The assessment also does not adequately take into account future population growth.</p> <p>Impacts are assessed according to national guidance, namely the Australian Government <i>Guidelines for Health Risk Assessment</i> (enHealth 2012) and the National Health and Medical Research Council <i>Approach to Hazard Assessment for Air Quality</i> (NHMRC 2006).</p> <p>However, for future assessments, it is worth noting that the above guidance is based on outdated international (state-of-the-art) knowledge and guidance on quantification of health impacts from air pollution. The current state-of-the art is described in the World Health Organization HRAPIE and REVIHAPP reports.</p> <p>Impacts are assessed against national and international noise and air quality guidance, standards, and thresholds.</p>	<p>health), a geography that includes all affected populations, and the implications of future population growth.</p> <p>See 1.3.1</p>

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
<p>1.3.9. For information given in the draft EIS, the EIS must state:</p> <p>(a) the source of the information</p> <p>(b) how recent the information is</p> <p>(c) how the reliability of the information was tested</p> <p>(d) what uncertainties (if any) are in the information</p> <p>(e) what guidelines, plans and/or policies have been considered during preparation of the draft EIS. (Information Sources Provided in the EIS, 11)</p>	<p>Sources of health baseline data are presented. Dates for the information are provided.</p> <p>Policy guidelines are discussed in relation to air quality and noise however, there is no discussion of the public health policy context. Recent information is used for noise and air quality but not for water – the limitations of this are stated in the report.</p> <p>Uncertainties are not presented in terms of using confidence intervals.</p>	<p>The public health policy context should have been reviewed, summarised in the draft EIS and used to inform the scope and approach of the assessment. For example, there is no discussion or justification of why a health risk assessment approach was used instead of a health impact assessment approach.</p> <p>See 1.1.5.</p>
1.4. Conclusion		
Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
<p><i>An overall conclusion as to the environmental acceptability of the proposal on protected matters must be provided, which includes:</i></p>		

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
(Conclusion 12)		
<p>1.4.1. a discussion on how consideration has been given to the objects of the EPBC Act, the principles of ecologically sustainable development, and the precautionary principle</p>	<p>A discussion on how consideration has been given to the objects of the EPBC Act is provided.</p> <p>Principles of ecologically sustainable development, and the precautionary principle are not explicitly discussed.</p>	<p>See 1.2.3</p>
<p>1.4.2. justification for undertaking the proposal in the manner proposed, including the acceptability of the avoidance and mitigation measures</p>	<p>Mitigation is not described in the Chapters but there is cross-referencing to air quality, water quality and noise chapters.</p> <p>There is no explanation of why the assessment only considers and assesses the health impacts/effects/risks of noise, air quality and water.</p>	<p>An outline of the mitigation framework/plan should be provided in the Health Chapters alongside cross-referencing to the air quality, noise and water quality chapters.</p>
<p>1.4.3. If relevant, a discussion of residual impacts and any offsets and compensatory measures proposed or required for significant residual impacts on protected matters, and the relative degree of compensation and acceptability.</p>	<p>There is also no discussion of residual impacts/effects after mitigation is in place. See 1.3.2</p> <p>There is no discussion of the acceptability of mitigation measures.</p>	<p>The significance and implications of the residual impacts/effects should be discussed. See 1.3.2</p> <p>There should also be a consideration and discussion of the acceptability to the community of proposed mitigation and compensation measures.</p>

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
EPBC Compliance Comments:		
<p>Overall, the Health Chapters of the draft EIS (draft EIS volume 2, chapter 13, volume 4, appendix G) comply with most of the EPBC Guidelines.</p> <p>The impacts that are considered in the human health chapters are those associated to changes in air quality, water quality and noise. Generally, these are assessed in detail in terms of nature and extent of short- and long-term impacts.</p> <p>Some of the information is presented in a way that makes it difficult for interested stakeholders to fully understand the scope and scale of the potential health impacts. The information provided is not always, clear, succinct and supported by maps or other accessible materials. Technical jargon is generally avoided without losing technical precision or the validity of the statements made. Cross-referencing is used however summaries of the findings of other chapters often do not fully explain key issues. Not all sensitive population sub-groups or receptors have been considered.</p> <p>The rational and justification for why a health risk assessment has been undertaken rather than a health impact assessment (HIA) are not discussed. There is existing national and state level guidance on the value of using HIA that should have been consulted in the development of the scope and methodology of the health assessment of the draft EIS. The key guidance documents are Health Impact Assessment Guidelines (enHealth, 2001), and Health Impact Assessment: A practical guide (UNSW and NSWHealth, 2007).</p> <p>Ecologically sustainable development in relation to health is not considered.</p> <p>Considering the most significant health impacts/effects/risks considered in the draft EIS are those related to changes in air quality, noise and water quality, the level of analysis and detail presented in the Health Chapters is reflective of the potential significance of these descriptors.</p> <p>Recommendations for the Health Chapters of the draft EIS to better comply with EPBC guidelines are provided below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Health Chapters of the draft EIS should assess the health impacts/effects of changes in the full range of environmental and social determinants of health and the potential inequalities/equity issues due to the proposed development. The level of analysis and detail 		

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
	<p>should be reflective of their likely significance. Examples are changes to road traffic movements and their potential health consequences (community severance, risk of road traffic accident and injury), changes in qualities and characteristics of the surrounding areas (including land values and other economic impacts) and changes in recreational use, amenity of natural areas and access to greenspace and nature and their associated health and wellbeing impacts through, for example, changes to levels of physical activity; effects on services and amenities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings should be presented in a way that helps to communicate the scale of the population affected, by determinant of health, and also what the synergistic impacts are likely to be to various communities from exposure to the combined hazards. • Not all unknown variables, assumptions, and limitations are included in the assessment. A specific comment relates to certain health impacts (e.g. air quality-related health impacts on children, other chronic effects such as incidence of chronic bronchitis in adults) known to occur from exposure to air pollution but for which the level (extent/magnitude) of the health impact associated with a certain level of pollution exposure is uncertain or unknown. These additional health impacts, for which quantification is uncertain or unknown, are not discussed. The Health Chapters should have considered and discussed health impacts where quantification is not currently recommended by national guidance (e.g. Australian Government <i>Guidelines for Health Risk Assessment</i>) such as air quality impacts on children, other chronic effects, other additional morbidity effects of short-term exposure but for which there is a widely acceptable evidence base supporting their likely occurrence (e.g. WHO REVIHAPP report). 	

Table 3 Health Pathways Included in the Draft EIS - Air Quality

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
1.1 Description of health effects		
1.1.1 The potential health impacts/effects of the project, both beneficial and adverse, should be identified and presented in a systematic way. ²⁰	<p>Health impacts/effects i.e. mortality and morbidity endpoints are presented systematically for short-term and long-term health effects in association with changes in both short-term and long-term exposure to air pollutants; health impacts are described for both the construction and operation (start of operation 2030 and full operation 2063) phases.</p> <p>Health impacts/effects are presented inconsistently and in a manner that makes it difficult to understand the potential scale of the impacts/effects across all the affected communities.</p> <p>Health impacts resulting from perceived risk and community concern have not been considered.</p>	Develop summary tables that provide consistent presentation of potential health impacts. For example: “For health impact/effect A an X increase in PM2.5 would lead to an additional Y events per 100,000 population. In M town with a population of N this would mean an extra Z cases in the next ten years.”
1.1.2 Has the exposure pathway been identified?	The exposure pathway for air quality is described from likely emission sources (during both construction and operation phases) to exposure of populations living within the vicinity of the airport.	None at this time.

²⁰ Does the identification of impacts consider short-term, long-term (and are these timescales defined?), direct and indirect impacts on health and well-being? Does the identification of health impacts distinguish between the construction phase, the operational phase and where relevant the decommissioning phase?

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
1.1.3 Has an appropriate time period been considered for health and wellbeing impacts/effects?	Health and wellbeing impacts have been described for 'snapshot' years: 2030 and 2063.	Consider presenting impacts for the entire assessment period e.g. 33 years (from 2030-2063).
1.1.4 Has an appropriate range of possible future (health relevant) scenarios been considered?	A worst case scenario was considered. This is appropriate and in line with common practice.	None at this time.
1.1.5 What is the predicted exposure level or condition? How does this compare with the exposure standard (for environmental impacts/risks) or acceptable condition (for social, community or psychological impacts/risks)?	Exposure levels are described in figures and the highest exposure level is discussed in the text in relation to the national air quality standard.	None at this time.
1.1.6 What level of risk has been designated for this impact?	Risks have been considered to be low with the highest risk being for all-cause mortality from long-term exposures of 6 additional deaths per 10 years predicted for 2063.	None at this time.

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
<p>1.1.7 What justification has been provided for this risk level?</p>	<p>Ranking risks as low has been based on what is considered acceptable levels of risk (“It is generally accepted by regulatory agencies that an increase in risk between 1 x 10⁻⁶ (1 in a million) and 1x10⁻⁵ (1 in 100,000) is considered to be a low risk and within acceptable criteria”) and against current deaths in Sydney (“According to Health Statistics NSW in 2012-13 there were 10,127 deaths in the Western Sydney Local Health District due to all causes. This is in a population of 904,886 people. ”).</p> <p>The human health chapter (volume 2 part D) discusses the widely accepted scientific consensus that there is no known safe level of exposure to key air pollutants below which there is no adverse health effect. However, this is only discussed under sub-section 13.10.3 on nitrogen dioxide when this is also true for the other air pollutants. In contrast in the health appendix (Appendix G) this is stated in the general introductory paragraphs to the air quality section.</p>	<p>The health chapter should discuss the no safe threshold in the general introductory paragraphs on air quality rather than in the nitrogen dioxide section so that it is clear that this issue is for all the key air pollutants discussed in the air quality section and not just nitrogen dioxide.</p>

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
<p>1.1.8 Has the weighting/significance of health impacts/effects/risks been described and is it appropriate?²¹</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Direction: Whether the potential change would be beneficial or adverse ➤ Severity: More severe effects include those that are disabling, life-threatening, and permanent ➤ Magnitude: How widely the effects would be spread within a population or across a geographical area ➤ Likelihood: How likely it is that a given exposure or effect will occur. ➤ Certainty: level of certainty or uncertainty attached to the predictions of health effects. 	<p>Impacts are described as adverse; severity is implicit as impacts are for mortality (death) or a range of morbidity effects (hospital admissions for cardiovascular or respiratory effects or emergency visits for asthma).</p> <p>Magnitude is described in terms of risk and attributable cases; likelihood is described in terms of risk i.e. probability of occurrence, and described in the context of an unmitigated worst case scenario.</p> <p>Certainty and uncertainty issues are implicit as the evidence base supports a strong association/causation between exposure to air pollution and occurrence of health impacts.</p> <p>Exposure response coefficients used are the central values. The uncertainty over the actual coefficients (captured by the 95% confidence intervals, CI) is not discussed.</p>	<p>There should be a clearer discussion of certainty or uncertainty, how levels of uncertainty are taken, or not taken into account, and assumptions used in the modelling and the calculation of predicted/forecasted health effects/impacts/risks.</p> <p>Clarify whether population growth, and the increase in people, affected by changes in air pollution, is taken into account in the estimation of magnitude.</p>

²¹ Does the assessment consider the severity of impact/exposure (intensity, reversibility and impact on vulnerable population groups), the impact magnitude (number of people affected and duration of impact/exposure) and the importance (political and ethical)? Have the health impacts of each alternative been assessed? Sometimes the health impacts are ranked and prioritized before making recommendations, if so; have the criteria for prioritizing and ranking health impacts been given?

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
<p>1.1.9 Does it take into account stakeholder and community concerns?</p>	<p>Stakeholder and community concerns are not discussed.</p>	<p>Community feedback on air quality and health (as well as other concerns) should be described and how this feedback was considered and addressed in the assessment should be discussed. Where community comments have not been incorporated or addressed an explanation justifying this should be presented. If there were no specific comments or concerns about noise and health then this should also be stated explicitly.</p>
<p>1.1.10 What mitigation measures have been proposed?</p>	<p>Mitigation measures for the operation are not described or discussed in this chapter. There is cross-referencing to the air quality chapter where the main mitigation is described and discussed.</p> <p>The reviewers have not reviewed the air quality chapter as this was not in the terms of reference for this review.</p>	<p>Provide in the Health Chapters a brief summary of the mitigation framework/plan and measures discussed in the air quality chapter.</p>

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
<p>1.1.11 Has a residual health risk level been determined and mitigated where practicable?</p>	<p>There is no discussion of residual impacts/effects after mitigation. However, the risks assessed for worst case and unmitigated scenarios are estimated to be low and therefore implicitly the likely residual risks after mitigation would be even lower.</p> <p>The report seems to assume that mitigation measures will attenuate most risk without discussing what the remaining risk will be and how they could be further minimised through ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of the proposed main mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Even though the residual risks are likely to be low/very low there should be a discussion/explicit statement about the level and significance of the residual risks from air quality changes after mitigation strategies are taken into account.</p>
<p>1.1.12 Have community concerns been identified and adequately addressed?</p>	<p>Same as 1.1.9</p>	<p>Same as 1.1.9</p>
<p>1.1.13 The causal pathway leading to health effects should be outlined along with an explanation of the underpinning evidence.²²</p>	<p>Causal pathways are described and evidence underpinning the pathway is detailed except for statements on the “international levels of acceptability” (discussed below in 1.2.2)</p>	<p>See 1.2.2</p>

²² The potential health effects may be presented in diagrams, which show the causal pathways and changes in intermediate factors by which the project may affect population health, or may be descriptive.

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
1.2 Risk assessment		
1.2.1 Have assumptions been made explicit and uncertainties considered and taken into account?	<p>A range of assumptions underpinning the evidence base and the health impact/risk/effect calculation methods are discussed.</p> <p>Exposure response coefficients used are the central values. The uncertainty over the actual coefficients (captured by the 95% confidence intervals, CI) is not discussed.</p>	<p>Provide estimates for the health impacts/effects estimated as a central value and a range to provide a sense of what the possible magnitude/extent of the impacts/effects may be.</p>
1.2.2 The report should identify and justify the use of any standards and thresholds used to assess the significance of health impacts.	<p>Standards and thresholds used are identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NEPM air quality standards - “It is generally accepted by regulatory agencies that an increase in risk between 1×10^{-6} (1 in a million) and 1×10^{-5} (1 in 100,000) is considered to be a low risk and within acceptable criteria.” – reference for this is not provided. While valid for cancer risk, the reviewer is unaware of its application or validity for mortality and morbidity effects from exposure to PM or NO₂. 	<p>It should be stated what regulatory agencies consider an increase in risk between 1×10^{-6} (1 in a million) and 1×10^{-5} (1 in 100,000) to be low and “within acceptable criteria” and references should be provided for this statement. In addition, the phrase “acceptable criteria” needs to be explained in terms of what is acceptable and to whom and again referenced.</p>

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
<p>1.2.3 Have the methods used to calculate impacts been adequately described (e.g. replicability, transparency, sources of information identified)</p>	<p>Yes, the health Risk Assessment (HRA) method is described.</p> <p>The formulas/equations used are described in the chapter. However, the quantification of health impacts/effects makes use of “baseline health incidence rate/100,000 population” figures taken from “baseline health statistics for Sydney”. It is unclear whether these figures are for the Sydney average or the relevant suburbs within 5 km of the airport site boundary. These figures are not presented in the human health chapter or the health appendix (appendix G) nor is a reference to their source provided.</p>	<p>It should be stated what “baseline health incidence rate/ 100,000 population” figures are used i.e. the Sydney average, suburb values or other area. A reference to the source of the information should be provided, and the actual rates should be presented as a table to enable the reader to understand the calculations made (enables replicability and transparency).</p>
<p>1.3 Analysis of distribution of effects</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>1.3.1 The affected populations should be explicitly identified.</p>	<p>Affected populations are described geographically i.e. the suburbs within 5 km of the airport site boundary.</p>	<p>See also 1.1.8 in relation to population growth.</p>

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
<p>1.3.2 Inequalities in the distribution of predicted health impacts should be investigated and the effects of these inequalities should be stated.²³</p>	<p>Inequality and equity, as important concepts that should be considered as part of the health assessment, are not discussed in the report.</p> <p>Potential impacts/effects/risks in terms of health inequalities or equity are not assessed or discussed.</p> <p>There is some allusion to potential impacts on inequality as the affected suburbs are rated in terms of relative deprivation but there is no discussion of whether the most deprived suburbs, or suburbs with higher proportions of vulnerable or sensitive group (e.g. children) are more affected than other suburbs.</p>	<p>There should be a discussion of how the distribution of health impacts/risks/effects between and within the suburbs/affected populations narrow or widen existing inequalities and whether these may be inequitable.</p> <p>There should also be a discussion of mitigation measures that could/are likely to reduce any identified health inequalities.</p>

²³ How does the report define inequalities? Inequalities are found between social groups and can be measured in different ways e.g. by geography, social class or social position, population (ethnicity, gender, sexuality etc.).

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
<p>1.3.3 Have populations more vulnerable to impacts/risk/effects been identified and discussed; and have mitigations been proposed?</p>	<p>Populations more vulnerable to air quality impacts have been identified, specifically elderly, people with existing cardiovascular and respiratory disease, people with asthma, low socio-economic groups/socially deprived, and children as groups likely to be more affected by exposure to air pollution and the reasons for this are discussed.</p> <p>However, differential impacts from exposure to the airport-related air pollution have not been discussed qualitatively or quantitatively except for PM_{2.5} and ozone and emergency department attendance in 1-14 year olds.</p> <p>Mitigation measures aimed at these groups are not discussed in the health chapter or health appendix. There is cross-referencing to the air quality chapter however the reviewers has not reviewed the air quality chapter, as this was not in the terms of reference for this review, and therefore cannot give a judgment on the appropriateness of the proposed mitigation in terms of sensitive groups.</p>	<p>Same as 1.3.2</p> <p>Develop a more detailed qualitative discussion of the health impacts/risks/effects of changes in air pollution on vulnerable groups described in Appendix G, and children specifically.</p>

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
<p>1.3.4 Impacts/risks/effects on health should be examined based on the population profile.²⁴</p>	<p>The health impacts/effects have been calculated based on existing levels of mortality and morbidity.</p> <p>It appears that population projections have not been taken into account. Where results are presented as expected numbers of cases this is likely to be an underestimation given the expected increases in population. This is not identified clearly as a limitation.</p>	<p>Population projections should be included in the calculations or, at a minimum, if excluded this should be clearly identified as a limitation.</p> <p>See also 1.1.8 and 1.3.1</p>

²⁴ It should be possible to determine whether effects are more prevalent in certain demographic or vulnerable groups.

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
Air Quality Assessment Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment of air quality-related health impacts follows a health risk assessment approach, focussing on quantification of health endpoints from exposure to a range of air pollutants. The methodology used is adequate. The range of air pollutants addressed is adequate. The range of health endpoints considered is also adequate and follows Australian evidence and guidance. • However, the range of health endpoints addressed could be expanded to include others for which solid exposure-response coefficients exist, for example, group A coefficients provided in the WHO HRAPIE Project report²⁵. • It is also not clear what baseline incidence rates were used (Sydney average or Liverpool/suburb rates). If Sydney rates are used, this may have resulted in a small underestimation of risks. For example, the Liverpool standardized mortality ratio is 107.3 (compared to New South Wales). • Risks are estimated for 2030 and 2063 snapshots and separately for each pollutant. As risks from exposure to different pollutants have similar effects (are synergistic) e.g. mortality and hospital admissions, these could have been added across pollutants to provide a picture of the total risk to the exposed communities. • Risks could also have been provided for the entire assessment period e.g. 30 years and not just for the snapshots. Discussion of the uncertainty around estimates could be enhanced, for example through the use of the upper and lower 95% confidence interval values of the exposure-response coefficients used. This would provide a better understanding of the likely range of actual impacts (for the worst-case unmitigated scenario). • A general level of acceptability for estimated risks is used, stated to be accepted by regulatory agencies. This is for a risk between 1×10^{-6} (1 in a million) and 1×10^{-5} (1 in 100,000). The regulatory agencies should be named and references for this statement should be provided. Consideration should also be given to stakeholder perceptions of acceptability of risk. • There is no discussion of the implication of the distribution of effects for inequality and equity although baseline information on sensitive/vulnerable groups is provided. • Community feedback and any potential perceptions or concerns of local residents are not discussed. • Perception effects are different from biological or epidemiological risks, can cause stress and anxiety and should be considered separately from mortality and morbidity effects. • Mitigation measures are not discussed, readers are just cross-referred to the air quality chapter. An outline of proposed measures (i.e. an air quality management framework or plan) should be provided in the health chapter and an explanation provided for how and to what extent these measures will mitigate the identified health impacts. 		

²⁵ Table 1. CRFs recommended by the HRAPIE project, p5-11

Table 4 Health Pathways Included in the Draft EIS - Noise

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
2.1 Description of health effects		
2.1.1 The potential health impacts/effects of the project, both beneficial and adverse, should be identified and presented in a systematic way. ²⁶	Health effects and attributable cases associated with exposure to daytime and night time noise are presented systematically; health impacts/effects are described for both the construction and operation phases.	None at this time.
2.1.2 Has the Exposure Pathway been identified?	Yes, exposure pathways linking noise to health effects are discussed in detail in Appendix G, Community Health, 6.1 Literature on Health Effects related to Noise.	None at this time.
2.1.3 Has an appropriate time period been considered for health and wellbeing impacts/effects?	Health and wellbeing impacts/effects have been described for ‘snapshot years’: 2030, 2050 and 2063 during the operation phase. There is a general discussion of the potential health effects during the construction phase.	None at this time.
2.1.4 Has an appropriate range of possible future (health relevant) scenarios been considered?	Yes. Potential health impacts/effects of noise are considered for the “Prefer 05”, “Prefer 23” and “head-to-head” operation phase scenarios. There is a general discussion on construction phase noise, though specific scenarios for the construction phase are not discussed.	None at this time.

²⁶ Does the identification of impacts consider short-term, long-term (and are these timescales defined?), direct and indirect impacts on health and well-being? Does the identification of health impacts distinguish between the construction phase, the operational phase and where relevant the decommissioning phase?

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
2.1.5 What is the predicted exposure level or condition? How does this compare with the exposure standard (for environmental impact/risks) or acceptable condition (for social, community or psychological impacts/risks)?	Tables detailing a range of daytime and night time exposure levels for different periods and scenarios are provided and compared to World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines.	None at this time.
2.1.6 What level of risk has been designated for this impact?	The level of risks is generally considered to be low. Some risks for some locations (Luddenham) are considered higher than low (not ranked but actual risk is described e.g. "In 2063, the increase is predicted to be about 10%").	Health risks should be presented for the different communities in a more accessible manner than what is currently presented in the tables. This should also be presented in a way so that multiple impacts (myocardial infarction, sleep disturbance, learning, etc.) and from multiple causes (daytime ground operations, night-time operations, over flights etc.) can be understood by a interested stakeholders.
2.1.7 What justification has been provided for this risk level?	Levels of risk have been compared, or benchmarked, against World Health Organization (WHO) or other similar guideline values (e.g. EEA identify that 33 dB Lnight, outside appears to be a threshold value for awakenings related to aircraft noise and below this, sleep disturbance is unlikely to occur), as well as described in the context of existing baseline levels of risk.	Explain why certain standards are used for different aspects of the assessment (i.e. the European Environment Agency - EEA - guidance/evidence is used at times and then WHO guidance/evidence is used at others)

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
<p>2.1.8 Has the weighting/significance of health impacts/effects/risks been described and is it appropriate?²⁷</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Direction: Whether the potential change would be beneficial or adverse ➤ Severity: More severe effects include those that are disabling, life-threatening, and permanent ➤ Magnitude: How widely the effects would be spread within a population or across a geographical area ➤ Likelihood: How likely it is that a given exposure or effect will occur. ➤ Certainty: level of certainty or uncertainty attached to the predictions of health effects. 	<p>Impacts are described as adverse; severity, in terms of morbidity, is implicit for some impacts e.g. cardiovascular disease.</p> <p>Severity for cognitive impairment in children or annoyance is not clearly defined, though this is a difficult area to consider.</p> <p>Magnitude is described in terms of risk and attributable cases (or events); it is not clear how population growth was considered/factored into the calculation of future attributable cases (magnitude).</p> <p>Likelihood is described in terms of risk, i.e. probability of occurrence, and described in the context of an unmitigated range of scenarios.</p> <p>Certainty and uncertainty attached to the predictions is not explicitly discussed. However, there is implicit discussion of the likelihood or certainty of key health effects occurring in the evidence base section. This discusses the scientific consensus that there is good/strong evidence of the link between exposure to noise and occurrence of some health impacts/effects.</p>	<p>There should be a clearer discussion of certainty or uncertainty, how levels of uncertainty are taken, or not taken into account, and assumptions used in the modelling and the calculation of predicted/forecasted health effects/impacts/risks.</p> <p>Consider a clearer discussion of the uncertainty in relation to the severity of the health effects of cognitive impairment and annoyance.</p> <p>Clarify whether population growth, and the increase in people, affected by changes in noise is taken into account in the estimation of magnitude.</p>

²⁷ Does the assessment consider the severity of impact/exposure (intensity, reversibility and impact on vulnerable population groups), the impact magnitude (number of people affected and duration of impact/exposure) and the importance (political and ethical)? Have the health impacts of each alternative been assessed? Sometimes the health impacts are ranked and prioritized before making recommendations, if so; have the criteria for prioritizing and ranking health impacts been given?

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
<p>2.1.9 Does it take into account stakeholder and community concerns?</p>	<p>Stakeholder and community concerns are not discussed.</p>	<p>Community feedback on noise and health (as well as other health concerns) should be described and how this feedback was considered and addressed in the assessment should be discussed. Where community comments have not been incorporated or addressed an explanation justifying this should be presented. If there were no specific comments or concerns about noise and health then this should also be stated explicitly.</p>
<p>2.1.10 What mitigation measures have been proposed?</p>	<p>Mitigation measures for the operation are not described or discussed in this chapter. There is cross-referencing to the noise chapter where the main mitigation is described and discussed. The reviewers have not reviewed the noise chapter as this was not in the terms of reference for this review.</p> <p>A short description on some specific temporary measures is provided for the construction phase.</p>	<p>Provide in the human health chapter a brief summary of the mitigation framework/plan and measures discussed in the noise chapter.</p> <p>Some specific temporary mitigation measures that are mentioned for the construction phase, e.g. temporary noise barriers and exclusions buffers, should become recommendations rather than “could be considered” measures.</p>
<p>2.1.11 Has a residual health risk level been determined and mitigated where practicable?</p>	<p>There is no discussion of residual impacts/effects after mitigation. The report seems to assume that mitigation measures will attenuate most risk without discussing what the remaining risk will be and how they could be further minimised through ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of the proposed main mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Residual impacts/risks/effects should be discussed given that it is stated that these could still be significant.</p> <p>There should be a discussion of the significance of the residual or unmitigated impacts/risks/effects given the discussion that some mitigation measures may not be feasible or effective.</p>

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
2.1.12 Have community concerns been identified and adequately addressed?	See 1.1.9	See 1.1.9
2.1.13 The causal pathway leading to health effects should be outlined along with an explanation of the underpinning evidence. ²⁸	Causal pathways are described and the evidence underpinning the pathway is discussed.	None at this time.
2.2 Risk assessment		
2.2.1 Have assumptions been made explicit and uncertainties considered and taken into account?	<p>A range of assumptions underpinning the evidence base and the health impact/risk/effect calculation methods are discussed.</p> <p>Assumptions relate to the assessment methodology and analysis of impacts/risks/effects. However, there are some assumptions mentioned in the HRA without a clear explanation in the health chapter and appendix of why they are used.</p> <p>For example, it is not clear in Appendix G why the “Head to Head” operation model is only used for the night-time operations. These types of assumptions should be clearly explained.</p>	Include a clearer explanation/discussion of all the assumptions made.
2.2.2 The report should identify and justify the use of any standards and thresholds used to assess the significance of health impacts.	Standards and thresholds used are identified, namely WHO daytime and night time noise guideline values and EEA 33dB _{L_{night, outside}} threshold value for awakenings.	See 1.1.7

²⁸ The potential health effects may be presented in diagrams, which show the causal pathways and changes in intermediate factors by which the project may affect population health, or may be descriptive.

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
<p>2.2.3 Have the methods used to calculate impacts/risks/effects been adequately described (e.g. replicability, transparency, sources of information identified)</p>	<p>The HRA method is described. The methods used to calculate impacts/risks/effects are adequately described and cross-referenced to literature.</p> <p>Unclear what sensitivity analysis has been carried out.</p> <p>The calculations are not always clear and incorporate many assumptions that are not well described. For example, it is not clear how population estimates and growth are considered in the calculation of health impacts/risks/effects.</p>	<p>Methods used should be presented in a manner that is clear and easily understood to a lay audience (to the extent possible).</p> <p>Indicate possible range of estimates by including results from sensitivity analysis (using range of parameters such as possible change in population upper and lower 95% CIs of risk estimates used in calculations and different exposure scenarios)</p>
<p>2.3 Analysis of distribution of effects</p>		
<p>2.3.1 The affected populations should be explicitly identified.</p>	<p>Affected populations are described geographically i.e. the suburbs and schools in the vicinity of the airport site boundary.</p> <p>However, how the growth in affected populations has been considered in the calculation of impacts/risks/effects is not clear.</p>	<p>See also 1.1.8 in relation to population growth.</p>

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
<p>2.3.2 Inequalities in the distribution of predicted health impacts should be investigated and the effects of these inequalities should be stated.²⁹</p>	<p>Inequality and equity, as important concepts that should be considered as part of the health assessment, are not discussed in the report.</p> <p>Potential impacts/effects/risks in terms of health inequalities or equity are not assessed or discussed.</p> <p>There is no discussion of whether the most deprived suburbs, or suburbs with higher proportions of vulnerable or sensitive groups (e.g. children) are more affected than other suburbs.</p>	<p>There should be a discussion of how the distribution of health impacts/risks/effects between and within the suburbs/affected populations narrow or widen existing inequalities and whether these may be inequitable.</p> <p>There should also be a discussion of mitigation measures that could/are likely to reduce any identified health inequalities.</p>
<p>2.3.3 Have populations more vulnerable to impacts/ effects/risks been identified and discussed; and have mitigations been proposed?</p>	<p>Populations more vulnerable/sensitive to noise impacts have been identified but only the impacts/risks/effects on children are discussed (hazard quotient for learning and cognitive development).</p> <p>Mitigation measures aimed at these groups are not discussed in the health chapter or health appendix. There is cross-referencing to the noise chapter however the reviewers have not reviewed the noise chapter, as this was not in the terms of reference for this review, and therefore cannot give a judgment on the appropriateness of the proposed mitigation in terms of sensitive groups.</p>	<p>Develop a more detailed qualitative discussion of the long term health impacts/risks/effects of noise on vulnerable groups described in Appendix G, and children specifically.</p>

²⁹ How does the report define inequalities? Inequalities are found between social groups and can be measured in different ways e.g. by geography, social class or social position, population (ethnicity, gender, sexuality etc.).

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
2.3.4 Impacts/effects/risks on health should be examined based on the population profile. ³⁰	Impacts/risks/effects have been assessed against the existing health status of affected populations.	None at this time.
Noise Assessment Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment of noise-related health impacts follows a health risk assessment approach, focussing on quantification of health endpoints from exposure to a range of noise. The quantitative methodology used is adequate. The range of noise metrics used is adequate. The range of health endpoints considered is also adequate and follows Australian and international evidence and guidance, namely the enHealth Guidance <i>Health Effects of Environmental Noise other than Hearing Loss</i> (enHealth, 2004). Risks are estimated for 2030, 2050 and 2063 periods for three different operation phase scenarios. • A qualitative analysis and discussion of impacts/risks/effects on vulnerable/sensitive groups and on health inequality/equity issues has not been undertaken. • There is no discussion of the implication of the distribution of effects for inequality and equity. • Community feedback and any potential perceptions or concerns of local residents are not discussed. • Perception effects are different from biological or epidemiological risks, can cause stress and anxiety and should be considered separately from mortality and morbidity effects. • Mitigation measures are only discussed in passing and readers are cross-referred to the noise chapter. An outline of proposed measures (i.e. a noise management framework or plan) should be presented in the health chapter and an explanation provided for how and to what extent these measures will mitigate the identified health impacts. 		

³⁰ It should be possible to determine whether effects are more prevalent in certain demographic or vulnerable groups.

Table 5 Health Pathways Included in the Draft EIS – Water Quality

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
3.1 Description of health effects		
3.1.1 The potential health effects of the project, both beneficial and adverse, should be identified and presented in a systematic way. ³¹	A systematic assessment has not been conducted. The risk identification is generally adequate, but the characterisation and assessment of these risks is not provided. There is inadequate detail of how mitigation measures will address potential health impacts.	A detailed quantitative assessment of water impacts is required. Further information on baseline conditions, exposure pathways, population affects and potential health outcomes is required.
3.1.2 Has the Exposure Pathway been identified?	No - The potentially contaminating activities, contaminants of potential concern and exposure pathway linkages are identified. However these are not fully assessed to determine potential health outcomes.	A full assessment to determine health risks and potentially affected populations see be conducted
3.1.3 Has an appropriate time period been considered for health and wellbeing impacts?	No – there is no description of latency of health impacts included.	Identify latency of health impacts in full assessment.
3.1.4 Has an appropriate range of possible future (health relevant) scenarios been considered?	There is no discussion of the various stages of operation (i.e. long term operations). It only lists potential risks associated with construction and operation.	Include assessment of long term operations.

³¹ Does the identification of impacts consider short-term, long-term (and are these timescales defined?), direct and indirect impacts on health and well-being? Does the identification of health impacts distinguish between the construction phase, the operational phase and where relevant the decommissioning phase?

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
<p>3.1.5 What is the predicted exposure level or conditions? How does this compare with the exposure standard (for environmental risks) or acceptable condition (for social, community or psychological risks)?</p>	<p>Standards are identified, but the exposure levels are not clearly articulated. The risks are not clearly and transparently assessed. The ground water and surface water risk assessment relies on data that is too limited and does not include specific exposure assessments or detailed quantitative risk characterisations.</p>	<p>See 1.1.2</p>
<p>3.1.6 What level of risk has been designated for this impact?</p>	<p>No clear risk has been stated, though the draft EIS notes: “the implementation of mitigation measures described in the related technical reports (surface water, water quality and groundwater), the potential risks would be minimised.” These mitigation measures are not described within this section, and the mechanisms by which they will reduce risks remains unclear.</p>	<p>Provide further detail on mitigation measures and how they will contribute to the reduction of specific risks.</p>
<p>3.1.7 What justification has been provided for this risk level?</p>	<p>There is an argument presented on potential risk though this is based on limited evidence.</p>	<p>See 1.1.2</p>

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
<p>3.1.8 Has the weighting/significance of health impacts been described and is it appropriate?³²</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Direction: Whether the potential change would be beneficial or adverse ➤ Severity: More severe effects include those that are disabling, life-threatening, and permanent ➤ Magnitude: How widely the effects would be spread within a population or across a geographical area ➤ Likelihood: How likely it is that a given exposure or effect will occur. ➤ Certainty: level of certainty or uncertainty attached to the predictions of health effects. 	<p>No weighting has been made for severity, magnitude, likelihood or certainty.</p>	<p>A description of the severity, magnitude, likelihood and certainty of health impacts should be provided as part of a complete assessment.</p>
<p>3.1.9 Does it take into account stakeholder and community concerns?</p>	<p>This is not detailed in this section. Although the report does mention that there were community concerns raised about the potential impacts from aircraft emissions to tank water (p137), it is not clear how these were considered in the assessment.</p>	<p>Community feedback on water quality and health (as well as other health concerns) should be described and how this feedback was considered and addressed in the assessment should be discussed. Where community comments have not been incorporated or addressed an explanation justifying this should be presented. If there were no specific comments or concerns about noise and health then this should also be stated explicitly.</p>

³² Does the assessment consider the severity of impact/exposure (intensity, reversibility and impact on vulnerable population groups), the impact magnitude (number of people affected and duration of impact/exposure) and the importance (political and ethical)? Have the health impacts of each alternative been assessed? Sometimes the health impacts are ranked and prioritized before making recommendations, if so; have the criteria for prioritizing and ranking health impacts been given?

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
3.1.10 What mitigation measures have been proposed?	Several mitigation strategies are outlined: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dust control - Surface water discharge control and monitoring - Monitoring of water quality in Warragamba Dam, Prospect Reservoir and local water tanks 	Further detail on mitigation measures and monitoring requirements is needed. Or make explicit where else these are listed in the draft EIS.
3.1.11 Has a residual health risk level been determined and mitigated where practicable?	There is no discussion of residual risks after mitigation strategies have been implemented.	Include discussion of residual risk.
3.1.12 Have community concerns been identified and adequately addressed?	Not addressed in section.	See 1.1.9
3.1.13 The causal pathway leading to health effects should be outlined along with an explanation of the underpinning evidence. ³³	The pathway beyond risk identification is not described.	Assessment should clearly outline impacts to health, including a literature review.
3.2 Risk assessment	Comment	Recommendation
3.2.1 Have assumptions been made explicit and uncertainties are considered and taken into account?	A number of assumptions have been alluded to in the section on “potential health risks associated with construction and operation”. These are used to argue against the significance of certain health risks but have not been clearly stated earlier in the section.	A clear list of assumptions underpinning the assessment of Groundwater and Surface Water impacts should be included.
3.2.2 The report should identify and justify the use of any standards and thresholds used to assess the significance of health impacts.	Standards are identified but their use and application is not described.	Include further justification for the inclusion and use of standards.

³³ The potential health effects may be presented in diagrams, which show the causal pathways and changes in intermediate factors by which the project may affect population health, or may be descriptive.

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
3.2.3 Have the methods used to calculate impacts been adequately described (e.g. replicability, transparency, sources of information identified)	The processes for exposure assessment and risk characterisation have not been clearly described.	See 1.1.2
3.3 Analysis of distribution of effects	Comment	Recommendation
3.3.1 The affected populations should be explicitly identified.	A population profile is provided earlier in the appendix but this section does not describe which populations will be affected.	Include an analysis of potential impacts to populations including vulnerable receptors (vulnerable groups) in the full assessment.
3.3.2 Inequalities in the distribution of predicted health impacts should be investigated and the effects of these inequalities should be stated. ³⁴	No differential impacts have been described.	Include discussion of the distribution of impacts with consideration for vulnerable populations as part of the full assessment.
3.3.3 Have populations more vulnerable to this impact been identified, discussed and mitigations proposed?	Vulnerable populations have not been described or assessed.	See 1.3.2
3.3.4 Effects on health should be examined based on the population profile. ³⁵	The impacts have not been assessed relative to the existing population profile.	Include assessment of impacts relative to the existing population profile as part of the full assessment.
Water Quality Assessment Comments:		
A more complete assessment is required that includes a clear list of assumptions, a description of population affected, and an assessment of impacts on vulnerable receptor population groups.		

³⁴ How does the report define inequalities? Inequalities are found between social groups and can be measured in different ways e.g. by geography, social class or social position, population (ethnicity, gender, sexuality etc.).

³⁵ It should be possible to determine whether effects are more prevalent in certain demographic or vulnerable groups.

Table 6 Review of Overall Report

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
4.1 Site description and policy framework		
4.1.1 The report should describe the physical characteristics ³⁶ of the project ³⁷ site and the surrounding area.	A brief description and map of the project site is located in the appendix. A more comprehensive description is in vol.1 introduction p. 59-61	Sufficient description for the appendix and health chapter.
4.1.2 Is there an adequate description and location of the communities likely to be affected by the proposed development?	Only includes a description of communities within close proximity to the airport site. It is not clear, given the proximity of other LGAs, and the reach of some health impacts (noise, AQ) why other communities were not considered.	Either include better justification of only assessing impacts to close proximity communities, Or also consider impacts to other affected communities.
4.1.3 The report should describe the way in which the project site and the surrounding area are currently used. ³⁸	Given that most of the land has been obtained and cleared by the Government for this project, there was not much description provided of the existing use of the land. There is no discussion of how development of the project may change use/demand on existing infrastructure and services.	A description of the land use of the area surrounding the airport (not just the airport itself) should be included. This would help to understand the community character not just the physical land use.

³⁶ The physical characteristics may include the location, design, size and an outline of the area of land take during the construction and operation phase. Presentation or reference to diagrams, plans or maps will be beneficial for this purpose. Graphical material should be easy to understand without having any knowledge about planning and design.

³⁷ The review package uses the term project to mean the execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes; or other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources (30;46).

³⁸ Does the site description indicate whether the site and the surrounding area are used, either formally or informally, and if so who by? What are the demands of the project on local infrastructure and services?

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
<p>4.1.4 The report should describe the policy context and state whether the project accords with significant policies³⁹ that protect and promote wellbeing and public health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	<p>The only policies referenced are the EPBC Act and Airports Act. It is stated in the health appendix that a health risk assessment is not required under the EPBC but that one has been undertaken because of the known effects of airports on human health. It states that the HRA has been conducted in accordance with Australian HRA guidelines and other practice guidelines (NHMRC, NEPC). No reference is made to relevant Health Impact Assessment Guidelines (e.g. enHealth HIA Guidelines, WHO guidelines:- A Guide for the Evaluation of Health Impact Assessments carried out within the EIA process)</p> <p>The context for the inclusion of an assessment on health is described but it is unclear why a health risk assessment rather than a health impact assessment was commissioned.</p>	<p>It is not clear why, if there is recognition of the impacts of airports on human health, that only an HRA was undertaken. Further clarification should be provided for only doing an HRA and not an HIA. Given the EPBC requirements to consider principles of inter-generational equity – “that the present generation should ensure that the health, diversity and productivity of the environment is maintained or enhanced for the benefit of future generations,” there should be a clear justification for not considering the full range of health impacts and health equity impacts.</p> <p>It should be noted that it appears the consultants who produced the Health Chapter were commissioned to carry out a health risk assessment of air quality, noise and water. So the issues relating to the failure to adequately assess a broader range of health impacts appears to have appeared at an earlier stage of planning the draft EIS.</p>

³⁹ The policies may be local, regional, national or international policies or they may be sector-specific.

4.2 Description of project	Comment	Recommendation
<p>4.2.1 The aims and objectives of the project should be stated and the final operational characteristics of the project should be described.⁴⁰</p>	<p>The objectives of the airport are described briefly in the appendix and are described in detail elsewhere in the draft EIS. The previous EIS considered site alternatives so none were explored in this draft EIS. There is also considerable detail provided around the governance structure of approval of both the EIS and the airport master plan. The objectives of the EIS are also clearly stated.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>4.2.2 The estimated duration of the construction phase, operational phase and, where appropriate, decommissioning phase should be given.</p>	<p>The multi-stage development (construction, stage 1, long term) are not described in the appendix or health chapter but are described in detail elsewhere in the report (vol. 1, introduction).</p>	<p>It would be helpful to have a summary of the various activities that will take place at the different stages within the health chapters, although activities are described within the assessment of each health pathway.</p>
<p>4.2.3 The relationship of the project with other proposals should be stated.</p>	<p>There is ample description of the justification of the airport and its relationship to other planning processes elsewhere in the report (Volume 1, chapter 2). Further description is not necessary for the health appendix or chapter.</p>	<p>None.</p>

⁴⁰ Has a do-nothing option and other alternatives to the project been described? Does the report also describe the primary advantages and disadvantages to health of the proposal and alternatives? It should be noted if no alternatives are being assessed.

4.3 Public health profile	Comment	Recommendation
<p>4.3.1 The public health profile should establish an information base from which requirements for health protection, health improvement and health services can be assessed.</p>	<p>General health information is provided for Liverpool LGA. Data is presented as real estimates and as a proportion of the NSW average. They also give childhood asthma prevalence for Liverpool, but nowhere else. It is not clear why the baseline data is only provided for Liverpool LGA when some of the communities that they are assessing are located in Penrith LGA. There is no rationale provided for why only Liverpool LGA is profiled. Page 24 of the Health Chapter states that “It should be noted that the airport site will occupy significant parts of Badgerys Creek and Luddenham and a number of current residents will be relocated. Therefore the future populations in these areas is likely to be much lower than that recorded in 2011.” This is misleading in that it does not acknowledge the future expected increases in population in the profile area.</p>	<p>The baseline indicators are appropriate for assessing predicted health impacts related to air quality. Given the impacts of noise on sleep disturbance and learning ability, it would have been useful to include baseline rates of depression (or overall mental health) and any cognitive learning indicators (if available). If these were not available then they should have been more clear about why they included the health indicators that they did. They should also either make explicit why they only provided baseline data for Liverpool LGA or should include the same data for Penrith LGA and any other relevant LGAs. The demographic profile should provide information about expected population changes.</p>

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
<p>4.3.2 The profile should identify vulnerable population groups. The profile should describe, where possible, inequalities in health between population groups and should include the wider determinants of health⁴¹.</p>	<p>They acknowledge that people of disadvantage are more at risk to airport impacts (i.e. air/noise pollution) and therefore provide indicators of socio economic disadvantage through the SEIFA index. They do point out that certain communities appear to be more disadvantaged than the Australian average but it is hard to discern to what extent they are disadvantaged based merely on the SEIFA score (e.g. how much more disadvantaged is someone with a SIEFA score of 881 vs. 914?) They do recognize that as a whole, due to their low SEIFA scores, certain communities will be more vulnerable to effects than others.</p>	<p>While the SEIFA index does help to show overall disadvantage, it is not a very useful tool in comparing communities or for the lay person to understand what a particular SEIFA score means. If possible, would be more useful to use SEIFA quintiles for a clearer comparison. Likewise, it is difficult to understand the overall burden of disease when it is compared to the NSW average. It would be more helpful to see the health indicators expressed as proportions of the local population rather than a comparison to state averages (or could do both). If data is available, it would also be helpful to understand the health status of the communities that have been identified as having vulnerability based on their SEIFA scores (i.e. do they also have higher rates of asthma or heart disease) if this data is available.</p>
<p>4.3.3 information provided should include characteristics of the populations such as:</p>		
<p>Population size, age and gender profile</p>	<p>Population Size – yes Age – Not in actual numbers but expressed as percentage less than 15, and over 65 years of age, but no further breakdown Gender - no</p>	<p>What is provided is generally sufficient</p>

⁴¹ People's health is influenced by the conditions in which they live. Health determinants are the personal, social, cultural, economic and environmental factors that influence the health status of individuals or populations. These include, but are not limited to, factors such as income, employment, education, social support and housing.

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
Population density and distribution	No	Include if possible, or reference to where it is located in other part of the draft EIS
Ethnicity	no	Include if possible, or reference to where it is located in other part of the draft EIS
Socioeconomic status	Yes – SEIFA score	Included
Vulnerable groups/locations such as schools, aged care facilities, hospitals	No	Should include
Health status from clinics and other authorities	Health status is expressed for Liverpool LGA level	It would be helpful to have more specific health data if available but the LGA may be all there is available
Sources of and types of employment	No	Include if possible, or reference to where it is located in other part of the draft EIS
Health behaviour indicators such as physical activities, smoking drug use	Rates of prevalence of the behaviour are not included but the disease burden (death and hospitalisations) attributable to smoking, high BMI and alcohol is included.	Include if possible
Environmental conditions such as air, water, soil quality	This is not included in the health appendix but it is available in the draft EIS (Air quality appendix, water appendix). Some current air quality, hydrogeology and water conditions are mentioned and/or described in the health chapter but a full baseline assessment is not included in the health chapters.	Include only as needed to further clarify information in the assessment or reference to where they are located in other parts of the draft EIS.

Assessment	Comment	Recommendation
Roads and other infrastructure such as power, water, transport – rail, road, air, and so on	No	Include if possible, or reference to where it is located in other part of the draft EIS
Housing types and quality	No	Include if possible, or reference to where it is located in other part of the draft EIS
Health services such as hospitals, clinics	No	Include if possible, or reference to where it is located in other part of the draft EIS
Community services such as police, ambulance, fire and other emergency services, recreation, etc.	No	Include if possible, or reference to where it is located in other part of the draft EIS
4.3.4 The information in the profile should be specific about the timescale, the geographic location and the population group being described and links should be made with the proposed project. ⁴²	Information is provided about the anticipated population growth of the Liverpool LGA. It is also mentioned that there will be a population decline in certain areas that inhabit the airport site. There is no further mention of whether anticipated population growth incorporates growth due to the airport, or whether there will be growth in those same areas in close proximity to the airport site.	Further clarification on population growth estimates and assumptions around population size of communities in close proximity to the airport in the future should be included.

⁴² Does the profile include consideration of the future profile of the population?

Overall Report Comments:

The description of the context and requirements for the HRA are generally sufficient. It would have been helpful to understand why only an HRA was undertaken and not a full HIA, particularly considering that recognition of the significance of the social determinants of health and their impacts on health. The population health profile was very limited in scope and is missing clarification for why only certain information is provided. Consideration of vulnerable populations is based around SEIFA scores only and again, it should be explained why only these scores, and not additional indicators of disadvantage are include. Any further information that is included in other chapters in the draft EIS should be referenced within the health chapters.

5. Coverage of Health Topics

The review team have identified the extent to which potential health impacts have been identified in the health chapter and associated appendix. The approach taken to considering health impacts in the health chapter is narrow and does not take into account the findings of other health-relevant assessments, such as in the SIA. This has resulted in key environmental and social determinants of health not being considered. The scoping process whereby the decision to focus on air quality, noise and water is unclear so it is not possible to assess whether the narrow focus is justified. However given the current level of evidence on the effects of airports on health as well as the more general evidence base around the social determinants of health it is likely that relevant health impacts are missing from the health chapter.

The review team have carried out a scoping review of the technical reports other than the health appendix to identify the extent to which health topics have been included within the entire draft EIS. It is outside the scope of this peer review to carry out a comprehensive review of the health topics covered in the non-health documentation or to assess/assess in more detail any health impacts.

The 'non health' sections of the draft EIS contain information about a number of significant impacts on the determinants of health (e.g. housing affordability, visual amenity). The majority of these relevant health determinants are covered within the SIA. These have not been identified as health impacts and the range and magnitude of potential health outcomes resulting from these impacts have not been assessed. For example, significant impacts on amenity have been identified but the link between amenity and health outcomes such as mental health has not been made. This means that the impacts on health resulting from these changes are unknown. As these are not currently included within the health chapter they risk being overlooked by stakeholders concerned with understanding how WSA potentially impacts on human health. Health effects may be overlooked and not taken into account when mitigation/enhancement is being considered. In addition, the inter-related nature of the health and wellbeing impacts identified in the draft EIS has not been fully considered and therefore combined effects from, for example, changes to air pollution, noise, water quality, flood risk, community, place and local economy have not been considered.

Table 7 shows potential health effects arising from the project that are covered in the health chapter and associated appendix. They are arranged by health determinant. For each determinant Table 7 shows project activity and the sub-activities by stage (e.g. construction and operation). The potential health outcomes arising from these activities are shown as are the likely affected communities. Communities are defined by geography and by shared characteristics. The potential effect on vulnerable populations is noted. The final two columns note where this information is located in the draft EIS and any mitigation measures provided. Table 7 shows that some key determinants of health have been considered in reasonable detail. However, the potential inequality/inequity impacts have not been sufficiently assessed or discussed. This is a significant gap.

Table 8 shows that some key determinants either do not seem to have been considered anywhere in the draft EIS or have not been considered and discussed in relation to health impacts in the Human Health Chapter and Community Health Appendix. The determinants that do not seem to have been covered anywhere in the draft EIS are those in table listed under the heading of socio-cultural:

Healthcare, Other public and community services, Recreation, Social capital and community cohesion and Housing. The determinants that have been covered elsewhere in the draft EIS but where specific health impacts or a discussion of the implications for community health have not been addressed in the Human Health Chapter and associated appendix are: Traffic and transportation, Economic (Employment/income), Visual intrusion, Odour and Climate change.

These determinants and why they should have been assessed or assessed in more detail is discussed in the next section.

Table 7 Health Topics Covered in Health Chapter

Health determinant	Activity	Sub activity	Potential health outcome/effect	Likely affected communities	Vulnerable populations	Where addressed in the draft EIS	Mitigation measures in draft EIS
Air quality	Construction activities	Bulk earthworks and aviation infrastructure works (emissions and dust deposition)	Long-term: All-cause mortality in adults; cardiopulmonary, ischemic heart disease, lung cancer mortality in adults (subset of all-cause mortality)	Geographically: communities/suburbs within 5 km from the airport boundary have been considered – Bringelly, Luddenham, Greendale, Kemps Creek, Mulgoa, Wallacia, Badgerys Creek, Rossmore and Mount Vernon Vulnerable/sensitive groups considered: elderly, people with existing cardiovascular and respiratory disease, people with asthma, low socio-economic groups/socially deprived and children	Impacts on inequality/equity not explicitly discussed but implicitly as impacts are described by areas for which information on existing levels of elderly, children and proportion of deprived residents is presented.	Human health chapter (chapter 13) and Health Risk Assessment appendix (appendix G)	Not presented in the human health chapter or appendix but cross-referred to the air quality and greenhouse gases chapter (chapter 12).
		Construction traffic (emissions)					
	Operation-related activities	Passenger vehicle movements	Short-term: all-cause mortality in all ages; Cardiovascular disease mortality; hospital admissions for respiratory, cardiac, cardiovascular, ischemic heart disease COPD and pneumonia/bronchitis in 65+; hospital admissions for respiratory disease in 15-64; ED visits for asthma in 1-14 year olds;				
		Staff vehicle movements					
		Internal airport vehicle movements					
		Air traffic movements					
Airport-related energy production and waste management including power plant/s							
Aircraft Auxiliary Power Units (APUs) and Ground Support Equipment (GSE)							
Noise	Construction activities	Construction traffic	Wellbeing (annoyance and sleep disturbance) Learning Cardiovascular	Geographically: Bringelly, Kemps Creek, Erskine Park, Kemps Creek 2, St Marys, Greendale,	Sensitive receptors such as schools mentioned.	Human health chapter (chapter 13) and Health Risk Assessment appendix (appendix	Not presented in the human health chapter or appendix but cross-referred to the noise chapter.

Health determinant	Activity	Sub activity	Potential health outcome/effect	Likely affected communities	Vulnerable populations	Where addressed in the draft EIS	Mitigation measures in draft EIS
			effects	Silverdale, Rossmore, Horsley Park, Rooty Hill, Prospect; Additionally, a range of locations for educational facilities have been considered given their sensitive nature;		G)	
Water quality	Chemical and fuel storage Equipment Operation Equipment maintenance Fire fighting	Potential leaking of underground storage tanks and pipes; fuel spillage or leakage during ground handling of aircraft; washing of aircraft and vehicles and fire-training for which flame-retardant chemicals may be used; fuel jettisoning Surface water discharge	Acute or chronic exposure to range of health hazards leading to range of health effects	No analysis of differential impacts in relation to water quality, including likely affected communities	None discussed	Pages 141-143	Monitoring proposed for surface water discharge but not detailed in this section. Spill management and containment protocols Fuel discharge is characterised as a rare occurrence.
	Dust emissions during construction	Impact on potable water supply at Warragamba Dam	Impact on water quality	No analysis of differential impacts in relation to water quality, including likely affected communities		Pages 142-143 Assessed risk to water quality through PM 10 modelling as being low	Dust controls through water spray

Error! Not a valid bookmark self-reference. shows potential health effects arising from the project that are not covered in the health chapter and associated appendix. They are arranged by health determinant. For each determinant Table 8 shows project activity and the sub-activities by stage (e.g. construction and operation). The potential health outcomes arising from these activities are shown.

Table 8 Health Topics Not Covered in Health Chapter

Health determinant	Activity	Sub activity	Potential health outcome/effect
Environmental			
Traffic and transportation	Construction-related traffic		RTAs related injuries and fatalities Severance (see social capital and community cohesion)
	Operation-related traffic (passengers, staff and freight HGVs e.g. fuel, retail, other)		
	Aircraft accidents		Aircraft accident related injuries and fatalities
	Fly parking and speeding		Wellbeing (annoyance/ frustration)
	Congestion and travel times		Wellbeing (annoyance/ frustration)
	National and international connectivity		Wellbeing (improved for those using)
Odour	Odour associated with aircraft		Wellbeing (annoyance)
Climate change	Construction	Primary and linked secondary greenhouse gas emissions	No direct health effects but potential for contributing to increase extreme weather events globally that have health effects (e.g. drought, flooding, forest fires, etc.)
	Operation	Primary and linked secondary greenhouse gas emissions	
Economic			
Employment/income	Job opportunities at airport and associated facilities (skills, training and additional income)		Physical and mental health and wellbeing (improved)
	Property Values		
Socio-cultural			
Healthcare	Increased demand on local level health care because of the		Mental health and wellbeing Physical health

Health determinant	Activity	Sub activity	Potential health outcome/effect
	presence of the workforce		
Other public and community services	Disruption to utilities	Construction Land take	Mental health and wellbeing Physical health
Recreation	Loss of public and green space		Mental health and wellbeing Physical health
Social capital and community cohesion	Land take for proposed runway	Displacement of People Loss of housing and sense of community	Mental health and wellbeing (e.g. psychosocial distress) Physical health
	Community disruption due to noise of air traffic and noise and severance of construction and operation related road traffic		
	Migration of workers and presence of non-local workers		
	Community concerns/ perceptions and beliefs about the airport		
Housing	Additional Housing		Mental health and wellbeing (improved) Physical health (improved)
	Creation of new facilities		
Visual intrusion	Land take for proposed runway	Loss of green space Loss of farming space	Mental health and wellbeing Physical health
	Construction		
	Visual effect of additional vehicles		

Important health implications of the determinants of health that have not been fully assessed in the draft EIS

Below potential health implications of the determinants of health that have not been fully assessed in the draft EIS, based on current public health evidence are described.

Environmental impacts

Traffic and transport

Higher levels of traffic in residential areas are associated with poor health and lower levels of social cohesion. This particularly affects older people and children. Time spent commuting can impact on family life and mental wellbeing. Increases in traffic can lead to increases in traffic related accidents. The social impact assessment identifies opportunity for “comprehensive planning, improvements to the road network in conjunction with new public transport infrastructure would create connected communities, reducing commute times and providing opportunities for an active lifestyle” (pg. 97). In addition, increased local job opportunities were predicted to reduce travel times and improve quality of life. Risk due to aircraft accidents is discussed but road traffic accidents due to increased traffic density has not been assessed.

Odour

Odour can cause annoyance and avoidance behaviour (for example, changes in use of outside areas). Odour from exhaust emissions and the on-site waste water treatment plant is assessed within the Air Quality Assessment. These were assessed to be below detectable levels off site for Stage 1. Odour was not assessed for the longer term scenario.

Climate Change

Climate change has significant impacts on human health ranging from changes to food production to increases in extreme weather events. Climate change is addressed in the draft EIS in the Biodiversity assessment. Climate change is identified as being exacerbated by WSA. Potential impacts on health from climate change have not been identified.

Economic impacts

Employment

Evidence shows that higher levels of employment lead to better population health. Participating in employment has been shown to have strong positive effects on mental and physical wellbeing. In general being in work is better for health than having no job; however there are exceptions. Workers in jobs that are poor quality, low paid and precarious (insecure) have similar health scores to the unemployed. Low paid, low skill, insecure jobs with few opportunities for training, development and progression are less healthy than higher paid, higher skill, secure jobs with good opportunities for training, development and progression. Previous HIAs of airports have shown that airports tend to generate a relatively high proportion of lower paid, low skill level jobs.

Employment and economic impacts are discussed in depth in the Social Impact Assessment technical report. It is estimated that during stage 1 construction there will be approximately 758 FTE jobs created. In addition, there is an estimated 7,500 FTE airport related employment by the end of stage

1 (2030) and a further 4,400 FTE jobs in the business parks associated with the airport. Longer term it is estimated that approximately 61,500 FTE jobs would be required for airport operations (2063). Although employment opportunities are expected to increase there are some expected negative impacts on agricultural and manufacturing industry due to competition for land. This could also result in potential loss of agricultural land. The potential health impacts related to the existing local economy and those employed in that economy are not described in the SIA.

The SIA identified a potential reduction in commuting times for Western Sydney residents by being able to access jobs closer to where they live. This could have positive benefits for community and family life.

Socio-cultural impacts

Community facilities

Healthcare

Changes on population, both residential and workforce, can lead to increased demand on health services. There are also potential effects on health services through risks associated with airport development. People within healthcare facilities also tend to be disproportionately vulnerable to impacts such as noise and air quality. The SIA identifies insignificant impacts on healthcare demand for Stage 1 and potential additional demand in the longer term scenario. Health care facilities are also identified as ‘sensitive social infrastructure’ more likely to be affected by impacts such as noise, social amenity, etc. but the specific health impact on these sensitive settings is not assessed.

Other public and community services

The SIA identifies sensitive social structures that may be particularly vulnerable to potential negative impacts (child care, schools, hospitals, recreational spaces and places of worship) but the specific health impact on these sensitive structures is not assessed.

New facilities

The SIA identifies that it is likely that new facilities will be developed as part of the growth associated with the airport.

Recreation resources

Access to good quality green space is associated with improved mental and physical health outcomes. This may happen through ameliorating stress, increased physical activity and there is also evidence of exposure to nature reducing blood pressure. The mental health benefits of activities in a natural environment have been identified as:

- Social, emotional, creative and cognitive development of children and young people
- Quality of life and relaxation
- Recovery from stress
- Relief of symptoms
- Therapeutic and healing; spiritual
- Physical activity; sport; adventure; challenge
- Learning; intellectual and creative development
- Sense of meaning/purpose/perspective
- Social contact; cohesion; belonging; identity
- Volunteering; conservation; “giving something back”

The SIA identifies loss of amenity for recreational areas from visual and noise impacts. Noise is expected to negatively impact on the amenity of Bents Basin Recreational Area in Greendale, Rossmore Grange, Twins Creek Golf and Country Club, Whalan Reserve at St Marys, Burratorang State Conservation Area and a small part of the Western Sydney Parklands and Prospect Nature Reserve). The Blue Mountains World Heritage Area is going to be negatively impacted on by noise and visual impact from planes. The impacts on recreational facilities and greenspace on health have not been considered.

Social capital and community cohesion

Research has demonstrated a link between social capital and health, in particular mental wellbeing. Communities with high social capital have higher levels of trust, reciprocity and participation. At an individual level social participation and support are associated with lower levels of mental health problems and higher levels of self-reported health. Further discussion on how social capital and community cohesion is addressed in the points below.

Land take for Airport

Loss of housing and forced relocation of residents and businesses have been shown to have significant negative health impacts on individuals as well as community level impacts due to loss of or disruption to social capital and community cohesion. The SIA excludes the impacts of forced relocation on health and wellbeing because the relocations have already taken place.

The SIA identifies that there will be a loss of agricultural land. Food security is an important public health issue and has not been assessed within the draft EIS.

Community disruption due to noise of air traffic and noise and severance of construction and operation related road traffic

The health chapter includes an assessment of noise related impacts in terms of awakenings, cardiovascular events, learning and cognitive development in children. Air quality is assessed in terms of impacts on physical health (e.g. cancer risk, increased mortality and morbidity). Community disruption, and impacts on social capital and community wellbeing are not assessed in the health chapters. Stress and anxiety related impacts are also not assessed. Within the SIA loss of amenity due to air and road traffic noise is identified as a potential negative impact. The implications of this for public health and wellbeing are not identified. The draft EIS has not assessed the potential increase in road traffic accidents as a result of airport related traffic.

Migration of workers and presence of non-local workers

Migration of workers and the presence of non-local workers in communities can cause community disruption and impacts on local facilities and resources. The SIA identifies that the majority of the workforce is expected to be local but also some moving into the area permanently and also people commuting in from other parts of Sydney. The expectation for a mostly local workforce appears to be based on the availability of working-age people in the South Western Sydney area. It was beyond the scope of this peer review to assess the validity of assumptions around employment opportunities. It is not clear whether the expected increase in employment opportunities will benefit young residents, unemployed residents and residents experiencing deprivation in the surrounding area. These residents are also likely to be most negatively affected by existing and future environmental, social and health impacts from airport activities.

Community concerns/ perceptions and beliefs about the airport

Evidence of health impacts, as laid out in the draft EIS, may not be the same as the community's perception of health risks. The perception of changes to noise, air quality, and home prices can influence the behaviour of local community members and in turn affect their health. This has been evidenced by other HIAs on airport developments. The extent to which individuals and communities have control over their lives has a significant influence on mental health and overall health. Lack of control and lack of influence (believing you cannot influence the decisions that affect your life) are independent risk factors for stress. Heightened risk perceptions, low control and low involvement in decision-making are associated with negative physical and mental health impacts. The SIA acknowledges uncertainty over the airport plans (e.g. flight path location) that could cause anxiety among local community but the potential impacts on health and wellbeing are not drawn out. This is a potentially significant area of health impact that has not been assessed.

Housing

The SIA reports that most stakeholders noted housing affordability during consultation as a key issue. The SIA identified no significant impacts on values for large blocks of land that are currently common around the airport. The population forecast carried out for the draft EIS predicts significant population growth in Southwest Sydney. Areas close to the airport have been identified as both employment and housing growth areas. The SIA identifies that potential longer term housing unaffordability due to growth may negatively impact on already disadvantaged groups.

In addition, housing prices may be relatively more affordable in areas exposed to higher levels of noise. This means that already vulnerable population groups are more likely to live closer to environmental risks. Communities close to the airport may have already experienced disruption and corresponding loss of identity, social capital and social cohesion due to relocation of housing and community facilities, changes in employment opportunities, and other environmental impacts due to the airport development. Although longer-term housing unaffordability is identified as a potential problem in the SIA, the implications of this for health and health equity are not drawn out.

Visual intrusion

The airport itself and associated development, construction and additional traffic will negatively impact on visual amenity. The SIA identifies the loss of agricultural land; this will impact on the visual amenity of the area as it is replaced by other more built up industries. As mentioned previously, recreational areas including the Blue Mountains will suffer loss of visual amenity due to the presence of planes overhead and for some areas changes to the landscape. Some residential areas will also have views of the airport.

The potential negative permanent impacts from the loss of amenity and green space on health are not identified in the SIA. These impacts would affect future generations. The potential health impacts on communities that will experience multiple amenity impacts (e.g. noise and visual) has not been considered. These impacts can lead to a significant loss of community and sense of place (with or without any additional increase in aircraft noise) making the area less desirable to live in and affecting community identity and cohesion.

6. Detailed Findings – Long Term Development

This section details the findings of the peer review conducted on the Health Chapters for long-term development. The peer review took into consideration long-term impacts described in the Health Appendix (G) and any health considerations included in Volume 3.

Table 9 Long Term Health Impacts Considered in the Draft EIS

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
4.4 Description of health effects		
4.4.1 The potential health effects of the project, both beneficial and adverse, should be identified and presented in a systematic way. ⁴³	The assessment focuses only on the risks (adverse effects) to human health. This section only considers the effects from the long-term development scenario (other timescales are considered in the health appendix). Impacts are limited to direct risks via noise, air quality and water exposure.	Consider broader range of health pathways and indirect impacts, as well as considering positive impacts/effects.
4.4.2 Has the Exposure Pathway been identified?	Exposure pathways for air, noise and water are clearly explained. They include exposure from aircraft overflights, ground activity, and traffic, which seem to include all the major pathways for these health determinants.	None.

⁴³ Does the identification of impacts consider short-term, long-term (and are these timescales defined?), direct and indirect impacts on health and well-being? Does the identification of health impacts distinguish between the construction phase, the operational phase and where relevant the decommissioning phase?

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
<p>4.4.3 Has an appropriate time period been considered for health and wellbeing impacts?</p>	<p>Without considering the appropriateness of the assumptions used in the air, noise and water assessments it is not possible to determine whether the assumptions used for the health assessment are appropriate. The HRA assesses for increased risk from exposure with an assumption for continued exposure (non-mitigated) in which case this would seem appropriate.</p>	<p>Given the long-term stage of this assessment, the time period for the health impacts seem appropriate.</p>
<p>4.4.4 Has an appropriate range of possible future (health relevant) scenarios been considered?</p>	<p>The health outcomes are very narrowly considered (all-cause mortality; cardiopulmonary mortality; respiratory mortality; ED visits for asthma in children; EEG awakenings; learning and cognitive development; myocardial infarction). These do not take into consideration any assumption about future health scenarios which may be appropriate given the uncertainties about the assumptions for the air and noise modelling for this future stage of development. However, the assessment does not taken into account future population growth scenarios.</p>	<p>Consider population growth scenarios in the assessment of long term impacts.</p>

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
<p>4.4.5 What is the predicted exposure level or conditions? How does this compare with the exposure standard (for environmental risks) or acceptable condition (for social, community or psychological risks)?</p>	<p>The Human health Chapter authors note that all exposure levels are below accepted standards. However this does not take into consideration the potential health outcomes of synergistic impacts (of the combined exposures). Likewise, the authors note that for NO₂, even though it falls below the NEPM standards, there is no safety threshold for NO₂. This is also true for PM 2.5, although this is not stated in the report. There is also no mention of the acceptability of these risks by communities or health professionals.</p>	<p>In addition to comparing risks to NEPM standards, they should also consider synergistic impacts and the acceptability of risks for the communities, particularly those that will be most impacted.</p>
<p>4.4.6 What level of risk has been designated for this impact?</p>	<p>The authors don't include specific findings for all pathways in this section, they only summarize the health impacts (i.e. they don't say what the actual dB will be just that it will result in 10 EEG awakenings). This information is in the Appendix (volume 4 appendix G). Only the "highest risk" for health effects are reported in this section.</p>	<p>This report should either provide better clarification on the level of risk or otherwise provide a reference to where it is located in the appendix.</p>
<p>4.4.7 What justification has been provided for this risk level?</p>	<p>Level of risk is only presented as a comparison (i.e. "highest" not "high, medium, low"). No further discussion of the justification of risk is provided.</p>	<p>Further characterisation of risk should be provided. See 1.1.8</p>

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
<p>4.4.8 Has the weighting/significance of health impacts been described and is it appropriate?⁴⁴</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Direction: Whether the potential change would be beneficial or adverse ➤ Severity: More severe effects include those that are disabling, life-threatening, and permanent ➤ Magnitude: How widely the effects would be spread within a population or across a geographical area ➤ Likelihood: How likely it is that a given exposure or effect will occur. ➤ Certainty: level of certainty or uncertainty attached to the predictions of health effects. 	<p>Health effects are characterized according to level of risk and community with highest risk.</p>	<p>As most risks look at mortality or hospitalization for AQ there's no need to define severity in this case. However, it would help to define severity for noise, such as EEG awakenings. There is a greater discussion in the literature review of awakenings in the appendix but some discussion or definition of the severity of awakenings and cognitive development should be included. Magnitude of impacts should also be considered. The authors include which communities will be most affected for PM2.5, PM10 and noise but not for NO2 or Ozone. They should be clearer about which communities will be impacted for all pathways, and discuss the magnitude of the impact in those communities including consideration for the most vulnerable. Consideration of likelihood and certainty should also be included.</p>

⁴⁴ Does the assessment consider the severity of impact/exposure (intensity, reversibility and impact on vulnerable population groups), the impact magnitude (number of people affected and duration of impact/exposure) and the importance (political and ethical)? Have the health impacts of each alternative been assessed? Sometimes the health impacts are ranked and prioritized before making recommendations, if so; have the criteria for prioritizing and ranking health impacts been given?

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
4.4.9 Does it take into account stakeholder and community concerns?	There is no discussion of stakeholder or community concerns. The assessment only makes mention of community concerns within the discussion of surface water.	Community feedback on health concerns should be described and how this feedback was considered and addressed in the assessment should be discussed. Where community comments have not been incorporated or addressed an explanation justifying this should be presented. If there were no specific comments or concerns about health impacts/effects or some determinants of health then this should also be stated explicitly. There should also be a discussion of how communities were consulted.
4.4.10 What mitigation measures have been proposed?	Within the three pathways assessed, mitigation strategies are only referenced within the noise pathway, and are in reference to chapter 31 (volume 3). No other reference to mitigation strategies is provided although they are discussed elsewhere in the report.	Mitigation measures should be discussed for each pathway or at least referenced to where they are discussed elsewhere in the draft EIS. Provide a brief summary of the mitigation framework/plan and measures discussed for each pathway.
4.4.11 Has a residual health risk level been determined and mitigated where practicable?	There is no discussion of residual health risk.	As part of the discussion of mitigation measures, residual health risk should also be determined.
4.4.12 The causal pathway leading to health effects should be outlined along with an explanation of the underpinning evidence. ⁴⁵	The casual pathway between health risks and outcomes is not discussed nor does it reference where this information is in the report. The relationship is presented in the literature reviews for each pathway in the appendix.	Reference the appendix to show relationship between health determinants, health risks and health outcomes (exposure pathways).

⁴⁵ The potential health effects may be presented in diagrams, which show the causal pathways and changes in intermediate factors by which the project may affect population health, or may be descriptive.

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
4.5 Risk assessment		
4.5.1 Have assumptions been made explicit and uncertainties are considered and taken into account?	The assumptions and limitations provided are in reference to the limitations and assumptions in the technical reports used to do the assessment (air/noise/water assessments). Other assumptions used for the HRA are not described.	Make explicit any assumptions or limitations in conducting the HRA or reference where these are located in the appendix.
4.5.2 The report should identify and justify the use of any standards and thresholds used to assess the significance of health impacts.	The report does not justify the use of standards or thresholds.	Provide better explanation of the use of thresholds and standards in the assessment (particularly when the report also discusses the lack of a safety threshold such as in the case for NO2). If it is not included in this section then it should at least be referenced to in the full assessment appendix.
4.5.3 Have the methods used to calculate impacts been adequately described (e.g. replicability, transparency, sources of information identified)	The HRA process is briefly described but the assessment calculations are not. These are provided in the health appendix but this section does not make reference to them.	This report should reference the detailed methods in the appendix when they are not provided in the report.
4.6 Analysis of distribution of effects		
4.6.1 The affected populations should be explicitly identified.	There is no discussion of the potentially affected populations aside from identifying which communities will be most affected from noise and air quality impacts.	Report should provide a description of the populations potentially affected or reference where that information is located in the appendix.

Requirement	Comment	Recommendation
4.6.2 Inequalities in the distribution of predicted health impacts should be investigated and the effects of these inequalities should be stated. ⁴⁶	There is no discussion of the equity distribution of impacts.	Report should provide a discussion of the equity impacts or reference where that information is provided in the appendix.
4.6.3 Have populations more vulnerable to this impact been identified, discussed and mitigations proposed?	There is no discussion of vulnerable populations.	Report should provide a discussion of vulnerable population or reference where information is provided in the appendix.
4.6.4 Effects on health should be examined based on the population profile. ⁴⁷	The report makes mention of comparing impacts to a baseline assessment from health statistics for Sydney. However, there is no reference to where this information is available in the report.	Report should reference where the full baseline health profile and health statistics are available in the appendix.
Long Term Impacts Assessment Comments:		
<p>This section is presented as a summary of the impacts that are discussed in more detail in the assessment. While the report does, at times, make reference back to the appendix, there is a lot of pertinent detail that is missing that should be referenced to the appendix. This section also lacks core components for clarity – such as discussing the methods used or mitigation measures - that would make this section acceptable as a standalone piece of work without having first read the appendix. This section also misses any discussion of long term cumulative impacts. It appears that cumulative impacts are considered elsewhere in the report (Volume 2. Chapter 27) however this report does not make clear if those cumulative impact assessments were used in this assessment. It would be particularly relevant to include discussion of cumulative impacts here as there is no mention of health impacts in the cumulative impacts chapter (Volume 2 chapter 27). This section should also provide better characterisation of health impacts or otherwise provide a reference to where it is located in the appendix.</p>		

⁴⁶ How does the report define inequalities? Inequalities are found between social groups and can be measured in different ways e.g. by geography, social class or social position, population (ethnicity, gender, sexuality etc.).

⁴⁷ It should be possible to determine whether effects are more prevalent in certain demographic or vulnerable groups.

7. Summary of Key Findings

The Health Risk Assessment (HRA) predicted the attributable health outcomes from air and noise exposures in communities near the airport. The summary of key findings from the review team's interpretation of the data is provided below. Sufficient data was not available to conduct a complete a health risk assessment for ground water and surface water, therefore the health impacts from changes in ground and surface water are not presented below..

Air Quality

The HRA primarily considered the health outcomes of exposure to particulate matter 10, particulate matter 2.5, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, and carbon monoxide from exposure associated with airport construction, stage 1 operations, and long term operations. The communities assessed were Badgerys Creek, Bringelly, Greendale, Luddenham, Kemps Creek, Mulgoa, Wallacia, Rossmore and Mount Vernon. The primary health outcomes considered were mortality, cardiovascular disease, respiratory disease, and emergency department visits related to asthma for 0-14 year olds. It should be noted that airport constructions is scheduled to occur over 10 years. Therefore, any impacts from construction that occur beyond 10 years are less likely to be realised.

Particulate Matter 10 (PM₁₀)

Stage 1 Operations

The communities with the highest predicted attributable cases across all health outcomes were Bringelly, Kemps Creek, Wallacia and Rossmore. Kemps Creek had the highest number of annual mortality cases (over 30 year olds) with 0.1 deaths per year, or 1 death every 10 years attributable to PM₁₀.

Long Term Operations

Bringelly, Kemps Creek, and Rossmore had the highest predicted attributable cases across all health outcomes. Rossmore had the highest number of annual mortality cases (over 30 year olds, long-term) with 0.4 deaths per year, or 4 deaths every 10 years attributable to PM₁₀.

Construction Bulk Earthworks

Luddenham will be most impacted with the most predicted attributable cases across all health outcomes and with the highest number of annual mortality cases (over 30 year olds) with .01 deaths per year, or 1 death every 100 years attributable to PM₁₀.

Construction Aviation Infrastructure

Kemps Creek had the highest predicted attributable cases across all health outcomes. Kemps Creek, Bringelly, Luddenham and Badgerys Creek all had the highest number of annual mortality cases (over 30 year olds) with .01 deaths per year, or 1 death every 100 years attributable to PM₁₀ in each community.

Particulate Matter 2.5 (PM_{2.5})

Stage 1 Operations

Bringelly, Kemps Creek and Rossmore had the highest predicted attributable cases across all health outcomes. The highest predicted risk is for all-cause mortality and cardiopulmonary mortality from long-term exposure. Rossmore and Kemps Creek had the highest number of annual mortality cases (over 30 year olds) with .06 deaths per year, or 6 deaths every 100 years, in both communities. Rossmore and Kemps Creek also had the highest number of cardiopulmonary mortality cases (over 30 years old) with .06 deaths per year, or 6 deaths every 100 years, in both communities, attributable to PM_{2.5}.

Long Term Operations

The communities with the highest predicted attributable cases across all health outcomes were Bringelly, Kemps Creek, and Rossmore. Rossmore had the highest number of annual mortality cases (over 30 year olds, long-term) with 0.3 deaths per year, or 3 deaths every 10 years attributable to PM_{2.5}.

Construction Bulk Earthworks

Kemps Creek had the highest predicted attributable cases across all health outcomes. Bringelly and Luddenham had the highest number of annual mortality cases (over 30 year olds, long-term) with 0.004 deaths per year, or 4 deaths every 1000 years attributable to PM_{2.5} in each community.

Construction Aviation Infrastructure

Luddenham had the highest predicted attributable cases across all health outcomes. Bringelly and Luddenham had the highest number of annual mortality cases (over 30 year olds, long-term) with .02 deaths per year, or 2 deaths every 100 years attributable to PM_{2.5} in each community.

Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)

Stage 1 Operations (including traffic)

The communities with the highest predicted attributable cases across all health outcomes were Bringelly, Kemps Creek, Mulgoa and Rossmore. Kemps Creek had the highest number of annual mortality cases (over 30 year olds, long-term), with .6 deaths per year, or 6 deaths every 10 years attributable to NO₂.

Long Term Operations (including traffic)

Kemps Creek had the highest predicted attributable cases across all health outcomes. Kemps Creek, Bringelly and Rossmore had the highest number of annual mortality cases (over 30 year olds, long-term), with .6 deaths per year, or 6 deaths every 10 years attributable to NO₂.

Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂)

Stage 1 Operations

Modelling for health impacts from SO₂ was only conducted for stage 1 operations. The highest predicted attributable cases were related to respiratory disease hospital admissions (over 65 year olds) and emergency department visits for asthma (1-14 year olds). Kemps Creek had the highest number of respiratory disease hospital admissions with .004 admissions per year, or 4 admissions

every 1000 years attributable to SO₂. Bringelly had the highest number of emergency department visits for asthma with .007 visits per year, or 7 visits per 1000 years attributable to SO₂.

Carbon Monoxide (CO)

Stage 1 Operations

The primary health outcome considered in the HRA for CO was cardiovascular disease hospital admissions (over 65 year olds). Kemps Creek had the highest number of cases with .005 admissions per year or 5 admissions per 1000 years attributable to CO.

Noise

The HRA considered the health outcomes associated with noise from aircraft over flights and ground based operations. The primary health outcomes considered were impacts on sleep disturbance, cognitive development and learning, and annoyance. The WHO has calculated the health effects from exposure to varying levels of noise (WHO, 2009). Noise exposure in a school environment over 35 dB may lead to interruptions in learning and cognitive development. Exposure over 40 dB inside at night may lead to sleep disruptions in the form of EEG awakenings (partial awakenings detected by electroencephalogram, EEG, readings) and full awakenings. Noise exposure above 55 dB may lead to annoyance, and increased risk for cardiovascular disease. The HRA considered impacts to Bringelly, Kemps Creek, Erskine Park, Kemps Creek 2 (secondary monitoring station), St Marys, Greendale, Silverdale, Rossmore, Horsley Park, Rooty Hill and Prospect. It also used data from monitoring stations at various schools: Warragamba Preschool; Emmaus Catholic College Kemps Creek; Horsley Park Public School; Luddenham Public School; Bringelly Public School; Mount Druitt Public School; St Marys South Public School; Bennett Road Public School; Colyton High School; St Clair High School; Banks Public School; Blackwell Public School; and Plumpton High School. It is assumed in the HRA that the noise levels at schools may be representative of the noise levels of the surrounding communities.

Aircraft Noise

Daytime

Annoyance

No community site exceeded the 55dB threshold for daytime noise exposure. No school site exceeded the 55dB threshold either.

Learning and Cognitive Development

Luddenham Public School and Horsley Park Public School exceeded the 35dB threshold for daytime noise exposure inside for certain operation stages and flight scenarios. The highest noise exposures would occur in Luddenham in 2063 operations with 39dB for flight scenario 'Prefer 05' and 41dB for flight scenario 'Prefer 23.'

Night Time

EEG Awakenings

Luddenham Public School had the most predicted additional EEG awakenings across all operation stages and flight scenarios. The most additional EEG awakenings would occur at Luddenham Public School in 2050 and 2063 with the most occurring in the 2063 operation stage with flight scenario 'Prefer 23' with 110 additional EEG awakenings per person per year, or .3 EEG awakenings per person per night. It is important to note that the average person will experience 24 EEG awakenings per night during 8 hours of undisturbed sleep.

Full Awakenings

Luddenham Public School had the most predicted additional full awakenings across all operation stages and flight patterns. The most additional full awakenings would occur at Luddenham Public School for 2050 operations with 10 additional full awakenings per person per year, in all flight scenarios.

Ground Operations Noise

Daytime

Annoyance

Only Luddenham Public School exceeded the daytime threshold of 55dB from ground operations noise. The highest level is for 2063 operations, with a noise level of 58dB.

Learning and Cognitive Development

Bringelly Public School and Luddenham Public School exceeded the 35dB daytime noise exposure inside. Luddenham Public School exceeded 35dB for all operation scenarios, with 44dB inside in 2030, 45dB inside in 2050, and 48dB inside in 2063. Bringelly Public School only exceeded the guideline in 2063 with 36dB inside.

Night Time

EEG Awakenings

Luddenham Public School had the most predicted additional EEG awakenings across all operation stages. The most additional EEG awakenings would occur at Luddenham Public School in 2063 with the most occurring in the 2063 operation with 400 additional EEG awakenings per person per year, or 1 additional EEG awakening per person per night from ground operations noise. It is important to note that the average person will experience 24 EEG awakenings per night during 8 hours of undisturbed sleep.

Full Awakenings

The most full awakenings per person per year would occur in Luddenham Public School with 10 additional awakenings in 2030, 12 additional awakenings in 2050, and 15 additional awakenings in 2063 operations stage from ground operations noise.

8. Opportunities in relation to assessment of health effects

The health chapter and associated technical reports considered health impacts resulting from changes in air quality, noise and water. The methods of assessment used for assessing the resulting predicted impacts are appropriate and largely in accordance with published standards and guidelines. The Review Team's detailed comments and recommendations are contained within the relevant sections in the review tables. It should be noted that where weaknesses in the assessment method have been identified this does not necessarily mean that if these were addressed the findings would be significantly different. However given the scale of this development, the potential for significant permanent impacts and this being the only environmental impact assessment currently planned for the WSA, it is recommended that these identified weaknesses be addressed.

The Health Chapter and appendix utilise a Health Risk Assessment approach. This is a quantitative methodology that takes changes to these environmental determinants and estimates their risk to health (i.e. the chances or risk of a disease or fatality occurring). This narrow approach does not address the full range of determinants of health and makes no use of the large evidence base on the association between health determinants, particularly social, and health outcomes. The narrow approach has over the years been found to be of limited use to policy and decision-makers and a fuller, more comprehensive qualitative and quantitative assessment of health impacts is often called for. This has occurred internationally as well as in Australia, with guidelines and practical guides published on how to undertake a comprehensive assessment of health impacts (enHealth 2001; NSW Health 2007).

There are two major weaknesses in relation to the assessment of health impacts that the review team strongly recommend be addressed in order to ensure that health effects are not overlooked or not taken into account when mitigation/enhancement is being considered. These are: the reporting of the identified health impacts; and the scope of the impacts included in the health chapter.

Reporting of the identified health impacts

Currently the results of the health risk assessment are presented in a way that it is difficult for readers of the report to identify the scale of the health impacts identified.

The review team recommend:

1. Presenting total number of people potentially affected by health outcomes (i.e. not just presented for individual communities).
2. Presenting information for all affected geographic areas not just worst affected area.
3. Presenting information in formats from which people can easily extract key information (i.e. clearly identifying significant impacts within tables, providing all necessary information within tables, clearly labelling tables).
4. Using consistent measurements of risk (e.g. number of cases per year) and detailing risk according to the community impacted, in terms of geographic areas and where appropriate by vulnerable/sensitive sub-groups.
5. Where numbers are presented, identify levels of certainty and assumptions used. For example, indicate possible range of estimates by including results from sensitivity analysis; where predictions of health outcomes are made for future scenarios (2030, 2060) state clearly if population growth predictions have not been taken into account and if the numbers presented are likely to be an underestimation.
6. Describing (qualitatively) the synergistic (combined) health impacts on communities close to the

airport.

7. Disaggregating the assessment to identify the potential differential health impacts on:
 - a. population groups (e.g. younger people, older people, low socio-economic people); and
 - b. 'sensitive social infrastructure,' such as education and health care facilities.

Scope of impacts included in the health chapter

Currently the 'non health' sections of the draft EIS contain information about a number of potentially significant impacts on the determinants of health (e.g. housing affordability, amenity, and employment). These impacts have not been identified as health impacts and the range and magnitude of potential health outcomes resulting from these impacts have not been assessed. This means that the potential health impacts resulting from these changes are currently unknown. This is likely the result of a Health Risk Assessment rather than a Health Impact Assessment being carried out. It is unclear why a health risk assessment rather than a health impact assessment, which would have incorporated the full range of health impacts, was not carried out. The review team recommends that the health implications of changes in determinants of health identified in 'non health' chapters be reported in the health chapter. This would enable interested stakeholders to identify the range and scale of potential health impacts.

The review team recommend:

8. The full range of potential significant impacts on health should be assessed and appropriate mitigation measures developed. Consideration should be given to including:
 - 8.1. Assessment of the public and community health impacts of the loss of agricultural land, green, open and recreation space.
 - 8.2. Potential impacts on health caused by perceived risk, stress and anxiety about the airport development.
 - 8.3. Loss of greenspace and loss of amenity of greenspace and the impact of this on health and wellbeing of current and future generations.
 - 8.4. Detailed information on the likely mix of part-time and full-time, low vs. high skill and low vs. high paid jobs generated by the airport and the likelihood of jobs being taken up by local communities and unemployed people to assess the quality and uptake of the employment likely to be generated and corresponding health benefits.
 - 8.5. The permanent loss of agricultural land should be considered from a food security, sustainability and public health perspective.
 - 8.6. The potential impacts on housing affordability on health, in particular the impacts on health inequalities resulting from increased housing prices and potential exposure of lower SES populations to residential areas with higher noise levels.
 - 8.7. Impacts on communities (e.g. social capital, community severance, social cohesion, community identity) due to noise and increases in traffic.
 - 8.8. Perception effects from noise and air quality – different from biological or epidemiological risks and can cause stress and anxiety - should be considered separately from mortality and morbidity effects.
 - 8.9. The potential for an increase in road traffic incidents, accidents and congestion including impacts on physical health and communities.
 - 8.10. The residual impact on communities resulting from compulsory relocations.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are only discussed in passing and readers are cross-referred to other sections of the draft EIS (e.g. noise chapter, air quality chapter). Mitigation measures to manage impacts identified in the draft EIS are described for noise, air quality and water issues. Mitigation measures specifically addressing health issues are not detailed as the health issues that have been considered are all associated with changes to air, water and noise hence managing these is considered sufficient in the environmental management framework. Mitigation measures aimed at vulnerable groups are not discussed in the health chapter or health appendix. There is no discussion of residual impacts (effects after mitigation). The report seems to assume that mitigation measures will attenuate most risk.

Where there is cross-referencing to the water/noise/air quality chapter the reviewers have not reviewed these chapters, as this was not in the terms of reference for this review, and therefore cannot give a judgment on the appropriateness of the proposed mitigation in terms of health impacts. The Part E Environmental Management Chapter does not include health specific mitigation measures.

The range of mitigation measures proposed for noise during Stage 1 design and construction is appropriate and likely to effectively manage the associated health impacts, provided the community aviation consultation forum and the community feedback provided by it is satisfactorily incorporated into the final specific mitigation measures and on an on going basis.

The range of mitigation measures proposed for air quality and greenhouse gases during Stage 1 design and construction is appropriate and likely to lower the likely health and wellbeing impacts associated with exposure to air pollutants.

The range of mitigation measures proposed for noise during Stage 1 operation is appropriate and likely to reduce some of the associated health impacts, provided health issues are given specific attention through involvement of NWS Health and/or other relevant health authorities and local communities are effectively engaged and their feedback satisfactorily incorporated into the noise management plan on an on going basis.

The range of mitigation measures proposed for air quality and greenhouse gases during Stage 1 operation is likely to lower the health and wellbeing impacts associated with exposure to air pollutants provided best available technologies and techniques are employed to reduce emissions. As this is uncertain, effective pre-operation air quality monitoring (to establish baseline conditions) and monitoring during operation is key to manage and address potential emerging health risks.

Stakeholder and community engagement will be managed through the use of a Community and Stakeholder Engagement Plan to guide activities, keep the community informed, address enquiries and complaints, and help manage potential impacts during construction of the proposed airport. Coordination with relevant government agencies should ensure NSW Health is included as a primary stakeholder.

The review team recommend:

9. An outline of proposed measures (i.e. a noise/air quality/water management framework or plan) should be presented in the health chapter and an explanation provided for how and to what

extent these measures will mitigate the identified health impacts.

10. In line with our previous recommendations to broaden the scope of the health chapter to include all relevant health impacts, the review team also recommend that corresponding health specific mitigation measures be provided.
11. This should include targeted mitigation measures for addressing impacts on vulnerable groups and sensitive social infrastructure.
12. Mitigation measures that take into account the synergistic (combined) nature of the impacts on communities close to the airport should be developed. This would include consideration of impacts due to: noise, air quality, traffic, loss of amenity, changes in populations, perceived risk, and community identity.

Part E Environmental Management Chapter currently proposes the development of specific management plans. There is no proposed management plan for health impacts.

The review team recommend:

13. A health specific management plan should be developed for both construction and operation phases.
14. In line with our previous recommendations this should include mitigation measures addressing:
 - 14.1. All relevant health impacts (i.e. not just limited to noise, air quality and water)
 - 14.2. Impacts on vulnerable groups and sensitive social infrastructure
 - 14.3. Synergistic nature of the impacts on areas close to the airport.
 - 14.4. Any health inequalities that may be widened (or health equity that is reduced).
15. Include identification of residual risks.
16. Identification of health opportunities where community health can be promoted and improved, health inequalities narrowed and health equity enhanced.

9. Qualifications of the Reviewers

Fiona Haigh

Project Manager

Fiona is an experienced Health Impact Assessment practitioner, researcher and educator. She has spent the last twelve years working in the field of HIA in Germany, United Kingdom and Australia. Fiona has had extensive experience of conducting HIAs using a range of methods. This includes, for example, modelling impacts of noise on health outcomes, literature reviews, collecting and analysing qualitative data from, surveys, focus groups, workshops and interviews. Fiona has routinely project managed large and small HIA projects and as well as providing expert support. Fiona has collaborated in the development of methods for HIAs, including 'EPHIA' – the European Policy Health Impact Assessment Guide, 'URHIA' - Urban HIA methodology, Health Equity Impact Assessment, Migrant Health Impact Assessment and Human Rights Health Impact Assessment. In addition Fiona was the lead project officer on a large study evaluating the effectiveness of HIA in Australia and New Zealand. This involved reviewing the quality of 55 HIA reports.

Fiona has led and been involved in a wide variety of HIAs including: airport runway extension, intermodal terminal, energy from waste facility, sports stadium and retail development, employment strategies, health service redevelopment, housing regeneration, and new housing developments.

Katie Hirono

Review Coordinator and Main Reviewer

Katie is an experienced trainer and practitioner of health impact assessment. Katie came to Australia from the leading HIA organisation in the U.S. - the Health Impact Project, a collaboration of the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. With over US \$10 million in funding to support the growth of HIA, the Health Impact Project provided grants, hosted national events, and developed legislative support for HIAs. As part of this Katie provided grant management, advisory support, and technical assistance to over 15 organisations conducting HIA. She also participated in national capacity developing events, including advisory sessions with the US Environmental Protection Agency to discuss integration of HIA in EIA. At the Centre for Health Equity Training, Research and Evaluation her research has focused on health impact assessment, health equity, and the social determinants of health. Katie was the lead project officer on the Trans Pacific Partnership Agreement HIA and conducted an evaluation of the HIA learning by doing training program. She has also helped to conduct two equity focused HIAs on health programs in Victoria.

Katie has been involved in HIAs on topics including: biomass fuel; intermodal terminals; public housing redevelopment; casino development; solar energy; water and plumbing development; clean water; concession bus fares; public transportation extension; waterway clean-up; and free trade agreements.

Salim Vohra

International HIA Expert Reviewer (Health Impact Evidence Review and Assessment Methods)

Salim has extensive experience of undertaking and researching Health Impact Assessment (HIA) in the UK and internationally (15 years) on economic, energy, health services, housing, transport, regeneration and waste at project and policy levels. These were either stand-alone HIAs or ones that were part of environmental, social and health impact assessments (ESHIA) and strategic environmental assessments/ sustainability appraisals.

He has undertaken a Strategic Health Equity-Focused Policy Review for the London Borough of Hillingdon, that critically reviewed the appropriateness and comprehensiveness of the health-relevant assessments undertaken as part of the Airports Commission, led by Sir Howard Davies, on where a new runway should be built in the South of England. He also has experience of HIAs of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects in the UK such as Thames Tideway Tunnel, High Speed 2 and Transport for London Tube Extensions.

He has worked with a range of international organisations such as the World Health Organization and the International Council on Mining and Metals as well as environmental consultancies and multinational commissioners of HIA and ESHIAs.

He is a specialist in public health with 23 years of experience in public health medicine in various settings. Apart from HIA he has extensive experience of public health research and epidemiology (13 years), management of community perceptions of environmental and health risks (10 years), stakeholder engagement (23 years), health systems management (6 years), reviewing public health and medical research ethics (6 years), community development work (5 years) and public health teaching and training (13 years ad hoc). He has over 20 years of project management experience gained in a variety of settings – university and voluntary, public and private sectors. He has worked with public, private and voluntary sector organisations throughout my career.

His educational background is in medicine (MBChB), environmental epidemiology (MSc) and public health policy (PhD).

He is a Lecturer in Health Promotion and Public Health at the University of West London. He is also an Honorary Fellow of Staffordshire University and Conjoint Lecturer at the University of South Wales for his expertise in HIA.

He is a Fellow of the Royal Society for Public Health; Associate Member of the Faculty of Public Health; Member and Webmaster for the Transport and Health Study Group; Affiliate Member of the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment; Member of the Town and Country Planning Association and Member, and ex Co-Chair of the Health Section, of the International Association for Impact Assessment. He is also an Editorial Board member for Environmental Impact Assessment Review.

Ben Harris-Roxas

International HIA Expert Reviewer (Social Determinants, Equity)

Ben has over 14 years' experience working in public health and program evaluation, both in Australia and overseas. He has worked in consulting and research for private sector companies, several universities, government agencies and NGOs.

Ben has project managed several large multi-year evaluation projects for Commonwealth and state government departments. Ben has conducted projects for the Commonwealth Department of Health, the NSW Ministry of Health, the Health Education and Training Institute, the Agency for Clinical Innovation, Queensland Health, NSW Treasury, the National Heart Foundation, private sector clients and several Australian local governments. These projects have involved developing logic

models, evaluation frameworks, in-depth interviewing and stakeholder consultations, statistical analysis of routinely collected quantitative service data, data linkage, qualitative research, and program and service evaluation.

Ben is also Conjoint Lecturer in the Faculty of Medicine at the University of NSW. He has also guest lectured and tutored at Macquarie University, the University of Newcastle and the University of Western Sydney.

Ben's PhD research was on the use of health impact assessment in health service planning. Ben has published 23 peer reviewed journal articles and seven book chapters and editorials. He is an Associate Editor for BMC Public Health and is on the Editorial Committee for Environmental Impact Assessment Review.

Ben is Convenor of the International Union for Health Promotion and Education's Global Working Group on Health Impact Assessment. He is on the NSW Committee of the Australasian Evaluation Society and was Health Section Co-Chair of the International Association for Impact Assessment from 2011-2015. He recently participated in expert consultations for the WHO Centre for Health Development in Kobe on multisectoral action for health and health indicators for urban development. Ben is also a member of the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2).

Ben Cave

International HIA Expert Reviewer (Airport Health Impacts, Peer Review Methods and Methodologies)

Ben has specialised in health and social impact assessment for the last 16 years. He has worked across the UK, in mainland Europe and further afield with policy makers, public health academics, environmental scientists and spatial planners. He has provided public health and policy advice at a senior level in local, regional, national and international arenas.

Ben conducts Strategic Environmental Assessments and advises the World Health Organization on requirements and methodologies for SEA. He also integrates health into environmental assessment at the project level: He has led Health Impact Assessments (HIAs) in conjunction with environmental assessments and focused on providing high quality HIAs that are robust and defensible. He has lead HIAs in a wide range of sectors: for example infrastructure for energy, mining, road and rail. Ben has also worked on health in environmental assessments at the following UK airports: Stansted; Heathrow; London-Luton; Bristol and London City.

He is committed to improving standards and quality in the field of impact assessment: he is an active member of, and has held leadership positions in, the International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA). In 2009 he led research for, and development of, a review package for HIA reports with input from an expert panel of reviewers. He convened a seminar on quality in impact assessment at the 2015 annual meeting of the IAIA. His work contributes to national and international developments.

His awards include: 2015 Honorary Member of the Faculty of Public Health; 2011 International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA) "Individual Award" for major achievement and advancement in the theory and/or practice over a period of time at an international level.

His professional associations include: Chair of Section Coordinating Committee of the IAIA (2011-2014) and co-chair of the Health Section of the IAIA (2005-2011); Associate member of the Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment. Ben is a member of the International Union of

Health Promotion and Education Global Working Group on HIA (2010-present); and sole European member of National Research Council/Institute Of Medicine committee for a study on Health Impact Assessment in the USA (2009-2011).

Filipe Silva

International HIA Expert Reviewer (Health Impact Evidence Review and Assessment Methods)

Filipe has 6 years of experience in public health medicine in various settings – undertaking health impact assessment and health assessment components of environmental and social assessments (3 years), public health research and epidemiology (3 years), epidemiological surveillance (1 year), health systems management (2 years), community development and health promotion work in both high income and low to middle income countries, mostly in the UK but also across Europe, Africa, South East Asia and South America, within public, private and voluntary sector organisations.

Filipe has participated in more than fifteen impact assessments including stand-alone health impact assessments and the health assessment component of EIAs and SEAs on policies, plans and projects in the transport, urban and spatial planning, and extractive sectors. He has a strong focus on the quantitative assessment of health effects, particularly in relation to air pollution. Filipe was part of the team that undertook a Strategic Health Equity-Focused Policy Review for the London Borough of Hillingdon, critically reviewing the appropriateness and comprehensiveness of the health-relevant assessments undertaken as part of the Airports Commission, led by Sir Howard Davies, on where a new runway should be built in the South of England. He also has experience of HIAs of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects in the UK such as High Speed 2 and Transport for London Tube Extensions. He has worked with a range of international organisations such as the World Health Organization and the Asian Development Bank as well as environmental consultancies and multinational commissioners of HIA and ESHIAs.

Filipe has a Bachelor and Masters in Medicine from the University of Oporto, Portugal, a Master's in Public Health by the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (2013) with a focus on health in EIA and SEA, environmental health and environmental epidemiology. He has undertaken additional specific training in geographical information systems applied to public health research and practice, health impact assessment (IMPACT, University of Liverpool, 2013), strategic environmental assessment and environmental impact assessment principles and practice.

Appendix F

Aviation planning (ARUP and The Airport Group)



WSP PB

**Western Sydney Airport - Draft
EIS Peer Review**

Aviation Planning

001

FINAL | 20 November 2015

This report takes into account the particular instructions and requirements of our client.

It is not intended for and should not be relied upon by any third party and no responsibility is undertaken to any third party.

Job number 246163

Arup
Arup Pty Ltd ABN 18 000 966 165



Arup
Level 17
1 Nicholson Street
East Melbourne VIC 3002
Australia
www.arup.com

ARUP

Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	1
1 Scope	5
1.1 Approach	5
1.2 Limitations	6
1.3 Components of the draft EIS Reviewed	6
2 Detailed Findings – Stage 1 Airport	8
2.1 Compliance with the EIS Guidelines	8
2.2 Assumptions	9
2.3 Validity of Conclusions	23
2.4 Mitigation and Management Measures	25
2.5 Uncertainty over Impacts and Environmental Risks	27
3 Detailed Findings – Long term Development	28
3.1 Approach	28
3.2 Gap analysis	28
3.3 Key risks and implications	31
3.4 Effectiveness	32
4 Key Impacts and Opportunities	33
5 Review Team	36

Executive Summary

Scope of Review

Our approach has been to review the four volumes of the draft EIS as well as the draft Airport Plan provided on the website (www.westernsydneyairport.gov.au).

This document is based on a desktop study and a literature review of the four volumes of the draft EIS and the draft Airport Plan, comparison of these against the EIS guidelines, identification of potential opportunities or inconsistencies and a comparison against available benchmarks.

Stage 1 airport

Issues identified in terms of aviation planning for the Stage 1 airport include:

Airport planning

- No vocation or aviation purpose is described for Western Sydney Airport.
- There is a degree of variability in the forecasts and demand information used in the draft EIS and draft Airport Plan. In addition, the forecast passenger loads per aircraft for Western Sydney Airport as presented in the draft EIS appear to be high.
- It is unclear what benchmarks or planning decisions sit behind the 1900m runway separation shown for Western Sydney and it is noted that other airports in Australasia are proposing wider runway separation.
- Benchmarking indicates that passenger throughput per aircraft stand is potentially high for Western Sydney Airport. This would imply that the number of aircraft stands shown is less than one might typically expect.

Airspace and flight tracks

- The proposed airspace model is noted as a “proof of concept” and not the subject of exhaustive analysis. The indicative airspace design was not developed with consideration to potential noise or other environmental impacts.
- A single airspace model is presented for Stage 1 development. The basis of the model is that operations at Sydney Kingsford Smith Airport are unaffected. Other than minor flight path displacement, feasible alternatives are not presented or evaluated. However, presenting alternatives is a requirement of the EIS guidelines provided by the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development.
- Departures track to 'exit gates', concentrating aircraft on several defined routes. This is a common tool used to improve air traffic flow. The impact of concentration and location of turn points has not been tested for environmental impact.

- Modes of operation (flight paths based on runways in use) are mentioned, but not how they affect surrounding areas.
- Noise abatement procedures, commonly implemented at other major airports, have not been developed.

Bird and bat strike

- The bird and bat strike assessment concludes that the overall risk for the airport is low. However the assessment is preliminary.

Fuel dumping

- Fuel dumping is concluded to be low risk and it is considered that the information presented in the draft EIS is appropriate.

Long term development

A number of the issues identified for Stage 1 are also apparent in the longer term planning of Western Sydney Airport.

- The lack of vocation or purpose for Western Sydney Airport and its relationship to the ongoing operation at Sydney Kingsford Smith Airport and, in particular, that potential long-term growth forecasts are very high.
- The variability in the number of stands and the apparent lack of consistency in terms of a base set of planning parameters used in developing the airport.
- Narrow runway separation to achieve all the proposed aviation uses.
- Lack of a full and thorough assessment of the interaction of aircraft traffic in the Sydney Basin which requires an airspace and flight path review not considered as part of Stage 1. The Stage 1 flight paths proposed in the Draft EIS are not considered appropriate for the long term plan.

Key impacts and opportunities

Key impacts and opportunities from an airport planning perspective for the above issues are as follows:

- Vocation or purpose of Western Sydney Airport – One might expect that, certainly in its early stages of development, the Western Sydney Airport would potentially be a domestic, low-cost carrier airport with a significant cargo operation, reflecting lower charges and the lack of noise curfew. Premium international flights would continue to use Sydney Kingsford Smith as the primary airport in New South Wales and the one which provides proximity to the tourist and business centre of Sydney CBD. This vocational aspect is important in influencing how the future airport will operate, peak periods of activity and the type of traffic that will use the airport.

- Forecasts – There is potential that the forecasts understate the number of aircraft movements required, which has knock-on impacts on dependent analysis such as noise modelling. This is a potential area for further assessment or clarification to confirm that findings in the draft EIS and draft Airport Plan based on these forecasts are robust.
- Runway separation – Any wider runway spacing would increase land take, with downstream environmental impacts on biodiversity, surface water and groundwater, landscape and visual amenity. In addition, wider spacing for the future two runway airport will impact on flight tracks and noise, given changes to runway thresholds.
- Aircraft stand provision – The number of aircraft stands shown is potentially less than one might typically expect, which has implications for land take and therefore related environmental impacts, though it is noted that the Land Use plan for Stage 1 shows a large area available for development.
- Airspace, OLS and PANS-OPS – In terms of requirements, the evaluation of protection volumes for flight paths and airspace containment is in accordance with normal methods mentioned in the Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations and under the Airports Act 1996. Analysis of Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS) and Instrument Flight Procedure protection volumes (known as PANS-OPS surfaces) indicates that, operationally, the Western Sydney airport can operate unrestricted from terrain and artificial obstacles.

However, the following impacts are identified which are either unresolved or which require further clarification:

1. The proposed airspace architecture is 'indicative' and has not been rigorously tested. The draft EIS proposes that another airspace model is tested closer to commencement of operations.
2. The modelling indicates several flight paths over water storages, such as Warragamba Dam and Prospect Reservoir. Other flight paths traverse the Blue Mountains National Park. The environmental impact is unclear.
3. The requirement under the Guidelines, produced by the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development (DIRD), for feasible alternatives to be included has not been met. This is particularly important in consideration of concentration of approaching traffic over the township of Blaxland for the Stage 1 development and departure tracks.
4. There is no consideration of community sentiment regarding changes to flight paths, proposed in the draft EIS, when the Airport operates with two runways.
5. An alternative Stage 1 airspace model, based on the long term proposal but operating with a single runway, is not tested.

6. Except for Sydney Kingsford Smith, flight paths for aerodromes, affected by the Western Sydney Airport are not evaluated.
7. The draft EIS suggests that Western Sydney Airport will detrimentally affect the operations at Bankstown and Camden, and affect Richmond (military). The environmental impact is not quantified.
8. Relocation of light aircraft traffic to other airports, the definition of new training airspace and consequent environmental impact, is not assessed.

Given the above, it is considered that the information on airspace presented in the draft EIS does not meet requirements.

- Bird and bat strike – the bird and bat strike assessment is preliminary and therefore further works in the airport site and study area are required to confirm the level of bird and bat strike risk and to refine the mitigation strategies.
- Fuel dumping – It is considered that the information presented in the draft EIS is appropriate though more detail could be provided to give certainty for local government and communities.

1 Scope

The following document provides a peer review of airport planning aspects of the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Western Sydney Airport released by the Federal Government for public exhibition on 19th October 2015. Airspace and flight tracks have been reviewed by The Airport Group (TAG) and salient points and key findings are also captured in this document. For the full discussion on airspace and flight tracks, the TAG report entitled “Peer Review - Western Sydney Airport EIS” and dated 17th November 2015 is also included in its entirety as Appendix A.

Given that Western Sydney Airport is a new facility, amendments to the Airports Act 1996 have been passed which provide for the preparation of an “Airport Plan” to guide the development of the airport and a draft of this Plan has been provided along with the draft EIS.

The draft EIS and draft Airport Plan have been put forward to obtain “planning, environment and development approval for Stage 1 of the proposed [Western Sydney] airport”.¹ In addition, indicative information is also provided for a longer term planning horizon out to 2063 to enable stakeholders and the public to understand and consider potential longer term environmental impacts of the new airport, including noise.

The document states that the “draft EIS has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the EPBC Act and the EIS guidelines, including the requirement for public consultation. In determining the Airport Plan, the Minister for Infrastructure and Regional Development must accept any environmental conditions proposed by the Minister for the Environment, taking into account the finalised EIS”.²

Longer term development beyond Stage 1 would be subject to the requirements of the Airports Act including provision of additional Master Plan and MDP studies, and potentially additional EIS requirements, as appropriate.

1.1 Approach

Our approach has been to review the four volumes of the draft EIS as well as the draft Airport Plan provided on the website (www.westernsydneyairport.gov.au).

The four volumes of the draft EIS are Volume 1 – Project Background, Volume 2 – Stage 1 Development, Volume 3 – Long Term Development and Volume 4 – Technical Appendices.

¹ p.9, Regulatory framework, Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development, Western Sydney Airport – Environmental Impact Statement – Volume 1, October 2015

² p.10, Regulatory framework, Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development, Western Sydney Airport – Environmental Impact Statement – Volume 1, October 2015

1.2 Limitations

This document is based on a desktop study and a literature review of the four volumes of the draft EIS and the draft Airport Plan, comparison of these against the EIS guidelines³, identification of potential opportunities or inconsistencies and a comparison against available benchmarks.

No analysis or modelling has been undertaken and indeed modelling files have not been made available.

The document provides guidance to WSROC in terms of the work undertaken and where further clarification may be required on key issues.

1.3 Components of the draft EIS Reviewed

The following sections have been reviewed for this aviation planning peer review:

- **Draft Airport Plan**
Part 1: Airport Plan for Western Sydney Airport
Part 2: Concept Design
Part 3: Specific Developments
- **Draft EIS Volume 1 – Project Background**, including
Part A – Project background and rationale
 1. Introduction
 2. The need for Western Sydney Airport
 3. Approvals framework*Part B – Airport plan*
 4. Land use plan
 5. Stage 1 Western Sydney Airport
 7. Airspace architecture and operation
- **Draft EIS Volume 2 – Stage 1 Development**, including
Part D – Environmental impact assessment
 9. Approach to impact assessment
 10. Noise (aircraft)
 12. Air quality and greenhouse gases
 14. Hazard and risk
 21. Planning and Land Use
 26. Greater Blue Mountains
 27. Cumulative Impact
Part E – Environmental Management
 28. Environmental management framework
- **Draft EIS Volume 3 – Long Term Development**, including
Part G – Assessment of long term development
 30. Introduction

³ These guidelines are provided in EIS Volume 4 Appendix C.

- 32. Air quality and greenhouse gases
- 39. Other environmental matters

- **Draft EIS Volume 4 – Appendices**, including:
 - Appendix E1 Aircraft overflight noise
 - Appendix F1 Local Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas
 - Appendix I Bird and Bat Strike
- Western Sydney Airport, Preliminary Airspace Management Analysis, Airservices Australia, 2015

2 Detailed Findings – Stage 1 Airport

2.1 Compliance with the EIS Guidelines

In general, most requirements of the EIS guidelines have been addressed in relation to aviation planning aspects.⁴ However, it is considered that the information on airspace presented in the draft EIS does not meet requirements.

From an aviation planning perspective, the EIS requirements are as described below:

- In accordance with Section 5(a) of the EIS guidelines, all operational components of the action, in this case the proposed development of a Western Sydney Airport, driven by aviation demand and planning of appropriate infrastructure, need to be presented. The draft Airport Plan which accompanies the draft EIS is provided to guide the development of the physical characteristics of airport, including runway, taxiways, aprons, terminal and landside facilities.
- The assessment needs to consider the Stage 1 operation, which is the action for which approval is sought, but also to foreshadow longer term development. This is in accordance with Section 5(a) of the EIS guidelines.
- The EIS Guidelines, Section 5(g) require a description of all of the relevant impacts of the action to the environment including:
 1. Consideration of potential flight paths and varying aircraft operating procedures (with respect to noise etc).
 - Airspace is discussed in Sections 7, 14, 21, 27 and 30 of the EIS, Volume 4 Appendix E1 Aircraft Overflight & Operational Noise and in the documents entitled Western Sydney Airport, Preliminary Airspace Management Analysis, Airservices Australia, 2015.
 2. Bird or bat airstrike - EIS Guidelines, Section 5(g) require the consideration of impacts arising from bird or bat airstrike, and the creation of any risks or hazards to people or property that may be associated with any component of the action.
 - Bird or bat airstrike is discussed in Section 14.4, 16.5 and 16.6 of the EIS and Volume 4 Appendix I.
 3. Aviation fuel dumping - EIS Guidelines, Section 5(g) require the consideration of air quality and environmental impacts arising from potential fuel dumping impacts.

⁴ The guidelines are entitled Guidelines for the Content of a draft Environmental Impact Statement Western Sydney Airport Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Reference: EPBC 2014/7391) and dated 22nd January 2015. They are provided in Appendix C of Volume 4 of the draft EIS.

- Fuel dumping is discussed in Section 7.8, 12.6 and 32.4 of the EIS and Volume 4 Appendix F1.
- In addition, under EIS Guidelines Section 3. Feasible Alternatives, the draft EIS is supposed to assess “feasible alternatives” to the action and then “undertak[ing] a comparative description of the impacts of each alternative on the matters of national environmental significance”.⁵

The following sections of this document describe the outcomes of the Arup and TAG peer review, with respect to the above guidelines and with commentary on assumptions and findings.

2.2 Assumptions

2.2.1 General

The draft Airport Plan and much of the draft EIS is focussed on the Stage 1 scenario, for which approval is sought. This is equivalent to an airport with a mixture of domestic and international traffic with a maximum throughput of 10 million annual passengers.

No rationale is provided for the 10 million passenger per annum threshold other than it provides for predicted demand in 2030, 5 years after the proposed opening of the airport in 2025. One might typically expect the approach to have been to look at the maximum capacity of single runway airport and to identify logical capacity stages to get to that point. The maximum capacity of the single runway as set out in the draft EIS is 37 million annual passengers by 2050, equivalent to the current throughput of Sydney Kingsford Smith Airport.

The approach taken leads to an incremental planning solution when moving to the long-term capacity scenario, with full build-out of terminal and apron capacity between two parallel runways, stated to be by 2063.

No vocation or aviation purpose is described for Western Sydney Airport. One might expect that, certainly in its early stages of development, the airport would potentially be a domestic, low-cost carrier airport with a significant cargo operation, reflecting lower charges and the lack of noise curfew.⁶ Premium international flights would continue to use Sydney Kingsford Smith as the primary airport in New South Wales and the one which provides proximity to the tourist and business centre of Sydney CBD.

⁵ p.4 Section 3, Feasible Alternatives, Appendix C, Guidelines for a draft Environmental Impact Statement for Western Sydney Airport, Australian Government, Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development, Western Sydney Airport – Environmental Impact Statement, October 2015

⁶ It is assumed that the need or otherwise for a noise curfew at Western Sydney is discussed in the review undertaken by the noise consultant. From an operational standpoint, it is preferable that an airport operates unrestricted by curfews, however it is imperative that principles of “Fly Neighbourly” are introduced to minimise the environmental impact of noise.

This vocational aspect is important in influencing how the airport will operate, peak periods of activity and the type of traffic that will use the airport. A number of these aspects are alluded to in the draft EIS without ever being fully explained.⁷

2.2.2 Aviation Demand and Activity

Estimating future aviation activity and demand is fundamental component of airport masterplanning, impacting not only on sizing of the airport and its associated infrastructure requirements but also being an important element in predicting aircraft noise as well as understanding landside transport impacts.

Future demand estimates to 2063

Demand estimates in the main volumes of the draft EIS broadly align and are summarised in Table 1 of this report. It is noted that growth between 2050 and 2063 is extremely high – 45 million annual passengers in 13 years, which is unprecedented. It is assumed that the 2063 time horizon is therefore indicative though this is not explained in the draft EIS.

Table 1: Western Sydney Airport - Aviation Demand

	2030	2050	2063
Annual passengers (arrivals and departures)	10,000,000	37,000,000	82,000,000
Peak hour passengers (international and domestic)	3,400	9,500	18,700
Total annual air traffic movements (passenger and freight)	63,000	185,000	370,000
Total peak hour air traffic movements	21	49	85

Source: p.16 Table ES 1 and p.106 Table 2-6, Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development, Western Sydney Airport – Environmental Impact Statement – Volume 1, October 2015

Whilst Tables ES 1 and 2-6 in the draft EIS reference 85 peak hour aircraft movements, elsewhere draft EIS volume 1 states “with parallel runways, the proposed airport could potentially achieve aircraft movement rates of around 100 movements per hour (one landing or one arrival constitutes an aircraft movement)”.⁸ This has potential implications for noise modelling.

Moreover, when considering the data provided, it would seem that peak hour demand in terms of passengers per movement is comparable to and potentially even less than the annual average – as shown in blue in Table 2.

⁷ p.150, Activity Forecasts, Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development, Western Sydney Airport – Environmental Impact Statement – Volume 1, October 2015

⁸ p.19, Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development, Western Sydney Airport – Environmental Impact Statement – Volume 1, October 2015

Table 2: Western Sydney Airport - Passengers per Aircraft Movement

	2030	2050	2063
Annual passengers (arrivals and departures)	10,000,000	37,000,000	82,000,000
Peak hour passengers (international and domestic)	3,400	9,500	18,700
Total annual air traffic movements (passenger and freight)	63,000	185,000	370,000
Passengers per movement (annual)	159	200	222
Total peak hour air traffic movements	21	49	85
Passengers per movement (peak)	162	194	220

Source: Arup analysis using the data provided in Table ES1 and Table 2-6 of draft EIS Volume 1

This is counter-intuitive and does not reflect trends at other airports. One would typically expect a 15% to 20% difference between peak hour and annual loads.

The passenger load per aircraft and its impact on ATMs is important as variations in this will affect the number of aircraft flying in an hour, across a day or across the year, which in turn impacts on other considerations, including noise modelling.

It is noted that the above data includes both annual and peak hour air freight traffic movements (which are broken out for Stage 1 only in the draft Airport Plan, as described in the section below). However, assuming consistent patterns of growth between peak hour and annual freight, the findings still seem atypical.

In addition, when considering other Australian Airports and load factors in their most recently approved Master Plans, passenger loads estimated for Western Sydney Airport seem high.

Current passenger loads through Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane are as follows:

- Sydney Airport – 36.9 million passengers on 292,800 passenger movements in 2012, at an average load per movement of 126 passengers.
- Melbourne Airport – 30.17 million passengers on 210,350 passenger movements in 2013, at an average load per movement of 143 passengers.
- Brisbane Airport – 21.3 million passengers on 194,000 passenger movements in 2012/13, at an average load per movement of 110 passengers.

All of these airports are mature, with well-defined markets, and reasonable share of international traffic. It therefore seems optimistic for Western Sydney Airport to expect higher average passenger loads per aircraft movement than these three airports in the 5 years after it opens.

Assuming higher passenger loads has the potential to understate the number of aircraft movements required, which has knock-on impacts on dependent analysis such as noise modelling. This is a potential area for further assessment or clarification.

Demand estimates for Stage 1 Airport

Table 3 provides information from Table 1 of the draft Airport Plan in terms of the mix of international and domestic passengers and air traffic movements (ATMs) and this data differentiates between passenger and freight ATMs.

When considering the data in the draft Airport Plan, peak hour arriving and departing passengers are shown as 4,000 passengers over 19 peak hour passenger ATMs (2,000 departing and 2,000 arriving passengers). This gives an average passenger load per aircraft of 211 which is higher than the annual average of 179 passengers.

This is intuitive as peak hour demand is generally higher than daily or annual averages, though it is noted that an average passenger load per ATM of 211 is very high when considering a predominantly domestic airport using Code C aircraft at 2030 – which is how the Stage 1 airport is described.⁹ The capacity of typical Code Cs flown in Australia are as follows - Qantas 737-800s at 168 seats, Jetstar A320s at 180 seats and Virgin Australia A320s at 168 seats.

Table 3: Stage 1 Aviation Demand

Annual Traffic	International	Domestic	Stage 1 Total
Annual passengers	2,200,000	7,800,000	10,000,000
Annual passengers ATM	7,700	48,300	56,000
Passengers per ATM	286	161	179
Annual freight throughput (tonnes)	167,000	52,000	220,000
Annual freight ATM	3,900	3,100	7,000
Design busy hour passengers			
Departing (passengers per hour)	550	1,600	2,000
Arriving (passengers per hour)	600	1,600	2,000
Design busy hour ATM			
Passenger (movements per hour)	4	17	19
Passengers per ATM	288	188	211
Freight (movements per hour)	3	4	6
Peak movements per hour	4	19	21

Source: p.73, Table 11, Draft Airport Plan, Australian Government, Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development, Draft Airport Plan – Western Sydney Airport, October 2015

From the draft Airport Plan, it is not clear if the 2,000 arriving and 2,000 departing passengers occur at the same time (i.e. if this is a two-way peak, or if these are peak passenger numbers for a specific arrivals peak hour and departures peak hour at different times of the day) and indeed elsewhere in the draft EIS, the combined peak hour of international and domestic passengers is quoted as 3,400 over 19 movements, which would be 179 passengers per aircraft, or in line with the annual average.

⁹ “In 2030, Code C aircraft are expected to account for the majority of domestic operations at the Airport, representing approximately 90 per cent of the domestic fleet mix. In the long-term, Code C aircraft could represent 80 per cent of the domestic fleet mix”. p.26, Aircraft Fleet Mix, Draft Airport Plan, Australian Government, Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development, Draft Airport Plan – Western Sydney Airport, October 2015

Landside Transport Analysis

It is noted that a separate analysis has been undertaken of surface transport impacts as documented in draft EIS Volume 4, Appendix J Surface transport and access. This analysis uses the following assumptions:¹⁰

- For each domestic aircraft, an assumed average capacity of 180 passengers with an average flight occupancy of 90 per cent has been assumed.
- For each international aircraft, an assumed average capacity of 420 passengers with an average flight occupancy of 90 per cent has been assumed.

It is unclear how these assumptions relate to the demand presented for the Stage 1 airport as repeated in Table 3 of this report. For example, assuming 4 international aircraft movements as per Table 3, this would equate to 4 aircraft at $420 \times 90\% = 378$ passengers for a total of 1,512 passengers. This is much higher than the combined international departing and arriving passenger numbers shown in the table ($550 + 600 = 1,150$ passengers) both in the draft Airport Plan and elsewhere in the draft EIS.

Summary

Given the importance of demand forecasts both for sizing the airport and its infrastructure but also for informing other dependent analysis such as noise modelling and planning of landside infrastructure, the variation in some of this data requires clarification to confirm that findings in the draft EIS and draft Airport Plan based on the aircraft forecasts are robust.

2.2.3 Airport Master Plan

The draft Airport Plan states that the Land Use Plan presented for Stage 1 “will apply from the grant of an airport lease until approval of the first master plan”.¹¹ Indeed, the draft Airport Plan clarifies further by stating that “some components of the Airport, such as the location of the runway and the required spacing of airfield infrastructure elements are fixed, while others such as the location and shape of the terminal and cargo areas may change provided they comply with the Land Use Plan and the development objectives for the airport”.¹²

¹⁰ p.58, GHD, | Report for Western Sydney Unit - Western Sydney Airport EIS, 21/24265, which forms draft EIS Volume 4 Appendix J, Australian Government, Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development, Draft Airport Plan – Western Sydney Airport, October 2015

¹¹ p.59 Land Use Plan, Draft Airport Plan, Australian Government, Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development, Western Sydney Airport – Environmental Impact Statement, October 2015

¹² p.17, Stage 1 Development – construction and initial operations (approximately 2016–2030), Draft Airport Plan, Australian Government, Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development, Western Sydney Airport – Environmental Impact Statement, October 2015

Figure 1: Western Sydney Airport - Stage 1 Airport Land Use Plan





Figure 2: Indicative Western Sydney Airport - Long-Term Airport Land Use Plan



Runway Characteristics

The aircraft mix used in assessing runway length requirements, in planning the airport is provided in Table 5-4 of Volume 1 of the draft EIS and is shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Fleet Mix used in Stage 1 Airport Planning

Table 5-4 – Maximum take-off weights for critical aircraft expected to use the proposed airport

Aircraft	Code	Maximum take-off weight (kg)	Runway length requirements (m)
B737-500	C	60,550	2,960
B747-400	E	396,894	3,790
B747-800	F	447,696	3,670
B767-300ER	D	186,880	3,790
B777-200	E	286,900	3,320
B777-300ER	E	351,535	3,640
A321-200	C	93,500	3,000
A330-300	E	242,000	3,650
A340-600	E	380,000	3,400
A380-800	F	575,000	2,900

Source: Aircraft Manufacturer's Manuals

The runway length shown for Stage 1 is 3,700m which is appropriate for all but the 747-400 and 767-300ER at Maximum Take-Off Weight (MTOW). As the draft EIS notes these two aircraft “are currently being phased out of the Boeing fleet”¹³ and accordingly a 3,700m accommodates the other main aircraft types.

The runway will be 60m wide to accommodate up to Code F aircraft.

Whilst the runway length and width are described, other characteristics which one might expect to see in an EIS are not included such as runway longitudinal and transverse slopes, runway surface, runway shoulder and strip longitudinal and transverse slopes etc. One would expect these to be included as they impact upon water run-off and drainage which is usually an important consideration in an EIS.

In terms of operation, the draft Airport Plan identifies that the airport will operate with a single runway to around 2050 at 37 million annual passengers on 185,000 movements, equivalent to 49 busy hour ATMs. At this point a second parallel runway of 3,700 metres is expected to be required.

It should be noted that 49 movements per hour off a single runway is close to the current maximum at Gatwick, which is the world’s busiest single runway airport at 39.7 million passengers¹⁴ and which achieves up 55 movements per hour. However, Gatwick is an exception globally and is currently engaged in discussion with the UK Government in relation to building a second runway. The next

¹³ p.154, Runway length requirements, Western Sydney Airport – Environmental Impact Statement – Volume 1, October 2015

¹⁴ Gatwick Airport website, <http://mediacentre.gatwickairport.com/press-releases/2015/15-10-09-london-gatwick-september-traffic-figures.aspx>

busiest single runway airport in the world is San Diego Airport at 18.8 million annual passengers.

These benchmarks would indicate that a potential second runway may be sought earlier than 2050 and this would require its own Master Plan and MDP process, potentially with additional EIS requirements as appropriate.

Runway Separation

In general, the principles behind the Land Use plans appear sensible.

The plans for Western Sydney Airport allow 1900m between the two runways which provides for development area for terminal, aviation and logistics support land uses when considering long-term growth. This aligns with the distance between the main runways for the original Beijing Airport and for the recently opened Kunming Airports and is greater than the runway separation for new Beijing T3 and Hong Kong Chek-Lap-Kok which are both at approximately 1500m.

However, recent development of independent parallel runways with main terminal complexes between them are typically wider between 2000m and 2500m (Auckland, Kuala Lumpur, New Istanbul and New Dubai). This is also reflected by other Australian and New Zealand Airports which are allowing for 2000m to 2100m including:

- 2000m at Brisbane, Melbourne and Perth Airports; and
- 2072m at Auckland Airport;

This is to provide greater flexibility for the central terminal area development.

It is unclear what benchmarks or planning decisions sit behind the 1900m runway separation shown and any wider spacing would increase land take, with downstream environmental impacts on areas such as in turn impacts on biodiversity, surface water and groundwater, landscape and visual amenity. In addition, wider spacing for the future two runway airport will impact on flight tracks and noise given changes to runway thresholds.


This closer runway separation will also likely provide for less room to manage the proposed incremental development of the site, in particular when considering construction, construction access, site compounds etc.

It is recommended that clarification is sought on the issue of runway separation and whether the proposed 1900m is appropriate.

Aircraft Stands

There are a number of inconsistencies in terminal sizing and provision of stands when considering the Stage 1 Master Plan, as shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Indicative Stage 1 Terminal Arrangements



Whilst the draft Airport Plan identifies that multiple terminal and stand configurations exist, one would expect the fundamental elements to remain the same. However, the total number of widebody (Code E or F) aircraft stands shown ranges from 13 to 14 and the location of these stands connected to the terminal (also known as contact stands) and those that are remote for aircraft parking ranges from all contact to up to 3 widebody aircraft on remote stands.


Indeed, the draft Airport Plan describes “the expectation that approximately 21 passenger aircraft stands (Code C, Code D and Code F) and four freight aircraft stands will be required to provide the Stage 1 Capacity. MARS and swing gates may be used to meet the Stage 1 Capacity and reduce the overall stand requirement to approximately 19”.¹⁵ This is a different set of numbers again, although the Master Plan options shown in Figure 4 would provide enough space for this mix.

Whilst not considered a critical issue at this stage, it does raise the question of consistency in terms of the base set of planning parameters used in developing the airport. Moreover, when considering 10 million annual passengers on 21 stands,

¹⁵ p.75, 3.2.3 Apron, Draft Airport Plan, Australian Government, Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development, Draft Airport Plan – Western Sydney Airport, October 2015

this gives a passenger throughput of 467,190 passengers per stand. This is a very high throughput and benchmarks with major airports such as Atlanta, Dubai, Amsterdam, Denver and Hong Kong. However, these are major hubs with much higher throughputs and 6 or 7 waves of arrivals or departures and high levels of transfer. One would not expect this level of demand per stand through a 10 million passenger per annum airport but a lower throughput. This implies that the Western Sydney Airport will actually require more aircraft stands than those shown on the plans.

Figure 5: Benchmarking – Annual Capacity per Stand



Source: Graph extracted from Arup benchmarking study using 2008 data

This is reaffirmed through benchmarking against current Australian airports. For example, when considering the current Sydney Airport, the published Aeronautical Information Package (AIP) indicates a total of 106 stands. Current throughput at Sydney is 36.9million passengers, which over 106 stands is equivalent to 348,113 passengers per stand.

It is unlikely that new airport in the same region would perform more efficiently than an existing airport with a mature route network and more extensive international reach, in particular in its early years of operation.

As per the passenger load per aircraft data described earlier in this section, this benchmarking would imply that the number of aircraft stands shown is less than one might typically expect, which has potential implications for land take and therefore related environmental impacts, though it is noted that the Land Use plan for Stage 1 shows a large area available for development.

Phasing


Overall the Master Plan appears to be largely influenced by the initial stage of development at 10mppa with incremental expansion out to 2063. This would imply that Western Sydney airport is not seen as a true competitor or even replacement airport to Sydney Kingsford Smith but more of a complementary airport to the existing one. Therefore, the planning appears to have been

developed on the basis of decanting traffic in as similar way to past development priorities at London Stansted or Montreal Mirabel.

As can be seen from Figure 6, the expansion plan is extremely incremental using multiple terminal processors and pier extensions all linked to each other. This raises questions with regard to the vision and purpose of Western Sydney Airport in relation to the current Sydney Airport.

In addition, the amount of capacity being added every 7 to 8 years is sometimes equivalent to 12 widebody Code E or F aircraft or 24 narrowbody Code C aircraft which is significant and implies the airport will be a continuous building site which raises questions of construction and buildability.

Figure 6: Indicative Staging of Expansion



2.2.4 Noise from Aircraft

Another consultant is reviewing the noise modelling presented in the draft EIS.

The aircraft mix used in the noise modelling is provided in Table 10-3 of Volume 3 of the draft EIS and is shown in Figure 7 below.

Figure 7: Fleet Mix used in Stage 1 Airport Planning

Aircraft	Daily movements
<i>Passenger Movements</i>	
Airbus A320	100
Airbus A330	18
Airbus A380	–
Boeing 737	28
Boeing wide-body general	–
Boeing 777	4
DeHaviland DHC8	8
Saab 340	12
<i>Freight Movements</i>	
Airbus A330	2
Boeing 737	2
Boeing 747	10
Boeing 767	4
Boeing 777-300	–
Small Freight	10

It is noted that planning to 2030 for Stage 1 of the airport includes aircraft that may not be operational at that time such as the B747-400 and B767-300 which as the draft EIS notes “are currently being phased out of the Boeing fleet”.¹⁶ By including for these in noise modelling, it is likely that this aspect of the modelling has been conservative as older aircraft are typically noisier than the more current generation. However, as noted earlier in this section, it is not clear whether the number of aircraft movements is correct or whether these numbers have been understated owing to high load factors.

2.2.5 Airspace and flight tracks

Airspace and flight tracks have been reviewed by The Airport Group (TAG) and salient points and key findings are also captured in this document. For the full discussion on airspace and flight tracks, the TAG report entitled “Peer Review - Western Sydney Airport EIS” and dated 17th November 2015 is also included in its entirety as Appendix A.

In summary, the airspace modelling presented in the draft EIS is repeatedly referenced as being “indicative” with further statements on the high-level nature

¹⁶ p.154, Runway length requirements, Western Sydney Airport – Environmental Impact Statement – Volume 1, October 2015

of the work such as being a “preliminary assessment undertaken by Airservices Australia ... limited to a conceptual level airspace management design”.¹⁷

The draft EIS goes on to explain that the “indicative airspace design did not consider potential noise or other environmental considerations”.¹⁸ In essence, the development of flight tracks has not been undertaken to respond to environmental considerations.

Moreover the work undertaken by Airservices Australia and which underpins the draft EIS is described as being “intended to meet a narrow scope focussed on demonstrating a proof of concept. It does not present a comprehensive airspace and air route design and does not consider all essential components that would be necessary to implement an air traffic management plan for the Sydney basin. Certain assumptions have been made and significant additional steps would be required to develop air traffic management plans suitable for implementation”.¹⁹

Both statements, above, indicate that the airspace components presented in this draft EIS do not meet the requirements of the EIS guidelines.

In addition, draft EIS does not explore alternatives to the flight paths shown. For Stage 1, other than minor flight path displacement, “feasible” alternatives are not presented or evaluated, as required in the Guidelines provided by the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development. This is evidenced by a single flight path “Point Merge” being located over Blaxland township for the Stage 1 development, as shown in Figure 8 overleaf.

The draft EIS implies that this single Point Merge for the short term plan can accommodate both runways and describes movement of the point by up to 3 nautical miles. However, no other options are considered for Stage 1, despite the long term plan having a different set of four Point Merges for the two runway system. This is at odds with the EIS guidelines provided in Appendix C and needs further investigation. A single untested airspace model based on traffic considerations is unlikely to provide a satisfactory outcome, as no comparative scenario is offered.


Based on the above, this draft EIS does not therefore meet the requirement of the EIS guidelines to demonstrate feasible alternatives. A refined method, considering a several alternative models, is required to meet the guidelines and also to remove uncertainty of flight paths and the consequent impact on the community from environmental considerations, such as noise, pollution, building restriction, etc.

¹⁷ p.18, Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development, Western Sydney Airport – Environmental Impact Statement – Volume 1, October 2015

¹⁸ p.197, Section 14.4.1 Flight Tracks, Western Sydney Airport – Environmental Impact Statement – Volume 2, October 2015

¹⁹ p.25, Section 2.6 Flight Tracks, Western Sydney Airport – Environmental Impact Statement – Volume 4, Appendix E1 Aircraft Overflight Noise

Figure 8: Flight Tracks Modelled for Initial Development (Single Runway – All Operating Modes Combined)



2.2.6 Bird and bat strike

The draft EIS references relevant standards and guidelines for the assessment and management of bird and bat strike risk, in accordance with Section 5(g) of the EIS guidelines.

However, the fieldwork described is limited to one set of surveys therefore seasonal/temporal changes cannot be identified. In addition, some sites within the study area were not assessed due to access limitations. Monitoring of seasonal variability is required by Section 5(g) of the EIS guidelines.

Volume 4 Appendix I states that study area for the assessment is 25km radius from the airport site centre point. This is based on international and national guidelines for identifying and managing wildlife attractants within 13km of runways. This is potentially misleading as Figure 7 shows the Study Area Assessment Locations and these extend to approximately 15km from the airport site. This requires clarification.

2.2.7 Aviation fuel dumping

No analysis is presented on fuel dumping in the draft EIS.

The draft EIS benchmarks current instances of “emergency fuel jettisoning occurring in approximately 0.001 per cent of all aircraft movements”²⁰ and

²⁰ p.247, 7.9.4 Emergency fuel jettison (fuel dumping), Western Sydney Airport – Environmental Impact Statement – Volume 1, October 2015

concludes that “given the rarity of fuel jettisoning globally, the known low occurrence in Australian airspace, the standards set out in the Aeronautical Information Package (AIP), and the high evaporation rates known to occur at high altitude, authorised fuel jettisoning associated with the operation of the proposed airport, is unlikely to cause significant environmental or social impacts”.²¹

If fuel dumping occurs as part of an emergency, the AIP as specified by Airservices Australia states that fuel jettison must occur “where possible, ... in clear air at an altitude of above 6,000 feet (approximately 1.8 kilometres) and in an area nominated by air traffic control” to limit local impacts to allow the fuel to evaporate. However, if fuel dumping were to occur below 6,000 feet, there is potential that this could occur over Blacktown or Wetherill Park when considering the flight tracks related to Rwy 23 or over Camden and Blacktown when considering the flight tracks related to Rwy 05. In order to reassure local government and communities, the draft EIS could discuss local measures which would prevent fuel dumping over these areas.

2.3 Validity of Conclusions

In general, the approach and findings appear valid. However, it is recommended that further explanation is ought on the following matters:

- Vocation or purpose of Western Sydney Airport – No vocation or aviation purpose is described for Western Sydney Airport. One might expect that, certainly in its early stages of development, the airport would potentially be a predominantly domestic, low-cost carrier airport with a significant cargo operation, reflecting lower charges and a lack of noise curfew.²² Premium international flights would continue to use Sydney Kingsford Smith as the primary airport in New South Wales and the one which provides proximity to the tourist and business centre of Sydney CBD. This vocational aspect is important in influencing how the airport will operate, peak periods of activity and the type of traffic that will use the airport.
- Forecasts – There is a degree of variability in the forecasts and demand information used in the draft EIS and draft Airport Plan. In addition, the forecast passenger loads per aircraft for Western Sydney Airport as presented in the draft EIS appear to be high. Assuming higher passenger loads has the potential to understate the number of aircraft movements required, which has knock-on impacts on dependent analysis such as noise modelling. This is a potential area for further assessment or clarification to confirm that findings in the draft EIS and draft Airport Plan based on these forecasts are robust.
- Runway separation – It is unclear what benchmarks or planning decisions sit behind the 1900m runway separation shown for Western Sydney and it

²¹ p.247, Section 7.9.4 Emergency fuel jettison (fuel dumping), Western Sydney Airport – Environmental Impact Statement – Volume 1, October 2015

²² It is assumed that the need or otherwise for a noise curfew at Western Sydney is discussed in the review undertaken by the noise consultant. From an operational standpoint, it is preferable that an airport operates unrestricted by curfews, however it is imperative that principles of “Fly Neighbourly” are introduced to minimise the environmental impact of noise.

is noted that other airports in Australasia are proposing wider runway separation. Any wider spacing would increase land take, with downstream environmental impacts on areas such as in turn impacts on biodiversity, surface water and groundwater, landscape and visual amenity. In addition, wider spacing for the future two runway airport will impact on flight tracks and noise given changes to runway thresholds.

- Aircraft stand provision – benchmarking indicates that passenger throughput per aircraft stand is potentially high for Western Sydney Airport. This would imply that the number of aircraft stands shown is less than one might typically expect, which has potential implications for land take and therefore related environmental impacts, though it is noted that the Land Use plan for Stage 1 shows a large area available for development.
- Airspace and flight tracks – In terms of airspace and flight tracks, conclusions drawn from the draft EIS with respect to Stage 1 flight paths and airspace (Air Traffic Management) include:
 1. There are no known physical impediments to the operation of an airport at Western Sydney;
 2. An indicative “proof of concept” airspace plan exists which facilitates the management of aircraft traffic, which conforms to current standards.
 3. Based on the airspace “concept”, noise modelling is indicative of the effect of aircraft on those flight paths.
 4. Maintaining aircraft at higher altitudes will reduce the noise impact on the community.

The conclusions are valid for the cases presented and they follow current “best practice” guidelines for flight path design and protection of airspace.

Items which are not considered include:

1. Any alternative airspace model and flight paths. It is considered that alternative scenarios should be developed to determine an acceptable overall model for airspace.
2. Environmental impact on selection of flight paths needs to be included to minimise impacts on the community.
3. There is no consideration of community acceptance of change to aircraft flight path and altitudes. The effect of noise is not restricted solely to loudness, but also to perception, and this has not been tested. Metrics of noise evaluation should be considered for the proposed paths.
4. Height restrictions on buildings not located in the immediate vicinity of the airport. Locations, such as the Blue Mountains Council region, Camden, Penrith, Parramatta etc, are potentially affected by the airport at Western Sydney and should be evaluated.

5. Noise abatement procedures are promulgated for major airports around Australia. They define modes of operation at certain times to reduce the effect on surrounding population centres. No consideration has been given to operational management to minimise public impact.
- Bird and bat strike – the bird and bat strike assessment in draft EIS, Volume 4, Appendix I concludes that the overall bird and bat strike risk for the airport is low. However the assessment is preliminary and therefore further works in the airport site and study area are required to confirm the level of bird and bat strike risk and to refine the mitigation strategies, in parallel with design development. Indeed, Appendix I provides recommendations for further work in Section 6, including monthly bird and bat surveys for one year to account for seasonal changes.
 - Fuel dumping – It is considered that the information presented in the draft EIS is appropriate though discussion of local effects would provide reassurance to local governments and communities. The advice presented in the draft EIS accords with policy for both the US Federal Aviation Authority (FAA) and UK Civil Aviation Authority.

2.4 Mitigation and Management Measures

2.4.1 Airport planning

No mention is made of measures to reduce environmental impact on airport e.g. reducing the impact of water run-off by minimising areas of pavement for aircraft parking.

No mention is made of terminal building design which is currently moving towards low energy consumption and sustainable or ‘green’ solutions including the harvesting of rain water for grey water reuse, reduced use of artificial light through the use of skylights, and so on.

Whilst this may be a level of detail too far for a Master Plan, this is something one might expect in an EIS.

2.4.2 Airspace and flight tracks

The primary methods of mitigation against flight path environmental impacts is to create a Point Merge System to reduce the emissions and noise generated on approach and to have tracking of departures over less sensitive areas. The former maximises the altitude of aircraft whilst reducing the thrust required, thereby minimising adverse environmental effects. The latter seeks to separate the emissions and noise events from sensitive areas.

Both strategies are commonplace, are considered ‘best practice’ and are presented in the draft EIS.

2.4.3 Bird and bat strike

Section 5 of Appendix I identifies mitigation measures for detailed design, construction and operation, in accordance with Section 6 of the EIS guidelines. The strike risk mitigation strategies described in Section 5 of Appendix I apply to Stage 1 of the development only.

Section 16.6.2.3 of the draft EIS describes the significance of the potential impacts to the EPBC listed Grey-Headed Flying Fox, and includes consideration of aircraft strike as a potential impact. The assessment concludes that the project is likely to have a significant impact to the Grey-Headed Flying Fox but that aircraft strike is unlikely to substantially impact the population as a whole.

Section 7 of the draft EIS guidelines require that details are provided of likely residual impacts upon a matter protected by a controlling provision, after the proposed avoidance and mitigation measures have been taken into account. This includes quantification of the extent and scope of significant residual impacts. The assessment does not specifically link the mitigation measures to a reduction in the level of impact, and residual impacts are not detailed for bird and bat strike, specifically for the Grey-Headed Flying Fox.

2.4.4 Fuel dumping

No mitigation measures proposed. Approach taken for Western Sydney aligns with the approach taken for other major Australian Airports though the majority of these are existing.

2.5 Uncertainty over Impacts and Environmental Risks

The issues presented around forecasts have implications for:

- Economics and social impact;
- Noise, which in turn impacts on Human Health;
- Air quality and greenhouse gases;
- Hazard and risk; and
- Traffic.

Wider runway separation and more aircraft stands have a potential impact on:

- Land take which in turn impacts on:
 1. Biodiversity;
 2. Surface water and groundwater;
 3. Landscape and visual amenity; and
 4. Airport construction and staging.

Changes to airspace and flight tracks will have potential impacts on:

- Noise and air quality;
- Hazard and Risk;
- Greater Blue Mountains; as well as
- The cumulative impact assessment when considering other airports.

Bird and bat strike have a potential impact in terms of:

- Hazard and risk.
- Impacts on birds and bats also relate to:
 1. Biodiversity.

3 Detailed Findings – Long term Development

3.1 Approach

As for Stage 1, our approach has been to review the four volumes of the draft EIS as well as the draft Airport Plan provided on the website (www.westernsydneyairport.gov.au).

The four volumes of the draft EIS are Volume 1 – Project Background, Volume 2 – Stage 1 Development, Volume 3 – Long Term Development and Volume 4 – Technical Appendices.

3.2 Gap analysis


A number of the issues identified for Stage 1 are also apparent in the longer term planning of Western Sydney Airport. Additional longer-term considerations are provided in the following sections.

3.2.1 Aviation demand and activity

In addition to the variations in demand identified in Section 2, the relationship between Western Sydney and Sydney Airport is not fully explored long-term.


Current throughput at Sydney is 40mppa as compared to a NSW population of 7.7 million. This is equivalent to ~5.2 trips per capita of population which aligns with analysis undertaken for Australia by *anna.aero* and Airbus, and as presented in the figures below.

Figure 9: Airport Passengers per head of Population for non-European Countries



Source: <http://www.anna.aero/2009/10/23/us-propensity-for-air-travel-is-15-times-greater-than-in-china-cyprus-tops-european-rankings/>

Figure 10: Airbus- Trips per Capita by Country



The draft EIS reflects the Government’s Joint Study on Aviation Capacity in the Sydney Region which projects potential demand to be 165 million passengers by 2060.²³ This would imply Sydney Airport operating at over 80 mppa. In addition, across the state, this would imply trips per capita more than doubling by 2060 at 13 trips per capita of population²⁴ which is significantly higher than current maximums for countries of the size and characteristics of Australia (as per Figure 9 and Figure 10).

The relationship between the two Sydney Airports is not explored in the draft EIS, although planning of the Airport and indeed flight tracks and airspace have been allocated assuming maximum growth at each airport without any exploration of the vocation of each airport or how traffic might be split between the two. This could affect the type of aircraft and carriers (e.g. low-cost, cargo etc) using each airport, which in turn will influence the environmental impacts of each airport.


3.2.2 Master Plan

As described in 2.2.3 for the Stage 1 Airport, total stands provision for the ultimate long-term airport development varies from 150 widebody stands to 165 widebody stands and significant variation in the amount of contact and remote capacity.

²³ Note that Joint Study on Aviation Capacity in the Sydney Region indicates even higher demand in the Sydney region at 165 million passengers by 2060. p.84, Capacity Constraints – The Joint Study, Western Sydney Airport – Environmental Impact Statement – Volume 1, October 2015

²⁴ Based on the Australian Bureau of Statistics projection of a NSW population of 12.6 million.
[http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/3222.0main+features72012%20\(base\)%20to%202101](http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/3222.0main+features72012%20(base)%20to%202101)

Figure 11: Indicative Long-Term Terminal Arrangements



The variability in the number of stands again raises the question of consistency in terms of the base set of planning parameters used in developing the airport.

In terms of runway separation, the terminal and transport centre are all contained within the 1900m separation between the runways and the space looks narrow for all of the functions that will be required here. In addition, when building the airport, it will be difficult to construct everything within this envelope whilst not disrupting airport operations.

3.2.3 Airspace and flight tracks

Most issues identified for Stage 1 are also apparent in the longer term planning of Western Sydney Airport. Additional longer-term considerations are provided in the following sections.

Flight path development

Due to the requirements for separation of aircraft on parallel runways, the modelling is much more complex for the longer term scenario than for that on a single runway. Aircraft must be separated vertically, longitudinally (time between aircraft crossing a point) or laterally. Flight paths created facilitate the separation with little, if any, external involvement by Air Traffic Control.

The draft EIS proposal contains a single model for flight paths, developed for parallel runway operations. Similarly, to Stage 1, there is no consideration of more than one scenario included in the modelling. The draft EIS includes statements that this is solely due to the extended timeframe and that there is uncertainty about the service available at implementation. Further, it is intimated

that amount of work required was not justified and would be required prior to commissioning in about 2050. This does not align with the DIRD guidelines.

Interaction with other airports

The model considers broad interaction with Sydney Kingsford Smith and notes that there will significant effects on the operation of other airports in the Sydney basin. The specific interactions, restrictions and changes to airspace is encapsulated in Section 7.4.1 in Volume 1 of the draft EIS entitled Airspace architecture, and potential impacts on air traffic movement. This states that “CASA recently identified a number of important Sydney basin airspace matters that should be considered in future airspace design process”.²⁵

The implication is that the current modelling may not have, or be able to have, future CASA determinations included for the draft EIS. However, it is clear that the ultimate mode of operation of Western Sydney Airport will result in operational incompatibility with the operations at smaller airports like Bankstown and Camden, potentially forcing closure or relocation. Neither eventuality is investigated.

Modelling

The draft EIS is based on assumptions for fleet operations and performance, and “indicative” and “proof of concept” flight paths and airspace definitions. As with Stage 1, no consideration of feasible alternatives is made. The location of Point Merge and Departure tracks and did not consider potential noise or other environmental considerations. Therefore, there has been no testing of alternate solutions.

Within the model, there are several modes of operation, and each is evaluated. The analysis associated with the above follows standard procedure and the results are consistent. It indicates that the modelling conducted will allow the operation of both Western Sydney Airport and Sydney Kingsford Smith independently and as high capacity aerodromes.

3.3 Key risks and implications

These are as for Stage 1 and as described in Section 4 below.

In terms of aircraft noise (which is being reviewed by another consultant), other than modes of runway operation, it is unclear whether the evaluation considers noise abatement. From an operational standpoint, it is preferable that an airport operates unrestricted by curfews, however it is imperative that principles of “Fly Neighbourly” are introduced to minimise the environmental impact of noise.

In terms of airspace, for the certainty of local government management and processes, it is expected that the draft EIS would develop some clarity regarding matters such as impacts on water quality, building restrictions, noise abatement

²⁵ p.229, 7.4 Interactions with Sydney Airport and the broader Sydney region airspace, Western Sydney Airport – Environmental Impact Statement – Volume 1, October 2015

and continuity of airspace flight paths. As with Stage 1, it is unclear whether any evaluation was undertaken with respect to building development restriction within local government areas surrounding the airport, with the exception of areas immediately at the runway ends. One would expect that this would be considered as part of the draft EIS.

For the long term development of the airport there is a potential risk to long term operation if the airspace and flight paths change. Revision to Stage 1 flight paths and airspace may meet with resistance from stakeholders, such as property owners and local authorities. As such, it would be expected that flight paths and airspace developed for Stage 1 can also be staged for the long term operation.

3.4 Effectiveness

The plan presented for longer term development are indicative. Whilst these highlight similar issues to those raised for the Stage 1 airport, it is noted that longer term development beyond Stage 1 would be subject to the requirements of the Airports Act including provision of additional Master Plan and MDP studies as appropriate.

In terms of airspace, it appears that the draft EIS is orientated to the current conditions and has not explored in sufficient depth the conditions expected for Stage 1, nor long term development at Western Sydney Airport.

4 Key Impacts and Opportunities

The following section summarises key impacts and opportunities from an airport planning perspective as identified in Sections 2 and 3.

- Vocation or purpose of Western Sydney Airport – No vocation or aviation purpose is described for Western Sydney Airport. One might expect that, certainly in its early stages of development, the airport would potentially be a predominantly domestic, low-cost carrier airport with a significant cargo operation, reflecting lower charges and the lack of noise curfew. Premium international flights would continue to use Sydney Kingsford Smith as the primary airport in New South Wales and the one which provides proximity to the tourist and business centre of Sydney CBD. This vocational aspect is important in influencing how the airport will operate, peak periods of activity and the type of traffic that will use the airport.
- Forecasts – There is a degree of variability in the forecasts and demand information used in the draft EIS and draft Airport Plan. In addition, the forecast passenger loads per aircraft for Western Sydney Airport as presented in the draft EIS appear to be high. Assuming higher passenger loads has the potential to understate the number of aircraft movements required, which has knock-on impacts on dependent analysis such as noise modelling. This is a potential area for further assessment or clarification to confirm that findings in the draft EIS and draft Airport Plan based on these forecasts are robust.
- Runway separation – It is unclear what benchmarks or planning decisions sit behind the 1900m runway separation shown for Western Sydney and it is noted that other airports in Australasia are proposing wider runway separation. Any wider spacing would increase land take, with downstream environmental impacts on areas such as in turn impacts on biodiversity, surface water and groundwater, landscape and visual amenity. In addition, wider spacing for the future two runway airport will impact on flight tracks and noise given changes to runway thresholds.
- Aircraft stand provision – benchmarking indicates that passenger throughput per aircraft stand is high for potentially high for Western Sydney Airport. This would imply that the number of aircraft stands shown is less than one might typically expect, which has potential implications for land take and therefore related environmental impacts, though it is noted that the Land Use plan for Stage 1 shows a large area available for development.
- Airspace, OLS and PANS-OPS – In terms of requirements, the evaluation of protection volumes for flight paths and airspace containment is in accordance with normal methods mentioned in the Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations and under the Airports Act 1996. Analysis of Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS) and Instrument Flight Procedure protection volumes (known as PANS-OPS surfaces) indicates that,

operationally, the Western Sydney airport can operate unrestricted from terrain and artificial obstacles.

However, the following impacts are identified which are either unresolved or which require further clarification:

1. The proposed airspace architecture is 'indicative' and has not been rigorously tested. The draft EIS proposes that another airspace model is tested closer to commencement of operations.
2. The modelling indicates several flight paths over water storages, such as Warragamba Dam and Prospect Reservoir. Other flight paths traverse the Blue Mountains National Park. The environmental impact is unclear.
3. The requirement under the Guidelines, produced by the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development (DIRD), for feasible alternatives to be included has not been met. This is particularly important in consideration of concentration of approaching traffic over the township of Blaxland for the Stage 1 development and departure tracks.
4. There is no consideration of community sentiment regarding changes to flight paths, proposed in the draft EIS, when the Airport operates with two runways.
5. An alternative Stage 1 airspace model, based on the long term proposal but operating with a single runway, is not tested.
6. Except for Sydney Kingsford Smith, flight paths for aerodromes, affected by the Western Sydney Airport are not evaluated.
7. The draft EIS suggests that Western Sydney Airport will detrimentally affect the operations at Bankstown and Camden, and affect Richmond (military). The environmental impact is not quantified.
8. Relocation of light aircraft traffic to other airports, the definition of new training airspace and consequent environmental impact, is not assessed.

Given the above, it is considered that the information on airspace presented in the draft EIS does not meet requirements.

- Bird and bat strike – the bird and bat strike assessment in draft EIS, Volume 4, Appendix I concludes that the overall bird and bat strike risk for the airport is low. However the assessment is preliminary and therefore further works in the airport site and study area are required to confirm the level of bird and bat strike risk and to refine the mitigation strategies. Indeed, Appendix I provides recommendations for further work in Section 6, including monthly bird and bat surveys for one year to account for seasonal changes.

- Fuel dumping – It is considered that the information presented in the draft EIS is appropriate though more detail could be provided to give certainty for local government and communities. The advice presented in the draft EIS accords with statements made by both the US Federal Aviation Authority (FAA) and UK Civil Aviation Authority which forbids fuel dumping unless in an emergency.

5 Review Team



Jim Peacock

Jim Peacock is an Associate with over 15 years of experience at Arup. Since joining Arup, he has attained particular experience in airport masterplanning and in airport terminal design.

Jim is currently Arup's Project Manager for provision of transport planning services to Gatwick Airport, including Gatwick's response to the UK Airports Commission for a second runway. Jim was Arup's Project Manager for the Auckland Airport Master Plan (2012-2013) and Arup's lead airport planner for the Terminal 1 expansion project at Perth Airport working with Woods Bagot. Jim also has terminal planning and masterplanning experience at Brisbane Airport, Hobart Airport and for a number of regional aerodromes in Victoria.



Kay Casson

Kay is a Senior Environmental Consultant in the Arup Brisbane office with 10 years' experience. Kay has been involved in a broad range of projects including environmental impact assessments and constraints studies for major infrastructure projects for government and private clients.

Kay has a strong background in airport projects, including Major Development Plans for Brisbane Airport, Gold Coast Airport and the environmental components of the Hobart Airport Master Plan, and the environmental referral documents for the Sunshine Coast Airport Expansion Project.

For airspace and flight tracks, the review team from TAG is as follows:

Name	Ray Romano
Location	Brisbane
Designation	Chief Designer and Airspace Specialist
Role	QA of product in accordance with CASA Parts 139 and 173
Qualifications	Bachelor of Engineering (Honours, Civil, UQ) Diploma in Instrument Flight Procedure Design (with Distinction, Singapore Aviation Academy)
Relevant Experience	Over 20 years' experience in airspace and instrument flight procedure design. Former Chief Designer, Airservices Australia (2007-2012). Instrument Flight Procedure Designer (1999-). Airways Data Officer (1996-1999). Commercial Pilot (1990-). Trainer of PANS-OPS instrument Flight Procedure Design.

Name	Mark Fineran
Location	Brisbane
Designation	Senior Procedure Designer
Role	Instrument Flight Procedure Design, Air Traffic Management
Qualifications	Diplomas in Aviation (Air Traffic Services) and Transport and Distribution (Air Traffic Control). Airservices Training College (2003) Diploma in Instrument Flight Procedure Design (Singapore Aviation Academy)
Relevant Experience	Over 10 years' experience in aviation. Specialising in Instrument Flight Procedure Design and Air Traffic Control liaison.

Appendix A

TAG Report - Peer Review,
Western Sydney Airport EIS,
Airspace and Flight Tracks



The Airport Group



AIRSIDE • COMMERCIAL • LANDSIDE • AIRSPACE

Peer Review

Western Sydney Airport EIS

Prepared for ARUP

November 2015

DOCUMENT SUMMARY

Project: Peer Review of Western Sydney Airport EIS

Client: ARUP

Client Contact: Ms Marissa Powell, Senior Specialist

Conducted By: TAG173 Pty Ltd, a licensee of The Airport Group

The Airport Group Pty Ltd
Brisbane Office
Unit 8/441 Nudgee Rd
HENDRA QLD 4011
T: 07 3268 6300
E: enquiries@theairportgroup.com.au

Contact: Ray Romano, Airspace Specialist, Chief Designer of
Instrument Flight Procedures

Document Version: Draft Peer Review: Version 2.0

Copyright & Disclaimer

© The Airport Group Pty Ltd. All rights reserved.

PLEASE NOTE: - The information contained in this document is provided solely and to be used only for the scope of the contract for which this document is prepared. No part of this material may be reprinted, reproduced, removed, distributed, translated, transmitted or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means without verifiable prior permission including written consent from the Directors. By default, any third party using the information contained within the document accepts complete responsibility for the information's use and origin.

DOCUMENT VERSION LISTING

Version	Version Description	Changes/ Actions	Staff	Date
1.0	Draft Peer Review	Initial draft created	RRR	03 Nov 2015
1.1	Draft Peer Review	Formatting	JN	06 Nov 2015
2.0	Draft Peer Review	Incorporation of comments	RRR	17 Nov 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DOCUMENT SUMMARY	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	4
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1.1. Scope of Review	5
1.2. Stage 1 Airport	5
1.3. Long Term Development	6
1.4. Key Impacts and Opportunities	6
2. SCOPE	8
2.1. Approach	8
2.2. Limitations	8
2.3. EIS Components Reviewed	8
3. DETAILED FINDINGS - Stage 1 Airport	10
3.1. Compliance with EIS Guidelines	10
3.1.1. General Content	10
3.1.2. Feasible Alternatives	10
3.1.3. Modelling	10
3.1.4. Flight path design	12
3.2. Validity of Assumptions	14
3.3. Validity of Conclusions	15
3.4. Mitigations and Management Measures	16
3.5. Impacts and Risks	16
4. DETAILED FINDINGS – Long Term Development	18
4.1. Overview	18
4.2. Differences to Assessment based on Stage 1	18
4.2.1. Flight path development	18
4.2.2. Interaction with other airports	19
4.2.3. Modelling	19
4.3. Risks and Implications	19
4.4. Further Assessment	20
4.5. Key Impacts and Opportunities	20
5. Review Team	22

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. Scope of Review

This review is based on a desktop study and a literature review of the four volumes of the draft EIS and the draft Airport Plan with respect to flight paths. A comparison is made against the EIS guidelines, specifically for flight paths, to identify any potential inconsistencies with legislation and common practice.

1.2. Stage 1 Airport

Issues identified in the Draft EIS regarding Airspace and Flight Paths for the development of the Stage 1 Airport include:

- Airspace and flight paths are derived from 'WESTERN SYDNEY AIRPORT, Preliminary Airspace Management Analysis', produced by Airservices Australia 2015.
- Due to assumptions regarding traffic numbers, fleets, staged airport development and primarily long timeframes, the proposed airspace model is noted as a 'proof of concept' and not the subject of exhaustive analysis.
- The indicative airspace design did not consider potential noise or other environmental considerations in flight path development.
- A single airspace model is presented for Stage 1 development. The basis of the model is that operations at Sydney Kingsford Smith Airport are unaffected.
- Other than minor flight path displacement, 'feasible' alternatives are not presented or evaluated, as required in the Guidelines provided by the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development. This is evidenced by a single flight path 'Point Merge' being located over Blaxland township for the Stage 1 development.
- Mitigation for environmental issues relies on the proposed airspace being based on adopted International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) methodologies. These methods have been implemented at several locations worldwide with positive results.
- Flight paths based on the ICAO methodology facilitate aircraft operations which minimise pollutants and noise generation on approach when compared to existing methods.
- Departures track to 'exit gates', concentrating aircraft on several defined routes. This is a common tool used to improve traffic flow. The impact of concentration and location of turn points is not tested for environmental purposes.

- Modes of operation (flight paths based on runways in use) are mentioned, but not how they affect surrounding areas.
- Noise abatement procedures, commonly implemented at other major airports, are not developed.

1.3. Long Term Development

There are several issues regarding airspace and flight paths for the long term development of a Western Sydney Airport.

- For safety of flight, the introduction of a second runway operating in parallel requires rules for separation of parallel traffic. Flight paths for separation of traffic at Western Sydney Airport will affect those at Sydney Kingsford Smith Airport and other airports in the Sydney Basin.
- Interaction of aircraft traffic in the Sydney Basin requires an airspace and flight path review not considered as part of Stage 1.
- The Stage 1 flight paths proposed in the Draft EIS are considered not appropriate for the long term plan.
- Except for Sydney KSA, the effects on other airports in the Sydney region are not quantified, other than in general terms.

1.4. Key Impacts and Opportunities

Key impacts and opportunities from the perspective of airspace and flight paths are as follows:

- The evaluation of protection volumes for flight paths and airspace containment is in accordance with normal methods mentioned in the Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations, and under the Airports Act, 1996.
- Analysis of Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS) and Instrument Flight Procedure protection volumes (known as PANS-OPS surfaces) indicates that, operationally, the Western Sydney airport can operate unrestricted from terrain and artificial obstacles.
- The proposed airspace architecture is 'indicative' and has not been rigorously tested. The draft EIS proposes that another airspace model is tested closer to commencement of operations.
- Flight paths appear to fly over water storages such as Warragamba Dam and Prospect Reservoir. The environmental impact is unclear.

- The requirement under the Guidelines, produced by the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development (DIRD), for 'feasible alternatives' to be included has not been met. This is particularly important in consideration of concentration of approaching traffic over the township of Blaxland for the Stage 1 development and departure tracks.
- There is no consideration of community sentiment regarding changes to flight paths, proposed in the draft EIS, when the Airport operates with two runways.
- An alternative Stage 1 airspace model, based on the long term proposal but operating with a single runway, is not tested.
- Except for KSA, flight paths for aerodromes, affected by the Western Sydney Airport, are not evaluated
- The draft EIS suggests that Western Sydney Airport will detrimentally affect the operations at Bankstown and Camden, and affect Richmond (military). The environmental impact is not quantified.
- Relocation of light aircraft traffic to other airports, the definition of new training airspace and consequent environmental impact, is not assessed.

2. SCOPE

The scope of this assessment is a Peer Review conducted with respect to Airspace and Flight Path matters discussed within the draft EIS for Western Sydney Airport released by the Federal Government for public exhibition on 19th October 2015.

2.1. Approach

The approach to this EIS peer review includes relevant matters in the four volumes of the draft EIS as well as the draft Airport Plan provided at the website www.westernsydneyairport.gov.au.

The methodology is to assess proposed flight paths and their containment volumes against the requirements of the Act and common practice. This entails correlating the proposed flight paths in relation to the sensitive areas for environmental significance and noise concentrations and population.

2.2. Limitations

This document is based on a desktop study and a literature review of the four volumes of the EIS and the draft Airport Plan, comparison of these against the EIS guidelines, identification of potential opportunities or inconsistencies and a comparison against available benchmarks.

No analysis or modelling has been undertaken.

The document provides guidance to WSROC in terms of considerations included in the draft EIS and where further clarification may be required on key issues,

2.3. EIS Components Reviewed

Airspace assessments contained in the following have been reviewed:

Volume 1 – Project Background

Part A – Project background and rationale

- Chapter 1 Introduction,
- Chapter 2 Need for Western Sydney Airport,
- Chapter 3 Approvals Framework,

Part B – Airport plan

- Chapter 7 Airspace architecture and operation,

Volume 2 – Stage 1 Development

Part D – Environmental impact assessment

- Chapter 10 Noise,

Chapter 14 Hazard and Risk,
Chapter 21 Planning and Land Use,
Chapter 26 Greater Blue Mountains,
Chapter 27 Cumulative impact assessment.

Volume 3 – Long Term Development

Part G – Assessment of long term development

Chapter 30 Introduction

Volume 4 – Appendices

Appendix E1 Aircraft overflight noise

and, specifically,

‘WESTERN SYDNEY AIRPORT, Preliminary Airspace Management Analysis’,
produced by Airservices Australia 2015.

3. DETAILED FINDINGS - Stage 1 Airport

3.1. Compliance with EIS Guidelines

3.1.1. General Content

The level of analysis and detail in the EIS does reflect the level of significance of the expected impacts on the environment.

Unknown variables and assumptions made in the assessment, such as future aircraft types, proposed staged runway development, technology implementation, assumed traffic and fleet projections, are stated and discussed.

Items which are not discussed include:

- Potential restriction of building heights in local government areas not directly in line with the runway complex;
- Environmental impacts of placing flight paths directly overhead water storage locations such as Warragamba Dam and Prospect Reservoir; and
- Noise Abatement Procedures.

3.1.2. Feasible Alternatives

Section 3 of the DIRD guidelines refers to *feasible alternatives*, and suggests that **any** feasible alternatives should be discussed and the rationale for the preferred option is presented. It also suggests that short, medium and long-term advantages and disadvantages of each should be considered.

The assessment concludes that a ‘proof of concept’, rather than an exhaustive analysis, is appropriate due to length of time before the operation of an airport at Western Sydney (reference § 7.3 Preliminary assessment of airspace). This concept is at odds with the guidelines and needs further investigation. Furthermore, as the proposed paths are the basis for all subsequent environmental considerations, the single, untested airspace model based on traffic considerations is unlikely to provide a satisfactory outcome, as no comparative scenario is offered.

3.1.3. Modelling

The airspace plan and flight paths are based on work done by Airservices Australia. The following are annotated excerpts from the draft EIS.

Note that the **proof of concept** “indicative airspace design did not consider potential noise or other environmental considerations”. (reference §14.4.1)


“The design and analysis presented in this report is intended to meet a narrow scope focussed on demonstrating a proof of concept. It does not present a comprehensive airspace and air route design and does not consider all essential components that would be necessary to implement an air traffic management plan for the Sydney basin. Certain assumptions have been made and significant additional steps would be required to develop air traffic management plans suitable for implementation”. (reference Volume 4 Appendix E1).

Both statements, above, indicate that the airspace components do not meet the requirements of the EIS guidelines. A refined method, considering a several alternative models, is required to meet the guidelines and also to remove uncertainty of flight paths and the consequent impact on the community from environmental considerations, such as noise, pollution, building restriction, etc.

In both the short term and long term, only one airspace and air route design is offered, and the long term plan does not expand on that proposed for the Stage 1.

This is due to the Stage 1 plan being based on leaving operations at Sydney KSA unaffected by the implementation of a new airport in Western Sydney. The long term plan considers that requirements for safe operation of parallel runways are inconsistent with current operations at Sydney KSA and thus a more comprehensive air traffic management plan for the Sydney basin is required. This is reasonable; however, it raises the question of why the long term alternative wasn't considered as an extension of Stage 1, especially given the concentration of traffic over Blaxland township for the short term plan.

3.1.4. Flight path design



Note: Indicative flight paths are based on Airservices Australia's Western Sydney Airport. Preliminary Airspace Management Analysis. It does not present a comprehensive airspace and air route design and does not consider many essential components that would be necessary to implement an air traffic management plan for the Sydney basin. The formal flight path design for the Airport will be undertaken much closer to the commencement of operations.

The proposed plans make use of 'Point Merge System' for approach, highlighted in yellow in the attached diagram. The concept is to offer several 'entry gates' (circled in red) and then use longer or shorter paths to increase or reduce flight times, such that aircraft arrive at the Point Merge (circled in blue) in a sequence to provide separation and minimise delays.

The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) sets worldwide standards for aviation. Future improvements and standardisation of aircraft operations are set out in blocks called Aviation System Block Upgrade (ASBU). The Point Merge System is part of the next ABSU to be introduced, and will facilitate Continuous Descent Operations (CDO). CDO is recognised as the best method of reducing and mitigating the environmental footprint of aviation, by requiring aircraft to remain at high altitudes

(where they are most efficient) for as long as possible, and then descend through altitudes where they operate inefficiently using just minimum engine thrust and gravity.

The Point Merge has been shown to minimise aviation environmental effects in both emissions and noise, have cost benefits for operators and reduce traffic delays and congestion.

The draft EIS suggests that there is a single Point Merge for the short term plan, which is located over Blaxland township and accommodates both runways. The report entertains movement of the point by up to 3 nautical miles, but considers no other options, despite the long term plan having a different set of 4 Point Merges (one for each runway). This is not in keeping with the guidelines, where ‘all feasible’ alternatives should be considered.




Figure 1 - Appendix A-1 (Preliminary Indicative Flight Tracks – Initial Development) to Appendix E of the EIS.




Figure 2 - Appendix B (Preliminary Indicative Flight Tracks – Longer Term Development) to Appendix E of the EIS.

Departures are to be implemented by conventional methods, and that aircraft will assigned flight paths along a corridor to a point from which routes to destination will commence. This is common practice and provides aircraft separation from both approaching and departing aircraft. However, indicative flight paths require refinement and evaluation of alternatives which are not provided in the draft EIS.

3.2. Validity of Assumptions

In dealing with flight paths and the containing airspace, the draft EIS indicates that it is a ‘proof of concept’. This means that it is recognised that further work is required prior to implementation. Although the work presented is indicative of the final outcome, and thus suitable for an evaluation, it does not compare any alternative scenarios as required by the DIRD guidelines.

The assumptions made for flight paths are based on known performance and operating characteristics of current aircraft fleets. Using this data is conservative with respect to emissions and noise effects.

The assumption regarding the orientation and length of runways at Western Sydney Airport is based on information derived from the Bureau of Meteorology and on the land holdings set aside for the airport. Both are reliable data sets and form valid assumptions.

Traffic utilisation of the airport is based on current fleets, and this is considered conservative. The operation of aircraft, and specifically the flight paths, are in accordance with current 'best practice'. The protection of airspace via Obstacle Limitation Surfaces and 'PANS-OPS' surfaces does meet the requirements of current regulations. However, a rigorous evaluation will be required at the construction phase.

The assumption that the Stage 1 development of airport flight paths can exist isolated from other airports is questionable, especially where long term parallel operations will require a comprehensive review of procedures in the Sydney basin. Although it is indicated that a system does exist to allow an isolated mode of operation, it delays the inevitable review and may potentially affect the ultimate airport development. The latter assertion is based on increasing population near the airport, as a centre for employment, and a resistance by community to changes in the environment and flight paths.

3.3. Validity of Conclusions

Conclusions drawn from the draft EIS with respect to Stage 1 flight paths and airspace (Air Traffic Management) include:

- There are no known physical impediments to the operation of an airport at Western Sydney;
- A 'concept' airspace plan exists which facilitates the management of aircraft traffic, which conforms to current standards.
- Based on the 'concept', noise modelling is indicative of the effect of aircraft on those flight paths.
- Maintaining aircraft at higher altitudes will reduce the noise impact on the community.

The conclusions are valid for the cases presented and they follow current 'best practice' guidelines for flight path design and protection of airspace.

Items which are not considered include:

- Any alternative airspace model and flight paths. It is considered that scenarios should be developed to determine an acceptable model for airspace.
- Environmental impact on selection of flight paths needs to be included to minimise impacts on the community.
- There is no consideration of community acceptance of change to aircraft flight path and altitudes. The effect of noise is not restricted solely to loudness, but also to perception, and this has not been tested. Metrics of noise evaluation should be considered for the proposed paths.
- Height restrictions on buildings not located in the immediate vicinity of the airport. Locations, such as the Blue Mountains Council region, Camden, Penrith, Parramatta etc, are potentially affected by the airport at Western Sydney and should be evaluated.
- Noise abatement procedures are promulgated for major airports around Australia. They define modes of operation at certain times to reduce the effect on surrounding population centres. No consideration has been given to operational management to minimise public impact.

3.4. Mitigations and Management Measures

The primary methods of mitigation against flight path environmental impacts is to create a Point Merge System to reduce the emissions and noise generated on approach and to have tracking of departures over less sensitive areas. The former maximises the altitude of aircraft whilst reducing the thrust required, thereby minimising adverse environmental effects. The latter seeks to separate the emissions and noise events from sensitive areas.

Both strategies are commonplace and are considered ‘best practice’.

3.5. Impacts and Risks

The air traffic management methods and proposed flight paths work to minimise distribution of adverse effects.

Part of the strategy is to concentrate aircraft on specific, repeatable flight paths. Provided that those paths are separated from sensitive areas, the methodology is simple, predictable and repeatable, offering economies in fuel, efficiency and standardisation of procedure and the risks are moderated.

However, repeatable flight paths leads to the concentration of noise events and emissions and may involve risk when those paths cross populated areas.

The draft EIS adopts the above methodology for flight paths; however it does not evaluate alternatives to the presented modelling.

4. DETAILED FINDINGS – Long Term Development

4.1. Overview

As for Stage 1, the approach to this EIS peer review includes relevant matters in the four volumes of the draft EIS as well as the draft Airport Plan provided at the website www.westernsydneyairport.gov.au.

4.2. Differences to Assessment based on Stage 1

Most issues identified for Stage 1 are also apparent in the longer term planning of Western Sydney Airport. Additional longer-term considerations are provided in the following sections.

4.2.1. Flight path development

Due to the requirements for separation of aircraft on parallel runways, the modelling is much more complex than for that on a single runway. Aircraft must be separated vertically, longitudinally (time between aircraft crossing a point) or laterally. Flight paths created facilitate the separation with little, if any, external involvement by Air Traffic Control.

The principles for the development of airspace remain the same; however, the proximity of another flight path has implications for spacing. The proposed runway layout and spacing will allow the runways to operate independently, meaning that each operation on a runway is not required to wait (time separation) for an operation on the other runway. This minimises delays and maximises the utilisation of the airport.

With widely spaced runways it is also possible to operate in a mode called Simultaneous Opposite Direction Parallel Runway Operations (SODPROPS). SODPROPS allows aircraft to land in one direction and take-off in the other from different runways. The benefit of SODPROPS is that all airport operations can be to one end of the airport when weather conditions allow, thereby confining environmental impacts to the end where it has lesser impact. Weather conditions play a major role and may preclude SODPROPS.

The draft EIS proposal contains a single model for flight paths, developed for parallel runway operations. Similarly, to Stage 1, there is no consideration of more than one scenario included in the modelling. The draft EIS includes statements that this is solely due to the extended timeframe and that there is uncertainty about the service available

at implementation. Further, it is intimated that amount of work required was not justified and would be required prior to commissioning in about 2050. This is at odds with the DIRD guidelines.

4.2.2. Interaction with other airports

The model considers broad interaction with Sydney KSA and notes that there will significant effects on the operation of other airports in the Sydney basin. The specific interactions, restrictions and changes to airspace is encapsulated in § 7.4.1 *Airspace architecture and potential impacts on air traffic movement*. This states that ‘CASA has identified matters that should be considered in future airspace design’. The implication is that the current modelling may not have, or be able to have, future CASA determinations included for the draft EIS. However, it is clear that the ultimate mode of operation of Western Sydney Airport will result in operational incompatibility with the operations at smaller airports like Bankstown and Camden, potentially forcing closure or relocation. Neither eventuality is investigated.

4.2.3. Modelling

The draft EIS is based on assumptions for fleet operations and performance, and ‘proof of concept’ flight paths and airspace definitions. As with Stage 1, no consideration of feasible alternatives is made. The location of Point Merge and Departure tracks and “indicative airspace design did not consider potential noise or other environmental considerations”. (reference §14.4.1) Therefore, there has been no testing of alternate solutions.

Within the model, there are several modes of operation, and each is evaluated. The analysis associated with the above follows standard procedure and the results are consistent. It indicates that the modelling conducted will allow the operation of both Western Sydney Airport and Sydney KSA independently and as high capacity aerodromes.

4.3. Risks and Implications

For the certainty of local government management and processes, it is expected that the draft EIS would develop some clarity regarding matters such as impacts on water quality, building restrictions, noise abatement and continuity of airspace flight paths.

The modelling indicates several flight paths over water storages, such as Warragamba Dam and Prospect Reservoir. Other flight paths traverse the Blue Mountains National Park. The environmental impact was not considered in selection of the flight paths.

As with Stage 1, it is unclear whether any evaluation was undertaken with respect to building development restriction within local government areas surrounding the airport, with the exception of areas immediately at the runway ends. One would expect that this would be considered as part of the draft EIS.

Other than modes of operation, it is unclear whether evaluation considers Noise Abatement. From an operational standpoint, it is preferable that an airport operates unrestricted by curfews, however it is imperative that principles of 'Fly Neighbourly' are introduced to minimise the environmental impact of noise.

For the long term development of the airport there is a potential risk to long term operation if the airspace and flight paths change. Revision to 'established' Stage 1 flight paths and airspace may meet with resistance from stakeholders, such as property owners and local authorities. As such, it would be expected that flight paths and airspace developed for Stage 1 can also be staged for the long term operation.

4.4. Further Assessment

As noted in the draft EIS, a revised assessment will be required closer to implementation. However, the work included will form the basis of a review. It would be expected that the EIS would form a solid base from which to commence that evaluation. It appears that the draft EIS is orientated to the current conditions and has not explored in sufficient depth the conditions expected for Stage 1, nor long term development at Western Sydney Airport.

4.5. Key Impacts and Opportunities

Key impacts and opportunities from the perspective of airspace and flight paths are summarised as follows:

- The evaluation of protection volumes for flight paths and airspace containment is in accordance with normal methods mentioned in the Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations, and under the Airports Act, 1996.
- An Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) and Instrument Flight Procedure protection volume (PANS-OPS) analysis indicates that, operationally, the Western Sydney Airport can operate unrestricted from terrain and artificial obstacles.
- The proposed airspace architecture is noted as 'indicative' and has not been rigorously tested. The draft EIS proposes that another airspace model is tested

closer to commencement of operations. This would indicate that the draft EIS is non-compliant with the requirements of the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development (DIRD) Guidelines.

- Flight paths appear to fly over water storages such as Warragamba Dam and Prospect Reservoir. The environmental impact is unclear.
- The requirement under the Guidelines for 'feasible alternatives' to be included has not been met.
- There is no consideration of community sentiment regarding changes to flight paths, proposed in the draft EIS, when the Airport operates with two runways.
- Except for KSA, flight paths for airports, affected by the Western Sydney Airport, are not evaluated.
- The draft EIS suggests that Western Sydney Airport will detrimentally affect the operations at Bankstown and Camden, and affect Richmond (military). The environmental impact is not quantified.
- Relocation of light aircraft traffic to other airports, the definition of new training airspace and consequent environmental impact, is not assessed.

5. Review Team

Name	Ray Romano
Location	Brisbane
Designation	Chief Designer and Airspace Specialist
Role	QA of product in accordance with CASA Parts 139 and 173
Qualifications	Bachelor of Engineering (Honours, Civil, UQ) Diploma in Instrument Flight Procedure Design (with Distinction, Singapore Aviation Academy)
Relevant Experience	Over 20 years' experience in airspace and instrument flight procedure design. Former Chief Designer, Airservices Australia (2007-2012). Instrument Flight Procedure Designer (1999-). Airways Data Officer (1996-1999). Commercial Pilot (1990-). Trainer of PANS-OPS instrument Flight Procedure Design.

Name	Mark Fineran
Location	Brisbane
Designation	Senior Procedure Designer
Role	Instrument Flight Procedure Design, Air Traffic Management
Qualifications	Diplomas in Aviation (Air Traffic Services) and Transport and Distribution (Air Traffic Control). Airservices Training College (2003) Diploma in Instrument Flight Procedure Design (Singapore Aviation Academy)
Relevant Experience	Over 10 years' experience in aviation. Specialising in Instrument Flight Procedure Design and Air Traffic Control liaison.

Appendix G

Social and economic (Hill PDA Consulting)



Independent Review of the Western Sydney Airport Environmental Impact Statement

Social and Economic Issues

Prepared for:

Western Sydney Regional Organisation of
Councils (WSROC) and Macarthur
Regional Organisation of Councils
(MACROC)

November 2015

HiIPDA
CONSULTING



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	2
PART A: Stage 1 Economic and Social Impacts	
Stage 1 Airport – Social (Assessment Gaps)	8
Stage 1 Airport – Economic (Assessment Gaps)	10
Stage 1 Airport – Economic (Validity of Assumptions & Conclusions)	13
Stage 1 Airport – Social and Economic Impacts (Mitigation & Management Measures)	15
Stage 1 Airport - Uncertainty & Risk	16
PART B: Long Term Impacts	
Long Term Development – Social and Economic Impacts (Information Gaps)	18
Long Term Development – Social and Economic Impacts (Risks and Gaps)	19

PART C: Compliance with draft EIS Guidelines	
Compliance with (EPBC ACT) EIS Guidelines	21
About the Reviewers	23
Abbreviations and Definitions	25
Document Reference	25

Limitations

This assessment is a desktop based review of the relevant documentation submitted with the EIS within a three week period. It does not therefore encompass any independent modeling, research or testing of assumptions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Report Purpose

The following Report has been commissioned as an independent review of the Social and Economic components of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared for the Western Sydney Airport (WSA).

This Report contributes to a broader review being undertaken by multiple specialists to provide independent advice to the Western Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils (WRSROC) together with the Macarthur Regional Organisation of Councils (MACROC).

Report Approach

In undertaking this review we have had particular regard to the requirements established by Section 10 of the Guidelines for the *Content of the Draft EIS – Western Sydney Airport* issued in January 2015 by the Department of the Environment.

We have also considered the implications of both the Stage 1 Airport and longer term development with regards to:

- Potential gaps in the preparation of the Social and Economic Specialist Studies;
- Any concerns regarding the validity of assumptions and conclusions; and
- Suggestions to improve the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures.

Components of the EIS Reviewed

This Report has reviewed the following EIS components:

- Relevant sections of the Executive Summary
- Volume 2—Stage 1 development – Chapters 23 and 24 – social and economic
- Volume 3—Long term development – Chapter 37
- Volume 4 – Specialist studies in appendix P1, P2 and P3

To discuss the key issues, this Report is structured into three parts:

Part A – Stage 1 – Social and Economic Impacts

Part B – Long Term Development – Social & Economic Impacts

Part C – Assessment against the draft EIS Guidelines

Key Finding

Our Review supports the EIS's summation that the main benefits of the WSA relate to the generation of jobs in Western Sydney and associated economic activity.

The importance of this contribution to Sydney represents an important policy shift since the preparation of the earlier EIS's for a second airport on the site as Western Sydney has become a greater focus for economic growth and activity.

In drawing this conclusion however we maintain the need for a balanced assessment across positive and negative social and economic impacts, both at a local and regional level, over the short and longer term. To this effect we identify six overarching issues in relation to the current EIS and its assessment of impacts during Stage 1 of the Airport and a further four regarding its assessment over the longer term as discussed on the following pages of this Executive Summary.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY CONT.

1 STAGE AIRPORT REVIEW FINDINGS

1. Balance of Discussion - Impacts

We identify a strong focus in the EIS on the economic benefits of Stage 1 of the WSA as distinct from a balanced discussion of economic and social costs and benefits.

For example the economic Chapter (24) in Vol. 2 focuses entirely on the regional (Western Sydney) and broader (Sydney, NSW and Australian) employment and economic benefits of the WSA with only one general reference to potential adverse economic impacts as follows.

“However there would be some negative impacts in the immediate vicinity of the airport site due to combination of the airport development and the changing land uses”

Vol. 2, Chapter 23, Pg. 504

A more balanced discussion of costs and benefits is therefore encouraged. For example in relation to matters such as impacts to local business activity during construction or the potential impacts of a new business park (with retail as a permissible use) to existing and proposed centres in the South West (i.e. Leppington, Edmondson Park and Liverpool).

2. Balance of Discussion – Geography

Our comments regarding the balance of discussion also relate to the EIS’s strong focus on the regional and Australian economic benefits of the WSA as distinct from any prospective local impacts.

For example the economic benefits and costs to centres within close proximity to the WSA (i.e. Luddenham or within the South West Growth Centre) are little, if at all discussed. Whilst the impacts may be positive or minimal, it is appropriate that they are considered and where possible quantified.

3. Translation of Issues within the EIS

The Specialist Social Impact Study in Appendix P identifies a number of likely adverse impacts to the local communities. Despite the significance of these impacts and their potential to raise notable social concerns, many are given relatively minor reference in the relevant Chapter (23) with no reference in the Executive Summary.

This results in an ill informed view of social issues for readers of the EIS who may not progress to read Chapter 23 or Appendix P in detail.

4. Statements without Assessment

In the Stage 1 social and economic chapters (23 and 24) many of the potential issues are stated with little assessment of their implications to communities, their degree of significance or duration and alternative approaches that may be applied to alleviate them. For example the provision of alternative open spaces to communities during the construction process, the severity of noise impacts to recreational areas, the degree of noise disturbance for different locations over the short and longer terms.

This approach weakens the appreciation of the issues and the means to mitigate them. It could also result in greater angst by the community as to the likely degree, duration and severity of impacts.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY CONT..

STAGE 1 AIRPORT REVIEW FINDINGS

5. Direct Response to Stakeholder Engagement

The initial stakeholder engagement programme for the WSA identified a range of social and economic concerns (Vol.1, Chapter 8).

A number of these concerns are listed by the specialist studies yet are not specifically addressed by Vol. 2 or 3 of the EIS. Furthermore the consultation chapter (Vol 1, Chapter 8) refers to an EIS summary paper being prepared however it is understood that this paper was not made available.

It is recommended that a summary consultation paper is prepared and made publically available and that each issue raised by stakeholders is considered and responded to by the specialist studies . In turn the body of the EIS should identify the most appropriate mitigation measures and minimise community concerns.

6. Transfer and Redistribution Effects

Much of the EIS's discussion regarding the economic value add as a consequence of the WSA recognises its *"....role in attracting economic activity to the Region"* at the expense of others i.e. *"There is a reduction in value-add in the Rest of Australia"* (Pg. 139) and *"The model assumed the future regional employment growth would be redistributed across Sydney..."* (Pg. 141).

Whilst the generation of jobs in Western Sydney is a strong positive of the WSA, the EIS does not discuss the economic or social implications of this transfer of activity from the other areas in Sydney or *"the rest of Australia"*. Whilst any such impact might be negligible or acceptable, the potential impact should be recognised and considered in the assessment.

LONGER TERM DEVELOPMENT REVIEW FINDINGS

The longer term assessment of impacts by the EIS is generally an extension of those identified upon operation for Stage 1. Our review finds that if left unmitigated, these impacts would generally be exacerbated on account of the significant increase in flights and passengers owing to the introduction of the second runway.

Key issues relate to:

1. How potential social and economic impacts could be managed and mitigated with such a significant and relatively quick increase in the number of passengers and associated on site employment (+120%) over the 13 year period between 2050 and 2063;
2. The potential impact of additional flight paths and operations to regional amenity and the impacts to the longer term development potential of affected areas in Western Sydney and more specifically in the South West Growth Centre i.e. height and noise restrictions to increasing residential density;
3. The degree to which the WSA could *"...lead to the reduction in social amenity and impacts on the existing lifestyle of people living and working..."* (Pg. 138) identified by the EIS; and
4. The economic costs or implications of the WSA's *"....role in attracting economic activity to the Region"* at the expense of others i.e. *"There is a reduction in value-add in the Rest of Australia"* (Pg. 139).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

LONG TERM DEVELOPMENT REVIEW FINDINGS

Mitigation of Longer Term Impacts

A review of the discussion concerning mitigation measures over the longer term focuses heavily on planning mechanisms (i.e. zoning of land to exclude residential uses) together with local and State Government investment to address broader traffic, transport and infrastructure issues.

There is no discussion however of how this would be co-ordinated or resourced to address specific impacts resonating from the WSA. Further there is no discussion as to who the key accountability would fall with.

This results in a potential risk that some mitigation measures and impacts would be missed or forgotten over time.

Setting a Framework for Further Assessment

To improve the longer term assessment and give some comfort to its approach, we suggest:

- Further assessment of the potential social and business impacts and the information gaps with some parameters or ranges of assessment; and
- The identification of the main body responsible for managing and mitigating these impacts and risks over time or how the mitigation framework will be managed.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

A review of the EIS has identified the following potential impacts and opportunities during Stage 1 and over the longer term.

Legend:

Positive impacts

Negative impacts / opportunities

Neutral or positive or negative impacts / opportunities dependant on stakeholder

STAGE 1

Impacts

Social

- Improved employment opportunities
- Reduced travel time to work opportunities
- Increases in average wages
- Improved retail and business service choice and price competition
- Changes to semi-rural lifestyle
- Changed access to spaces and community facilities on the WSA site
- Impacts to community cohesion
- Impacts to social service provision
- Perceived impacts and associated social anxiety
- Amenity impacts during construction (dust, noise, road closures)
- Amenity and health impacts (noise, visual and air quality) upon operation
- Housing affordability

Economic

- Construction jobs
- Multiplier benefits of operational job generation
- Economic value add for the economy
- Increased customer base and business activity
- Redistribution of jobs to Western Sydney
- Local business impacts during construction and operation
- Land value changes
- Impact to retail and centre viability
- Changes in traffic congestion
- Congestion impacts to WSEA and local and regional roads
- Decline in agriculture industries

LONGER TERM

Social

- Improved employment opportunities
- Reduced travel time to work opportunities
- Increases in average wages
- Improved retail and business service choice and price competition
- Impacts to social service provision
- Amenity and health impacts (noise, visual and air quality) owing to airport operation

Economic

- Multiplier benefits of job generation
- Agglomeration benefits for Western Sydney businesses
- Economic value add for the Western Sydney economy
- Redistribution of jobs to Western Sydney
- Improved appeal of investing and operating airport related businesses in Western Sydney
- Land value changes
- Impact to retail viability and opportunities

Opportunities

- Greater population growth and diversity (age and socio-economic) owing to employment opportunities
- Improved live / work connections
- Potential increase in tourism in the Blue Mountains
- Greater appeal of Western Sydney to business and investment

- Continued population growth and improvements in social diversity
- Improved balance of economic outcomes across Sydney
- Improved balance of social and community outcomes
- Enhanced local, Sydney and Australian economies

Part A

Stage 1 Economic and Social Impacts

The following Part reviews the Stage 1 Social and Economic assessments provided in the EIS having particular regard to:

- Information and assessment gaps
- Assumptions and conclusions
- Proposed mitigation measures

STAGE 1 AIRPORT – SOCIAL ASSESSMENT GAPS

The Stage 1 social impacts are assessed within:

- Vol 2. Chapter 23
- Appendix P1 – Report for Western Sydney Unit, WSA EIS (GHD, 2015)
- Appendix P1 – Socio – Economic Impact Assessment, Western Sydney Population and Demographic Analysis (SGS, 2015)

There are varying references in the GHD Specialist Study as to whether it is a Social Impact Assessment (SIA) or Socio-economic Assessment. In any case it draws together the findings of the specialist studies in Appendix P1 prepared by SGS, Appendix P2 prepared by JLL and Appendix P3 prepared by EY suggesting that it is in fact a Social and Economic Assessment of the WSA. It is on this basis that the Specialist Study is considered and the subsequent translation of issues into the body of the EIS.

Local Community - Perceived and Actual Impacts

As identified by the GHD specialist study *“perceived impacts are as important as actual (measurable) impacts as people may modify their behaviours or experience discomfort simply because of a perceived impact”*(Page 12).

Despite this recognition, we highlight a number of potential or perceived social impacts to the local communities that do not appear to be adequately identified or assessed by the Specialist Study including:


- Consideration of the physical and perceived impacts of a new airport (and resulting restrictions to access across the locality) to social cohesion and any associated community and cultural connections;
- Consideration of the potential social concerns relating to the perceived or actual impacts of the WSA to the local communities health (i.e. noise disturbance, fuel jettisoning etc.);
- Consideration of the potential social concerns relating to airport related risks and hazards (i.e. terrorism, aircraft crashes etc.) identified during initial stakeholder engagement (Vol. 1, Chapter 8);
- Consideration of the social implications of the locality changing from a rural and low density residential area to a more urbanised one. Whilst the GHD Specialist Study (Appendix P1) makes the assumption that this transition would be a positive one (i.e. provide additional jobs and improved access to work Page 485) we highlight that different communities may value varying levels of urbanisation differently. Therefore a change to a denser built form may be considered undesirable and stressful for some established and retired community members;
- Consideration of the degree and duration of the impacts to existing residents located in Luddenham, Badgerys Creek, Bringelly, Greendale and Wallacia during construction and operation i.e. construction noise, access and traffic congestion.

STAGE 1 – AIRPORT- SOCIAL

ASSESSMENT GAPS CONT...

- Further consideration of the implications of increased pressure on social services as well as impacts to housing availability and affordability owing to worker relocation (as identified by the SIA);
- Consideration of the implications of the identified impacts of the WSA to the range of existing facilities likely to be adversely affected by the WSA including:
 - Five schools;
 - A child care centre;
 - Three parks and recreational facilities;
 - Three places of worship in Luddenham and Mulgoa; and
 - Thirteen recreational areas.

➤ Concerns (% of respondents that strongly agree with the following issues)



Source: Fig 8-5, Volume 1 of Draft EIS

Relocations from the WSA Site

- Further gaps in assessment have been identified in relation to the relocation of existing residents, business and community uses from the WSA site.
- The need to relocate from the WSA site was identified as a concern by stakeholders in the Benchmark surveys referenced in the Vol. 1, Chapter 8 of the EIS. Whilst the uses affected have been listed in the GHD Specialist Study (Appendix P1) and subsequently in Chapter 23, they are not discussed or assessed to any degree as the majority (yet not all) had been relocated a few months prior to the GHD Specialist Study’s finalisation.
- Whilst the relocations have been actively managed by the Commonwealth in conjunction with the NSW Government, including the appointment of a Place Manager, the assessment would benefit from reference to this and the approach employed to mitigate:
 - The impacts to the 139 residential tenancies relocated or extinguished from the WSA site having particular regard to the elderly, disabled and / or longer term tenants;
 - The impacts of lost or restricted community access to existing uses and facilities on the WSA site i.e. Badgery’s Creek Park, the Scout Hall, cemeteries etc.; and
 - The loss or relocation of jobs generated by businesses on the WSA site i.e. the 16 agricultural tenancies and eight commercial tenancies (quarry, vineyard and Christmas tree farm).

STAGE 1 AIRPORT- ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT GAPS

The Stage 1 economic impacts are assessed within:

- Vol 2. Chapter 24
- Appendix P1 – Socio – Economic Impact Assessment, Western Sydney Population and Demographic Analysis (SGS, 2015)
- Appendix P2 – Potential Impacts on Property Prices (JLL, 2015)
- Appendix P3 – Draft Economic Analysis (EY, 2015)

The relevant sections of the EIS have a strong focus on job generation and economic value add. As described in Vol.2 Chp 24 an SCGE model was prepared to *“identify the potential economic impacts”* of the WSA and assist *“....in the translation of the benefits and costs into real economic impacts accrued through time...”*.

The model has a number of inputs including improvements to value add, gross business profits, gross household labour incomes, enhanced productivity per worker and net imports.

Each of these elements have a positive focus resulting in a strong narrative regarding the economic and employment benefits of the WSA to Western Sydney and Sydney more generally.

There is no discussion however with respect to the modeling or otherwise assessment of the potential costs of the WSA.

Whilst on balance the benefits of the WSA might outweigh the costs for Sydney, a more detailed discussion of costs, and who would be affected is recommended i.e. costs with respect to increased traffic generation and congestion, health impacts, the loss of agricultural land, local business impacts etc.

Chapter 24 and the specialist studies provided in Appendix P1, P2 and P3 also identify that the WSA would result in employment and population growth being redirected from Sydney to Western Sydney.

For example it is stated that the *“...WSA is a city-shaping investment that will contribute to a more balanced and sustainable growth for Sydney.”*

In doing this however the same report states that *“A project such as the WSA has the potential to impact jobs and population growth in Sydney. In particular the WSA would be expected to redistribute population and employment towards Western Sydney, away from other parts of Sydney”* (EY, Page 29).

Whilst this is a welcome redistribution with regards to Government Policy objectives, the redistribution does come at an opportunity cost from other areas that are ‘loosing’ prospective employment and growth. The effects of this redistribution and any associated opportunity costs to areas such as the City of Sydney, Botany Bay, Rockdale, North Sydney and Randwick are not however assessed.

This effect should also be considered in the context of Kingsford Smith Airports capacity challenges and the impact of no WSA to actual job growth across Sydney more generally.

STAGE 1 AIRPORT- ECONOMIC

ASSESSMENT GAPS CONT...

- The costs and / or benefits of redistributing growth from inner city, urban infill areas of Sydney to greenfield areas is also not discussed with respect to infrastructure provision.
- In this regard it is unclear what the 'standing' of any cost benefit analysis is for the assessment – that is what is the area being assessed. If the standing is Western Sydney as a whole, there would be a net benefit gained by the WSA to the area of assessment. If the standing is Greater Sydney, the Specialist Studies infer that there would be no net increase with regards to job growth or value add over the short term as result of the WSA.

Local Business Impacts

- The risk assessment profiled in Vol. 2 Chp 9 states that a risk to be assessed by the Social and Economic Chapters relates to the:
“Significant reduction in business activity and services caused by general access and land use changes associated with construction” (Vol.2 Pg 17).
- Despite this identified risk, impacts to local businesses during construction and operational phases are not discussed in Chapters 24 (Stage 1) or 37 (longer term) nor by all four specialist studies.
- Whilst it is recognised that the area immediately surrounding the WSA site is not a dense business area, a number of businesses do operate within the locality. The EIS should provide details about the local business context to better understand the potential impacts to existing businesses (i.e. access constraints, additional traffic congestion, noise effects and customer implications) together with potential benefits and costs to businesses operating within surrounding centres such as Luddenham.
- We also identify the need to balance the discussion regarding job generation with the impacts of relocating the existing businesses on the site and any implications this might have to local business activity and job provision.
- The EIS also recognises that the WSA would increase congestion on parts of the M4, M5 and M7 Motorways together with the M31 Hume Highway. The potential impacts to businesses reliant on these access routes for servicing and delivery should also be considered.
- As a final consideration, there is no assessment of the potential impacts of the WSA (positive or negative) to the future operation of businesses within the Western Sydney Employment Lands (i.e. in relation to noise or congestions impacts, access improvements and land value increases – perceived or otherwise).

STAGE 1 AIRPORT- ECONOMIC

ASSESSMENT GAPS CONT....

Local and Regional Centre Impacts

A number of minor references are made within the EIS to the designation of land on the WSA site as a business park. More specifically 167ha of land is proposed in Stage 1 with the potential for a further 148ha over the longer term.

Of particular note, the proposed permissible uses within this zone include commercial, business and retail. On this basis, the EY 2015 report provides the most detail regarding the business park calculating:

- In Stage 1 it could provide over 158,000sqm of bulky goods floorspace increasing to a significant 561,000sqm by 2063;
- Over the longer term a new regional shopping centre of 200,000sqm – equating to the size of a new Liverpool or Leppington centre;
- 15,000sqm of petrol station and food outlets increasing to 40,000sqm by 2063;
- 10,000sqm to 100,000sqm of office space; and
- 350,000sqm to 845,000sqm of industrial space.

Importantly these calculations are estimates and do not necessarily mean that this type of development and the associated jobs would transpire.

By the same token, there is potential for additional floorspace (i.e. retail and bulky goods) to be provided within the proposed business park zone and at an earlier date i.e. during Stage 1.

Despite the significant quantum of new retail, commercial and industrial floorspace proposed, the EIS does not:

- Assess the potential economic impacts of the retail floorspace to the economic viability of existing centres in the South West (i.e. Luddenham or Liverpool) or the timely delivery of proposed centres in the South West Growth Centre (i.e. Leppington and Edmondson Park);
- Assess the demand for, or impacts as a result of, a new business park in this part of the South West and the potential implications to other centres such as Campbelltown and Leppington that both aspire to provide a regionally significant business park;
- Assess the demand for, and implications of a potential 845,000sqm of additional industrial floorspace to the Western Sydney Employment Lands;
- Assess the level of demand for, and impact to social infrastructure in the locality as a result of these uses and their employees (+4,400 to +27,000 people); and
- Assess the potential benefits of a business park and how these jobs would align with the characteristics and skills of the new population in the South West.

STAGE 1 AIRPORT- ECONOMIC

VALIDITY OF ASSUMPTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Property Prices

The potential impact of the WSA to property prices as a consequence of noise impacts was identified as a key concern by stakeholders during the WSA's initial stakeholder engagement (Vol.1, Chapter 8). To this effect, whilst property prices are discussed within the Social impacts Chapter (23), we believe they are also an important economic consideration.

A specific specialist study was commissioned to consider the effects of the WSA to property prices (JLL,2015). The JLL Study identified that the noise impacts associated with the WSA would be likely to adversely affect the sale value of land zoned for non-residential uses. Owing however to the complexities of quantifying this impact the assessment was restricted to residential properties having particular regard to large lot residential.

Impacts to Residential Property Prices

- The JLL 2015 Study's multiple regression analysis of property sales data for Brisbane and Adelaide found a strong correlation (most significantly in Adelaide owing to the wealth of available sales data) between airport noise and land values.
- A similar correlation was not however found for land affected by Sydney and Melbourne airports.

- The JLL Study poses a number of reasons for this result including the fact that property values in Central Sydney may be more significantly and positively influenced by factors other than noise including proximity to Sydney CBD. We support this suggestion and caution any conclusions that seek to draw the same correlation as central Sydney between property prices and airport noise for the WSA. Despite this, Chapter 24 concludes:

"Overall there would be no discernable negative impact expected on property values, as the anticipated value uplift from land use changes will outweigh any consequence or concern about noise impacts" Pg. 489

- Rather we caution that the characteristics of land and properties surrounding the WSA could be more akin to the localities surrounding Adelaide or Brisbane airports (i.e. land that is not located within a few kilometres of a Global CBD) resulting in a different correlation between noise and land values to the Kingsford Smith Airport analysis.
- We also draw attention to the conclusion made by the JLL Study that the growth rates for properties affected by Sydney airport were on par with other non affected areas in Sydney. Whilst this may certainly be the case with respect to growth rates, there is likely to be very different actual sale value starting points i.e. lower land values in noise affected areas than non affected areas consistent with the findings of other literature cited by the Study.

STAGE 1 AIRPORT- ECONOMIC

VALIDITY OF ASSUMPTIONS & CONCLUSIONS CONT..

Impacts to Large Lot Residential

We also caution against the JLL Study's inability to find a discernible effect between airport noise and the value of large lot housing. This result was drawn from the Study's assessment of land value impacts within a 5km radius of the WSA site following the announcement of the WSA. In this regard we highlight:

- Not all land within a 5km radius of the WSA site would be noise affected. Therefore the sale values sample has a mix of noise and non noise affected land skewing results and contributing to the conclusion of no discernible effect;
- The recent increase in property prices in the locality may be a short term speculative response to the announcement of the investment stimulus and once again incorporates a notable proportion of land that would not be noise affected; and
- Unlike the other case studies referenced, the WSA is not yet operational and therefore the degree or significance of potential noise is not yet apparent to the market.

Employment Calculations

- The EY Report 2015 estimates that the proposed business park would generate 4,439 jobs by Stage 1 increasing to 27,148 by 2063.
- A review of the employee occupancy rates used to calculate these figures (Table 10, Page 24) indicates they are likely to be overly ambitious. For example 1 employee per 10sqm of commercial floorspace equates to rates achieved in new Sydney CBD stock and not greenfield business parks. Further 1 employee per 50sqm of industrial floorspace is also considered high, particularly if the uses are more orientated to freight and logistics.
- Conversely we believe that the employee occupancy figures calculated for the regional shopping centre (1 job per 90sqm) are too low and should be re-adjusted to 55-65sqm GFA per worker.
- Applying our revised rates, we calculate that the Stage 1 workforce would be 3,800 workers by 2031 increasing up to 20,000 in 2063, lower than the EY Report estimates.
- To improve the accuracy of these estimates, we suggest a similar approach is taken to benchmarking employment related to airports in other parts of the EIS. That is the benchmarking of rates achieved by business parks connected with airports internationally.

STAGE 1 AIRPORT – SOCIAL & ECONOMIC IMPACTS

MITIGATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES PROPOSED

A review of the proposed mitigation measures for both the social and economic impacts finds the following.

- No mitigation measures have been identified by the economic Chapter 24 or Specialist Studies as very few adverse impacts were identified.
- A fairly standard approach to mitigation measures has been taken to address the social impacts. That is the GHD Specialist Study cross references identified risks to appropriate measures. Further the the majority of key issues are addressed through a series of plans with the detail yet to be determined i.e. stakeholder engagement plans, construction and environmental management plans etc.
- This general approach is considered appropriate given the timescale associated with the development of the WSA. The approach does however rely on the quality of approach detail provided within the subsequent plans regarding how best to manage the implementation of the measures set out in the plans.
- Chapter 23 Social summarises these measures down to two – the development of an Australian Industry Participation Plan and Stakeholder Engagement. Both of these measures are supported however we would add the need for an engagement plan that provides timely and regular information updates to allay any concerns and fears by stakeholders during construction and a point of contact during operation.
- We also highlight the strong reliance on mitigation measures being addressed and implemented by local and State Government with little discussion as to how this would work in practice nor how any ongoing mitigation measures would be resourced or co-ordinated / who would be accountable for their implementation and any associated ongoing monitoring.
- This becomes a particular issue over the longer term when construction management plans are no longer applicable and it is unclear who the responsible party is to mitigate impacts i.e. the airport operators vs. local and State Governments.

STAGE 1 AIRPORT

UNCERTAINTY OVER IMPACTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS

On the basis of our independent review, we summarise some of the key uncertainties and risks of the WSA to be:

- The potential economic costs i.e. health services, reduced travel times by road, viability impacts to existing and proposed centres;
- The degree of economic impact to the viability and desirability of existing and proposed centres and business parks in the South West as a result of a significant supply of new retail, bulky goods and commercial floorspace on the WSA site;
- Potential impacts during construction and operation to existing local businesses together with prospective future businesses in the Western Sydney Employment Area;
- Implications as a consequence of the transfer of population and job growth to Sydney's greenfields as opposed to infill locations;
- Potential impacts to non-residential land values;
- Potential implications to existing residents, businesses and community services of being relocated from the WSA site;
- The degree of potential impacts, consequences and alternatives to local residents, businesses and community facilities during construction and operation;
- The potential for social concerns regarding community dislocation, airport related risks and hazards (i.e. terrorism, aircraft crashes etc.) and the potential impacts of this to business investment and land values; and
- The degree of impact to housing supply and affordability.

Part B

Longer Term Impacts

The following Part reviews the Longer Term Social and Economic assessments provided in the EIS having particular regards to:

- Information and assessment gaps
- Assumptions and conclusions
- Proposed mitigation measures

LONG TERM DEVELOPMENT – SOCIAL & ECONOMIC IMPACTS

INFORMATION GAPS

The longer term social and economic impacts associated with the WSA are assessed within:

- Vol 3. Chapter 37
- Appendix P1 – Report for Western Sydney Unit, WSA EIS (GHD, 2015) and Socio – Economic Impact Assessment, Western Sydney Population and Demographic Analysis (SGS, 2015)
- Appendix P2 – Potential Impacts on Property Prices (JLL, 2015)
- Appendix P3 – Draft Economic Analysis (EY, 2015)

The longer term assessment of impacts by the EIS is generally an extension of those identified upon operation for Stage 1. These impacts are generally recognised as being exacerbated however on account of the significant increase in flights and passengers owing to the introduction of the second runway. Those longer term impacts that could be quantified relate to:

- Significant employment growth associated with both the airport and expanded business park (4,400 employees to over 27,000);
- The value add as a result of the additional airport activity.

Other impacts that could not be quantified relate to:

- The changing nature of the locality and the impacts this would have to communities.
- The reduction in social amenity and impacts on existing lifestyles in the locality as a result of noise, air quality, traffic and social infrastructure impacts (medical facilities, schools, dentists, pharmacies and child care) together with 13 identified recreational areas.

Information Gaps

The first 3 of the 9 pages of the longer term impact assessment provided by Chapter 37 reiterates the same methodological approach applied for the assessment of the Stage 1 impacts.

A further 2 pages identifies general social impacts related to amenity impacts. The remaining 4 pages reiterate the employment benefits, population projections and conclusion.

It therefore follows that many of the information gaps identified in Part A of this Report hold true for the longer terms impacts. We highlight however some additional matters that we believe should be considered including:

- How potential social and economic impacts would be managed and mitigated with such a significant and relatively quick increase in the number of passengers and associated on site employment (+120%) over the 13 year period between 2050 and 2063;

LONG TERM DEVELOPMENT – SOCIAL & ECONOMIC IMPACTS

RISKS AND GAPS

- What impact the additional flight paths, operations and associated amenity impacts would have to the longer term development potential of affected areas in Western Sydney, and specifically in the South West Growth Centre i.e. height and noise restrictions to increasing residential density;
- The degree to which the airport could “...lead to the reduction in social amenity and impacts on the existing lifestyle of people living and working...” (Pg. 138) identified by the EIS; and
- The economic costs or implications of the WSA’s “...role in attracting economic activity to the Region” at the expense of others i.e. “There is a reduction in value-add in the Rest of Australia” (Pg. 139).

Key Risks and their Implications

As discussed above, the EIS identified the potential for additional amenity impacts to the local communities as a consequence of the WSA. Means to mitigate these impacts are not identified other than general references to the need for local and State Government planning (i.e. appropriate land use zoning) and service provision (i.e. new community facilities etc.).

Whilst it is difficult to be definitive with respect to mitigation measures over such a period of time, this predicament, combined with the significant scale of the development, creates a significant risk over the longer term. This risk is on account of uncertainties as to how these additional facilities would be funded and who would be responsible for their provision, operation and maintenance to a level that adequately addressed the impacts.

This reliance on other parties to manage the WSA’s impacts has the potential to result in missed mitigation measures and governance overlaps or gaps.

Setting a Framework for Further Assessment

To improve the longer term assessment and give some comfort to its approach, we suggest:

- Further assessment of the potential social and business impacts and the information gaps with some parameters or ranges of assessment; and
- The identification of the main body responsible for managing and mitigating these impacts and risks over time or how the mitigation framework will be managed.

Part C

Compliance with Section 10 of the
Draft EIS Guidelines for the WSA

COMPLIANCE WITH EIS GUIDELINES

Based on the assessment discussed in Parts A and B of this Report, we provide the following comments (in blue font) in relation to the matters established under Section 10 of the Department of the Environment's guidelines (black font).

- a) The economic and social impacts of the action, both positive and negative, must be analysed.

The EIS has a strong focus on the economic benefits of the WSA. Concerns are raised by this Report however regarding the balance of the assessment having particular regard to the assessment of potential economic costs as well as the translation of social costs to matters summarised in the Executive Summary.



Source: Volume 1, Chapter 8 of Draft EIS

Matters of interest may include:

- i. details of any public consultation activities undertaken, and their outcomes

The GHD Specialist Study profiles the stakeholders consulted during its preparation (Appendix P1, Pg. 12).

The Specialist Study does not however profile the issues raised by these stakeholders (as set out in Part in Vol.1 Chapter 8), nor whether they have been addressed by the assessment and where.

As discussed in this Report, some of the Stakeholder issues identified within Vol. 1 of the EIS (shown in the adjacent image) have not been discussed or assessed in detail including:

- property access for site investigations;
- integration with other major infrastructure projects; and
- ensuring local economic benefits are realised.

- ii. details of any consultation with Indigenous stakeholders

Whilst discussed in other sections of the EIS, matters raised by these stakeholders and responses to them are not clear from a reading of Chapter 23 or the GHD Specialist Study.

COMPLIANCE WITH EIS GUIDELINES CONT...

- iii. projected economic costs and benefits of the project, including the basis for their estimation through cost/benefit analysis or similar studies

The SGS and EY Specialist Studies (Appendix P1 and P3) identify many of the economic benefits of the WSA however they do not constitute a cost benefit analysis prepared in accordance with Australian Treasury Guidelines. We note that there is some reference to broader cost benefit analysis in Vol.1 Chapter 2 with respect to site choice, however there is no assessment of the costs and benefits of the WSA compared to the base case – i.e. no airport or alternative staging and development scenarios.

- iv. employment opportunities expected to be generated by the project (including construction and operational phases).

The number of potential jobs generated by the WSA are quantified by the SGS and EY Specialist Studies (Appendix P1 and P3). Our independent assessment suggests that there may be a modest over-estimation of jobs generated by the proposed business park based on benchmark employee occupancy ratios.

- b) The economic and social impacts must include impacts at the local, regional and national level.

The EIS has a strong focus on the economic benefits of the WSA at the regional (Western Sydney and Sydney wide) and national level. Our review identifies a gap however with respect to the assessment of economic and social impacts at the local level.

- c) Details of the relevant cost and benefits of alternative options to the proposed action, as identified in Section 3, should also be included.

In response to this requirement, the EIS (Vol.2 Chapter 2) discusses the findings of a rapid cost benefit analysis of potential airport locations across NSW.

The details of the analysis have not however been provided nor any cost benefit analysis of alternative scenarios for the WSA itself i.e. with / without the business park, alternative flight paths etc.

ABOUT THE REVIEWERS

Sarah Hill is an Adjunct Professor at the University of Technology Sydney in the Faculty of Design, Architecture and Building as well as a Director of Hill PDA, Australia's leading firm of land economists, property valuers and planners. Sarah specialises in providing strategic advice to local and State Government to bridge the divide between land economics and planning.

Previously Sarah worked as a Principal Planner in London where she developed and led the London Borough of Hackney (LBH) Major Projects Development Assessment Team. While working for the LBH Sarah created a new planning authority known as the London Olympic and Paralympic Joint Planning Authority that successfully assessed the planning application for the London 2012 Olympic Games and its Legacy. In turn, Sarah acted as lead consultant for the London Olympic Delivery Authority on planning, design and environmental matters.

Sarah is the immediate past President of the NSW Division of the Planning Institute of Australia and a graduate of the Australian Institute of Company Directors. Sarah is presently appointed as:

- The Land Economics and Planning Advisor to the Parramatta Road Precinct Review Panel for UrbanGrowth NSW (panel to sit from March to April 2015);
- Chair of the UTS Dean's Advisory Board;
- Member of the University of Sydney Planning Research Centre;
- Member of the Planning Institute of Australia NSW Divisional Committee and Executive Committee;
- Director of the NSW Building Professionals Board (BPB); and
- Member of the BPB Accreditation and Judiciary Committees.

Previously Sarah was appointed as:

- The independent chair of the Industry Advisory Panel (Minister appointed role) to assess the market, economic and planning

implications of the Redfern Waterloo Built Environment Plan 2;

- A member of the NSW Affordable Housing Taskforce (Minister appointed role);
- A Specialist advisor to the Sydney Metropolitan Development Authority (SMDA);
- An advisor to the NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure (as it was known) on matters relating to NSW planning reform;
- An independent panel member of the DP&E E planning Steering Committee, funding review panel and metropolitan open space grant funding panel;
- The Independent member of the NSW Panel for the grant allocations in relation to the National Rental Affordability Scheme (Housing NSW);
- Member of the PIA NSW Division Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Committee;
- The planning expert on the NSW Minister for Justice's Break and Enter Working Group; and
- A member of the NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure Culture Change Working Group.



SARAH HILL
Adjunct Professor, UTS,
Director, HillPDA

Sarah has been the recipient of numerous awards including the Mayor of London's Award for Planning Excellence (2005), the 2005 Royal Town Planning Institute Award for Planning (2005) and the UDIA NSW and Stockland Women in Development Leadership Award (2012).

ABOUT THE REVIEWERS

Adrian is a principal of the firm with over 22 years of service at Hill PDA. Prior to Hill PDA he worked 10 years in both local and state government (Department of Housing and Darling Harbour Authority) in strategic planning, statutory planning and project management.

At Hill PDA Adrian has played a leadership role in all consultancy activities of the practice including market research, analysis and forecasting, development feasibility appraisal, economic appraisals (including cost benefit analysis), economic impact assessment, financial modelling, policy research, affordable housing studies and employment lands and commercial centres strategies. This has led to an involvement in diverse array of projects for government bodies, private sector corporations, institutions and other organisations.

Adrian manages the retail economics team in the preparation of both long-term strategies and specific development proposals. He developed and continues to refine numerous models in this field including expenditure forecasts, retail floor space demand, gravity modelling and economic impact assessment.

Regularly he provides expert advice and evidence in the land and environment court in the area of economic impact assessment (in relation to appeals and compulsory acquisition) and in highest and best use assessment (land valuation cases).

Adrian is also on the NSW Planning Institute's Economic Development Chapter. The chapter's role seeks to promote the understanding of economics, property and development in the Planning profession.

Through much of the 1990's and the early part of the following decade he was the principal architect of Estate Master, the industry standard in property development analysis software and he is still responsible for its continued development and refinement. This involved working with industry representatives in refining the

the development feasibility model, sensitivity and probability procedures and the funding structuring. Adrian also had a major role in developing the investment analysis and development management models.

Relevant Projects Experience

- North West Rail Link Economic Analysis, Urban Growth NSW (2014)
- Meadowbank Railway Station Precinct Master Plan – Stage 1 Market Demand Assessment (2014)
- Bays Precinct Urban Activation Precinct Financial Modelling, UrbanGrowth NSW (2014)
- Economic Impact Study of Pacific Highway Upgrade at Wyong Town Centre (2014)
- Eastern Creek Business Hub, Western Sydney Parklands Trust (2013)
- Liverpool Retail Centres Hierarchy Review, Liverpool City Council (2012)
- Campsie Retail Revitalisation Plan, RailCorp (2012)



ADRIAN HACK

Principal, HillPDA

ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

EIS – Environmental Impact Statement

GFA – Gross Floor Area

MACROC - Macarthur Regional Organisation of Councils

WSA – Western Sydney Airport

WSROC - Western Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils

DOCUMENTS REFERENCES

Western Sydney Airport Environmental Impact Statement
Incorporating:

- *Volume 2—Stage 1 Development – Chapter 37 – Social and Economic*
- *Volume 3—Long Term Development.*
- *Volume 4, Appendix P1 – The Socio – Economic Impact Assessment undertaken by GHD (October 2015) and associated specialist studies including:*
 - *Western Sydney Population and Demographic Analysis (SGS, July 2015)*
 - *Potential Impacts on Property Prices (JLL, September 2015)*
 - *Western Sydney Airport – Draft Economic Analysis (EY, September 2015)*



HillPDA SYDNEY

Level 3, 234 George Street
Sydney NSW 2000
GPO Box 2748 Sydney NSW 2001
t: +61 2 9252 8777
f: +61 2 9252 6077
e: sydney@hillpda.com

HillPDA MELBOURNE

Suite 114, 838 Collins Street
Docklands VIC 3008
GPO Box 3424 Melbourne VIC 3001
t: +61 3 9629 1842
f: +61 3 9629 6315
e: melbourne@hillpda.com

HillPDA BRISBANE

Level 27 Santos Place,
32 Turbot Street
Brisbane QLD 4000
GPO Box 938 Brisbane QLD 4001
t: +61 7 3181 5644
e: brisbane@hillpda.com

FOLLOW US



www.hillpda.com

Appendix H

Surface water and groundwater (Cardno)



Peer Review of Draft EIS - Surface Water and Groundwater

Western Sydney Airport
Environmental Impact Statement

Prepared for
WSROC

23 November 2015



Contact Information

Cardno (NSW/ACT) Pty Ltd
Trading as Cardno (NSW/ACT)
ABN 95 001 145 035

Level 9, The Forum, 203 Pacific Highway
St Leonards NSW 2065
PO Box 19 St Leonards NSW 1590

Telephone: 02 9496 7700
Facsimile: 02 9439 5170
International: +61 2 9496 7700

sydney@cardno.com.au
www.cardno.com

Author(s):

David Whyte
Manager – Water Engineering

Approved By:

Kevin Roberts
Manager - Environment

Document Information

Prepared for	WSROC
Project Name	Western Sydney Airport Environmental Impact Statement
File Reference	59916060 R001 RevB Western_Syd_Airport_Draft EIS SW and GW review.docx
Job Reference	59916060
Date	23 November 2015

Document History

Version	Effective Date	Description of Revision	Prepared by:	Reviewed by:
A	10/11/2015	Draft for Client Review	D Whyte, F d’Hautefeuille	K Roberts
B	20/11/2015	Final Report including comments	D Whyte, F d’Hautefeuille	K Roberts

© Cardno. Copyright in the whole and every part of this document belongs to Cardno and may not be used, sold, transferred, copied or reproduced in whole or in part in any manner or form or in or on any media to any person other than by agreement with Cardno.

This document is produced by Cardno solely for the benefit and use by the client in accordance with the terms of the engagement. Cardno does not and shall not assume any responsibility or liability whatsoever to any third party arising out of any use or reliance by any third party on the content of this document.

Executive Summary

1. Scope of review

Cardno was engaged by WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff on behalf of the Western Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils (WSROC) to undertake a peer review of the Western Sydney Airport Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the supporting surface water and groundwater studies including hydrology, hydraulics, stormwater management, groundwater and water quality components.

It is noted that any reference to EIS throughout the document should be taken as referring to the draft EIS.

Approach

Cardno have undertaken a desktop review of the draft EIS documents and have assessed the draft EIS with respect to the following items:

- An evaluation of whether the ground and surface water studies meets the requirements of the EIS Guidelines and relevant other guidelines and methodologies;
- An evaluation of whether the conclusions reached in the studies are valid;
- An evaluation of whether the underlying assumptions used to inform the assessment are plausible and credible;
- A review of the mitigation and management measures proposed and advice provided on their likely adequacy in mitigating impacts;
- An evaluation of the level of uncertainty over impacts and the environmental risks that will arise as a result of the project; and,
- A summary of the key impacts and opportunities associated with the project in relation to the Surface Water and groundwater studies.

Descriptions of methodologies and impacts have been cross-referenced across chapters and the technical reports and figures checked for whether they aid understanding. Limited spot checks on values presented in tables have been undertaken together with applying sanity checks to data and model results with expected outcomes.

Surface water and groundwater have been reviewed by separate specialists, except where there is an inter-connection between the two, such as with water quality.

Prior to release of the draft EIS, Cardno initially reviewed available background documents to gain an understanding of site settings and project history including EPBC documentation and the 1997-99 draft EIS by PPK.

Limitations

The following limitations apply to the review of the surface water and groundwater:

- No site visit has been undertaken;
- No numerical models were available and hence no review of models or inputs has been undertaken other than what has been reported, nor have any models been run as part of the review;
- No data is available for review and assessment is limited to commentary on the data provided, however, data gaps have been identified;
- Cardno assumed the data used for the impact assessment had gone through a quality control process before use and therefore can be relied upon; and,
- Similarly Cardno did not review the interpretation of the data, for example the attribution of a bore to a specific aquifer.

Components of the EIS reviewed

The following components of the draft EIS have been reviewed in relation to surface water and groundwater:

- **Volume 1—Project Background**
 - Executive Summary
 - Part A—Project background
 - Part B—Airport Plan
- **Volume 2—Stage 1 Development**
 - Part D—Environmental Impact Assessment:
 - Chapter 9: Approach to impact assessment
 - Chapter 17: Topography, geology and soils
 - Chapter 18: Surface water and groundwater
 - Chapter 27: Cumulative impact assessment
 - Part E—Environmental Management
 - Part F—Conclusions
- **Volume 3—Long Term Development**
 - Part G—Assessment of Long Term Development
 - Chapter 30: Approach to impact assessment
 - Chapter 34: Surface water and groundwater
 - Chapter 39: Other environmental matters
 - Part H—Conclusion and recommendations
- **Volume 4—EIS Technical Reports**
 - Appendix C: Western Sydney Airport EIS Guidelines
 - Appendix L:
 - L1 Surface water hydrology and geomorphology
 - L2 Surface water quality
 - L3 Groundwater

2. Stage 1 airport

- *Summary of detailed findings including compliance with EIS guidelines*

A summary of the assessment of compliance of the draft EIS with the EIS guidelines is provided in **Table 2-1**. In general the elements of the EIS Guidelines have been addressed, however, some gaps have been identified in the assessments which means that compliance with certain EIS guidelines are incomplete.

Primarily, discussion on how the reliability of the information was tested and what uncertainties (if any) are in the information is not presented. Further, figures and maps are provided, however, many figures and maps are not clear and could be improved to aid understanding.

Mitigation and management measures are identified, however, are generally broad and do not necessarily target specific residual impacts or propose specific measures or targets. The proposed mitigation and management measures are not concise and appear to differ in different sections of the draft EIS.

The review has also identified some technically incorrect statements made in the EIS, however, Cardno has assessed that consequences for the outcomes of the impact assessment are limited.

Surface Water

The overall outcome of the impact assessment is that there are minimal impacts to surface water, geomorphology and water quality as a result of the Stage 1 development incorporating mitigation measures. Some specific residual impacts are noted in relation to changes to water level and geomorphology at Oaky Creek and on a tributary of Badgerys Creek.

The identified gaps in the assessment relate to:

- Flooding – Residual impacts in Cosgroves, Oaky and Badgerys Creek are identified. Cardno agree that the impacts may be relatively minor if the results as presented are correct. However, it is difficult to confirm whether the statements and conclusions are valid as there is a lack of supporting information and presentation of inputs and results are not clear and concise. Further, these impacts still require management to mitigate them to negligible levels.
- Duncans Creek and its tributaries have not been modelled to allow definition of baseline and relative hydraulic impacts in these locations. Such impacts have been assessed by the changes in the hydrology for these catchments. As such, all summary impacts do not fully consider impacts to the Duncans Creek downstream areas. Investigation of a basin at this location is proposed as a mitigation/management measure.
- Many of the figures/maps provided in both the main chapters of the EIS and in the technical reports are either not easy to understand or omit relevant information to aid ease of understanding.
- Cumulative impacts have been discussed, however, no assessment has been undertaken to quantify the potential impacts other than for climate change scenarios.
- Geomorphological changes are documented as being expected to be low, however, have simplified/understated the potential impact. Changes to bed shear stress are determined to be around a 5% change, however, could be as high as 25% (or more in isolated locations). Further, assessment of erosion potential has centred on threshold values for vegetation (100-200 N/m²) rather than consideration of the in-situ sediment critical shear stress which is likely much lower (potentially <5N/m²).
- Water quality has not been presented in terms of achieved pollutant load reduction or assessment against guideline pollutant reduction targets. The EIS seems to dismiss any relevance of increased pollutant loads on the receiving environment and instead determines that impacts are acceptable because there are general improvements in pollutant concentrations due to increased flow volumes.
- There are significant impacts to water quality which are not addressed as part of the currently proposal water quality measures and significant improvements to the design will be required to address water quality to meet any of the identified guidelines.
- The EIS discusses the tributary of Badgerys Creek that joins Badgerys Creek approximately 300 metres downstream of Elizabeth Drive under existing conditions. It acknowledges that threatened ecological communities have not been mapped outside the site as part of the biodiversity assessment, but there is evidence of some remnant native vegetation along this reach of creek which would be reliant on occasional flooding and would be impacted under the current proposals. Such impacts need to be assessed to ensure there are no impacts and any mitigation and management measures identified.
- Management and mitigation measures are not concise and are not clearly identified consistently throughout the document. No costing is provided and there is no specific criteria recommended to address certain residual impacts as part of future mitigation and management measures.

Surface water impact management is required to address the following residual risks to surface water:

- Outstanding localised increases to flood depths in Cosgroves, Oaky and Badgerys Creeks.
- Risks to erosion and geomorphological changes to the downstream creeks due to increases in bed shear stress at various locations
- Undefined impacts and mitigation for runoff to Duncans Creek.
- Implications of increases in pollutant loads, particularly for cumulative impacts are not addressed. Water quality with current management measures does not currently meet any guidelines.
- Ecological impacts in receiving waters are not clearly addressed
- Impacts of potential use of stormwater to provide water supply for site preparation works has not been considered.

Groundwater

The overall outcome of the impact assessment is that there would be no impact to groundwater systems and associated values due to the presence of tight clay soils and limited groundwater presence directly below the site. Cardno does not concur fully with the assessment, this difference results from a key assumption made in the EIS by characterising the uppermost aquifer.

The identified gaps in the assessment relate to:

- Groundwater values are identified, however the groundwater dependent ecosystem lacks characterisation and conceptualisation with respect to water source.
- Sufficiently complete characterisation of the weathered rock (regolith) aquifer is not provided. For example, the aquifer composition, nature and thickness distribution is unknown (this could have been collated through a review of all drilling logs performed on site overtime), and the level of saturation of the aquifer is also unknown. This is a limitation in understanding the connectivity of the weathered rock (regolith) aquifer to the alluvium aquifer supporting groundwater dependent ecosystem.
- Similarly, no baseline time-series data has been collected. This is especially a limitation when it comes to characterisation of the weathered rock (regolith) aquifer and the contribution of this aquifer to the alluvium formations along the creek lines where groundwater dependent ecosystems are primarily located.
- The impacts are reasonably well identified, however some of the impact assessment is missing a clear outcome statement.
- Impact management and mitigation measures are only discussed generally with potential mitigation measures to be considered and monitoring to be implemented. Groundwater impact arising from contamination is suitably addressed. Groundwater impact arising from the development of the site is, in view of the lack of information on the uppermost aquifer, inappropriate especially when addressing impacts on groundwater dependent ecosystems.
- Consideration of groundwater recharge is discussed at length for the Bringelly Shale and overlying aquifer, however, the discussion does not extend to the alluvium aquifer.

Groundwater management is required to address the two residual risks to groundwater values:

- Risk of soil and subsurface contamination from spill/release of chemicals or contaminants. A discussion is suitably provided to this effect in the EIS documents. Cardno agrees that the details of the management program cannot be defined at this stage and should be incorporated in a site environmental management plan.
- Risk of impact on groundwater dependent ecosystems from reduced water supply to the creek alluvium system. In Cardno's view, the EIS documents do not provide a robust impact assessment of the risk to the Cumberland Plain Woodland along Badgerys Creek. Cardno would suggest that

the following management and mitigation approach could be considered to address the EIS guidelines requirements:

- Implementation of baseline data acquisition with an aim to document the contribution of recharge to the creek alluvial system from the weathered rock (regolith) aquifer, the Bringelly Shale and streamflow;
- A review of the risk to the groundwater dependent ecosystem;
- Based on the outcome of the previous item, the management and mitigation will vary with the level of risk. A risk propagation based monitoring strategy and response plan may be suitable. In this case, a response plan would propose a suitable early warning indication of impact propagation and provide the management and mitigation measures if necessary to prevent adverse impact. If the risk is identified to be more significant, engineered solutions may need to be considered in the site design. Another management and mitigation solution could involve inputs into site design to prevent impact on streamflow and indirectly aquifer recharge or mitigate the loss of recharge.

3. Long term development

- *Summary of detailed findings including key gaps, risks and effectiveness of assessment in setting a framework for further assessment.*

Surface Water

For the long term development, the impact assessment builds on the assessment for Stage 1. The hydrologic, hydraulic and water quality models used in the assessment include representations of the drainage system incorporated into the concept design of the indicative long term development.

The concept design of the long term development includes expanding the drainage system to control the flow of surface water. An extension of the Stage 1 detention basins is proposed together with provision of an additional detention basin in the longer term.

The following risks to surface water for the long term development and their implications have been identified:

- Outstanding localised increases to flood depths in Cosgroves, Oaky and Badgerys Creeks.
- Risks to erosion and geomorphological changes to the downstream creeks due to increases in bed shear stress at various locations
- Undefined impacts and mitigation for runoff to Duncans Creek.
- Implications of increases in pollutant loads, particularly for cumulative impacts are not addressed.
- Ecological impacts in receiving waters are not clearly addressed
- Impacts of potential use of stormwater to provide water supply for site preparation works has not been considered.

It is believed that most of the above issues can be addressed through refinement of the drainage strategy to manage flows, velocities and water quality. There are some outstanding impact assessments which have not been considered and should be addressed such as ecological impacts, use of stormwater for construction and impacts on Duncans Creek.

A reasonably robust assessment of the long term development has been undertaken. There is no formal framework for further assessment established as part of the EIS. The EIS for the Long Term Development simply lists considerations for future development as part of future design stages to address the impacts to be minimised. While this list identifies some of the key items to be addressed, it does not recommend any specific measures or processes that must be adhered to so as to tie those activities back to this EIS and associated approvals.

Groundwater

The following risks to groundwater for the long term development and their implications have been identified:

- Risk associated with change of land use and decrease of groundwater recharge. The implication is possibly, a lack of groundwater supply to the groundwater dependent ecosystems (EPBC listed). If the studies highlighted in the data gap analysis confirm that there is a risk, an artificial groundwater supply scheme to the alluvial aquifer or designed streamflow release upstream of the ecosystem will possibly be required to support aquifer recharge. If the studies identify that there is no risk of impact to the groundwater dependent ecosystem water supply, then no further work will be required.
- Risk associated with the possible use of chemicals over irrigated areas. The level of risk will depend largely on locations and practices. The implication is possibly an impact to the health of groundwater dependent ecosystem through runoff and infiltration in the alluvial aquifer. Management of this risk implies best practices be followed for the use of fertilizer and pesticides, additionally, targeted analytes could be included in groundwater monitoring.
- Risk associated with the use of groundwater as a supply. A groundwater assessment will be required to establish whether the extraction of the required volume is feasible and the impact on nearby groundwater users. It should be noted that the target aquifer will be the deeper Hawkesbury Sandstone. The implications in terms of work required will depend on the volume required. At most, the studies for a groundwater assessment are likely to require the drilling of a few wells (at least one observation and one pumping well), pump testing and analysis and some groundwater modelling.

The EIS identifies some of the required assessments and activities especially in relation to water quality management. The EIS also identifies that additional assessments will be required would the project require to use groundwater as a water supply. However, the EIS did not identify the state and federal regulatory processes likely to be required for the management of the site groundwater values (liaison, review and approvals, licences for example), nor did it clearly identify the management plans and response plans required to be in place. The EIS did not identify assessment remaining to be performed to collect baseline data and confirm the hydrogeological conceptual model.

4. Key impacts and opportunities

Key project impacts and opportunities are as follows:

- Localised increases in flood depths are indicated at a number of locations.
- Impacts in Duncans Creek are not fully considered and additional modelling would be required to determine residual impacts and any proposed management measures.
- Potential erosion and geomorphology changes with increased flow volumes and isolated increases in bed shear stress
- Increased pollutant loads for total suspended solids and nutrients, although pollutant concentration are equal or reduced compared to existing.
- Impacts on the groundwater dependent ecosystem associated with Badgerys Creek are not fully identified due to a lack of characterisation of the alluvium aquifer and in particular of:
 - The relationship between the alluvial aquifer and the weathered rock (regolith) aquifer; and
 - The characterisation of the recharge of the alluvium aquifer.
- These groundwater dependent ecosystems are declared a Matter of National and Environmental Significance under the EPBC Act. A review of the groundwater conceptual model would be required to enable characterisation of impacts on the Badgerys Creek groundwater dependent ecosystem.

There is an opportunity to improve the outcomes of the EIS to manage the residual impacts through refinement of the drainage strategy and management plans during future detailed design stages. It is recommended that the residual impacts are clearly defined in the EIS and appropriate specific management measures and targets be proposed or specified to ensure that these issues are addressed.

Given the complete redevelopment and earthworks taking place on site, there is opportunity to introduce even higher levels of stormwater management and water quality treatment to further minimise the impacts of the project and potentially improve the outcomes. This would assist in minimising cumulative impacts on the environment that may occur in combination with the surrounding South West Growth Centre and Western Sydney Employment Area development impacts.

With respect to groundwater impacts, there is an opportunity before site activities to acquire suitable baseline data and review the level of risk to the groundwater dependent ecosystem along the creeks. There is also an opportunity to define site design requirements to ensure recharge of the alluvium aquifer and, consequently, preservation of Badgerys Creek groundwater dependent ecosystem.

Overall there are some key shortcomings of the draft EIS and the assessment and the document could be improved by addressing these:

- The main chapters of the report in relation to surface water and groundwater, particularly Chapter 18, lack much of the key content of the technical reports and passes over some key information, descriptions, residual impacts and management measures.
- Figures and graphs are not well presented, missing some key information, which makes it difficult to understand some of the descriptions and inputs of data.
- There are inconsistencies between different chapters with similar content. E.g. key environmental impacts as well as mitigation and management measures.
- Residual Impacts are not clearly identified and listed in a separate section, but are rather interspersed throughout the document.
- There are no proposed specific compliance criteria linked to future assessments to address any outstanding items not completed in the current assessment to ensure that residual impacts are addressed to a specific recommended outcome.

Table of Contents

1	Scope of the Review	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Approach	1
1.3	Limitations	2
1.4	Components of the EIS reviewed	3
2	Detailed Findings – 1st Stage Airport	4
2.1	Compliance with the requirements of the (EPBC Act) EIS Guidelines	4
2.1.1	Requirements	4
2.1.2	Assessment of Compliance	5
2.1.3	Conclusion of Assessment of Compliance with EIS Guidelines	1
2.1.4	Surface Water	1
2.1.5	Groundwater	2
2.2	Commentary on Validity of Assumptions	3
2.2.1	Surface Water	3
2.2.2	Groundwater	3
2.3	Suitability of Technical Findings/Conclusions	4
2.3.1	Surface Water – Overall Findings	4
2.3.2	Groundwater – Overall Findings	6
2.3.3	Surface Water – Detailed Findings	9
2.3.4	Groundwater – Detailed Findings	16
2.4	Review of Mitigation & Management Measures Proposed	19
2.4.1	Surface Water	19
2.4.2	Groundwater	20
2.5	Discussion on Existing Level of Uncertainty over Environmental Risks and Impacts	21
2.5.1	Surface Water	21
2.5.2	Groundwater	22
3	Detailed findings – Long Term Development	23
3.1	Description of Approach to Impact Assessment Developed in the EIS	23
3.1.1	Surface Water	23
3.1.2	Groundwater	23
3.2	Assessment Gap Identification	23
3.2.1	Surface Water	23
3.2.2	Groundwater	24
3.3	Resulting Key Risks and Implications	25
3.3.1	Surface Water	25
3.3.2	Groundwater	25
3.4	Effectiveness of assessment in setting a framework for further assessment	25
3.4.1	Surface Water	25
3.4.2	Groundwater	26
4	Key Project impacts and opportunities	27
5	Reviewers' Qualifications	28

Tables

Table 2-1	Compliance with the EIS Guidelines	1
-----------	------------------------------------	---

1 Scope of the Review

1.1 Introduction

Cardno was engaged by WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff on behalf on the Western Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils (WSROC) to undertake a peer review of the Western Sydney Airport Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the supporting surface water and groundwater studies including hydrology, hydraulics, stormwater management, groundwater and water quality components.

The scope of the review falls under compliance with the “Guidelines for a content for a draft Environmental Impact Assessment”, issued by the Department of the Environment (DoE) under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (the EPBC Act) in January 2015 for the Western Sydney Airport.

It is noted that any reference to EIS throughout the document should be taken as referring to the draft EIS.

1.2 Approach

Cardno have undertaken a desktop review of the draft EIS documents and have assessed the EIS with respect to the following items:

- An evaluation of whether the ground and surface water studies meets the requirements of the EIS Guidelines and relevant other guidelines and methodologies;
- An evaluation of whether the conclusions reached in the studies are valid;
- An evaluation of whether the underlying assumptions used to inform the assessment are plausible and credible;
- A review of the mitigation and management measures proposed and advice provided on their likely adequacy in mitigating impacts;
- An evaluation of the level of uncertainty over impacts and the environmental risks that will arise as a result of the project; and,
- A summary of the key impacts and opportunities associated with the project in relation to the Surface Water and groundwater studies.

Descriptions of methodologies and impacts have been cross-referenced across chapters and the technical reports and figures checked for whether they aid understanding. Limited spot checks on values presented in tables have been undertaken together with applying sanity checks to data and model results with expected outcomes.

Surface water and groundwater have been reviewed by separate specialists, except where there is an inter-connection between the two, such as with water quality.

Prior to release of the draft EIS, Cardno initially reviewed available background documents to gain an understanding of site settings and project history.

Cardno referred to the following documents:

1. EPBC documentation:

- Guidelines for the content of a draft Environmental Impact statement, Western Sydney Airport, Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Reference: EPBC 2014/7391), 29 January 2015
- Decision whether action needs approval/approval required, 23 December 2014. This decision confirms that the development requires assessment and approval under the EPBC Act before it can proceed.

- Invitation for Public Comment on Referral, 04 December 2014
 - Western Sydney Airport Referral of proposed action, Dec 2014, Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development*
 - Environmental field survey of Commonwealth land at Badgerys Creek Report prepared for Western Sydney Unit Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development, SMEC, 2014*
 - Biodiversity Report Commonwealth land at Badgerys Creek, Prepared for Western Sydney Unit Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development, SMEC, October 2014*
 - Badgerys Creek Initial Environmental Survey: Historic Heritage, Australian Museum Consulting for SMEC, October 2014
 - Environmental Survey of Commonwealth Land at Badgerys Creek: Aboriginal Heritage, Australian Museum Consulting for SMEC, October 2014
- 2. 1997-99 EIS and associated technical studies documentation:
 - Draft EIS, Summary of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Second Sydney Airport at Badgerys Creek, PPK, 1997-1999
 - Second Sydney Airport Proposal, Technical Paper 7: Geology, Soils and Water, PPK, 1997
 - Second Sydney Airport Proposal Technical Paper 10: Hazards and Risks, PPK, 1997

Upon release of the draft EIS, Cardno reviewed:

- general chapters of the draft EIS to obtain an understanding of the proposal, the general approach to the impact assessment, and any community hydrological and hydrogeological concerns;
- the (EPBC Act) EIS Guidelines and any requirements relevant to surface and groundwater; and
- the chapters relevant to surface water and groundwater; and
- surface water and groundwater technical reports of the draft EIS.

1.3 Limitations

The following limitations apply to the review of the surface water and groundwater:

- No site visit has been undertaken
- No numerical models were available and hence no review of models or inputs has been undertaken other than what has been reported, nor have any models been run as part of the review
- Assessment is limited to commentary on the data provided, however, data gaps have been identified
- Cardno assumed the data used for the groundwater impact assessment had gone through a quality control process before use and therefore can be relied upon
- Similarly Cardno did not review the interpretation of the data, for example the attribution of a bore to a specific aquifer.

1.4 Components of the EIS reviewed

The following components of the EIS have been reviewed in relation to surface water and groundwater:

- **Volume 1—Project Background**
 - Executive Summary
 - Part A—Project background
 - Part B—Airport Plan
- **Volume 2—Stage 1 Development**
 - Part D—Environmental Impact Assessment:
 - Chapter 9: Approach to impact assessment
 - Chapter 17: Topography, geology and soils
 - Chapter 18: Surface water and groundwater
 - Chapter 27: Cumulative impact assessment
 - Part E—Environmental Management
 - Part F—Conclusions
- **Volume 3—Long Term Development**
 - Part G—Assessment of Long Term Development
 - Chapter 30: Approach to impact assessment
 - Chapter 34: Surface water and groundwater
 - Chapter 39: Other environmental matters
 - Part H—Conclusion and recommendations
- **Volume 4—EIS Technical Reports**
 - Appendix C: Western Sydney Airport EIS Guidelines
 - Appendix L:
 - L1 Surface water hydrology and geomorphology
 - L2 Surface water quality
 - L3 Groundwater

2 Detailed Findings – 1st Stage Airport

2.1 Compliance with the requirements of the (EPBC Act) EIS Guidelines

2.1.1 Requirements

The draft EIS was assessed for compliance with the requirements of the EIS Guidelines and key requirements for impact assessment from the NSW Office of Water or NSW EPA on groundwater.

The EPBC EIS Guidelines for the Western Sydney Airport requires the EIS is to provide the following with respect to surface water and groundwater:

- A Description of the Environment
 - Information on listed threatened species (including suitable habitat) and ecological communities that are or are likely to be present in all areas of potential impact.
 - A description of the environment in all areas of potential impact, including all components of the environment as defined in Section 528 of the EPBC Act:
 - ecosystems and their constituent parts, including people and communities
 - natural and physical resources
 - the qualities and characteristics of locations, places and areas
 - Heritage values of places
 - the social, economic and cultural aspects of a thing mentioned in preceding dot points.
- Relevant impacts are required to be identified
 - Impacts to the environment (as defined in section 528) should include but not be limited to the following:
 - changes to water quality on site and downstream of the site
 - changes to siltation
 - hydrological changes
 - native flora and fauna habitat removal and degradation (on site and in surrounding areas that may be affected by the action)
 - changes in recreational use and amenity of natural areas
 - creation of any risks or hazards to people or property that may be associated with any component of the action.
 - The guidelines require that Quantification and assessment of impacts should be:
 - against appropriate background/baseline levels
 - be prepared according to best practice guidelines and compared to best practice standards
 - consider seasonal and temporal variations where appropriate (including temporal changes in the sensitivity of the receptor)
 - be supported by maps, graphs and diagrams as appropriate to ensure information is readily understandable
 - Guidelines and standards used to quantify baselines and impacts should be explained and justified.
- The EIS must provide information on proposed avoidance and mitigation measures to manage the relevant impact to a MNES
- The EIS is to provide specifics on the management measures

- The EIS must provide details of the likely residual impacts on MNES and any proposed offset packages to reduce the residual impact
- The EIS must include information on any other requirements for approval or conditions that apply, or that the proponent reasonably believes are likely to apply, to the proposed action i.e. State Government's applicable requirements.
- The EIS must inform on sources of information as follows: the source of the information, how recent the information is, how the reliability of the information was tested, what uncertainties (if any) are in the information
- Reference to the Guidelines, plans and/or policies that have been considered during preparation of the EIS.

2.1.2 Assessment of Compliance

The summary of the assessment of compliance of the draft EIS with the EIS guidelines is provided in **Table 2-1**. Please note that technical validity is discussed in later sections in further detail (Section 2.1.3 to Section 2.5 for the first stage and Section 3 for long term development).

Table 2-1 Compliance with the EIS Guidelines

	Groundwater	Surface Water
Identification of Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES)	The response of the draft EIS is incomplete. MNES are not clearly identified in the groundwater chapters. A discussion on the presence of high value Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems (GDEs) is given, however, there appears to be conflicting information between maps and text on the Cumberland Plain Woodland and sources, age and reliability of data is not provided.	MNES are not clearly identified in the surface water chapters. However, the relevant MNES is taken as the environment in general.
4. Description of the Environment (a) Information on listed threatened species (including suitable habitat) and ecological communities that are or are likely to be present in all areas of potential impact. (c) A description of the environment in all areas of potential impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ecosystems and their constituent parts, including people and communities • natural and physical resources • the qualities and characteristics of locations, places and areas • heritage values of places • the social, economic and cultural aspects of a thing mentioned in preceding dot points. 	The response of the draft EIS is incomplete. The hydrogeological settings are reasonably well provided albeit for some gaps in the characterisation having significant impact on the ability of characterise impacts to some of the groundwater values. Some technical limitations identified.	The response of the draft EIS only partly addresses the guideline. Ecological communities that are or are likely to be present in all areas of potential impact are not defined outside the airport site in the receiving creeks which are impacted by the project. Description of catchments and watercourses is well presented. There is no discussion of the social, economic and cultural aspects of the natural and physical resources. No linkages to specific ecosystems is provided.
5. Identification of relevant impacts	The guideline is addressed, however, there are gaps in the assessments. Relevant impacts are identified, however the qualification of the level of impact is not fully addressed.	The guideline is addressed however, there are gaps in the assessments. Impacts are identified, however the qualification of the level of impact is not fully addressed and gaps in the assessment exist. For Example, surface water and geomorphological impacts on Duncans Creek have not been defined.
(b) Cumulative Impacts	Long term development scenario is addressed	Impacts of the long-term development scenario have been undertaken (except for Duncans Creek). Cumulative impacts have been considered for Climate Change and future adjacent development,

		however, impacts have only been quantified through modelling for Climate Change.
(g) Changes to water quality on site and downstream of the site	The response of the draft EIS is acceptable. Impacts include change to water quality. Impact to water quality resulting from release of contamination and runoff water management are addressed fully. Technical limitations identified in relation to potential water quality changes to the creek alluvial aquifer from reduced groundwater inter-aquifer flows.	Impacts include changes to surface water quality, however, there are some queries around the assessment and conclusions discussed in more detail in sections of this review.
(g) Changes to siltation	N/A	The response of the draft EIS is acceptable. Changes to siltation are discussed, particularly impacts during construction
(g) Hydrological Changes	The response of the draft EIS is not appropriate. Changes to hydrological behaviour and impact on groundwater recharge are considered but exclude the alluvium aquifer along Badgerys Creek.	The response of the draft EIS is incomplete. Changes to hydrology are considered extensively with regards to impacts. However, there are still gaps and some changes are undefined, particularly for Duncans Creek. Geomorphological conclusions may have technical deficiencies.
(g) Quantifications and assessment of impacts are prepared: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Against baseline levels • Follow best practices • Consider seasonal and temporal variations • be supported by maps, graphs and diagrams for ease of understanding 	The draft EIS response is only partly appropriate, it is not appropriate in regards to impacts to groundwater dependent ecosystems. Quantification of impact against baseline levels are not provided. The reviewer agrees with the report that considering the low level of changes and hazards that a qualitative discussion is appropriate. The reviewer notes that a sentence to this effect could be added to the impact assessment section introduction. Follow best practice – the impact assessment could gain by using a clearer risk assessment approach Consider seasonal and temporal variations – not considered however Cardno agrees with the technical report that it is not necessary for the impact assessment at this stage. It is required to be addressed for monitoring and management measures in regards to surface water flows and water levels in the weathered rock (regolith) aquifer. Supporting maps, graphs and diagrams are provided	The EIS guideline is mainly addressed. Quantification of baseline flood behaviour, geomorphology and water quality is presented. Impacts are compared to baseline levels. Assessment generally follows best practice, although impacts for the full range of design rainfall events is not reported. There is consideration of seasonal variability of rainfall when planning construction stage activities when managing soil and water. However, this is not deemed to be as important during operation because major flood events can occur at any time of year. Maps and graphs are provided to support the assessment, however, do not necessarily provide the relevant information to aid ease of understanding. Many figures could include additional information e.g. Appendix L1 Figure 3-5 should include ground contours to assist with demonstrating the catchment delineation.

6. (a) Information on proposed avoidance and mitigation measures to manage the relevant impact to a MNES	The response of the draft EIS is acceptable. Some generic discussion on approach to avoidance and mitigation is provided.	The response of the draft EIS is incomplete. Management and mitigation measures are identified, albeit are fairly general and aren't necessarily targeted to mitigating a specific impact.
6. (c) Specifics of the mitigation measures	The response of the draft EIS is not appropriate. Partly provided, for groundwater monitoring. Technical limitations identified. No response plan provided. Agency responsible not identified.	The response of the draft EIS is partly appropriate. This is noted generally within Chapter 17 and 18, however, more specific measures are identified in the Appendix L1 technical report. No costing has been provided. Agency responsible has not been provided for all measures. Criteria for the success of a mitigation measure has not been provided.
7. Details of the likely residual impacts on MNES	Not discussed	Residual impacts are identified, however, these are not clearly identified in a concise format or dedicated section. Some impacts are omitted from Table 29-1 –summary of key environmental impacts in Chapter 34 – Conclusion.
9. Other requirements for approval or conditions that apply, or likely to apply	Only partly provided	This is provided in reference to development of various management plans and their need to adhere to industry standards and guidelines to ensure effective mitigation of impacts. No proposed conditions for approval are made to ensure specific residual impacts are effectively mitigated or long term development impacts are managed.
11.(a) – (d) Document sources of information including age of data, reliability and uncertainties	The response of the draft EIS is acceptable. Source and age references are provided, reliability and uncertainties of data not provided	The response of the draft EIS is acceptable. Source and age references provided, reliability and uncertainties of rainfall or water quality data is not provided.
11. (e) Reference to guidelines, plans and/or policies considered during preparation of the EIS	The response of the draft EIS is appropriate. Provided.	The response of the draft EIS is appropriate. Provided.

2.1.3 Conclusion of Assessment of Compliance with EIS Guidelines

In general the elements of the EIS Guidelines have been addressed however, some gaps have been identified in the assessments. The review has also identified some technically incorrect statements made in the EIS, however, Cardno has assessed that consequences for the outcomes of the impact assessment are generally limited.

2.1.4 Surface Water

Overall the surface water impact assessment addresses the relevant EIS guidelines including:

- Description of existing environment (catchments and watercourses) is well presented.
- Description of baseline flood conditions are presented
- Impact assessment during construction has been undertaken
- Impact assessment during operation has been undertaken
- Mitigation and management measures are identified
- Reference to guidelines, plans and/or policies considered during preparation of the EIS is provided.

However, full compliance with many of the EIS guidelines fall short due to incomplete or missing assessments or information. The identified gaps in the assessment relate to:

- Flooding – It is difficult to confirm whether the statements and conclusions are valid as there is a lack of supporting information and presentation of inputs to confirm their validity. E.g. Residual impacts in Cosgrove, Oaky and Badgerys Creek are identified. Cardno agree that the impacts in Cosgrove, Oaky and Badgerys Creek may be relatively minor if the results as presented are correct. Further, these residual impacts still require management to mitigate them to negligible levels.
- Duncans Creek and its tributaries have not been modelled to allow definition of baseline and relative hydraulic impacts in these locations. Such impacts have been assessed by the changes in the hydrology for these catchments. As such, all summary impacts do not fully consider impacts to the Duncans Creek downstream areas. Investigation of a basin at this location is proposed as a mitigation/management measure.
- Many of the figures/maps provided in both the main chapters of the EIS and in the technical reports are either not easy to understand or omit relevant information to aid ease of understanding. E.g. Stage 1 design contour information, to identify the proposed ridgeline separating the Stage 1 runway and longer term second runway and the extent of earthworks proposed is not provided on any figures.
- Cumulative impacts have been discussed, however, no assessment has been undertaken to quantify the potential impacts other than for climate change scenarios.
- Water quality has not been presented in terms of achieved pollutant load reduction or assessment against guideline pollutant reduction targets. The EIS seems to dismiss any relevance of increased pollutant loads on the receiving environment and instead determines that impacts are acceptable because there are general improvements in pollutant concentrations due to increased flow volumes.
- The EIS discusses the tributary of Badgerys Creek that joins Badgerys Creek approximately 300 metres downstream of Elizabeth Drive under existing conditions. It acknowledges that threatened ecological communities have not been mapped outside the site as part of the biodiversity assessment, but there is evidence of some remnant native vegetation along this reach of creek which would be reliant on occasional flooding and would be impacted under the current proposals. Such impacts need to be assessed to ensure there are no impacts and any mitigation and management measures identified.
- Management and mitigation measures are not concise and are not clearly identified consistently throughout the document. No costing is provided and there is no specific criteria recommended to address certain residual impacts as part of future mitigation and management measures.

2.1.5 Groundwater

The overall outcome of the impact assessment is that there would be no impact to groundwater systems and associated values due to the presence of tight clay soils and limited groundwater presence directly below the site. Cardno does not concur fully with the assessment, this difference results from a key assumption made in the EIS by characterising the uppermost aquifer.

The identified gaps relate to:

- The lack of qualification of the data (previous data and interpretation of the reliability and uncertainty of outcomes).
- The identification of MNES is not provided in the groundwater studies. The MNES of relevance appears to be the Cumberland Plain Woodland. This ecosystem is also classified as a high priority groundwater dependent ecosystem under the NSW regulatory framework. The text of the EIS does not clearly define the Cumberland Plain Woodland as a MNES. Additionally, the text in the EIS documents locates the Cumberland Plain Woodland along Badgerys Creek, however, the map appears to locate the ecosystem at several places over the site. Due to the nature of the project, vegetation over most of the site is expected to be cleared. As such, impacts to the Cumberland Plain Woodland ecosystem only need to be addressed for the groundwater impact assessment along creek lines. This is provided in the EIS documents.
- Sufficiently complete characterisation of the weathered rock (regolith) aquifer is not provided as no additional data from previous studies was collected.
- Similarly, no baseline time-series data has been collected. This is especially a limitation when it comes to characterisation of the weathered rock (regolith) aquifer and the contribution of this aquifer to the alluvium formations along the creek lines where groundwater dependent ecosystems are primarily located.
- The impacts are reasonably well identified, however some of the impact assessment is missing a clear outcome statement.
- Impact management and mitigation measures are only discussed generally with potential mitigation measures to be considered and monitoring to be implemented. Groundwater impact management is required to address the two residual risks to groundwater values:
 - Risk of soil and subsurface contamination from spill/release of chemicals or contaminants. A discussion is suitably provided to this effect in the EIS documents. Cardno agrees that the details of the management program cannot be defined at this stage and should be incorporated in a site environmental management plan. .
 - Risk of impact on groundwater dependent ecosystems from reduced water supply to the creek alluvium system. In Cardno's view, the EIS documents do not provide a robust impact assessment of the risk to the Cumberland Plain Woodland along Badgerys Creek. Cardno would suggest that the following management and mitigation approach could be considered to address the EIS guidelines requirements:
 - Implementation of baseline data acquisition with an aim to document the contribution of recharge to the creek alluvial system from the weathered rock (regolith) aquifer and the Bringelly Shale;
 - A review of the risk to the groundwater dependent ecosystem;
 - Based on the outcome of the previous item, the management and mitigation will vary with the level of risk. A risk propagation based monitoring strategy and response plan may be suitable. In this case, a response plan would propose a suitable early warning indication of impact propagation and provide the management and mitigation measures if necessary to prevent adverse impact. If the risk is identified to be more significant, engineered solutions may need to be considered in the site design.

2.2 Commentary on Validity of Assumptions

2.2.1 Surface Water

The surface water and water quality impact assessment developed for the Western Sydney Airport makes the following assumptions:

- Hydrology – % Impervious parameters are generally reasonable for the existing scenario except it is reported that 10% imperviousness has been used for “Infrastructure”. It is not clear what “Infrastructure” refers to or what it was applied to. This might be a typographical error and is supposed to be 100% for buildings etc.
- Hydraulics - Roughness parameters are generally reasonable, although there could be a wider range of categories to represent more land use or vegetation types.
- Downstream boundary of the hydraulic model is noted as a normal depth boundary. This should be checked against flood levels in South Creek and an appropriate coincident flood chosen for the tailwater condition. For example if the 5 year ARI flood in South Creek is higher than the normal depth within Badgerys Creek for a 100 year ARI, then the South Creek tailwater condition should be adopted. A validation of results with the South Creek flood model appears to indicate an acceptable correlation.
- The EIS assumes that current impacts (increases in stream depths and modelled shear stress values) indicated along sections of Badgerys Creek between Basin 2 and Basin 3 are not expected to eventuate as the design layout used in the hydraulic model has been subsequently superseded. This may be a valid assumption, however, not enough information has been provided about the differences in the concept layout and modelling of the new concept would be required to demonstrate this is correct.
- The Water quality assessment for Stage 1 development notes that there are some discrepancies between the surface water management plans provided and the land use plan for which assumptions had to be made, however, there is no detail on the assumptions and hence no comment on the validity of the assumptions can be made.

Overall, the impact assessment has followed appropriate methodology and used industry standard software. It is difficult to assess the validity of some inputs as the presentation of data to match the descriptions and assumptions is lacking in some instances.

2.2.2 Groundwater

The hydrogeological impact assessment developed for the Western Sydney Airport makes the following assumptions:

- The EIS assumes that existing hydrogeological site conditions have not changed significantly since the previous studies (Coffey, 1991 and PPK, 1999). Previous investigation results have been considered suitable for this EIS. Cardno agrees that since the site activities have remained unchanged, hydrogeological conditions are unchanged and previous data can be used. Cardno would however point out that this EIS is required to address additional elements than was required in the previous EIS, for example impact on groundwater dependent ecosystems, and that data had not necessarily been collected or analysed consistent with the current objectives. As a consequence, the previous assessment dataset or outcomes may not fully address the current EIS guidelines.
- The hydrogeological conceptual model assumes the weathered rock unconfined aquifer to be intermittent. No data is provided to support this assumption. Under this assumption, contribution of groundwater flow to the creek alluvial aquifer is limited to water seeping from the Bringelly Shale. As a consequence, there could be an under estimation of impacts to groundwater dependent ecosystems located along the creek.
- Cardno notes that there appears to be a reasonable spread of groundwater bores over the site so that sufficient, additional stratigraphy data could be available from the geotechnical investigation, provide to better confirm the assumption about the weathered rock (regolith) aquifer.

- The technical report assumes a low aquifer recharge rate from rainfall. The information provided on recharge rates does not confirm this assumption due to the heterogeneity of the results presented and the lack of associated discussion. However, this is of no consequence to the outcome as the soils are defined as being silt and clay overlying residual clays (Section 17.3.3 EIS) which by nature are associated with low rainfall recharge.
- The risk of dewatering of the Bringelly Shale associated with the potential construction of an underground train station and other types of excavation required for buildings has been dismissed based on the low hydraulic conductivity value of the Bringelly Shale at depth and the small seepage volumes expected. It should be noted that no project specifications are developed enough at this stage to document further the risk associated with underground facilities. Cardno generally agrees that underground facilities at depth in the Bringelly Shale are unlikely to cause significant groundwater impacts.
- The risk associated with groundwater impact assessment does not address the impact from groundwater extraction to partially sustain site water supply. Site requirements for groundwater use are unknown at this stage. The EIS documents states that this would be subject to a separate approval. Cardno agrees with this assumption.

2.3 Suitability of Technical Findings/Conclusions

2.3.1 Surface Water – Overall Findings

Cardno has reviewed the description of the hydrological settings and the methodology and inputs to models to ensure validity of the discussions which support the impact assessment. Based on the site information provided, Cardno has checked that all environmental values associated with surface water have been identified and that impact on these values has been assessed in the draft EIS.

Appropriate and industry recognised software has been used for hydrology (XP-RAFTS), hydraulics (MIKE 21) and water quality (MUSIC) modelling.

Identification of environmental values:

The key indicators of changes considered throughout the EIS are:

- changes in discharge from the site;
- changes in watercourse bed shear stress;
- changes in water quality; and
- changes in downstream water level.

It is agreed that these are the main considerations, however, note that additional considerations should be considered including:

- Changes to biodiversity
- Changes to hazards and risks to downstream people and property due to flooding or dam break of proposed detention basins

Outcome of impact assessment

The following conclusions are reached in the EIS for the Stage 1 Development:

- Modelling of stream flows indicates that duration, volume and velocity of surface water flows in watercourses would generally be similar or reduced when compared to existing flow conditions.
- Flood impacts noted are “increases of up to 100 mm in stream depths may occur at Cosgroves Creek and up to 250 mm in limited reaches of its tributary Oaky Creek for the smaller one year ARI and five year ARI events, plus associated increases in flow volume and velocity. No changes to flood levels are expected to occur at dwellings or other infrastructure surrounding the airport site”.
- The EIS concludes that the Stage 1 Development will have a low impact on the morphology of watercourses adjoining and downstream of the airport site.

- The Stage 1 development leads to “general improvements in pollutant concentrations locally and regionally, the improvements would not be sufficient to meet ANZECC guideline objectives, noting the catchment has not met ANZECC guidelines for several years.
- The attenuation of the incoming flows by the basins indicates that a basin strategy can be used to manage the increase in flow peaks and impacts to flood peak timing. Cardno agree with this conclusion.

Cardno make the following comments

- Duncans Creek or its tributaries have not been modelled with a hydraulic model to allow definition of baseline and relative hydraulic impacts in these locations. The EIS notes that “The land use downstream of the site was largely primary industry, with few dwellings identified close to the creek. Following the hydrology assessment, the benefit of developing a detailed hydraulic model of Duncans Creek to inform the impact assessment was considered limited. An impact assessment was carried out but was based on the findings of the hydrology model at the points of discharge from the site for Duncans Creek”. As such, all summary impacts do not fully consider impacts on the Duncans Creek downstream areas.
- No figures presented show the topography or DEM used for the different model scenario runs, so it is difficult to understand the topography used for catchment delineation or hydraulic model setup, particularly for Stage 1 where only half the site will be constructed.
- Figures of Stage 1 flood depth and flood difference results would be enhanced with an overlay of the Stage 1 development to understand the flood extents in relation to the development and potential flood affected dwellings. Further providing the locations of properties with above floor flooding from Appendix L1 Figure 1-1 would allow an easy assessment of flood impacts at those locations.
- Figures showing afflux (change in flood level/depth) for Stage 1 development are only provided for the 1, 5 and 100 year ARI events, so it is not clear what the relative impacts are for other modelled design storm events i.e. 20 year ARI and PMF.
- Conclusions focus on the one year ARI, five year ARI and the 100 year ARI. There is no presentation or discussion of other intermediate design storm events to ascertain whether there are impacts for these events.
- Geomorphological changes are documented as expected to be low, however, have simplified/understated the potential impact. Changes to bed shear stress are determined to be around a 5% change, however, could be as high as 25% (or more in isolated locations). Further, assessment of erosion potential has centred on threshold values for vegetation (100-200 N/m²) rather than consideration of the in-situ sediment critical shear stress which is likely much lower (potentially <5N/m²).
- The EIS discusses the tributary of Badgerys Creek that joins Badgerys Creek approximately 300 metres downstream of Elizabeth Drive under existing conditions. It acknowledges that threatened ecological communities have not been mapped outside the site as part of the biodiversity assessment, but there is evidence of some remnant native vegetation along this reach of creek which would be reliant on occasional flooding and would be impacted under the current proposals.
- There are significant impacts to water quality which are not addressed as part of the currently proposal water quality measures and significant improvements to the design will be required to address water quality to meet any of the identified guidelines.
- Despite the general decrease in pollutant concentrations, Stage 1 would result in increased loads of phosphorous and nitrogen, largely as a function of the increase in runoff volumes associated with the modified catchment areas and changes to land-use”. The EIS notes that “further resolution of mitigation measures would be provided in the final EIS having regard to identified downstream assets and potential for impacts”. This is a fairly key statement and should have already been addressed given that downstream assets and potential for impacts should have already been identified as part of this draft EIS.

- The adopted reduction pollutant targets are derived from the UPRCT WSUD Guidelines for Western Sydney as being 80% for TSS, 40% for Total Phosphorus and 40% for Total Nitrogen. This document may be considered to be outdated and that adjacent Council DCP requirements may provide a better guidance on targets that should be adopted to align with the overall objectives of the receiving areas being managed by the relevant Councils. These would indicate pollutant reduction targets of 80% for TSS, 60% for Total Phosphorus, 45% for Total Nitrogen and 90% for Gross Pollutants.
- The EIS notes there would be increased pollutant loads due to increased runoff volumes, however, the focus of impacts reporting centres around ANZECC guidelines for pollutant concentrations and do not focus on the achieved reduction targets versus the adopted guidelines. Pollutant load guidelines are not met at the basin outlets and are not met for the overall site.

2.3.2 Groundwater – Overall Findings

Cardno has reviewed the description of the hydrogeological settings and the hydrogeological conceptual model to ensure validity of the discussions which support the impact assessment. Based on the site information provided, Cardno has checked that all environmental values associated with groundwater have been identified and that impact on these values has been assessed in the draft EIS.

Identification of groundwater values

The groundwater values identified throughout the EIS documents are:

- Groundwater dependent ecosystems located within the alluvial formation along Badgerys Creek;
- Groundwater users (private groundwater bores); and
- Water quality (through potential changes to groundwater quality affecting surface water through baseflow and migrating off-site).

Cardno agrees with these findings.

Groundwater Conceptual Model

A groundwater conceptual model is the simplified representation of the groundwater system characteristics (aquifer/aquifers characteristics, groundwater flows, groundwater levels and groundwater quality), its environmental values and the interactions between the characteristics and with surface water. The groundwater conceptual model needs to be well defined for a robust approach to the risk identification and impact assessment.

The EIS describes the aquifer system as including:

- unconfined aquifer in the shallow alluvium of the main watercourses at the airport site;
- intermittent aquifer in weathered clays overlying the Bringelly Shale;
- confined aquifer within the Bringelly Shale; and
- confined aquifer within the Hawkesbury Sandstone.

The following statements in the EIS further define the hydrogeological conceptual model:

- The aquifer extents are interpreted to be limited to the three creeks surrounding the site (Badgerys Creek, Cosgrove Creek and Duncan Creek);
- The Bringelly Shale is considered to have low hydraulic conductivity (EIS Chapter 18) and, the technical groundwater study describes the aquifer systems as having low yield (this statement is expected to exclude the Hawkesbury Sandstone);
- There appears to be a strong downward head gradient (EIS Chapter 18) and the technical groundwater study only relates to a downwards head gradient of the alluvial aquifer and the Bringelly Shale;
- Groundwater recharge is low;
- Groundwater quality is poor (high salinity levels);

- Baseflow to creeks is limited (based on electrical conductivity values). Note that no quantification is provided. The technical report adds that the creeks are intermittent, reinforcing the low reliance of creek flow on baseflow;
- Groundwater levels are found between 1 to 12 m below ground level and a groundwater level map is provided.

Overall, the different elements of the hydrogeological conceptual model are provided and appear thorough, however, Cardno's review has identified a number of technically incorrect conclusions. The significant ones are listed below, the detailed findings section enters further into the technical findings.

- The definition of the different aquifers, more specifically the Bringelly Shale and the weathered rock (regolith) aquifer.
 - Characterisation of the "intermittent aquifer in weathered clays overlying the Bringelly Shale: is necessary, including thickness of the formation, geographical distribution, discussion of material, water levels. This characterisation is required to understand the potential interactions (if any) of the weathered rock (regolith) aquifer with the alluvial aquifer. This has potential implication on the impact assessment and support of groundwater dependent ecosystems. This aquifer is not reflected on the hydrogeological conceptual model drawing.
 - The Bringelly Shale is defined as an aquifer where it should be defined as an aquitard. Apart from being confusing terminology there is no consequence to the impact assessment as the properties of the shale formation are accurately considered.
 - Although the aquifer in weathered clays overlying the Bringelly Shale will be bounded by the creeks as defined in the EIS documents, the Bringelly Shale and Hawkesbury Sandstone extend regionally. The Luddenham Dyke is a flow barrier and a local flow divide in the southern part of the site.
- Based on the data provided in the EIS documents, the nature of the hydraulic connectivity between formations should be qualified as follows:
 - Very small downwards gradient between the alluvial aquifer and the Bringelly Shale. No information is available on seasonal variations, the gradients could possibly be reversed at times;
 - Under natural conditions, the Hawkesbury Sandstone is not hydraulically connected to the upper alluvial aquifer or unconfined weathered rock aquifer simply due to the stratigraphical properties, low hydraulic conductivity and significant thickness (approximately 100 m over the site, as informed in the EIS documents) of the Bringelly Shale.
- The occurrence of baseflow (groundwater flow into the creek) is discussed. Cardno notes that the discussion should also include groundwater recharge of the alluvium aquifer and the contribution made by the surrounding aquifers. This would set the scene for assessing the impact to groundwater ecosystems.
- A groundwater quality summary for each aquifer is not provided. A suitable baseline would be necessary prior to the start of the project (further discussed in Section □).

Overall, Cardno considers that the conceptual model is lacking information about aquifer characterisation and the aquifers geographical distribution and interactions along Badgerys Creek. If the weathered rock formation proves to be thin and effectively only carries interflow, then these gaps are of no consequence to the impact assessment findings. If the aquifer is reasonably thick and has a constant water table, the conclusion of the current impact assessment on impacts to groundwater dependent ecosystems may be different.

Impact Assessment Process

Cardno's review of the groundwater impact assessment process is that it is not supported by a rigorous risk analysis process:

- The impact assessment is based on three categories of consequences of the site activities (i.e. decreased recharge, decreased water levels and change of water quality) rather than approaching

the impact assessment from the activities that are the source of the impact. While good practice Cardno considers that this deficiency does not appear to be important for the outcome of the assessment. The impact qualification is not based on a risk matrix approach, this has the potential to make the outcome quite subjective.

- The impact assessment does provide a clear conclusion on the impact to groundwater for each risk. A clear statement could have been provided for each risk. For example, the impact conclusion on water quality changes states that the likelihood of the impact is (low) and the pathway for impact (low hydraulic conductivity) is medium. However, the impact could still rank as high if the risk resulted in a non-reversible impact on high value receptors.

Outcome of impact assessment

The technical study and section 18.5.4 of the EIS come to the following conclusions:

- Reduction of recharge is not expected to affect sensitive ecological receptors and beneficial uses;
- Groundwater drawdown resulting from the re-profiling of the soil would result in minor impacts. The drawdown is not expected to be below creek level and dry the creeks;
- Adverse impact on groundwater quality may potentially emerge. The emergence of groundwater quality impact would be slow (EIS). The technical report discussed the risk to groundwater quality and concludes it is low, with the risk level possibly decreasing upon implementation of control measures.

The conclusion on the impact from reduced recharge is intrinsically linked to the hydrogeological conceptual model. Cardno would comment that the role of the upper weathered rock (regolith) aquifer needs to be confirmed to conclude either way.

Cardno agrees that groundwater drawdown due to excavations is not likely to affect groundwater levels substantially. It may cause local groundwater built up and local groundwater flow changes, but have no impact on environmental values. The technical report states that groundwater drawdown in the upper part of the ground profile associated with cuts is expected to result in seepages (as opposed to flows) and result in minor drawdown impacts.

Groundwater quality impacts will be associated with the accidental release of contaminants. Cardno agrees with the general findings of the study that impact levels are low and that impact can be controlled through management and monitoring measures.

Vulnerability of groundwater values

Groundwater users:

Impact on groundwater users is not clearly addressed in the EIS documents. Cardno's review however concludes that groundwater users are not at risk of impact due to the distance of existing bores from the site and the different aquifer that existing private bores are tapping. Groundwater users tap into the Hawkesbury Sandstone that is located at depth and isolated from surface activities at the project site by the Bringelly Shale. It should be noted here, that no requirement for groundwater supply from the Hawkesbury Sandstone for the project is included in the project definition. If groundwater supply was required, additional review would be required.

Groundwater dependent ecosystems

Vulnerability of the groundwater dependent ecosystems was assessed through impact of reduced recharge and groundwater drawdown. The technical report concludes that drawdown impact in areas of sensitive vegetation are expected to be minor. The report states that construction and development of the airport will reduce recharge and hence reduce groundwater discharge to the surrounding creek systems. The technical report appears to associate contribution to the alluvial aquifer to baseflow discharge and implies that the reliance on groundwater discharge is low and would have minor impacts. Cardno's review is that there is currently not sufficient data to conclude the vulnerability of groundwater dependent ecosystems.

The level of the risk will be linked to the level of groundwater contribution from the unconfined regolith aquifer (undocumented until now) to the alluvial aquifer. If the aquifer is intermittent as stated in the EIS documents, then Cardno agrees the impact will be insignificant.

Groundwater quality

Cardno's review supports the conclusion that there is a risk on groundwater quality. The technical report classified it as low in Section 6.2 and the EIS report does not provide a conclusion on the risk (as discussed earlier). Cardno believes that the risk is likely to rank low to medium if using a risk matrix approach. The risk can be decreased to low by implementing site controls as defined in EIS documents.

2.3.3 Surface Water – Detailed Findings

This section follows a chronological reading of the surface water and geomorphology technical report (Appendix L1) and water quality technical report (Appendix L2) and the various sections of the EIS document related to surface water. The comments below are only presented when providing more detailed technical findings that are presented in the overall findings section.

2.3.3.1 Appendix L1 – Surface Water hydrology and geomorphology

Section 3.2 – Data Collection and Review

Data review and sources are presented. No discussion of quality or accuracy of data is presented.

Section 3.3 – Existing environment modelling and analysis

Hydrology – % Impervious parameters are generally ok for existing except it is reported that 10% imperviousness has been used for Infrastructure. It is not clear what “Infrastructure” refers to or what it was applied to. Might be a typographical error and is supposed to be 100% for buildings etc.

Figure 3-1 shows catchment areas for the existing scenario. This figure would aid understanding if surface contours were also provided to show the topography associated with the catchment delineation. The figure also does not show the Badgerys Creek, Cosgroves Creek and Duncans Creek catchments, which are referenced in Table 3-3. Such broader catchments are shown in Figure 4-2.

Roughness parameters used in hydraulic modelling are generally acceptable, although there could be a wider range of categories to represent more land use types, particularly for creek roughness.

Downstream boundary is noted as a normal depth boundary. This should be checked against flood levels in South Creek and an appropriate coincident flood chosen for the tailwater condition. For example if the 5 year ARI flood in South Creek is higher than the normal depth within Badgerys Creek for a 100 year ARI, then the South Creek tailwater condition should be adopted.

Section 3.4 – Stage 1 and longer term modelling and analysis

Figure 3-5 and Figure 3-6 would be enhanced by providing the Stage 1 design contours and the longer term development design contours, respectively. It is difficult to understand the topography used for catchment delineation or hydraulic model setup, particularly for Stage 1 where only half the site will be constructed.

Section 3.5 Impact Assessment

The assessment considered the impacts of the development on:

- surface flows, including the effectiveness of the proposed basins in mitigating changes to hydrology;
- watercourse geomorphology;
- flooding and flood risk to surrounding developments and people; and
- cumulative aspects.

The assessment did fully consider:

- native flora and fauna habitat removal and degradation (on site and in surrounding areas that may be affected by the action) – e.g. the ecology of sensitive receiving environments
- changes in recreational use and amenity of natural areas
- creation of any risks or hazards to people or property – no consideration of flood hazard (velocity x depth criteria) or any risks posed by dam break of detention basins.

Consideration of climate change is included in the assessment

Sensitivity of model parameters is included in the assessment

A validation of model results against previous studies has been undertaken

Section 4 – Existing Environment

The report notes the following flood affected properties – “There are a number of existing dwellings located within the flood extent or in close proximity to the flood extent clustered on Badgerys Creek upstream of the site. Two dwellings in close proximity to the flood extent were also identified downstream of the airport site on Cosgroves Creek. On the eastern bank of Badgerys Creek are a number of flood affected lots, though the existing dwellings are located beyond the 100 year flood extent”.

There is no comparison of the actual increase in flood level at these properties documented as part of impact assessment in later sections of the report.

Section 5 – Construction Impacts

It is noted that due to the long construction period, the likelihood of a major flood event occurring is high. Due to the modifications to the site and impervious area added, the volume of runoff from the site would increase and without mitigation, this would result in increased peak flows from the site and the potential for associated flooding and geomorphological impacts downstream.

Given the high likelihood of flooding, specific management measures should be identified rather than a general statement that it needs to be managed.

Section 6.1 – Operational Impacts Stage 1 Development

Duncans Creek or its tributaries have not been modelled with a hydraulic model to allow definition of baseline and relative hydraulic impacts in these locations. The EIS notes that “The land use downstream of the site was largely primary industry, with few dwellings identified close to the creek. Following the hydrology assessment, the benefit of developing a detailed hydraulic model of Duncans Creek to inform the impact assessment was considered limited. An impact assessment was carried out but was based on the findings of the hydrology model at the points of discharge from the site for Duncans Creek”. As such, all summary impacts do not fully consider impacts on the Duncans Creek downstream areas.

Figures 4-6 to 4-9 of Stage 1 development flood depth results would be enhanced with an overlay of the Stage 1 development masterplan to understand the flood extents in relation to the development. Further providing the locations of properties with above floor flooding from Figure 1-1 would allow an easy assessment of flood impacts at those locations.

Figures showing afflux (change in flood level/depth) for Stage 1 development are only provided for the 1, 5 and 100 year ARI events, so it is not clear what the relative impacts are for other modelled design storm events i.e. 20 year ARI and PMF.

Conclusions focus on the one year ARI, five year ARI and the 100 year ARI. There is no presentation or discussion of other intermediate design storm events to ascertain whether there are impacts for these events.

The EIS discusses the tributary of Badgerys Creek that joins Badgerys Creek approximately 300 metres downstream of Elizabeth Drive under existing conditions. It acknowledges that threatened ecological communities have not been mapped outside the site as part of the biodiversity assessment, but there is evidence of some remnant native vegetation along this reach of creek which would be reliant on occasional flooding and would be impacted under the current proposals. Such impacts may be important and should be addressed.

The EIS states that “Where increases in flow discharging from the basins are predicted, no major impacts to flood prone residences are predicted, though some increases in flow depths are indicated”.

- There is no quantification of the impact to flood prone residences, so it is unknown what is meant by “no major impacts”.

The EIS identifies residual impacts on Oaky Creek and the identified tributary of Badgerys Creek. It states that it is expected that the basin strategy would mitigate the major impacts of changes to surface water from the development, though refinement of the strategy during design development would be required to reduce

impacts to negligible levels and address specific more substantial impacts on Oaky Creek and the identified tributary of Badgerys Creek.

- This is a loose statement and merely states that the action would be required. There is no specific criteria set to tie achievement of an appropriate outcome back to the approval.

The EIS does not clearly summarise the residual impacts, rather they are dispersed through the sections.

Section 6.1.2 – Impacts on watercourse geomorphology

The EIS concludes that as flow durations for the modelled events under the Stage 1 conditions remain similar to existing conditions, and peak discharges typically reduce, the potential for significant impacts to the morphology of watercourses downstream is considered low.

Further, existing bed shear stress levels are noted to be between 20-100 N/m² (from Figures C1-C3) and changes in shear stress values as a result of the Stage 1 Development are between – 5 to +5 N/m². The EIS uses shear stress thresholds for the disturbance of vegetation and surface erosion in the range of 100 to 200 N/m² and concludes that “Given the modelled shear stress changes under the Stage 1 Development are typically at least less than 5% of this threshold range, the Stage 1 Development is unlikely to result in widespread and significant further exceedances of thresholds for the disturbance of vegetation and surface erosion along watercourses adjoining and downstream of the airport site”.

The following comments are made:

- The statements assume vegetation cover for this threshold value to be valid and does not consider the critical shear stress of the in-situ bed sediments which are likely present which have lower threshold shear stress, generally 50-200 for cobbles, 5-50 for gravel and <5 for sands, silts and clays
- the in-situ stream condition may be susceptible to erosion under existing shear stress values and any change may worsen the level of erosion.
- further, if the existing shear stress is actually closer to 20N/m², then a 5N/m² change is actually a 25% change which could be significant.
- the calculations note increases in bed shear stress which could lead to greater erosion, so it is difficult to conclude that impacts are low without further management or criteria placed on future design.

Section 6.2 - Long Term Development

It is noted that changes to catchments could create a transfer of water from the Water Sharing Plan's Wallacia Weir Management Zone (in which Duncans Creek is located) to the Upper South Creek Management Zone (in which Badgerys, Oaky and Cosgroves Creeks are located). The implications of this are not discussed.

On Duncans Creek, there is a predicted increase in flow in a 100 year ARI event at Location K, and there is potential for localised increase in flooding and scour at this location under large flood events. No basin is currently proposed at this location although is noted that consideration of a basin at this location is included as a management measure.

The EIS concludes that as flow durations for the modelled events under the longer term development conditions remain similar to existing conditions, and peak discharges typically reduce, the potential for significant impacts to the morphology of watercourses downstream is considered low. Figures 6-14 to 6-21 show that flow durations will actually be longer under the longer term development as would be expected from the behaviour of detention basins.

In addition, Cardno make the same comments as for Stage 1 in that increases in bed shear stress could lead to greater erosion, so it is difficult to conclude that impacts are low without further management or criteria placed on future design.

Section 7 Cumulative Impacts

Changes to flood depth for Climate Change scenarios are presented in Figure 7-1 and Figure 7-2. The scale and information presented does not provide a clear understanding of the impacts. An afflux/difference plot would more clearly show the changes in flood depth expected in these scenarios.

Cumulative impacts of surrounding development is discussed, however, only very briefly and no assessment or quantification of the impacts has been undertaken.

2.3.3.2 Appendix L2 – Surface Water Quality

Section 2 – Methodology

Legislation and guidelines are well documented.

The assessment uses industry accepted software – the Model for Urban Stormwater Improvement Conceptualisation (MUSIC).

Section 2.5 – MUSIC water quality modelling approach

The MUSIC model has used user defined nodes for the model setup and has adjusted parameters to calibrate the model against field data. This may not be appropriate given (as noted in the EIS) that the field data were discrete rather than continuous and little or no correlation to rainfall or flow conditions at the time of the sampling was available. As such, adjusted the model to suit sampling from a discrete time with no correlation and then using this to estimate water quality changes over longer periods may be flawed.

Table 2-7 and Table 2-9 show the Adopted Modelling Parameters for existing conditions and then the Stage 1 and longer term development, respectively. There are changes to parameters such as recharge rate increasing from 30% under existing conditions to 50% under Stage 1 which are not explained/justified and which may influence the results of the water quality modelling.

Section 2.5.4 notes that for the Stage 1 development modelling “The surface water management plans provided were based on an earlier version of the land use plan. As a result, there were minor inconsistencies between the data sources characterising the airport site. Where necessary, assumptions in the assessment were made to manage those discrepancies”. However, there is no detail provided about the assumptions.

Section 2.6 – Bio-retention basins sizing and treatment targets

In evaluating the effectiveness of the proposed measures, three treatment targets were assessed, as follows:

- existing or pre-development pollutant loads for total phosphorus, total nitrogen, and suspended solids (Neutral OR Beneficial Effect (NORBE));
- WSUD Guidelines (pollutant load reduction targets); and
- ANZECC Guidelines (pollutant concentration criteria).

The report states that “It is understood that the bio-retention sizes adopted in the Draft Airport Plan have been provided with the aim of satisfying WSUD Guidelines, rather than Neutral or reduced Beneficial Effects (NORBE) or ANZECC Guidelines. Accordingly, it is expected that supplementary design and management measures would be required during detailed design to further improve the water quality prior to downstream discharge.”

- This statement doesn’t indicate which criteria/guidelines the detailed design would need to meet. The technical report focusses on meeting ANZECC guidelines and suggest that this cannot be met with the current design. The report doesn’t give the impression that there are significant water quality issues other than this statement.

Section 3 – Existing Conditions

The existing environment is well described.

The presentation of meteorological data is complete and includes discussion of seasonal variability.

The assessment and description of existing land uses is well documented.

Section 4 – Assessment of operational impacts of proposal

Table 4-2 notes considerable increases in impervious (paved and roofed areas) for Stage 1 and longer term development scenarios which does not appear to be consistent with impervious area increases documented in Appendix L1 for hydrology. As such, it is not clear whether the water quality and flooding assessments are consistent.

Section 4.3 - Stage 1 development

Section 4.3.1 notes impacts in relation to NORBE guidelines. Key findings are:

- Local Impacts – There are large increases in pollutant loads at basin outlets as a result of the Stage 1 development (-40% to +497% for TSS, +108% to +624% for TP and +42% to +308% for TN). It is concluded that the bio-retention basins proposed for Stage 1 for water quality management are not adequate in satisfying the NORBE or pre-development load targets.
- Regional Impacts – the EIS states that “results indicate that the NORBE targets are not achieved at the downstream regional locations assessed with the bio-retention basins in place. However, it is expected that these regional impacts would progressively decrease at locations further downstream of the airport due to the increasing loads derived from catchments outside the airport at those downstream locations”.

Section 4.3.2 documents performance in relation to WSUD Technical Guidelines for pollutant load reduction targets. This shows that reduction targets are met at only a few locations and generally only for one pollutant, never for all three (other than Basin 6 and 7 which come close to meeting the targets).

Section 4.3.3 notes impacts in relation to ANZECC guidelines. Key findings are:

- Local Impacts – There are general improvements in pollutant concentrations discharging from the site except for a few exceptions.
- Regional Impacts – similar to local impacts other than Duncans Creek where the concentrations are estimated to increase for all the three pollutants.
- ANZECC water quality objectives would not be achieved, despite the general improvements in water quality.

Cardno make the following comments:

- There are significant impacts to water quality which are not addressed as part of the currently proposal water quality measures and significant improvements to the design will be required to address water quality to meet any of the identified guidelines.
- Statements around meeting NORBE for regional impacts relies and flows and loads from other rural areas to “dilute” the impacts. This does not consider the cumulative impacts of surrounding developments that would reduce or worsen this effect.
- Not meeting the WSUD Guidelines is explained that this is due to land areas modified for the proposed airport development, or residual areas, that cannot physically discharge into the basins under Stage 1 of the development. Additional land management is required to intercept and treat such flowpaths or over-treatment of other areas which do discharge to basins would be required.

Section 5 – Assessment of Construction Impacts

This section identifies the appropriate impacts expected during construction and identifies then need for management through a Soil and Water Management Plan (SWMP) and a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). A water quality monitoring plan would also be developed and implemented as part of these plans to monitor any potential impacts during the construction phases of the project.

Section 6 – Mitigation and management measures

This section identifies mitigation and management measures that can be implemented through design and management based measures for Operational Phase along with Construction Phase measures, namely erosion and sediment control. Mitigation measures are identified in a reasonably comprehensive list to address identified risks. However, as required by the EIS guidelines, the measures are not costed or responsibilities identified, nor are there any criteria provided which must be met for specific impacts requiring management.

2.3.3.3 Chapter 14 – Hazard and Risk

Chapter 14 addresses broadly how stormwater will be managed on site and the relevant design criteria.

The following comments are made:

- Section 14.5.3 notes that the airport infrastructure has been designed in accordance with the Stormwater Drainage Design Manual, however, this is not a full reference and it is not clear which Stormwater Drainage Design Manual is being referenced.
- In Section 14.5.3 it is noted that a “detailed surface water management plan would be developed to manage the impacts of on-site flooding during the construction period”, however, stormwater management plan to mitigate/manage site flooding is not listed in Table 14–5 – Mitigation measures to be resolved in future design stages.
- The EIS in Chapter 14 focusses on hazards and risks on site such as site flooding (Section 14.5.3), but does not necessarily consider hazards to people or property off-site such as the potential change in flood depth or hazard to adjacent and downstream areas. The EIS guidelines require consideration of the creation of any risks or hazards to people or property that may be associated with any component of the action.

2.3.3.4 Chapter 17 – Topography, geology and soils

Chapter 17 focusses on soil erosion and degradation on site and does not discuss the erosion potential for soils off-site that may be impacted by increased flow. Erosion and geomorphology are, however, discussed in Chapter 18 and Appendix L1.

Stage 1 design contour information, to identify the proposed ridgeline separating the Stage 1 runway and longer term second runway and the extent of earthworks proposed is not provided on any figures. Long term development design contours are not provided in any figures.

Chapter 17 also identifies a reclaimed water irrigation scheme and notes that “the principal risk associated with the operation of a reuse scheme is excess irrigation, leading to additional waterlogging, leaching of nutrients, a rise in water tables and increases in soil salinity or other soil properties.”

Section 17.6 identifies suitable management and mitigation measures to address:

- soil erosion and degradation - through a site soil and water management plan and erosion and sediment controls in accordance with relevant guidelines and standards as part of a construction Environmental Management Plan (EMP).
- Reclaimed irrigation scheme – through risk management framework in accordance with relevant guidelines and standards. It is also proposed that soil and groundwater conditions would be monitored to identify and correct trends in soil salinity or other potential effects of irrigation.

Cardno agree that these issues could be addressed through appropriate management plans, though identifying the appropriate standards and guidelines in use today would be a good benchmark, even if changes to standards require these references to be updated in the future.

2.3.3.5 Chapter 18 – Surface Water and Groundwater

Information reported in Chapter 18 is essentially taken from the technical reports Appendix L1 and L2, however, there is some omission of key information with no reference to the relevant information in the technical reports.

Cardno makes the following comments:

Stormwater and Flooding

- A sub-catchment breakdown of impervious areas is not provided and the impervious areas in Table 18-6 do not appear to be high enough given the expected large impervious areas presented by the airport. No figure is provided to show the catchments for Stage 1 in relation to the airport plan to understand the derivation of these values. This figure would also demonstrate the changes to the catchments from existing and how the detention basins are situated with respect to the proposed catchments.

- The only flood impacts noted are “increases of up to 100 mm in stream depths may occur at Cosgroves Creek and up to 250 mm in limited reaches of its tributary Oaky Creek for the smaller one year ARI and five year ARI events, plus associated increases in flow volume and velocity. No changes to flood levels are expected to occur at dwellings or other infrastructure surrounding the airport site”. There are no figures in the main EIS Chapter 18 provided to show where and what extents such increases cover. It does not describe what is impacted and does not quantify the impact in terms or areas or duration and any associated economic, social or environmental impacts. Further, it seems to only identify impact to current property and ignores future growth plans for WSEA and SWGC where such increases may affect the development potential of lands or properties that have been built in the interim prior to the airport’s construction.
- The EIS notes that stormwater would be used for site preparation works and notes that “to meet water demand during construction it may be necessary to source water from other sources such as groundwater or other sources of surface water. However, consideration of the impacts associated with using these alternative sources would be subject to a separate assessment”. – these impacts should be considered as part of this assessment if it is deemed that such sources would be potentially required either during normal weather or due to drought periods. Consideration of the total storage capacity of identified sources or basins with relation to demand should be undertaken to assess the likelihood of this eventuality.
- The nominated mitigation measures of potential impacts are through further refinement of the surface water drainage system to reduce flows as far as reasonably practical. However, this does not nominate whether this is likely to be easily achieved or whether there are limitations to this. Nor does it propose specific measures associated with the residual impacts and does not nominate a target outcome.

Water Quality

- Table 18-8 – there are some unusual results in this table. Phosphorus and suspended solids would normally increase and decrease in correlation with each other as phosphorus is adhered to sediments and is removed through settlement of suspended solids. Some results in this table show opposite trends for the two parameters.
- Section 18.6.3 notes that Stage 1 development leads to “general improvements in pollutant concentrations locally and regionally, the improvements would not be sufficient to meet ANZECC guideline objectives, noting the catchment has not met ANZECC guidelines for several years. Despite the general decrease in pollutant concentrations, Stage 1 would result in increased loads of phosphorous and nitrogen, largely as a function of the increase in runoff volumes associated with the modified catchment areas and changes to land-use”.
- The EIS notes that “further resolution of mitigation measures would be provided in the final EIS having regard to identified downstream assets and potential for impacts”. This is a fairly key statement and should have already been addressed given that downstream assets and potential for impacts should have already been identified as part of this draft EIS.
- The adopted reduction pollutant targets are derived from the UPRCT WSUD Guidelines for Western Sydney as being 80% for TSS, 40% for Total Phosphorus and 40% for Total Nitrogen. This document may be considered to be outdated and that adjacent Council DCP requirements may provide a better guidance on targets that should be adopted to align with the overall objectives of the receiving areas being managed by the relevant Councils. These would indicate pollutant reduction targets of 80% for TSS, 60% for Total Phosphorus, 45% for Total Nitrogen and 90% for Gross Pollutants.
- The EIS notes there would be increased pollutant loads due to increased runoff volumes, however, these are not reported in terms of the achieved reduction targets versus the adopted guidelines.
- The EIS also notes the potential for accidental spills of fuels and chemicals being released to the environment in the event of a mishap during refuelling, maintenance or general storage and handling. Management and mitigation of such spills is noted as the implementation of Australian

standards for the storage and handling of hazardous materials. This does not identify the appropriate example measures and does not call out the need for the development of a spill and remediation action plan.

2.3.3.6 Chapter 27 – Cumulative impacts

Section 27.3.5. Water Resources only considers cumulative impacts of water quality of receiving waters and indicates that there is an improvement in water quality from the airport site, which is not true for all locations, as documented in Section 18.6.3. Further, this seems to be with respect to general reductions in pollutant concentrations, yet it is noted that there would be increased loads of phosphorous and nitrogen due to increased runoff volume. Such loads are important and would in fact have a bearing on the cumulative impact and the capacity of the receiving environment to cope with such increased nutrient loads, particularly when added to loads from other surrounding developments.

Other potential cumulative impacts such as flood affectation and total runoff volumes have not been addressed in this chapter.

Cumulative Impacts of climate change and urban development are presented in Appendix L1, however, are not discussed in this Chapter of the draft EIS.

2.3.3.7 Chapter 28 – Environmental Management

This chapter discusses mitigation measures identified in earlier chapters. It identifies proposed environmental management plans and timing, however, does not always note what organisation is responsible for undertaking the monitoring/management except during construction and operation. Preparation of a plan to refine the surface water drainage system during detailed design timing is identified as a “pre-construction”, however, does not note who would be responsible for developing it.

2.3.3.8 Chapter 29 – Conclusion

Table 29–1 – Provides a summary of key environmental impacts. The following comments are made:

- Under “Water” it states “While there are potential risks to surface and groundwater resources from construction and operation of the airport site, most of these are not specific to airport developments and a range of standard industry design and precautionary measures would be implemented to reduce these risks”.
 - It does not appear relevant whether impacts are specific to airport developments. It appears as though it is suggesting that impacts can be managed as per common practice for other major infrastructure developments, however, the specific impacts have not been identified in this summary.
- Under “Surface water and groundwater” it states “Changes to catchment areas within the airport site and the permeability of the ground surface, would alter the duration, volume and velocity of surface water flow”.
 - There is no discussion on the implications or actual impacts that altered duration, volume and velocity of surface water flow would have.

2.3.4 Groundwater – Detailed Findings

This section follows a chronological reading of the technical groundwater report (Appendix L3) and the groundwater sections of the EIS document (Section 18). The comments below are only presented when providing more detailed technical findings that are presented in the overall findings section.

2.3.4.1 Groundwater Technical Report – Appendix L3

Table of contents:

Cardno notes that no methodology is included therefore, no qualification of the data is provided in terms of reliability, age and completeness.

Section 2.4.2 Water Sharing Plans on Access to Groundwater

The water sharing plan identifies spare allocation for the Sydney Basin central porous rock aquifer as stated in the report. If the project requires groundwater supply, it will need to be provided from the Hawkesbury Sandstone and will require liaison with the NSW Office of Water.

Section 3.3 Geology:

There is a terminology error in the Bringelly Shale description. The report should read laminite (defined as a sedimentary rock composed of very fine layers) instead of laminate.

The Luddenham Dyke should be named on the geological map. This would provide more understanding about groundwater flow direction if mapped on the groundwater level contour map.

Section 3.4.1 Aquifer Parameters

Aquifer water levels need to be compared together using the same elevation reference system. Water levels cannot be compared as the depth below ground level for bores are located at significant distance from each other. The values should be expressed as an elevation (m AHD). Because of this, the sentence “The standing water elevations relative to well depth in the surrounding registered use bores (presented in Appendix B), suggests there is a strong downward head gradient, which supports the presence of very low vertical hydraulic conductivities” is technically incorrect. If compared correctly the data is likely to still indicate a downwards gradient. The issue however does not affect the outcome of the impact assessment.

Section 3.5 Groundwater Elevation

Cardno’s review disagrees with the conclusion that the data presented indicate that there is a limited hydraulic connection between the two aquifer systems. Cardno considers that there is the presence of low vertical hydraulic conductivities in the Bringelly Shale aquifer. The groundwater head difference between the alluvial aquifer and the Bringelly Shale are observed at two location to be 0.4 m and 1.4 m (not 2.4 m as wrongly calculated in the report). Cardno agrees that these values indicate a downward gradient. The gradient may change overtime due to the recharge or discharge of the alluvial aquifer. The formations being adjacent, there is likely to be some level of connectivity at the interface generally with a downwards contribution.

The presence of low vertical hydraulic conductivity in the shale is linked to the nature of the formation, the low value of the hydraulic conductivity acquired through hydraulic testing and the fact that generally vertical conductivity in fractured rock aquifers are a few orders of magnitude lower than the horizontal conductivity.

Section 3.7 Groundwater Recharge

This section is unnecessarily long and provides a list of previously acquired results without discussion and conclusion, the data is not used later in the report. Additionally, Cardno notes that the units are inconsistent preventing comparison of results.

Section 3.10 Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems

There is inconsistency between the map and the statement of the second paragraph as to the location of the vegetation of high groundwater dependence. The source and date of the data mapped is not provided. Ultimately, any remaining vegetation not in the creek corridor is expected to make place for the airport facilities. The groundwater impact assessment focusses on the groundwater dependent ecosystems along Badgerys Creek.

Section 3.11 Conceptual Model

The aquifer extents are wrongly defined if it applies to all aquifers. The current definition will only apply to the unconfined weathered rock aquifer (which is defined as intermittent).

For the unconfined regolith aquifer, the following comments are made:

- the thickness of the aquifer over the site needs to be known to inform on the role of the aquifer within the hydrogeological conceptual model;
- The water levels are unknown and the intermittent status is undocumented. The depth to groundwater is identified as ranging between 2.4 m and 4 m below the measuring point. This statement requires further characterisation on the timing of these measurements, the reliability of the

data and the distribution of the data available. The intermittent nature of the aquifer needs supporting information.

For the Bringelly Shale aquifer, the following comment is made:

- The classification as an aquifer requires some qualification. On a regional scale, the Bringelly Shale is considered as an aquitard (McNally 2009)¹, this is the reason why no producing bores are drilled within the Bringelly Shale and is supported by low hydraulic conductivities. Nevertheless, the classification needs to be consistent with the definition of the term aquifer adopted for the EIS. The technical report defines an aquifer as a groundwater bearing formation sufficiently permeable to transmit and yield groundwater. It is noted that the Bringelly Shale may contain some small water bearing zones associated with minor sandstone beds but the storage capacity is expected to be very low. As such the Bringelly Shale is more likely to seep water than yield a useful amount of water.

Figure 6 – Conceptual Hydrogeological Model shows the water pressures in the Bringelly Shale and the alluvial aquifer as the same which contradicts the previous findings. In line with the defined intermittent status of the weathered rock aquifer, no water table is drawn for that aquifer.

The interaction between creek and groundwater is partly explained through the documents. It could however be improved by including discussion on creek perennial or ephemeral characteristics and illustration of surface water-groundwater interactions.

Section 4 Impact assessment

The approach taken in the EIS identified three categories of impact:

- impact from decreased recharge,
- impact from decrease of water levels,
- impact from change of water quality.

This approach ignores any other impacts as for example the potential increase of water levels due to underground constructions. However, this is unlikely to affect the outcome of the assessment. The report would gain in ease of reading by presenting a visual approach such as a table summarising the activity causing the impact (for e.g. change in ground conditions), the potential consequence/risk (for e.g. decrease of groundwater recharge) of the impact and the resulting impact on receptors/ groundwater values.

2.3.4.2 Groundwater Impact EIS Chapter 18

Information reported in Chapter 18 is essentially taken from the technical report, however some rewording has resulted in wrong statements.

Cardno makes the following comments:

- The section on groundwater levels (S 18.4.6) appears to assimilate water levels (expressed in depth to water in a monitoring bore) and the depth of the top of an aquifer. For confined systems, the depth to water level (water pressures) is usually not the depth to the top of the water bearing zone and can be found metres above the top of the geological formation. Access to it, however requires access to the geological formation.
- Paragraph 3 of Section 18.4.6, plural form for the Bringelly Shale suggesting a different groundwater system than previously stated.
- Last paragraph of Section 18.4, the Hawkesbury Sandstone is not preferably targeted for its better water quality than the Bringelly Shale but critically because it is an aquifer able to yield commercial amount of water as opposed to an aquitard.
- Section 18.5, introduction, the use of groundwater as a potential water supply has been commented upon earlier.

¹ Greg McNally, Soil and groundwater salinity in the shales of western Sydney, Proceedings of the International Association of Hydrogeologists, New South Wales Branch Groundwater in the Sydney Basin Symposium, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 4 – 5, August 2009

2.4 Review of Mitigation & Management Measures Proposed

Cardno has reviewed the proposed management strategies for technical soundness, practicality and reliability of the outcomes.

2.4.1 Surface Water

The EIS documents propose the following broad mitigation and management measures for surface water:

- **Surface Water Drainage System:** Preparation of a plan to refine the surface water drainage system during detailed design to address the following:
 - detailed design of basins and channels to capture the majority of runoff, including during construction;
 - refinement of drainage system design performance standards to optimise capacity and release timing, mimicking natural flows as far as practicable;
 - provision of intermediate sediment retention basins upstream of larger basins to provide additional treatment;
 - provision of separate bio-retention swales and basins to provide additional treatment and separation of these features from the drainage system to protect contained water during floods;
 - provision of pollutant traps to prevent debris and other coarse material entering the drainage system;
 - stabilisation structures at outlets to include rock check dams at regular intervals along channels and energy dissipaters at basin outlets; and
 - capacity for containment of accidental leaks or spills in the drainage system at maintenance areas, fuel farms or other areas where fuels or chemicals are stored or handled in accordance with Australian standards.
- **Erosion and Sedimentation:** The surface area disturbed at any one time would be minimised as far as possible by construction staging and stabilised with vegetation or appropriate cover.

Appendix L1 provides the following mitigation and management measures for specific surface water impacts:

- Changes to water level at Oaky Creek and on a tributary of Badgerys Creek need to be managed through subsequent design development.
- Need to further develop the basin strategy during design development such that the basins would be effective at mimicking natural flows as closely as possible across a range of storm durations and magnitudes including low and high flows.
- Consideration should be given to the need to introduce a basin or alternative water quantity management measure at one of the site discharge points into a tributary of Duncans Creek.
- Requirement to ensure that any future development in the vicinity of Badgerys Creek where it passes through the site would be appropriate for a third order creek, including protecting and preserving habitat along the riparian corridor and ensuring no worsening of flooding downstream.

The EIS documents provides the following monitoring specifications:

- Baseline and ongoing monitoring of surface water and groundwater would be undertaken to characterise any residual impacts and prompt corrective action where necessary.
- Surface water quality monitoring would be conducted at basin outflows and selected upstream and downstream conditions.

Cardno makes the following comments:

- There are differences between the summary tables for mitigation and management measures (Table 18–9 and Appendix L1 Table 8-1, Table 28–4 and Table 28-5) and mitigation and management measures discussed throughout the various chapters. Alignment of these would provide a clearer outcome and framework for future assessment and mitigation measures.

- It is agreed that many of the residual impacts relating to increase flows, velocities and water levels can be managed through refinement of the drainage system during detailed design.
- It is agreed that residual impacts relating to water quality can be managed through refinement of the drainage system during detailed design. However, the impacts at present are not clearly defined in terms of their ability to meet pollutant reduction loads and hence the likelihood of achieving these through refinement of the drainage treatment system is not clear.
- The EIS also notes the potential for accidental spills of fuels and chemicals being released to the environment in the event of a mishap during refuelling, maintenance or general storage and handling. Management and mitigation of such spills is noted as the implementation of Australian standards for the storage and handling of hazardous materials. This does not identify the appropriate example measures and does not call out the need for the development of a spill and remediation action plan in Chapter 28.

2.4.2 Groundwater

The EIS documents propose the following mitigation and management measures for groundwater:

- The documents discuss possible mitigation measures to mitigate the risk of impact to groundwater dependent ecosystems. The documents recommend a reactive approach based on monitoring be considered.
- Water quality risks are to be managed through a series of measures either as part of the airport design or to be incorporated in the site construction environmental management plan and the operational environmental management plan.

The EIS documents provides the following monitoring specifications:

- Key locations for monitoring: the areas of monitoring proposed in the EIS report target sensitive creeks and groundwater dependent ecosystems. The technical report provides additional locations.
 - areas of subsurface infrastructure and cuttings where seepage could occur to characterise potential groundwater impacts (water level);
 - areas near creeks and areas with groundwater dependent ecosystems (water level, water quality);
 - around and down-gradient of major infrastructure (water quality);
 - surface water down-gradient of key site works (seepage monitoring during dry periods, water quality).
- Monitoring target: Bringelly Shale, alluvial aquifer, possibly targeted fill areas and creeks.
- Frequency: quarterly monitoring for water levels and water quality
- Length: three years or until stabilisation
- Baseline monitoring on a quarterly basis.

Cardno makes the following comments:

- Monitoring location and frequency needs to be defined based on the risk of impact. Generally Cardno agrees with the locations defined in the technical report, however Cardno would recommend that the need for monitoring near infrastructure be assessed on a case by case basis;
- Cardno agrees with the monitoring targets. The unconfined weathered rock aquifer may need to be included in the target (this will depend on the outcome of its characterisation);
- Frequency:
 - The water quality monitoring frequency is suitable for detection of contamination near the infrastructure;

- The water quality monitoring frequency is suitable for acquisition of baseline in the aquifers near sensitive ecological receptors and upon review of the data, the frequency could then be reduced;
- The water level frequency is not suitable for baseline acquisition or for ongoing monitoring. Baseline acquisition requires daily water level data (through the use of an automated logger and quarterly manual water level to confirm the logged data). This is even more critical in aquifers which are subject to discharge to creek and to direct rainfall recharge. The data is critical for assessment of water level changes during operation and removal of natural variability which may otherwise trigger an exceedance. The definition of the frequency monitoring for ongoing monitoring should be based on the assessment of the baseline data.
- Length: the length provided in the EIS documents is acceptable. Cardno notes that monitoring of baseline would ideally start before the start of any activities on site, one year is often a minimum recommended time.
- Water quality parameters: the parameters defined in the technical study are suitable for contamination identification. With respect to baseline, some analytes would need to be changed to allow for a full characterisation. Critically major cations and anions should be added. Cardno notes that suspended solids are typically done only in surface water monitoring.

Cardno makes the additional comments on the approach and specifications taken to management and mitigation:

- The management and mitigation measures do not include a response plan. The approach provided in the EIS documents is suitable for the detection of contamination, however not suitable for the identification of impact to groundwater levels affecting groundwater dependent ecosystems. The response plan should take into consideration the level of risk associated with a confirmed exceedance, the time for impact propagation (i.e. the time available for implementing mitigation if required), identify the various steps between identification of an exceedance and mitigation and identify the regulatory and compliance requirements applicable to the situation.
- The use of the ANZECC Guidelines 2000 as a trigger will not necessarily be successful. As identified in the EIS documents, natural concentrations for a number of water parameters currently exceed the ANZECC 20000. It is recommended that triggers be defined specific to the protected environmental value. For contamination to groundwater, the NSW Contaminated Land Management Act 1997 (CLM Act) should be referred to.

2.5 Discussion on Existing Level of Uncertainty over Environmental Risks and Impacts

2.5.1 Surface Water

While the approach, methodology and description of parameters appear to be appropriate, a robust presentation of inputs to the hydrology and hydraulic model setup is lacking. For example, figures showing catchments do not show overlays of topography, airport concept plan layouts or the water management strategy. As such the figures do not allow an assessment of the appropriateness of catchment delineation, stormwater design or assignment of impervious percentages.

While it is noted that a full range of design rainfall events has been modelled (1, 2, 5, 20, 100 year ARI and PMF), not all events are presented in the impacts. It is assumed that intermediate events are unlikely to alter from the trend of results presented, however, they have not been documented and hence some uncertainty remains.

Impacts on Duncans Creek are only assumed at this stage and no hydraulic assessment has been undertaken. Further no mitigation measures are proposed other than consideration of a basin at this location

Limitations with water quality monitoring are noted and this lends to uncertainty over the baseline water quality levels. However, a model has been used for simulating water quality impacts and was calibrated to the monitoring data. As such, the model should provide a reasonable estimate of the relative impacts from the airport construction.

Further, it is noted that a surface water quality monitoring program will be implemented to collect additional background data prior to the commencement of construction to provide additional baseline data to allow further calibration of the modelled results. This will allow a more robust design to be developed to address water quality relative to better data into the future.

2.5.2 Groundwater

The main uncertainties come from the assumption that the unconfined regolith aquifer is intermittent. The assumption is unsubstantiated in the EIS documents. If the assumption is proven to be valid, then the overall risk to groundwater values will be insignificant. If the assumption is not valid, the groundwater dependent ecosystems in Badgerys Creek could be at risk of impact from reduced groundwater flow towards the groundwater dependent ecosystem due to changes to the ground surface and infiltration/recharge.

3 Detailed findings – Long Term Development

3.1 Description of Approach to Impact Assessment Developed in the EIS

3.1.1 Surface Water

The assessment of the Long Term Development builds on the assessment of impacts associated with the Stage 1 development. The assessments focusses on the operational impacts and construction impacts have not been considered due to the unknowns surrounding the final Stage 2 layout and the timing of construction being so far into the future.

The EIS uses the predictive numerical models to consider the impact of the change in landform characteristics on runoff volumes and the subsequent impacts on stream flow, flooding, groundwater recharge and water quality. Potential impacts on the environmental values and beneficial uses of surface and groundwater resources were identified, and options for future management practices were considered as part of the assessment.

The hydrologic, hydraulic and water quality models used in the assessment include representations of the drainage system incorporated into the concept design of the indicative long term development.

The concept design of the long term development includes expanding the drainage system to control the flow of surface water. An extension of the Stage 1 detention basins is proposed together with provision of an additional detention basin in the longer term.

The results of the models were analysed to identify impacts on waterways, people and property and thereby assess the effectiveness of the drainage system. The drainage system has been designed to contain flows up to the 100 year average recurrence interval (ARI) event.

A climate change scenario to determine likely impacts has also been considered.

3.1.2 Groundwater

The EIS's approach is that the risk to groundwater and groundwater values will not change between the first stage and the operational phase, neither will the level of impact (S 34.4.4).

Cardno agrees that the risks to groundwater values are unchanged. However, a new risk, the risk associated with irrigation of reclaimed water needs to be included in the discussion. The risk is discussed in a previous section (S 34.4.3), but the discussion does not consider products such as fertilisers often associated with irrigation which may have an impact on groundwater dependent ecosystem along the creek.

The risk to groundwater dependent ecosystem is the same as during the first stage of development and also needs to be considered for the long term development unless proven insignificant.

Cardno agrees with the EIS on other conclusions regarding long term impacts to groundwater, as follows:

- The modification of groundwater flow are minor and located near underground structures, they would result in minor groundwater seepage which is required to be controlled through infrastructure design.
- There would be no impact to groundwater users, note that this assumes groundwater will not be used as water supply at the site. Impact to groundwater users will required to be assessed separately would the project decide to use groundwater as a supply.
- There is a risk to groundwater quality through chemical contamination release and spills. The risk can be managed efficiently though a number of measures such as implementation of Australian standards and best practices and implementation of an environment management plan.

3.2 Assessment Gap Identification

3.2.1 Surface Water

Gaps in the assessment are largely the same as for Stage 1 development:

- Duncans Creek and its tributaries have not been modelled to allow definition of baseline and relative hydraulic impacts in these locations. As such, all summary impacts do not fully consider impacts to the Duncans Creek downstream areas. Investigation of a basin at this location is proposed as a mitigation/management measure.
- Cumulative impacts have been discussed, however, no assessment has been undertaken to quantify the potential impacts other than for climate change scenarios.
- Various detention basin peak outflow values are higher than existing peak flows, indicating that there is likely to be an impact of stream flood depths downstream, however, such increases are not reported to occur. Further, there are no figures presenting the afflux (changes in flood level/depth) presented in the main report (Chapter 18) to clearly show the modelled impacts at all locations.
- Water quality impacts have not been presented in terms of achieved pollutant load reduction or assessment against guideline pollutant reduction targets. The EIS seems to dismiss any relevance of increased pollutant loads on the receiving environment and instead determines that impacts are acceptable because there are general improvements in pollutant concentrations due to increased flow volumes.
- Threatened ecological communities have not been mapped outside the site as part of the biodiversity assessment. But there is evidence of some remnant native vegetation along the tributary of Badgerys Creek that joins Badgerys Creek approximately 300 metres downstream of Elizabeth Drive under existing conditions. This reach of creek would be reliant on occasional flooding and would be impacted under the current proposals. Such impacts need to be assessed to ensure there are no impacts and any mitigation and management measures identified.

3.2.2 **Groundwater**

The following gaps have been identified. The data gaps affect both the first stage and the operational phase of the airport project.

- The weathered rock (regolith) aquifer requires further characterisation to establish its role in regards to supply to the alluvial aquifer and as such potential indirect impact from reduced recharge to the groundwater dependent ecosystems. This data gap should ideally be addressed during the first stage of development. The study will be followed by a review of the risk to groundwater dependent ecosystems along Badgerys Creek.
- Similarly, attention should also be brought to the role played by streamflow in the recharge of the alluvial aquifer and the impacts which can result from the design of flow control elements.
- Time series water level data are required to be collected as baseline for the alluvial aquifer, the Bringelly Shale and the weathered rock (regolith) aquifer to allow for the consideration of natural variations when assessing long term compliance data.
- A groundwater management and mitigation plan will need to be developed upon collection of groundwater baseline and groundwater characterisation of the groundwater dependent ecosystem and the weathered rock (regolith) aquifer. The plan should allow for a risk based approach to monitoring and mitigation and the project team should engage early during preparation with the applicable regulatory agencies.
- Handling of chemical and wastes may warrant some operation licences under the NSW POEO Act. The project team should consult with the NSW EPA. The monitoring requirements should be included in the site environmental management plan.
- A separate groundwater assessment and liaison with the NSW Office of Water would be required would the project decides to use groundwater as a water supply option either for construction or ongoing use. Groundwater would be sourced from the Hawkesbury Sandstone.

Upon addressing the data gaps identified above, the risks and associated impacts should be reviewed.

3.3 Resulting Key Risks and Implications

3.3.1 Surface Water

The following risks to surface water for the long term development and their implications have been identified:

- Outstanding localised increases to flood depths in Cosgroves, Oaky and Badgerys Creeks.
- Risks to erosion and geomorphological changes to the downstream creeks due to increases in bed shear stress at various locations
- Undefined impacts and mitigation for flood and geomorphology due to runoff to Duncans Creek.
- Implications of increases in pollutant loads, particularly for cumulative impacts are not addressed.
- Ecological impacts in receiving waters are not clearly addressed
- Impacts of potential use of stormwater to provide water supply for site preparation works has not been considered.

It is believed that most of the above issues can be addressed through refinement of the drainage strategy to manage flows, velocities and water quality. There are some outstanding impact assessments which have not been considered and should be addressed.

3.3.2 Groundwater

The following risks to groundwater for the long term development and their implications have been identified:

- Risk associated with change of land use and decrease of groundwater recharge. The implication is possibly, a lack of groundwater supply to the groundwater dependent ecosystems (EPBC listed). If the studies highlighted in the data gap analysis confirm that there is a risk, an artificial groundwater supply scheme to the alluvial aquifer will possibly be required. If the studies identify that there is no risk of impact to the groundwater dependent ecosystem water supply, then no further work will be required.
- Risk associated with the possible use of chemicals over irrigated areas. The level of risk will depend largely on locations and practices. The implication is possibly an impact to the health of groundwater dependent ecosystem through runoff and infiltration in the alluvial aquifer. Management of this risk implies best practices be followed for the use of fertilizer and pesticides, additionally, targeted analytes could be included in groundwater monitoring.
- Risk associated with the use of groundwater as a supply. A groundwater assessment will be required to establish whether the extraction of the required volume is feasible and the impact on nearby groundwater users. It should be noted that the target aquifer will be the deeper Hawkesbury Sandstone. The implications in terms of work required will depend on the volume required. At most, the studies for a groundwater assessment are likely to require the drilling of a few wells (at least one observation and one pumping well), pump testing and analysis and some groundwater modelling.

3.4 Effectiveness of assessment in setting a framework for further assessment

3.4.1 Surface Water

A reasonably robust assessment of the long term development has been undertaken. There is no formal framework for further assessment established as part of the EIS. The EIS for the Long Term Development simply lists considerations for future development as part of future design stages to address the impacts to be minimised. While this list identifies some of the key items to be addressed, it does not recommend any specific measures or processes that must be adhered to so as to tie those activities back to this EIS and associated approvals.

3.4.2 **Groundwater**

The EIS identifies some of the required assessments and activities especially in relation to water quality management. The EIS also identifies that additional assessments will be required would the project require to use groundwater as a water supply. However, the EIS did not identify the state and federal regulatory processes likely to be required for the management of the site groundwater values (liaison, review and approvals, licences for example), nor did it clearly identify the management plans and response plans required to be in place. The EIS did not identify assessment remaining to be performed to collect baseline data and confirm the hydrogeological conceptual model.

4 Key Project impacts and opportunities

Key project impacts are as follows:

- Localised increases in flood depths are indicated at a number of locations.
- Impacts in Duncans Creek are not fully considered and additional modelling would be required to determine residual impacts and any proposed management measures.
- Potential erosion and geomorphology changes with increased flow volumes and isolated increases in bed shear stress.
- Increased pollutant loads for total suspended solids and nutrients, although pollutant concentration are equal or reduced compared to existing.
- Impacts during construction related to water demand for site preparation works are not fully considered.
- Impacts on the groundwater dependent ecosystem associated with Badgerys Creek are not fully identified due to a lack of characterisation of the alluvium aquifer and in particular of:
 - The relationship between the alluvial aquifer and the weathered rock (regolith) aquifer; and
 - The characterisation of the recharge of the alluvium aquifer.
- These groundwater dependent ecosystems are declared a Matter of National and Environmental Significance under the EPBC Act. A review of the groundwater conceptual model would be required to enable characterisation of the impacts on the Badgerys Creek groundwater dependent ecosystem.

There is an opportunity to improve the outcomes of the EIS to manage the residual impacts through refinement of the drainage strategy and management plans during future detailed design stages. It is recommended that the residual impacts are clearly defined in the EIS and summarised in a separate chapter and appropriate specific management measures and targets be proposed or specified to ensure that these issues are addressed.

Given the complete redevelopment and large earthworks taking place on site, there is opportunity to introduce even higher levels of stormwater management and water quality treatment to further minimise the impacts of the project and potentially improve the outcomes. This would assist in minimising cumulative impacts on the environment that may occur in combination with the surrounding South West Growth Centre and Western Sydney Employment Area development impacts. With respect to groundwater impacts, there is an opportunity before site activities to acquire suitable baseline data and review the level of risk to the groundwater dependent ecosystem along the creeks. There is also an opportunity to define site design requirements to ensure recharge of the alluvium aquifer and consequently preservation of Badgerys Creek groundwater dependent ecosystem.

5 Reviewers' Qualifications

No significant qualifications are noted other than the limited time available for review. The entire document has not been read and reviewed, and only selected components have been reviewed as outlined in Section 1.4.

The general chapters, particularly describing the project and the airport plan have not been read in depth, but rather reviewed in brief to identify relevant background information sufficient to inform this review. The focus has been on reviewing the relevant specialist chapters and technical reports in detail.

While all care has been taken to identify the relevant sections of the EIS, a guarantee cannot be provided that some relevant information pertaining to surface water and groundwater is not contained within other sections of the EIS such as "Biodiversity" and "Planning and Land Use".

The review is limited to comments on the methodology, processes and outcomes presented. As no data or models have been reviewed, it is difficult to confirm whether the inputs, parameters and model setup is accurate and appropriate, especially for the water quality assessment. As noted throughout the review, figures to support the descriptions of inputs and outcomes are not well presented often lacking vital information to ease understanding.

Appendix I

Biodiversity (EMM)



Western Sydney Airport EIS

Biodiversity Assessment Peer Review

Prepared for WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff | 19 November 2015



Western Sydney Airport EIS

Biodiversity Assessment Peer Review

Prepared for WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff | 19 November 2015

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

T +61 2 9493 9500

F +61 2 9493 9599

E info@emmconsulting.com.au

www.emmconsulting.com.au

Western Sydney Airport EIS

Final

Report J15103RP2 | Prepared for WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff | 19 November 2015

Prepared by **Katie Whiting**

Approved by **Duncan Peake**

Position Associate – Ecology Services
Manager

Position Associate Director - Executive
Leader

Signature



Signature



Date 19 November 2015

Date 19 November 2015

This report has been prepared in accordance with the brief provided by the client and has relied upon the information collected at the time and under the conditions specified in the report. All findings, conclusions or recommendations contained in the report are based on the aforementioned circumstances. The report is for the use of the client and no responsibility will be taken for its use by other parties. The client may, at its discretion, use the report to inform regulators and the public.

© Reproduction of this report for educational or other non-commercial purposes is authorised without prior written permission from EMM provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of this report for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without EMM's prior written permission.

Document Control

Version	Date	Prepared by	Reviewed by
1	9 November 2015	Katie Whiting	Duncan Peake
2	19 November 2015	Katie Whiting	Duncan Peake



T +61 (0)2 9493 9500 | F +61 (0)2 9493 9599

Ground Floor | Suite 01 | 20 Chandos Street | St Leonards | New South Wales | 2065 | Australia

www.emmconsulting.com.au

Executive summary

ES1 Introduction

EMM Consulting Pty Limited was commissioned to conduct a peer review of the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1), Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) and biodiversity chapter (EIS Chapter 16) of the *Western Sydney Airport Environmental Impact Statement* (GHD 2015a). The purpose of the review is to provide the Western Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils (WSROC) and Macarthur Regional Organisation of Councils (MACROC) with factual, unbiased information regarding the technical rigour of the biodiversity study. The review will provide information to support individual submissions from WSROC and MACROC on the environmental impact statement (EIS) and supporting technical studies.

ES2 Approach

The adequacy of the above documents was reviewed against the *Western Sydney Airport EIS guidelines* (the EIS guidelines), biodiversity survey and assessment guidelines and background data, where appropriate. The review criteria comprised:

- evaluate if the biodiversity study meets the requirements of the EIS guidelines and other relevant guidelines and methods;
- evaluate the validity of the data relied upon to inform the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1);
- evaluate the validity of the underlying assumptions of the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1);
- evaluate the validity of the conclusions reached in the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1);
- review the mitigation and management measures proposed and advise of the adequacy in mitigating impacts; and
- evaluate the level of uncertainty of biodiversity impacts and provide advice on the resulting environmental risks.

A summary of the key impacts and opportunities associated with the project has also been provided.

ES3 Stage 1 development review findings

The reports were found to be generally compliant with the EIS guidelines. However, a number of partial and non-compliances were identified. The assumptions and conclusions of the assessment were considered valid, with the exception of three criteria which were deemed 'partially compliant'. The proposed mitigation and management measures were deemed suitable for this stage of the project, with further information required prior to construction with respect to biodiversity and environmental management.

Data gaps were identified with respect to land access restrictions, threatened species locations, the assessment of threatened species, and a large deficit in the proposed offsets. The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) does not clearly define the extent of land access restrictions. A key risk associated with

insufficient access (if this is the case) is that biodiversity values and offsetting requirements may have been underestimated.

Assessments of significance were not completed for the Green and Golden Bell Frog, Australasian Bittern, Australian Painted Snipe and a number of migratory species listed under the EPBC Act. Key risks associated with the omission of these assessments are that the level of impact and the offsets required may have been underestimated. The large credit deficit, particularly for Cumberland Plain Woodland in the Sydney Basin Bioregion, listed as a critically endangered ecological community under the *Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995* (TSC Act) and *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* is a key risk as it is not currently known if the quantum of offsets required is available.

ES4 Long-term development review findings

The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) (GHD 2015b) provides a general assessment of adverse the long-term development impacts of the project. However, it does not consider the potential impact of successful implementation of biodiversity management measures from the Stage 1 development, which may result in increased biodiversity values and therefore underestimate the longer-term development impacts. In addition, the Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) does not state how offsets will be identified and secured for the long-term development.

ES5 Key impacts and opportunities

Key impacts of the project comprise:

- the loss of 90 ha of Cumberland Plain Shale Woodlands and Shale Gravel Transition Forest critically endangered ecological community; and
- the loss of 120 ha of habitat critical to the survival of the Grey-headed Flying-fox, a vulnerable species.

Key opportunities of the project comprise:

- location of the airport site on predominantly cleared land;
- identification of potentially suitable offset sites on private property that may have otherwise degraded, and been subject to key threatening processes;
- in addition to the offsets, the creation of an on-site environmental conservation zone, containing native vegetation representative of the vegetation types to be cleared.

Table of contents

Executive summary	E.1
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Approach	1
1.3 Limitations	3
1.4 Components of the EIS reviewed	3
Chapter 2 Detailed findings - Stage 1 development	5
2.1 Compliance of the Biodiversity Assessment with the Western Sydney Airport EIS Guidelines	5
2.2 Validity of data relied upon	15
2.3 Validity of assumptions	17
2.4 Validity of conclusions	18
2.5 Efficacy of proposed mitigation and management measures	18
2.5.1 Design	18
2.5.2 Pre-construction	19
2.5.3 Construction	20
2.5.4 Pre-operation and operation	20
2.6 Level of uncertainty regarding impacts and environmental risks	21
2.6.1 Uncertainty identified by the author	21
2.6.2 Data gaps and potential associated risks	22
Chapter 3 Detailed findings – long-term development	25
3.1 Overview of approach to assessment to long-term development taken in the Biodiversity Assessment	25
3.2 Gaps identified relative to a comprehensive/ conventional assessment	25
3.3 Key risks and implications as a result of the gaps	25
3.4 Effectiveness of assessment in setting a framework for further assessment	26
Chapter 4 Key impacts	27
4.1 Key project impacts to biodiversity	27
4.2 Key opportunities	28
Chapter 5 Conclusion	29
Chapter 6 Qualifications and study team	31
6.1 Lead peer reviewer - Katie Whiting – BSc, MWldMgt (Habitat)	31
6.2 Strategic direction - Duncan Peake – BSc (Hons)	31
References	33

Appendices

A Qualifications of reviewers

Tables

1.1	Method	1
2.1	Overview of compliance of EIS Chapter 16 Biodiversity, Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) and Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) with the EIS guidelines	7
2.2	Validity of data relied upon	15
2.3	Validity of assumptions	17

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff commissioned EMM Consulting Pty Limited (EMM) to complete a technical peer review of the biodiversity components of the Western Sydney Airport Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (GHD 2015a). These components comprise the EIS chapter 16 Biodiversity (GHD 2015a), Biodiversity Assessment Report (EIS Appendix K1) (GHD 2015b) and Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) (GHD 2015c).

The purpose of the review is to provide the Western Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils (WSROC) and Macarthur Regional Organisation of Councils (MACROC) with factual, unbiased information regarding the technical rigour of the biodiversity study. The review will provide information to support individual submissions from WSROC and MACROC on the EIS and supporting technical studies.

1.2 Approach

The review method is shown in Table 1.1, which provides details on the guidelines against which the technical rigour of the biodiversity study was assessed, and how each component of the biodiversity study was evaluated.

Table 1.1 Method

Scope item	Guidelines assessed against	How each scope item was evaluated
Prior to exhibition		
Background reading	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Detailed review of the 1997-1999 EIS.• Desktop review of local vegetation mapping datasets and plant community types for the bioregion.• Database searches on the Atlas of NSW Wildlife, OEH threatened species database and Protected Matters Search Tool to determine relevant threatened species, populations and communities (threatened biodiversity).• Review other publically available local biodiversity studies.
During exhibition		
Evaluate if the biodiversity study meets the requirements of the EIS Guidelines and relevant other guidelines and methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Guidelines for the content of a draft Environmental Impact Statement: Western Sydney Airport (Reference: EPBC 2014/7391)</i>• <i>Survey guidelines for Australia's threatened bats</i>• <i>Survey guidelines for Australia's threatened birds</i>• <i>Survey guidelines for Australia's threatened frogs</i>• <i>Survey guidelines for Australia's threatened mammals</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Detailed review against Section 4(a) of the EIS guidelines to and Commonwealth survey guidelines and referral guidelines for the Koala to determine if the survey effort has been completed satisfactorily.• Identify gaps in survey effort or the threatened biodiversity considered in the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1).• Confirm that potential groundwater dependent ecosystems have been investigated.

Table 1.1 Method

Scope item	Guidelines assessed against	How each scope item was evaluated
Evaluate the validity of the information relied upon	<p><i>threatened mammals</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Survey guidelines for Australia's threatened reptiles</i> • <i>EPBC Act referral guidelines for the vulnerable Koala</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compare local vegetation mapping datasets to those identified in the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) determine if vegetation types are accurate. • Review of justification for plant community types assigned in accordance with the Vegetation Information System to check accuracy. • Compare database search results to those identified in the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) to ensure all relevant threatened biodiversity have been identified and considered. • Review preliminary determinations for threatened species, populations and communities to ensure they are considered. • Compare the list of target threatened biodiversity to those identified in the desktop study to ensure all relevant target biodiversity has been identified. • Review of known threats to the threatened biodiversity identified. • Review the likelihood of occurrence for threatened biodiversity, to ensure all relevant species have been considered. • Review the assessments of significance to ensure that the necessary assessments have been completed. • Review calculations and assumptions used in the Commonwealth offset calculator. • Comparison of offset package against the offset principles in the <i>EPBC Act Environmental Offsets Policy</i>. • Review the identification of groundwater dependent ecosystems.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>EPBC Act Policy Statement 1.1 Significant Impact Guidelines for Matters of National Environmental Significance</i> • <i>EPBC Act Environmental Offsets Policy</i> 	
Evaluate the validity of the underlying assumptions used to inform the assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess validity and consistency against EIS Chapter 16, the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) and Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2).
Evaluate the validity of conclusions reached in the biodiversity study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>EPBC Act Policy Statement 1.1 Significant Impact Guidelines for Matters of National Environmental Significance</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the project description to determine the intensity, duration, magnitude and geographic extent of impacts. • Review assessments of significance against the Significant Impact Criteria in the <i>Significant Impact Guidelines for Matters of National Environmental Significance</i> for each relevant threatened species, population and community to ensure that all relevant direct and indirect impacts have been considered.

Table 1.1 Method

Scope item	Guidelines assessed against	How each scope item was evaluated
Review the mitigation and management measures proposed and advise of the adequacy in mitigating impacts	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review assessment of impacts on potential groundwater dependent ecosystems. review management and mitigation measures for the pre-construction, construction and operational stages and assess their suitability for the threatened species, communities and populations to be impacted.
Evaluate the level of uncertainty of biodiversity impacts and provide advice on the resulting environmental risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>EPBC Act Policy Statement 1.1 Significant Impact Guidelines for Matters of National Environmental Significance</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review conclusions of each assessment of significance and the impact assessment chapter to determine any uncertainty openly identified (ie where the precautionary principle has been applied due to data gaps) by the report author. Identify areas where data gaps exist and conclusions have been made without sufficient background data. Identify potential risks resulting from data gaps and changes to the outcome of assessments of significance.
Provide a summary of the key impacts and opportunities associated with the project and the biodiversity study	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarise the key impacts and opportunities identified in the biodiversity report. Summarise key data gaps and potential risks arising from these.

1.3 Limitations

This report is based on a desktop based assessment, with no field verification. Therefore, this review is reliant on the provision of information that is publically available, to determine the reliability and accuracy of the biodiversity study.

1.4 Components of the EIS reviewed

Three components of the EIS were reviewed, comprising the:

- Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) (GHD 2015b);
- Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) (GHD 2015c); and
- EIS Chapter 16 Biodiversity (GHD 2015a).

Other relevant background documents reviewed comprise the:

- Guidelines for the content of a draft Environmental Impact Statement: Western Sydney Airport* (hereafter referred to as the EIS guidelines);
- Draft Environmental Impact Statement Second Sydney Airport Proposal: Technical Paper 8 Flora and Fauna* (Biosis 1997); and
- Biodiversity Report: *Commonwealth Land at Badgery's Creek (SMEC 2014)*, hereafter referred to as 'the baseline report'.

2 Detailed findings - Stage 1 development

2.1 Compliance of the Biodiversity Assessment with the Western Sydney Airport EIS Guidelines

Table 2.1 summarises the EIS guidelines with respect to biodiversity and assesses the compliance of the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) with these guidelines. The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) is generally compliant with the EIS guidelines, with a few exceptions. Items that are not compliant have been classified into:

- partially compliant: items that have been completed, however sufficient detail has not been provided; and
- not compliant: items that have not been considered.

These comprise:

- partial compliance:
 - a detailed outline of the monitoring and management has been provided, however the future management plans will detail the outcomes to be achieved and a framework for auditing their effectiveness;
 - the self-assessment of biodiversity survey effort is not quantitative (ie does not compare number of plots, targeted searches and fauna survey effort against the number of sampling points and effort required);
 - assessments of significance have been completed for most species and communities listed under the EPBC Act. However, assessments have not been completed for the Green and Golden Bell Frog (*Litoria aurea*), Australasian Bittern (*Botaurus poiciliptilus*), Australian Painted Snipe (*Rostratula australis*) and migratory species, which are all considered likely to occur;
 - recovery plans have been considered in the assessments of significance. However, the recovery plans of species where assessments of significance were omitted (as above) have not been considered;
 - the EIS Chapter 16 and the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) report state that high-probability groundwater dependent ecosystems occur in the project area. However, potential impacts to these groundwater dependent ecosystems as a result of the project have not been discussed;
 - potential traffic impacts to fauna are examined for the operational phase, but not the construction phase of the project; and
 - a detailed assessment of significance on the Greater Blue Mountains Heritage Area will be included in the final draft of the report following a multidisciplinary workshop to assess potential impacts.
- not compliant:

- a statement has not been provided regarding whether the impacts are unknown, unpredictable or irreversible;
- the predicted effectiveness, policy basis and likely cost of mitigation measures has not been assessed/provided;
- an Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) has been presented for the project, while the EIS guidelines require an offset package (ie finalised offset plan); and
- an analysis of how the Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) meets the requirements of the EPBC Act Environmental Offset Policy (SEWPaC 2012) has been provided. However, as this has not been finalised into an offset package, an assessment of how it meets the policy cannot be provided.

A detailed assessment of the Biodiversity Assessment's (EIS Appendix K1) compliance against the EIS guidelines is provided in Table 2.1. The adequacy of the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) is discussed in further detail in the following sections.

Table 2.1 Overview of compliance of EIS Chapter 16 Biodiversity, Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) and Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) with the EIS guidelines

Relevant part of EIS guideline	Section addressed in the EIS Chapter 16	Section addressed in EIS Appendix K1	Section addressed in EIS Appendix K2	Compliance with EIS guidelines
<i>Section 4 Description of the environment</i>				
<i>The EIS must include a description of the environment, land uses and character of the proposal site and the surrounding areas that may be affected by the action. It is recommended that this include the following information:</i>				
(a) Listed threatened species (including suitable habitat) and ecological communities that are or are likely to be present in all areas of potential impact.	Section 16.3	Chapter 4	Section 2.1	Compliant
To satisfy this requirement details must be presented on the scope, timing/effort (survey season/s) and methodology for studies and surveys used to provide information on the relevant listed threatened species/ecological community/habitat (as identified in Attachment 3). This includes details of:	Section 16.2.3 (terrestrial) and 16.2.4 (aquatic)	Section 4.4	N/A	Compliant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> how best practice survey guidelines have been applied; 	Section 16.2.3 (terrestrial) and 16.2.4 (aquatic)	Section 3.1	N/A	Compliant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> how surveys are consistent with (or a justification for divergence from) published Australian Government guidelines and policy statements. 	Not detailed	Appendix B provides a general assessment of compliance, but does not quantify how these guidelines have been met.	N/A	Partially compliant
<i>Section 5 Relevant impacts</i>				
(a) The EIS must include a description of all of the relevant impacts of the action. Relevant impacts are impacts that the action will have or is likely to have on a matter protected by a controlling provision (as listed in the preamble of this document). Impacts during both the construction, operational and (if relevant) the decommissioning phases of the project should be addressed, and the following information provided:	Section 16.4 and 16.5	Chapter 5 and Chapter 6	N/A	Compliant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a detailed assessment of the nature and extent of the likely short-term and long-term relevant impacts (detailing direct and indirect impacts); 	Summary provided in Section 16.4 and 16.5	Section 5.1 and 5.2	N/A	Compliant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a statement whether any relevant impacts are likely to be unknown, unpredictable or irreversible; and 	Not provided	Not provided	N/A	Not compliant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> analysis of the significance of the relevant impacts; and any technical data and other information used or needed to make a detailed assessment of the relevant impacts. 	Summary provided in Section 16.6	Summary provided in Chapter 8, Assessments of Significance in accordance with the EPBC Act	N/A	Partially compliant

Table 2.1 Overview of compliance of EIS Chapter 16 Biodiversity, Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) and Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) with the EIS guidelines

Relevant part of EIS guideline	Section addressed in the EIS Chapter 16	Section addressed in EIS Appendix K1	Section addressed in EIS Appendix K2	Compliance with EIS guidelines
(b) The EIS should identify and address cumulative impacts, where potential project impacts are in addition to existing impacts of other activities (including known potential future expansions or developments by the proponent and other proponents in the region and vicinity).	Not detailed	provided in Appendix D. It should be noted that Assessments of Significance were not prepared for the Green and Golden Bell Frog, Australasian Bittern, Australian Painted Snipe and migratory species were not completed because significant impacts were not predicted. Further information is provided in Section 2.2 of this report. Chapter 7	N/A	Compliant
(c) The EIS should address the potential for facilitated impacts upon MNES at the local, regional, state, national and international scale.	Not detailed	Chapter 7	N/A	Compliant
(d) If the conclusion is made that any relevant controlling provision or element of a relevant controlling provision will not be impacted by the proposed action, then justification must be provided for how this conclusion has been reached. This includes any threatened species or ecological communities that are likely to be present on site, heritage items/places likely to be on site and other relevant elements of the environment that may be impacted by the proposed action.	Summary provided in Section 16.6	Summary provided in Chapter 8, assessments of significance in accordance with the EPBC Act provided in Appendix D. It should be noted that Assessments of Significance were not prepared for the Green and Golden Bell Frog, Australasian Bittern, Australian Painted Snipe and migratory species were not completed because significant impacts were not predicted. Further information is provided in Section 2.2 of this report.	N/A	Partially compliant
(g) Impacts to the environment (as defined in section 528) should include but not be limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> changes to water quality on site and downstream of the site; 	Section 16.4.1.3	Section 6.1.7	N/A	Compliant

Table 2.1 Overview of compliance of EIS Chapter 16 Biodiversity, Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) and Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) with the EIS guidelines

Relevant part of EIS guideline	Section addressed in the EIS Chapter 16	Section addressed in EIS Appendix K1	Section addressed in EIS Appendix K2	Compliance with EIS guidelines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> changes to siltation; 	Section 16.4.2	Section 6.1.8	N/A	Compliant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> hydrological changes; 	Section 16.4.2	Section 4.2.4 states that high probability groundwater dependent ecosystems are present. However, the impacts to these are not assessed.	N/A	Partially compliant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> native flora and fauna habitat removal and degradation (on site and in surrounding areas that may be affected by the action); 	Section 16.4.1.1	Section 5.1.2 (Stage 1) and 5.2.1 (Longer-term)	Section 2.2.1	Compliant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> aircraft noise and vibration impacts on everyday activities and on sensitive environmental receptors (all sensitive receptors within the community and natural environment); 	Section 16.4.2	Section 5.2.2	N/A	Compliant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> noise and vibration from construction activities and machinery; 	Section 16.4.2	Section 5.1.11	N/A	Compliant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> potential fuel dumping impacts; 	Section 16.4.2.5	Section 5.2.2	N/A	Compliant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> changes in traffic movements during construction and operation (associated with both passenger movements and workers); 	Not provided for construction. Detailed in and 16.5.1.2 (operation)	Not provided for construction. Detailed in Section 6.1.2 (operation)	N/A	Partially compliant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> bird or bat airstrike; and 	Section 16.6.2.3 and 16.5.1.1	Section 6.1.1. It should be noted that a separate independent review is being completed to determine the adequacy of the bird and bat airstrike assessment.	N/A	Compliant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> lighting impacts on everyday activities and on sensitive environmental receptors (all sensitive receptors within the community and natural environment). 	Summary provided in Section 16.4.2.7 (construction) and 16.5.2.1 (operation)	Section 5.1.11 (construction) and 6.1.4 (operation)	N/A	Compliant
Quantification and assessment of impacts should:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> be against appropriate background/baseline levels; 	Section 16.2.1 states that the baseline assessment (SMEC 2014) was used to verify results, against	Section 3.1.1 states that the baseline assessment (SMEC 2014) was used to verify results, against which the impact assessment was completed.	N/A	Compliant

Table 2.1 Overview of compliance of EIS Chapter 16 Biodiversity, Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) and Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) with the EIS guidelines

Relevant part of EIS guideline	Section addressed in the EIS Chapter 16	Section addressed in EIS Appendix K1	Section addressed in EIS Appendix K2	Compliance with EIS guidelines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> be prepared according to best practice guidelines and compared to best practice standards; and 	<p>which the impact assessment was completed.</p> <p>Section 16.1 states that the assessment was prepared in accordance with the EIS guidelines.</p>	<p>Appendix B provides a general assessment of compliance, but does not quantify how these guidelines have been met.</p>	N/A	Partially compliant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> be supported by maps, graphs and diagrams as appropriate to ensure information is readily understandable Guidelines and standards used to quantify baselines and impacts should be explained and justified. 	<p>Figures 16-1-A to 16-1-D, Figure 16-2-A to 16-2-D</p>	<p>Figure 4A to 4D, Figure 5A to 5D, Figure 6A to 6D</p>	N/A	Compliant
<p><i>6 Avoidance and mitigation measures</i></p> <p>(a) The EIS must provide information on proposed avoidance and mitigation measures to manage the relevant impact of the action on a matter protected by a controlling provision (as listed in the preamble of this document).</p>	<p>Section 16.7.1 provides a summary of minimisation measures. However, avoidance measures are not discussed.</p>	<p>Avoidance is discussed in Section 9.1 and minimisation measures are discussed in Section 9.2.</p>	N/A	Compliant
<p>(b) The EIS must take into account relevant agreements and plans that cover impacts or known threats to a matter protected by a controlling provision (including but not necessarily limited to:</p> <p>(i) any recovery plan and/or conservation advice for the affected species or ecological community</p>	<p>Discussed in Section 16.8.3.2, 16.3.3.4, 16.6.2.1 with respect to threatened species, populations and communities.</p>	<p>Recovery plans are considered in all assessments of significance in Appendix D, with the exception of the assessments of significance that were omitted.</p>	N/A	Partially compliant
<p>(ii) any threat abatement plan for a process that threatens an affected species or ecological community</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>	<p>Addressed in Section 8.1.3</p>	N/A	Compliant
<p>(iii) any wildlife conservation plan for the affected species</p>	<p>Discussed in Section 16.8.3.2, 16.3.3.4, 16.6.2.1 with respect</p>	<p>Recovery plans are considered in all assessments of significance in Appendix D, The Offsets Strategy (EIS</p>	N/A	Partially compliant

Table 2.1 Overview of compliance of EIS Chapter 16 Biodiversity, Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) and Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) with the EIS guidelines

Relevant part of EIS guideline	Section addressed in the EIS Chapter 16	Section addressed in EIS Appendix K1	Section addressed in EIS Appendix K2	Compliance with EIS guidelines
(iv) any relevant strategic assessment undertaken in accordance with an agreement under Part 10 of the EPBC Act.	to threatened species, populations and communities. Not described	Appendix K2) has not been finalised into an offset package. Therefore, an analysis cannot be provided. Section 9.3.1 states that the future offset package would consider the North West and South West growth centres strategic assessment.	Section 1.2 states that the future offset package would consider the North West and South West growth centres strategic assessment.	Compliant
(v) the Greater Blue Mountains Area World Heritage property, the World Heritage Convention; the Australian World Heritage Management Principles; the Greater Blue Mountains Area World Heritage Area Strategic Plan, and relevant NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service/Office of Environment and Heritage Plans of Management.	Section 16.2.7	Appendix D states that a detailed assessment of significance of impacts on the BMWHA will be included in a Final Draft of this report after a multidisciplinary workshop is held to help identify and assess potential impacts.	N/A	Partially compliant
(c) The EIS must include specific and detailed descriptions of the proposed avoidance and mitigation measures based on best available practices. This must include the following elements:	Section 16.7.1 provides a summary of minimisation measures. However, avoidance measures are not discussed.	Avoidance is discussed in Section 9.1 and minimisation measures are discussed in Section 9.2.	N/A	Compliant
i. A consolidated list of mitigation measures proposed to be undertaken to prevent, minimise or compensate for the relevant impacts of the action, including:	Section 16.7.1 provides a summary of minimisation measures. However, avoidance measures are not discussed.	Table 70	N/A	Compliant
• a detailed description of proposed measures;	Section 16.7.1	Table 70	N/A	Compliant

Table 2.1 Overview of compliance of EIS Chapter 16 Biodiversity, Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) and Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) with the EIS guidelines

Relevant part of EIS guideline	Section addressed in the EIS Chapter 16	Section addressed in EIS Appendix K1	Section addressed in EIS Appendix K2	Compliance with EIS guidelines
	provides a summary of minimisation measures. However, avoidance measures are not discussed.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> assessment of the expected or predicted effectiveness of the mitigation measures; 	Not provided	Not provided	N/A	Not compliant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> any statutory or policy basis for the mitigation measures; and 	Not provided	Not provided	N/A	Not compliant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the likely cost of the mitigation measures. 	Not provided	Not provided	N/A	Not compliant
ii. A detailed outline of a plan for the continuing management, mitigation and monitoring of relevant matters protected by a controlling provision, including a description of the outcomes that will be achieved and any provisions for independent environmental auditing.	Not described	Table 70 outlines the management and monitoring plans that will be completed for the project.	N/A	Partially compliant
iii. Where appropriate, each project phase (construction and operation) must be addressed separately. It must state the environmental outcomes, performance criteria, monitoring, reporting, corrective action, contingencies, responsibility and timing for each environmental issue.	Not described	Table 70 outlines the management and monitoring plans that will be completed for the project.	N/A	Partially compliant
iv. The name of the agency responsible for endorsing or approving each mitigation measure or monitoring program.	Not described	Table 70 outlines the management and monitoring plans that will be completed for the project, which would include the responsible agency.	N/A	Partially compliant
<i>7 Residual impacts and offsets</i>				
i) The EIS must provide details of the likely residual impacts upon a matter protected by a controlling provision after the proposed avoidance and mitigation measures have been taken into account. This includes:	Section 16.8.2	Section 9.3.2	Chapter 3	Compliant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the reasons why avoidance or mitigation of impacts may not be reasonably achieved; and 	Section 16.8.2	Section 9.3.2	Chapter 3	Compliant
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> quantification of the extent and scope of significant residual impacts. 	Section 16.8.2	Section 9.3.2	Chapter 3	Compliant
ii) The EIS must include details of an offset package to be implemented to	Section 16.8.3	Section 9.3.3 outlines the proposed	Chapter 4	Not compliant

Table 2.1 Overview of compliance of EIS Chapter 16 Biodiversity, Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) and Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) with the EIS guidelines

Relevant part of EIS guideline	Section addressed in the EIS Chapter 16	Section addressed in EIS Appendix K1	Section addressed in EIS Appendix K2	Compliance with EIS guidelines
compensate for residual significant impacts associated with the project, as well as an analysis of how the offset meets the requirements of the Department's Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 Environmental Offsets Policy October 2012 (SEWPaC 2012).	discusses the proposed offset strategy	offset strategy, and the compliance of the strategy against the EPBC offset policy. This offset strategy has not yet been finalised into an offset package.	outlines the proposed offset strategy. However, no analysis is provided on how the offsets meet the EPBC Act Environmental Offset Policy (SEWPaC 2012).	
b) The offset package can comprise a combination of direct offsets and other compensatory measures, as long as it meets the requirements of the EPBC Act Environmental Offset Policy. Offsets should align with conservation priorities for the impacted protected matter and be tailored specifically to the attribute of the protected matter that is impacted in order to deliver a conservation gain.	Section 16.8.3 discusses the proposed offset strategy, which only includes direct offsets. The offset package has not yet been finalised, however the strategy only references impacts from the Stage 1 development with no consideration of the subsequent long term development.	Section 9.3.3 discusses the proposed offset strategy, which only includes direct offsets. The offset package has not yet been finalised, however the strategy only references impacts from the Stage 1 development with no consideration of the subsequent long term development.	Chapter 4 outlines the proposed offset strategy, which only includes direct offsets. The offset package has not yet been finalised, however the strategy only references impacts from the Stage 1 development with no consideration of the subsequent long term development.	Not compliant
c) Offsets should compensate for an impact for the full duration of the impact.	Section 16.8.3.1	Section 9.3.3 states that offsets will	Section 1.3.2	Compliant

Table 2.1 Overview of compliance of EIS Chapter 16 Biodiversity, Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) and Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) with the EIS guidelines

Relevant part of EIS guideline	Section addressed in the EIS Chapter 16	Section addressed in EIS Appendix K1	Section addressed in EIS Appendix K2	Compliance with EIS guidelines
	states that offsets will be protected into perpetuity.	be protected into perpetuity.	states that offsets will be protected into perpetuity.	
d) Offsets must directly contribute to the ongoing viability of the protected matter impacted by the project and deliver an overall conservation outcome that maintains or improves the viability of the protected matter, compared to what is likely to have occurred under the 'status quo' (i.e. if the action and associated offset had not taken place).	As the offset strategy and package has not been finalised, this cannot be determined.	As the offset strategy and package has not been finalised, this cannot be determined.	As the offset strategy and package has not been finalised, this cannot be determined.	Partially compliant
e) Note: offsets do not make an unacceptable impact acceptable and do not reduce the likely impacts of a proposed action. Instead, offsets compensate for any residual significant impact.	Section 16.8.2 states that the purpose of offsets is to compensate for residual impacts.	Section 9.3.2 states that the purpose of offsets is to compensate for residual impacts.	Chapter 3 states that the purpose of offsets is to compensate for residual impacts.	Compliant
f) The EIS must provide: i details of the offset package to compensate for significant residual impacts on a protected matter; and	Section 16.8.2 provides details of the offset strategy. The offset package has not been finalised.	Section 9.3.2 provides details of the offset strategy. The offset package has not been finalised.	Chapter 3 provides details of the offset strategy. The offset package has not been finalised.	Not compliant
ii an analysis of how the offset package meets the requirements of the EPBC Act Environmental Offsets Policy (SEWPaC 2012).	The offset package has not been finalised. Therefore, an analysis cannot be provided.	The offset package has not been finalised. Therefore, an analysis cannot be provided.	The offset package has not been finalised. Therefore, an analysis cannot be provided.	Not compliant

2.2 Validity of data relied upon

The validity of the data relied upon in the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) (GHD 2015b) was tested against 11 criteria, listed in Table 2.2. The data relied upon in the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) are valid, with the exception of three criteria which are partially valid (ie some information has been omitted). Some threatened and migratory species have not been considered. While they are not expected to occur in the project area, it was required that this was considered and documented accordingly. Assessments of significance were not completed for the Green and Golden Bell Frog, Australasian Bittern, Australian Painted Snipe and migratory species listed under the EPBC Act. A comparison of the Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) was provided against the EPBC Act Environmental Offset Policy (SEWPaC 2012). However, as the offset strategy has not yet been finalised into an offset package, an effective comparison against the policy cannot be made.

Table 2.2 Validity of data relied upon

Criteria to test validity of data relied upon	Assessment	Validity of data relied upon
Compare local vegetation mapping datasets to those identified in the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) to determine if vegetation types are accurate.	The vegetation types in the Biodiversity Assessment were compared to the baseline assessment (SMEC 2014) and vegetation mapping for the Cumberland Plain (NPWS 2002). Vegetation types in the Biodiversity Assessment were found to be consistent.	Valid
Review of justification for plant community types assigned in accordance with the Vegetation Information System to check accuracy.	The plant community types assigned in the biodiversity assessment were compared to their descriptions in the Vegetation Information System (OEH 2015a). These were found to be consistent.	Valid
Compare database search results to those identified in the biodiversity assessment to ensure all relevant threatened biodiversity have been identified and considered.	<p>The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) considered all threatened flora and fauna species listed under the EPBC Act that are predicted to occur in the locality (DoE 2015), with the exception of the Dural Land Snail. Whilst the species distribution is outside the project area, as it was predicted by the Protected Matters Search Tool (DoE 2015), it was required to be considered and documented accordingly in the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1). Irrespective of distribution, it is a DoE requirement to report all species predicted to occur by the Protected Matters Search Tool. It is noted that this species has been recently listed on the EPBC Act.</p> <p>Four migratory species listed under the EPBC Act were also not considered. Whilst they were not expected to occur in the project area (based on the habitat types), they were required to be considered and documented accordingly. These comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oriental Cuckoo – non-breeding vagrant to Australia, therefore habitat in the project area is not important to the species; • Black-faced Monarch – only occurs in rainforest, which is absent from the project area; • Yellow Wagtail – non breeding vagrant to Australia, therefore habitat in the project area is not important to the species; and • Satin Flycatcher – only occurs in tall wet forest, which is absent from the project area. <p>Whilst not required to consider state environmental and planning legislation due to the Commonwealth <i>Airports Act 1996</i>, the EIS stated that it would consider relevant state legislation, which includes the NSW <i>Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995</i> (TSC Act).</p>	Partially valid

Table 2.2 **Validity of data relied upon**

Criteria to test validity of data relied upon	Assessment	Validity of data relied upon
Review preliminary determinations for threatened species, populations and communities to ensure they are considered.	Further, Section 1.1 of the Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) states that DoE instructed the proponent to include impacts to species listed under the TSC Act in the offset package. The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) considered all threatened flora and fauna species and populations listed under the TSC Act that have been previously recorded in the locality (OEH 2015b). The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) has not reviewed preliminary determinations. There are currently nine preliminary determinations, none of which are relevant to the project area.	Valid
Compare the list of target threatened biodiversity to those identified in the baseline study to ensure all relevant target biodiversity has been identified.	The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) builds upon the results of the baseline study and is consistent with its findings.	Valid
Review of known threats to the threatened biodiversity identified.	Section 8.1 of the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) identifies relevant key threatening processes.	Valid
Review the likelihood of occurrence for threatened biodiversity, to ensure all relevant species have been considered.	The likelihood of occurrence was reviewed for all species considered. I agree with the assessment. It is worth noting that the White-bellied Sea Eagle was considered as a migratory species under the EPBC Act. This species was delisted shortly after the EIS was exhibited.	Valid
Review the assessments of significance to ensure the necessary assessments have been completed.	Assessments of significance have been completed for most of the relevant species in accordance with the EPBC Act. However, no assessments carried out for the Green and Golden Bell Frog, Australasian Bittern, Australian Painted Snipe or migratory species that were deemed 'possible' to occur in the project area. The EPBC Act Policy Statement 1.1 Matters of National Environmental Significance guidelines (DoE 2013) state that their purpose is to: <i>'The significant impact criteria, set out on the following pages, for each matter of national environmental significance, are intended to assist you in determining whether the impacts of your proposed action on any matter of national environmental significance are likely to be significant impacts.'</i> In consideration of the above, assessments of significance should have been completed for the abovementioned species.	Partially valid
Review calculations and assumptions used in the Commonwealth offset calculator.	The calculations and assumptions used in the Commonwealth offset calculator have been reviewed, and are commensurate to the impacts of the project and the value of the offset sites.	Valid
Comparison of offset package against the offset principles in the EPBC Act Environmental Offsets Policy (SEWPaC 2012).	Section 9.3.4 of the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) has compared the offset strategy against the offset principles in the EPBC Act Environmental Offsets Policy (SEWPaC 2012). However, as the Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) has not yet been finalised into an offset package, an effective comparison against the policy cannot be made.	Partially valid

2.3 Validity of assumptions

The validity and consistency of the assumptions in Section 1.5 of the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) was evaluated against the content of EIS Chapter 16, the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) and the Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2), and the EIS guidelines. One assumption was found to be partially valid, one was not valid, and four assumptions were valid.

Table 2.3 Validity of assumptions

Assumption	Assessment	Validity
No vegetation clearing or other direct impacts would occur outside the airport site to meet the requirements of the proposed airport's Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) or for other significant infrastructure.	The <i>Western Sydney Infrastructure Plan</i> (DIRD 2015) identifies the need for significant infrastructure, comprising upgrades to the existing Bringelly Road and The Northern Road, and a new motorway connecting the M7 and The Northern Road. These significant infrastructure projects have been assessed separately to the EIS, and therefore only need to be considered with respect to cumulative impacts with the Stage 1 development and long-term development.	Partially valid
The environmental conservation zones shown on Figure 2 would be managed as open space. Native vegetation would be retained and would be available as refuge habitat for displaced fauna and translocated snails, frogs, habitat resources etc. as required.	The <i>Standard instrument - Principal Local Environmental Plan 2015</i> does not contain an 'open space' zoning. Section 9.2 of the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) states that the cleared parts of the proposed environmental conservation zone would be revegetated. A more appropriate zoning for this area would be E2 Environmental Conservation, as the zone objectives aim to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> protect, manage and restore areas of high ecological, scientific, cultural or aesthetic values; and prevent development that could destroy, damage or otherwise have an adverse effect on those values. <p>However, if a Biobanking agreement is established in this area (see Section 2.6.1), rezoning to E2 is not recommended as the land would generate more offset credits if it retained its rural zoning.</p>	Not valid
Assessments of significance have been prepared in accordance with the <i>'Matters of National Environmental Significance Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999'</i> (DotE 2013a) for impacts on threatened biota and other MNES and the <i>'Significant Impact Guidelines 1.2 - Actions on, or impacting upon, Commonwealth land and Actions by Commonwealth Agencies'</i> (DotE 2013b) for impacts on flora and fauna. Impacts on other aspects of the environment are discussed in the EIS and relevant technical reports.	These are the correct guidelines to assess impacts on matters of national environmental significance.	Valid
The biodiversity offset package is for Stage 1 only and includes the preferred approach to offsetting along with the specific detail that was available at the time of publication.	The Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) does not explicitly state that its purpose is to only compensate for the Stage 1 development's impacts, however the long-term development is not considered. The EIS guidelines require that offsets are calculated for the	Not valid

Table 2.3 **Validity of assumptions**

Assumption	Assessment	Validity
Offsets on threatened biota listed under the EPBC Act have been calculated with reference to the EPBC Act Environmental Offset Policy.	entire project, which would include both the Stage 1 development and long-term development. The EIS guidelines require that offsets for matters of national environmental significance are calculated in accordance with the EPBC Act Environmental Offset Policy.	Valid
The suite of biodiversity credits that would be presented to offset impacts on threatened biota listed under the EPBC Act and TSC Act have been calculated using BioBanking.	Section 1.1 of the Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) states: <i>'Further consultation with the Commonwealth Department of the Environment (DotE) has revealed that the estimate of offsets for residual impacts on the environment, including threatened biota and their habitats listed under the New South Wales (NSW) Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995 (TSC Act), should be calculated using the NSW Biodiversity Banking and Offsets Scheme (BioBanking) assessment methodology'.</i> Therefore, credits have also been calculated using BioBanking.	Valid

2.4 Validity of conclusions

The validity of the conclusions reached in the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) was tested against the intensity, duration, magnitude and geographic extent of the project’s expected impacts. The impacts have been deemed significant for Cumberland Plain Shale Woodland and Shale-Gravel Transition Forest critically endangered ecological community and the Grey-headed Flying-fox. These conclusions have been deemed valid.

Assessments of significance have not been completed for threatened species, populations and communities listed under the TSC Act, as this is not required for the project. As stated in Section 1.1 of the Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2), the impacts to threatened biodiversity listed under the TSC Act will be accounted for by finding and securing suitable offsets in accordance with the NSW Biodiversity Banking and Offsets Scheme (BioBanking) assessment methodology. These conclusions have been deemed valid.

No conclusion has been reached with respect to the impacts on high-priority groundwater dependent ecosystems in the conservation area, or outside the project area. This conclusion is partially valid as the information is incomplete.

2.5 Efficacy of proposed mitigation and management measures

2.5.1 Design

The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) recommended measures to be implemented at the design stage to address four issues, comprising:

- fauna hazard: development of a wildlife hazard management plan and implementing ways to make the airport less attractive to fauna (and reduce wildlife hazard);
- hydrology: design of surface water systems that are sensitive to downstream environments;

- waterway crossings: in accordance with *Policy and guidelines for fish habitat conservation and management* (DPI 2013); and
- lighting: as far as is practical, reducing light spill.

These proposed measures are considered suitable for implementation at the design stage. However, it may be very difficult to achieve a reduction in light spill from the project, to the extent that nocturnal fauna would still use brightly lit areas adjacent to the project. Increased light is known to be a deterrent to some nocturnal species that will move away from suitable habitat if it is too brightly lit.

2.5.2 Pre-construction

The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) recommended a number of measures for the pre-construction stage, comprising:

- the preparation of a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) and relevant sub-plans;
- worker inductions;
- sediment and erosion controls;
- deferral of vegetation clearance and habitat loss as long as practical;
- inclusion of disease management (ie *Phytophthora cinnamomi*, Myrtle Rust and Chytrid Fungus) in the CEMP;
- development of threatened fauna management plans;
- development of a threatened flora translocation plan;
- completion of pre-clearance surveys for threatened species;
- development of a habitat clearing and fauna management protocol;
- preparation of a weed management plan;
- development of an unexpected finds protocol;
- development of a dam decommissioning protocol; and
- development of a bushfire management plan.

The measures were compared against the expected impacts identified in Section 5.1 (construction impacts) of the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1). The recommended measures are considered suitable for this stage of the project. Their effectiveness should be determined through the development of review and monitoring protocols within each of the management plans to be developed. Each management plan should also be prepared in consultation with the relevant agencies (ie DoE for the threatened species management plan).

2.5.3 Construction

The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) has recommended a number of measures to minimise biodiversity impacts during construction. These comprise:

- water quality management in accordance with the ANZECC (2000) guidelines;
- groundwater seepage treatment prior to discharge;
- reduction of lighting spill;
- implementation of erosion and sediment controls in accordance with the CEMP;
- implementation of weed management in accordance with the CEMP;
- fauna management, including the completion of pre-clearance surveys and the use of a fauna spotter/catcher to safely relocate fauna outside the clearing area;
- implementation of threatened species management plans; and
- implementation of dam decommissioning protocol.

The measures have been compared against the expected impacts identified in Section 5.1 (construction impacts) of the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1). The recommended measures are considered suitable for the construction stage of the project. Their effectiveness should be determined through the monitoring and reporting protocols within each of the management plans to be developed and conditions of approval.

2.5.4 Pre-operation and operation

The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) has recommended a number of pre-operation and operational measures to minimise biodiversity impacts. These comprise:

- active bird and bat strike management;
- the development of operational environmental management plans (OEMPs);
- preparation of a vegetation management plan;
- compliance with the *Quarantine Act 1908*;
- compliance with wildlife strike management practices prescribed by the *Civil Aviation Safety Requirements 1998*;
- implementation of the bushfire management plan;
- implementation of measures to manage contaminants; and
- implementation of stormwater and water quality measures.

The measures were compared against the expected impacts identified in Section 6.1 (operational impacts) of the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1). The recommended measures are considered suitable for the operational stage of the project, with the exception of the Vegetation Management Plan. It is recommended that the Vegetation Management Plan is prepared at the pre-construction stage to adequately manage the clearing operations and salvage of habitat resources for use in the proposed conservation zone and biodiversity offset sites. The effectiveness of these measures should be determined through the monitoring and reporting protocols within each of the operational environmental management plans to be developed and conditions of approval.

2.6 Level of uncertainty regarding impacts and environmental risks

2.6.1 Uncertainty identified by the author

The author of the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) has stated that there were limitations with respect to weather conditions, access, and targeted surveys for the Green and Golden Bell Frog:

The targeted Green and Golden Bell Frog surveys were conducted towards the end of the nominated September-March survey period because of property access restrictions. On no occasion did a total of greater than 50 mm of rain fall in the week prior to a given survey as is specified in the EPBC Act significant impact guidelines for the species (DEWHA 2009a). However conditions were warm, humid and still and other frog species were calling and were active and easily detected during surveys at the airport site. Green and Golden Bell Frogs were active (but not calling) at the reference site and were readily observed. Given these considerations it is likely that the targeted Green and Golden Bell Frog surveys would have detected the species if a population was present at the airport site.

However, the author has stated that the following measures should be implemented for the species, prior to construction:

...additional targeted searches of the airport site for the Green and Golden Bell Frog in optimal conditions to confirm that they are not present at the site (surveys for the species were conducted at the end of the survey season and were subject to access constraints as discussed in Section 3.4.3). A management plan should be prepared as a sub plan to the CEMP to provide more detail on Green and Golden Bell Frog relocation and habitat management should this species be located during targeted surveys. Frog collection and relocation would need to be conducted by appropriately experienced ecologists.

Given the inclusion of this measure, it appears that there is some uncertainty from the author whether the Green and Golden Bell Frog is present in the project area. As the survey did not access all properties and the conditions were not optimal (although it is acknowledged that they were close to optimal), I agree that this additional targeted survey is completed for the species in the project area when access is granted, during optimal weather conditions.

The author of the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) states in Section 1.3.1 that an environmental conservation zone would be established, and that it would be managed for the purposes of biodiversity conservation. Section 5.1.2 on native vegetation clearing states that:

Impacts would be further mitigated by the retention of around 122 hectares of land in the environmental conservation zone, including around 61 hectares of native vegetation and representative areas of each of the vegetation types at the airport site (see Figure 4). All or part of the 61 hectares of land within the conservation zone that does not currently contain native vegetation could be revegetated.

However, the protection mechanism for the environmental conservation zone has not been discussed. Despite containing vegetation communities that would be impacted by the project and the potential to reduce the offset deficit, the environmental conservation zone has not been included in the Offsets

Strategy (EIS Appendix K2). If the environmental conservation zone was protected under a BioBanking agreement it would have protection into perpetuity and ongoing management funding. Its protection under an environmental conservation zone only does not provide protection into perpetuity and ongoing management funding, therefore the continued ability of these areas to mitigate the project's impacts are uncertain.

2.6.2 Data gaps and potential associated risks

- Key data gaps were identified in the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) and Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) which relate to: land access restrictions;
- assessments of significance; and
- offset requirements

i Land access restrictions

The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) states that land access was not possible in all areas and some survey seasons. However, the report does not detail or provide any map to show the extent of land that could not be accessed, and the methods used to assess the biodiversity values in areas of restricted access.

The risk associated with restricted land access is that biodiversity values and offset requirements may have been underestimated in these areas, if suitable methods were not employed to address data gaps, ie assessing aerial imagery, available vegetation mapping datasets and biodiversity databases to infer biodiversity values.

ii Assessments of significance

Assessments of significance were not completed for the following species that have been deemed 'possible' to occur in the project area:

- Australasian Bittern;
- Australian Painted Snipe; and
- migratory species listed under the EPBC Act.

The author stated that the assessments were not completed as impacts to these species were not predicted to be significant. The EPBC Act Policy Statement 1.1 Matters of National Environmental Significance guidelines (DoE 2013) state that their purpose is to:

The significant impact criteria, set out on the following pages, for each matter of national environmental significance, are intended to assist you in determining whether the impacts of your proposed action on any matter of national environmental significance are likely to be significant impacts.

In consideration of the above, assessments of significance should have been completed for the abovementioned species to adequately consider potential impacts.

In addition, the Green and Golden Bell Frog was considered by the author to have a low probability of occurrence. However, the author has recommended that an additional targeted survey should be completed for the species to verify their presence (or otherwise) despite close to optimal survey conditions. As there is some doubt, the precautionary principle should have been applied in this instance, and an assessment of significance should have been completed.

Where there is risk of serious or irreversible harm, it is necessary to establish whether there is adequate scientific knowledge of the subject to evaluate the perceived threat. Where risk of serious or irreversible harm and lack of scientific knowledge of the nature of environmental harm combine, the precautionary principle applies. Case law has established that if the precautionary principle is triggered the proponent bears the burden of proof for demonstrating that their actions will not cause environmental harm (Preston 2008 in RMS 2014).

The potential risks association with not completing assessments of significance for these species are that the proposed mitigation and offsets may not account for their specific requirements.

iii Offset requirements

Section 7a of the EIS guidelines state that an offset package must be developed for the project. However, the Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) has not been finalised into an offset package (ie all offsets identified to compensate for project impacts), and only refers to offsets required for the Stage 1 development. In addition, the offset sites identified do not satisfy the requirements of the EPBC Act Offset Policy (SEWPaC 2012).

The author of the Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) against the EPBC Act Environmental Offset Policy (SEWPaC 2012). The author states:

The outcome of these preliminary EPBC offset assessment calculations is that:

- the proposed offset areas containing around 180 hectares of EPBC Act Cumberland Plain Woodland would offset 59 per cent of the proposed airport's impacts on the ecological community;
- the proposed offset areas containing around 79 hectares of poorer condition Cumberland Plain Woodland would offset around 15 per cent of the proposed airport's impacts on the ecological community, resulting in a total offset contribution of 74 per cent of the proposed airport's impacts;
- the proposed offset areas containing up to 401 hectares of habitat for the Grey-headed Flying-fox would offset around 136 per cent of the proposed airport's impacts on this vulnerable species.

Based on these preliminary calculations, the proposed offset sites could not meet all of the proposed airport's EPBC Act offsetting requirements as direct offsets. Additional offset sites containing Cumberland Plain Woodland will be identified throughout the environmental assessment and approval process for the proposed airport and will be included in the final offset package.

As the Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) cannot achieve a 90% direct offset, it does not meet criteria 4 of the EPBC Act Environmental Offset Policy (SEWPaC 2012), in that it is not 'of a size and scale proportionate to the residual impacts on the protected matter'. Therefore, the Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) currently does not meet the requirements of the EPBC Act Environmental Offset Policy (SEWPaC 2012). The above statement also says that additional offset sites will be identified during the environmental assessment and approval process. Given the approval pathway for the development, the finalised EIS (which considers the issues raised during the public exhibition of the draft EIS) would need to

include a final offset package to satisfy the EPBC Act Environmental Offset Policy (SEWPaC 2012). Following finalisation of the EIS, the DotE notifies the DIRD (as determining authority) of any conditions to be included to protect the environment. The statement within the Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) is not clear that the offset package will be finalised for the review of DotE..

As referenced in Section 1.1 of the Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2), the proponent was instructed by the Commonwealth to use the NSW Biodiversity Offset and Banking Scheme to estimate offsets for residual impacts on the environment. A review of this information indicates large deficits for offsets calculated using the NSW Biodiversity Offset and Banking Scheme. This comprises a deficit of 5,689 ecosystem credits for HN528 (Cumberland Plain Woodland critically endangered ecological community), 156 credits for HN512 (Shale-Gravel Transition Forest endangered ecological community) and 688 credits for HN630 (Freshwater Artificial Wetlands). If the Biobanking metric used to convert the credits into hectares is used (ie division of credits by 9.3), the credit deficit for Cumberland Plain Woodland translates to approximately 645 ha of the community. This is a large area and it has not yet been determined if sufficient offsets exist in the area that would meet these credit requirements. In addition, a large number of species credits are required, totalling 6,723. The author has completed a preliminary assessment of the proposed offset sites to provide these species credits. The feasibility of the offset sites providing the required species credits therefore has not yet been determined.

3 Detailed findings – long-term development

3.1 Overview of approach to assessment to long-term development taken in the Biodiversity Assessment

The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) investigated the biodiversity values of the entire project area (ie Stage 1 and long-term) in their method and results. Therefore, their assessment of impacts is based upon the current biodiversity values, and the threatened species, populations and communities that currently occupy the site.

The author provided a general assessment of the direct and indirect long-term development impacts for both the construction and operational stages of the project, separately to the Stage 1 development. Although not explicitly stated as the purpose in the Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2), the author has only provided biodiversity offset calculations for the Stage 1 development, and has not provided calculations for long-term development. In addition, the Offsets Strategy has not identified how and when suitable offsets for the long-term development would be identified.

3.2 Gaps identified relative to a comprehensive/ conventional assessment

The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) identified the current biodiversity values of the long-term development area, and assesses impacts on this basis. However, the long-term development is forecast to commence in approximately 2050. It is very difficult to predict the biodiversity values of the long-term development area in 35 years time. As the clearing of these areas will be deferred until approximately 2050, their biodiversity values may degrade, and therefore the impact of their removal would be lower than is currently predicted. Conversely, the biodiversity values of these areas may increase through good management (ie higher number of threatened flora and fauna species present), and therefore the impact of their removal may be greater than is currently predicted. For example, the removal of key threatening processes such as ‘predation by the Eastern Gambusia’ may lead to expansion of the Green and Golden Bell Frog population (if present) or re-colonisation (if not currently present). It is also likely that new species and communities will be listed in the years leading up to 2050, and the current biodiversity planning and assessment legislation may change.

3.3 Key risks and implications as a result of the gaps

The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) does not acknowledge the effect of the biodiversity management applied for the Stage 1 development, and how its success may influence biodiversity of the area in 35 years time for the longer-term development (ie regeneration of vegetation communities and/or improvement of corridors and habitat connectivity).

Key risks and implications resulting from a potential increase in biodiversity values leading up to 2050 include:

- underestimation of the range of the mitigation and management measures required to account for threatened biodiversity in the long-term development area; and
- no consideration of the successful implementation of biodiversity management measures for the Stage 1 development and its influence on the biodiversity of the area for the long-term development.

3.4 Effectiveness of assessment in setting a framework for further assessment

The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) has not set a framework for further assessment of the long-term development area. It is acknowledged that it would be very difficult to do so, as an assessment can only be made based on the current biodiversity values of the long-term development area. However, the following measures are recommended for inclusion to ensure that threatened biodiversity impacts of the longer-term development are adequately managed and offset:

- review of current listings of threatened species, populations and communities prior to construction of the longer-term development area;
- consider the successful implementation of biodiversity management measures for the Stage 1 development and its influence on the biodiversity of the area for the longer term development; and
- review the current biodiversity legislation, assessment and offsetting requirements, prior to construction of the long-term development area.

4 Key impacts

4.1 Key project impacts to biodiversity

The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) has identified the following key impacts relevant to threatened biodiversity listed under the EPBC Act:

- the loss of 90 ha of Cumberland Plain Shale Woodlands and Shale Gravel Transition Forest critically endangered ecological community; and
- the loss of 120 ha of habitat critical to the survival of the Grey-headed Flying-fox, a species listed as vulnerable.

The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) has determined that the project is likely to result in a significant impact for this community and species, and that offsets are required in accordance with the EPBC Act Environmental Offsets Policy (SEWPaC 2012).

The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) also identified the following key impacts relevant to threatened biodiversity listed under the TSC Act which were required to be considered in the estimate of residual impacts using the NSW Biodiversity Offset and Banking Scheme:

- removal of the local occurrence of *Pultenaea parviflora*, a vulnerable shrub;
- removal of the local occurrence of *Marsdenia viridiflora* subsp. *viridiflora* endangered population in the Bankstown, Blacktown, Camden, Campbelltown, Fairfield, Holroyd, Liverpool and Penrith local government areas;
- the loss of 221.3 ha of Cumberland Plain Woodlands in the Sydney Basin Bioregion critically endangered ecological community, 34.1 ha of River Flat Eucalypt Forest in the Sydney Basin Bioregion endangered ecological community and 2.6 ha of Shale Gravel Transition Forest in the Sydney Basin Bioregion endangered ecological community;
- the removal of 120.6 ha of known habitat of the endangered Cumberland Plain Land Snail; and
- removal of and fragmentation of known habitat for the vulnerable Eastern Freetail Bat (*Mormopterus norfolkensis*) and potential habitat for the Eastern False Pipistrelle (*Falsistrellus tasmaniensis*), Greater Broadnosed Bat (*Scoteanax rueppellii*) and Yellow-bellied Sheathtail Bat (*Saccolaimus flaviventris*).

The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) has determined that the project is likely to result in significant impacts to these threatened species, populations and ecological communities, and that biodiversity offsets are required in accordance with the NSW Biobanking framework.

4.2 Key opportunities

Key opportunities of the project comprise:

- location of airport site on predominantly cleared land, comprising 784 ha; and
- identification of potentially suitable offset sites on private property that may have otherwise degraded and subjected to key threatening processes listed under the TSC and EPBC Acts, including:
 - the clearing of native vegetation;
 - invasion of native plant communities by African Olive;
 - aggressive exclusion of birds from potential woodland and forest habitat by overabundant Noisy Miners;
 - forest eucalypt dieback associated with overabundant psyllids and Bell Miners;
 - clearing of hollow-bearing trees; and
 - removal of dead wood and dead trees.
- in addition to the offsets, the creation of an on-site environmental conservation zone covering 122 ha. This environmental conservation zone currently contains 61 ha of native vegetation representative of the vegetation types to be cleared. The remainder of the area not currently containing native vegetation (ie 61 ha) would be revegetated.

5 Conclusion

The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1), Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) and EIS Chapter 16 of the *Western Sydney Airport EIS* have been reviewed. The purpose of the review was to:

- determine the compliance of these reports with the EIS guidelines;
- test the validity of data relied upon, assumptions and conclusions;
- determine the efficacy of proposed mitigation and management measures;
- determine the level of uncertainty regarding impacts and environmental risks;
- examine the efficacy of the assessment approach with respect to longer-term development; and
- identify key project impacts and opportunities.

The review was completed by comparing the methods, results, impact assessment and offsets against the relevant government guidelines, and by comparison with a structured set of criteria.

The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1), Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) and EIS Chapter 16 were found to be generally compliant with the EIS guidelines. Some items were found to be partially compliant, where further information was required to comply with the guidelines. However, some items were also found to be non-compliant where required items had not been considered.

The underlying assumptions of the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) were valid, with the exception of three criteria tested. Although their distribution is outside the project area, one threatened and four migratory species listed under the EPBC Act had not been considered. Assessments of significance were not completed for three threatened species and a number of migratory species that may occur in the project area. The Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) had also been compared against the EPBC Act Environmental Offsets Policy (SEWPaC 2012). However, as the Offsets Strategy (EIS Appendix K2) has not been finalised into an offset package, an effective comparison against the policy cannot be made. These items were deemed as 'partially valid', as additional information is required to achieve compliance with the EIS guidelines.

The proposed mitigation and management measures were deemed effective for the current stage of the project. Further detail is required to be included in the CEMP and specific sub-plans to be developed. The efficacy of these plans can be tested in the future through the development and implementation of monitoring and reporting protocols contained within the plans.

Data gaps and associated risks were identified, relating to:

- land access restrictions: the extent of land access restrictions has not been clearly identified in the Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1). Biodiversity values and offset requirements may have been underestimated in these areas if suitable methods were not employed to address data gaps;
- threatened species assessment: assessments of significance were not completed in accordance with the EPBC Act for the Green and Golden Bell Frog, Australasian Bittern, Australian Painted Snipe and a number of migratory species. If these assessments predict that impacts are significant, then the biodiversity has underestimated the level of impact and offsets required; and

- proposed offsets: the offsets do not meet the EPBC Act Environmental Offsets Policy (SEWPaC 2012) of providing a 90% direct offset. In addition, there is a large deficit in the proposed offsets under the BioBanking scheme, particularly for Cumberland Plain Woodland critically endangered ecological community, which equates to approximately 645 ha. It is not currently known if this large area of this critically endangered ecological community is available to secure as biodiversity offsets.

The Biodiversity Assessment (EIS Appendix K1) has provided a general assessment of the adverse direct and indirect long-term development impacts of the project. This assessment is based upon the current biodiversity values of the longer-term project area. It is acknowledged that accurate assessment of the long-term impacts is difficult as they will occur approximately 35 years from now, when the area may have degraded (ie reduced biodiversity value) or improved (ie increased biodiversity value) through successful implementation of biodiversity measures from the Stage 1 development. In addition, new threatened species, populations and/or communities may be listed, and the biodiversity planning and assessment legislation and mechanisms may have changed.

It is recommended that the following measures are implemented to ensure that threatened biodiversity impacts of the long-term development are adequately managed and offset:

- review of current listings of threatened species, populations and communities prior to construction of the longer-term development area;
- consider the successful implementation of biodiversity management measures for the Stage 1 development and its influence on the biodiversity of the area for the long-term development; and
- review of the current biodiversity legislation, assessment and offsetting requirements, prior to construction of the long-term development area.

6 Qualifications and study team

6.1 Lead peer reviewer - Katie Whiting – BSc, MWldMgt (Habitat)

Katie is EMM's Ecology Services Manager and the nominated lead peer reviewer for the project. She has over a decade of experience in ecological and environmental consulting, and has a broad range of experience in infrastructure projects. Katie provides expert ecological advice to her clients and their projects. She has led biodiversity assessments for state significant infrastructure projects, and has a strong background in:

- peer review for biodiversity assessments;
- ecological and environmental impact assessment;
- preparation of Commonwealth referrals;
- threatened biodiversity survey, monitoring and assessment; and
- biodiversity offsets.

Katie has successfully completed the Biobanking Assessor Accreditation Course and is in the process of applying for accreditation through the OEH.

In addition to her strong technical experience, Katie has excellent communication skills and high ethical standards. She communicates with clients in an open and practical manner to achieve best-for-project outcomes. Katie also has great time management skills and has a strong focus on delivering projects on time and within budget.

Katie's CV is provided at Appendix A.

6.2 Strategic direction - Duncan Peake – BSc (Hons)

Duncan is a very experienced Project Director and peer reviewer of complex environmental impact assessments, inclusive of high profile state significant developments in NSW. He has extensive experience working within the framework of the EPBC Act for a range of infrastructure projects, including at airports with the Commonwealth as the proponent. Duncan has the following directly relevant experience for the project:

- has over 15 years experience in the preparation of environmental impact assessments for state significant development within the NSW and Commonwealth planning framework;
- is a nominated pre-qualified EIS peer reviewer for the NSW Department of Planning and Environment;
- has managed environmental assessments for airports and associated infrastructure; and
- obtained approvals for state significant development under the EPBC Act.

Duncan has provided strategic direction to the project and a technical and quality review of the document prior to submission. Duncan's CV is provided at Appendix A.

References

Biosis 1997, *Draft Environmental Impact Statement Second Sydney Airport Proposal: Technical Paper 8 Flora and Fauna*, report prepared for PPK Environmental Consultants

Department of Primary Industries (DPI) 2013, *Policy and guidelines for fish habitat and conservation*, NSW Department of Primary Industries (Fisheries), Wollongbar

Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development (DIRD) 2015, *Western Sydney Infrastructure Plan*, https://infrastructure.gov.au/infrastructure/western_sydney/index.aspx, viewed 18 November 2015

Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Populations and Communities (SEWPaC) 2012, *EPBC Act Environmental Offsets Policy*, Department of the Environment, Canberra

Department of the Environment (DoE) 2015, *Protected Matters Search Tool*, www.environment.gov.au/, viewed November 2013

DoE 2013, *EPBC Act Policy Statement 1.1 Matters of National Environmental Significance*, Department of the Environment, Canberra

GHD 2015a, *Western Sydney Airport EIS Chapter 16: Biodiversity*, report prepared for the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development

GHD 2015a, *Western Sydney Airport EIS Volume 4 Appendix K1: Biodiversity*, report prepared for the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development

GHD 2015b, *W Western Sydney Airport EIS Volume 4 Appendix K2: Offset strategy, Biodiversity*, report prepared for the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development

NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) 2002, *Interpretation guidelines for the native vegetation maps of the Cumberland Plain, Western Sydney*, NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service, Hurstville

OEH 2015a, VIS Classification v2.0, <http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/NSWVCA20PRapp>, viewed November 2013

OEH 2015b, Atlas of NSW Wildlife, www.environment.nsw.gov.au/atlasapp/, viewed November 2013

RMS 2014, *Ecologically sustainable development - practice note*, Environment Branch, Roads and Maritime Services

SMEC 2014, *Biodiversity Report: Commonwealth Land at Badgery's Creek*, report prepared for the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development

Appendix A

Qualifications of reviewers

Curriculum vitae

Duncan Peake

Associate Director

Duncan is an Associate Director with over 15 years experience in environmental impact assessment (EIA), environmental compliance auditing, environmental management and community and stakeholder engagement in Australia, Europe and Africa. He has considerable experience in the following sectors: mining, extractive industries, transport, energy industry, agriculture, oil and gas and waste management.

Duncan has specialised in EIA for state significant development and infrastructure under the *NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*.


Duncan has considerable project management and direction experience in the development of approval strategies and the preparation of EIAs for large infrastructure projects.

Qualifications and memberships

- Bachelor of Science (Hons) in Applied Economic Geography, University of New South Wales, 2000
- Member of the Environment and Sustainability Committee for the Urban Development Institute of Australia, NSW branch, 2011–2014

Career

- EMM Consulting, 2009–present
- Associate Environmental Planner, AECOM (formerly HLA-Envirosciences), 2005–2009
- Environmental Planner, Environmental Resources Management, Sydney and Edinburgh, 2000–2005



Representative experience

Key environmental impact assessment and approvals

- Mount Thorley and Warkworth Continuation Projects, Singleton LGA NSW (Rio Tinto Coal Australia)
- Mangoola Coal Mine Modification 6, Muswellbrook LGA NSW (Glencore)
- Warkworth Mine Extension, Singleton LGA (Warkworth Mining)
- Mount Pleasant Project modifications, Mount Pleasant NSW (Rio Tinto Coal Australia)
- Gloucester Gas Project modifications, Gloucester LGA NSW (AGL Energy)
- Integrated oilseed processing and biodiesel plant, Wagga Wagga NSW (ROBE)

Environmental management plans

- Baal Bone Colliery, annual environmental management plan, Wallerawang NSW (Wallerawang Collieries)
- Hunter Gas Project Exploration, Hunter Valley NSW (AGL Energy)
- Gloucester Gas Project Exploration, Gloucester NSW (AGL Energy)
- Mount Pleasant Project, Mount Pleasant NSW (Rio Tinto Coal Australia)
- Camden Gas Projects, Camden NSW (AGL)

Environmental compliance auditing

- Doyles Creek Exploration Program, independent compliance audit, Doyles Creek NSW (Sparke Helmore Lawyers)

Curriculum vitae



Duncan Peake

Other environmental impact assessment and approvals

- Teven Quarry modifications, Teven NSW (Boral Resources)
- Mount Pleasant, modification to operations, Mount Pleasant NSW (Rio Tinto Coal Australia)
- Camden Gas Project, coal seam methane expansion, Spring Farm and Menangle Park NSW (AGL)
- Attenuation Reservoir, capacity increase, Sydney NSW (Eraring Energy)
- Camden Gas Project Modifications, Camden NSW (AGL Energy)
- Continued operation of Baal Bone Colliery, Lithgow NSW (Xstrata coal)
- Camden Gas Project, northern expansion, Camden NSW (AGL Energy)
- Upgrade and extension of electricity distribution line along Wolgan Road, Wolgan Valley NSW (Emirates)
- Geothermal Energy, various locations in rural NSW (AGL Energy)


Review of environmental factors

- Rookwood Road Substation, Rookwood NSW (TransGrid)
- Hunter Gas Project, Windermere pilot testing, Hunter Valley NSW (AGL Energy)
- Hunter Gas Project, Spring Mountain pilot testing, Hunter Valley NSW (AGL Energy)
- Gloucester Gas Project, corehole exploration, Gloucester NSW (AGL Energy)
- Gloucester Gas Project, 2D seismic exploration, Gloucester NSW (AGL Energy)
- Gloucester Gas Project, Waukivory pilot testing, Waukivory NSW (AGL Energy)
- Gloucester Gas Project, Wards River pilot testing, Wards River NSW (AGL Energy)

Environmental risk assessments

- Coleambally Ethanol Plant, scoping study, Coleambally NSW (AIE)
- Mount Pleasant, environmental gap analysis, Mount Pleasant NSW (Rio Tinto Coal Australia)
- Environmental opportunities and constraints analysis for a new coal mine, Hunter Valley NSW (confidential)

Curriculum vitae



Katie Whiting

Ecology Services Manager

Katie is EMM's Ecology Services Manager. She provides expert ecological advice to clients and has led studies with complex technical issues. Katie has a strong focus on achieving best for project outcomes, and works closely with her clients to find balanced solutions.

Katie has extensive experience in ecological and environmental impact assessment, threatened biodiversity survey and providing practical on site biodiversity management assistance to construction teams.

Katie's ecological expertise lies in the survey of microchiropteran bats including harp trapping, ultrasonic detection and the collection of reference calls. Katie is skilled in the identification and analysis of ultrasonic bat call signatures.

Qualifications and memberships

- Bachelor of Science in Ecology, Macquarie University, 2003
- Master of Wildlife Management (Habitat), Macquarie University, 2008
- Australasian Bat Society — extended executive
- Australasian Bat Society – NSW Flying-fox subcommittee

Career

- EMM Consulting, 2011–present
- Senior Ecologist, SMEC Australia, 2007–2011
- Environmental Consultant, SPA Consulting, 2004–2007

Representative Experience

Ecological impact assessments and due diligence

- Sydney Sewer Rehabilitation Program ecological impact assessments, Sydney NSW, Abergeldie Watertech
- Hume Coal Project Terrestrial Ecology Impact Assessment, Southern Highlands NSW (Hume Coal Pty Ltd)
- North West Rail Link Due Diligence Ecological Assessment, Sydney NSW (Lend Lease)
- HVO North Fine Reject Emplacement Modification Ecological Assessment, Singleton NSW (Coal & Allied);
- Cobbora Coal Project, Cobbora NSW (Cobbora Holding Company)
- Moolarben Coal Project Stage 1, optimisation modification, Moolarben NSW (Moolarben Coal)
- Talbragar Quarry Ecological Assessment, Dubbo NSW (Boral Country)
- Allandale Quarry Expansion ecological assessment, (Quarry Products Newcastle)

Ecological impact statements

- Hume Coal Project, Southern Highlands NSW (Cockatoo Coal)
- Majura Parkway Project, Pialligo ACT (Roads ACT)
- Clarrie Hermes Drive Extension, Nicholls ACT (Roads ACT)
- Kings Highway Upgrade, Kowen district ACT (Roads ACT)

Curriculum vitae



Katie Whiting

Peer review services

- Goonbri Road Biodiversity Assessment Peer Review, Narrabri NSW (Narrabri Shire Council)
- Objection to Moorebank Waste Facility Biodiversity Assessment, Sydney NSW (Investa Property Group)
- Moorebank Intermodal Offset Review (assistance to peer reviewer), Sydney NSW (Moorebank Intermodal Company Ltd)

Expert witness services

- Broken Head Quarry Redevelopment Expert Witness, Ballina NSW (Broken Head Quarries)
- Allandale Quarry (assistance to expert witness), Hunter Valley NSW (Quarry Products Newcastle)

Ecological monitoring and management plans

- Auburn Stabling Project Grey-headed Flying-fox monitoring project, Sydney NSW (Transport for NSW)
- North West Rail Link Project baseline ecological monitoring, Sydney NSW (Lend Lease)
- Tarcutta Bypass, threatened species monitoring, Tarcutta NSW (Tarcutta Hume Alliance)
- Upper Nepean Borefields, baseline ecological monitoring, Sydney NSW (Sydney Catchment Authority)
- Georges River, estuary process study, Sydney NSW (Georges River Combined Council's Committee)
- Prospect Creek, strategic management plan and rehabilitation plan, Sydney NSW (Fairfield City Council)

Fauna mitigation and on-site ecological management

- HVO South and Mount Thorley Warkworth pre-clearance surveys, Hunter Valley NSW (Rio Tinto Coal Australia)
- Johns River and Seaham Quarry pre-clearance survey and fauna rescue, NSW (Boral)
- North West Rail Link Early Works pre-clearing surveys, fauna rescue and nest box allocation, Sydney NSW (Lend Lease)
- Tarcutta Bypass, fauna rescue and nestbox allocation, Tarcutta NSW (Tarcutta Hume Alliance)
- Holbrook Bypass, fauna rescue and nestbox allocation, Holbrook NSW (Abigroup; RTA)
- Hume Highway, nestbox survey, pre-clearing surveys and fauna rescue, Wagga Wagga NSW (Northern Hume Alliance; RTA)

SYDNEY

Ground floor, Suite 1, 20 Chandos Street
St Leonards, New South Wales, 2065
T 02 9493 9500 F 02 9493 9599

NEWCASTLE

Level 5, 21 Bolton Street
Newcastle, New South Wales, 2300
T 02 4927 0506 F 02 4926 1312

BRISBANE

Suite 1, Level 4, 87 Wickham Terrace
Spring Hill, Queensland, 4000
T 07 3839 1800 F 07 3839 1866

