

Your reference: SSD 6674
Our reference: EF13/5547, DOC15/71040-02
Contact: J Goodwin 9995 6838

Ms Megan Fu
Department of Planning and Infrastructure
GPO BOX 39
SYDNEY 2001

Dear Ms Fu

MP 08 0116 MOD 5 – UTS BROADWAY PRECINCT CONCEPT PLAN – EXHIBITION OF REQUEST

I am writing to you in reply to your invitation to the EPA to comment on the proposed modification of the above mentioned plan.

The EPA is not aware of having been previously consulted in regard to the original Concept Plan. And understands that the project involves demolition of existing UTS building 2 and associated infrastructure and replacement with a new building to occupy the expanded design envelope. The EPA further understands the replacement building is proposed to accommodate the UTS library and research facilities of unknown nature and scope.

The EPA notes the proximity of high density housing on the southern side of Broadway and directly opposite building 2.

The EPA has identified the following site specific concerns based on the information in the Environmental Impact Statement as obtained from the Department's Major Projects web site:

- (a) potential site contamination;
- (b) demolition, site preparation and construction and construction-related noise and vibration impacts (including recommended standard construction hours and intra-day respite periods for highly intrusive noise generating work);
- (c) demolition, site preparation and construction phase dust control and management;
- (d) demolition, site preparation and construction phase runoff and sediment control;
- (e) demolition, site preparation and construction phase air quality impacts;
- (f) operational noise and vibration impacts;
- (g) potential operational waste management including radioactive waste, clinical and related wastes and trackable wastes;

- (h) potential operational radiation control associated with research facilities; and
- (i) operational energy efficiency and water conservation.

The EPA expands on its concerns in Attachment A to this letter.

Should you require clarification of any of the above please contact John Goodwin on 9995 6838.

Yours sincerely



FRANK GAROFALOW
Manager, Metropolitan Infrastructure
NSW Environment Protection Authority
encl. Attachment A

ATTACHMENT A

- ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY COMMENTS -

UTS CITY CAMPUS BROADWAY PRECINCT CONCEPT PLAN MODIFICATION

1. General

The EPA considers that the project the subject of the EIS comprises distinct phases of construction and operation and has set out its comments on that basis.

The EPA notes the proximity of surrounding residences which may be adversely affected by noise impacts during demolition, site preparation, construction and operation phases of the project. And the risk of encountering underground petroleum storage systems on the development site.

2. Construction phase

The EPA anticipates that construction and construction-related activities will be undertaken in an environmentally responsible manner with particular emphasis on –

- Site investigation and remediation,
- compliance with recommended standard construction hours,
- intra-day respite periods from high noise generating construction activities (including jack hammering, rock breaking, pile boring or driving, saw cutting),
- feasible and reasonable noise and vibration minimisation and mitigation,
- effective dust control and management,
- runoff, erosion and sediment control, and
- waste handling and management, particularly concrete waste and rinse water.

2.1 Site investigation and remediation

Underground Petroleum Storage System (UPSS)

The EPA understands from previous site assessments that one or more UPSSs may have been installed on precinct sites.

The EPA emphasises that the UPSS removal work must be undertaken in accordance the Protection of the Environment Operations (Underground Petroleum Storage Systems) Regulation 2014 and related technical notes and guidelines available on the EPA web site via the following links –

<http://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/clm/upssguidelines.htm>

<http://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/resources/clm/1036technotedecom.pdf>

Recommendation

The proponent be required to confirm to explicitly identify whether or not any underground petroleum storage system had been or is installed on the building 2 re-development site. And, as necessary to obtain a validation report pursuant to the requirements of the Protection of the Environment Operations (Underground Petroleum Storage Systems) Regulation 2014 prior to undertaking work for the purposes of that development.

Recommendation

The proponent be required prior to commencing work for the project –

- (a) to undertake additional detailed investigation of potential soil and groundwater contamination,
- (b) to prepare and implement an appropriate procedure for identifying and dealing with unexpected finds of site contamination, and
- (c) to develop and implement site clean up and remediation as necessary.

Recommendation

The proponent should commit to satisfying the requirements of the Protection of the Environment Operations (Waste) Regulation 2014 with particular reference to Part 7 'asbestos wastes'.

Note: The EPA provides additional guidance material at its web-site

<http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/waste/asbestos/index.htm>.

Recommendation

The proponent should commit to consulting with Workcover NSW concerning the handling of any asbestos waste that may be encountered.

2.2 noise and vibration

The EPA notes the proximity of noise sensitive receivers, including high density residences on the southern side of Broadway.

The EPA emphasises the importance of properly managing noise and vibration impacts during demolition, site preparation, construction and construction-related activities, especially in regard to high noise impact activities, such as grinding, jack hammering, pile driving, rock breaking and hammering, rock drilling, saw cutting, and vibratory rolling. The EPA strongly recommends that intra-day respites be imposed.

The EPA understands that the proposal includes the demolition of existing building 2 and any associated structures.

The EPA provides guidance material available on its web site including downloadable copies of –

- the Interim Construction Noise Guideline (2009), and
- Assessing Vibration: a technical guideline (2006).

The EPA considers that the project is likely to generate significant noise and vibration impacts on surrounding residences and both hospitals during demolition, site preparation, construction and construction-related activities.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to establish the background noise level at the most affected residential receivers.

2.2.1 *general construction hours*

All construction and construction-related activities should be undertaken during standard construction hours as recommended in Table 1 Chapter 2 of the Interim Construction Noise Guideline (ICNG), July 2009

2.2.2 *intra-day respite periods*

ICNG section 4.5 specifies construction activities proven to be particularly annoying and intrusive to nearby residents. The EPA anticipates that those site preparation, demolition, construction and construction-related activities generating noise with particularly annoying or intrusive characteristics would be subject to a regime of intra-day respite periods where –

- (a) they are only undertaken after 8.00 am,
- (b) they are only undertaken over continuous periods not exceeding 3 hours with at least a 1 hour respite every three hours, and.
- (c) 'continuous' means any period during which there is less than an uninterrupted 60 minute respite between temporarily halting and recommencing any of the work referred to in ICNG section 4.5

Recommendation

The proponent be required to schedule intra-day 'respite periods' for construction activities identified in the Interim Construction Noise Guideline as being particularly annoying to residents.-

2.2.3 *queuing and idling construction vehicles and vessels*

The EPA is aware from previous major infrastructure projects that community concerns are likely to arise from noise impacts associated with the early arrival and idling of construction vehicles (including concrete agitator trucks) at the development site and in the residential precincts surrounding that site.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to ensure construction vehicles (including concrete agitator trucks) and vessels involved in construction and construction-related activities do not arrive at the project site or in surrounding residential precincts outside approved construction hours.

2.3 Dust control and management

The EPA is unclear whether the proposal involves bulk earthworks and the likelihood of large stockpiles of excavated material on the project site.

The EPA considers dust control and management to be an important air quality issue during demolition, site clearance and preparation, and subsequent construction. Bulk earthworks inevitably generate dust as a result of –

- (a) demolition,
- (b) the excavation, processing and handling of excavation spoil,
- (c) wind action on spoil stock piles, and

- (d) wind action on and plant movement across areas bare of vegetation or other cover.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to :

- (a) minimise dust emissions on the site, and
- (b) prevent dust emissions from the site.

2.4 Erosion and sediment control

Managing Urban Stormwater Soils and Construction, 4th Edition published by Landcom (the so-called 'Blue Book') provides guidance material for achieving effective erosion and sediment control on construction sites. However, the proponent should implement all such feasible and reasonable measures as may be necessary to prevent water pollution in the course of developing the site.

The EPA emphasises the importance of –

- (a) not commencing demolition, earthmoving, construction and construction-related activities until appropriate and effective erosion and sediment controls are in place, and
- (b) daily inspection of erosion and sediment controls which is fundamental to ensuring timely maintenance and repair of those controls.

2.5 Waste control and management (general)

The proponent should manage waste in accordance with the waste management hierarchy. The waste hierarchy, established under the Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Act 2001, is one that ensures that resource management options are considered against the following priorities:

Avoidance including action to reduce the amount of waste generated by households, industry and all levels of government

Resource recovery including reuse, recycling, reprocessing and energy recovery, consistent with the most efficient use of the recovered resources

Disposal including management of all disposal options in the most environmentally responsible manner.

All wastes generated during the project must be properly assessed, classified and managed in accordance with the EPA's guidelines to ensure proper treatment, transport and disposal at a landfill legally able to accept those wastes.

The EPA further anticipates that, without proper site controls and management, mud and waste may be tracked off the site during the course of the project.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to ensure that :

- (1) all waste generated during the project is assessed, classified and managed in accordance with the "Waste Classification Guidelines Part 1: Classifying Waste" (Department of Environment Climate Change and Water, December 2009);

- (2) the body of any vehicle or trailer, used to transport waste or excavation spoil from the premises, is covered before leaving the premises to prevent any spill or escape of any dust, waste, or spoil from the vehicle or trailer; and
- (3) mud, splatter, dust and other material likely to fall from or be cast off the wheels, underside or body of any vehicle, trailer or motorised plant leaving the site, is removed before the vehicle, trailer or motorised plant leaves the premises.

2.5 Waste control and management (concrete and concrete rinse water)

The EPA anticipates that during the course of the project concrete deliveries and pumping are likely to generate significant volumes of concrete waste and rinse water. The proponent should ensure that concrete waste and rinse water is not disposed of on the project site and instead that –

- (a) waste concrete is either returned in the agitator trucks to the supplier or directed to a dedicated watertight skip protected from the entry of precipitation, and
- (b) concrete rinse water is directed to a dedicated watertight skip protected from the entry of precipitation or a suitable water treatment plant.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to ensure that concrete waste and rinse water are not disposed of on the development site;

3. Operational phase

The EPA considers that environmental impacts that arise once the development is operational should be able to be largely averted by responsible environmental management practices, particularly with regard to:

- (a) feasible and reasonable noise mitigation measures,
- (b) appropriate management of any clinical and related waste arising from research facilities,
- (c) appropriate control and management of any 'regulated material' (i.e. radioactive substances, ionising radiation apparatus, non-ionising radiation apparatus of a kind prescribed by the Regulations, and sealed source devices) that may be associated with proposed research facilities, and
- (d) energy efficiency and water conservation measures.

3.1 Noise and vibration impacts

The EPA anticipates that replacement building 2 is likely to incorporate rooftop cooling towers and other mechanical ventilation plant as well as a loading dock and an emergency generator.

The EPA anticipates that operational noise impacts are likely to include noise from amongst other things -

- mechanical ventilation plant and equipment,
- truck movements (incl. reversing beepers) associated with use of any loading dock and with waste collection services, and
- testing of emergency generators.

The EPA anticipates the proposed development may have significant operational noise impacts on nearby sensitive receivers (residences) located south of Broadway.

The EPA considers that a detailed assessment of the operational noise impacts of the proposed development against the relevant INP criteria is essential to the proper assessment of project environmental impacts.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to undertake background monitoring at the most affected residential receivers in accordance with the guidance material provided in the NSW Industrial Noise Policy.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to ensure that all noise resulting from operation of plant and equipment associated with operation of the building, loading dock operations and waste collection services does not exceed properly determined night, evening and day background levels by more than 5dB at the potentially most affected residence.

3.2 Radiation Control Act and Regulation

The EPA administers the Radiation Control Act 1990 (and Radiation Control Regulation 2013) and anticipates that 'regulated material' may be stored and possessed on the university campus. 'Regulated material' means

- (a) radioactive substances,
- (b) ionising radiation apparatus,
- (c) non-ionising radiation apparatus of a kind prescribed by the regulations, and
- (d) sealed source devices.

A 'person responsible' within the meaning of section 6 of the Radiation Control Act 1990 is obliged to hold an appropriate 'radiation management licence' in respect of regulated material at the university campus.

A natural person who uses regulated material at the university campus must hold a 'radiation user licence' and must comply with any conditions to which the licence is subject.

Frequently asked questions about radiation management licences is available via the following link

<http://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/radiation/management/faq.htm>

Recommendation

The proponent be required to consult with the Environment Protection Authority in regard to any necessary amendment to the University's 'radiation management licence' in respect of regulated material at the new facilities and the management and handling of waste containing radioactive material.

The EPA is unclear whether the proposed research facilities are likely to generate Class 7 radioactive (substances) wastes.

Waste containing radioactive material must be classified in accordance with the EPA's Waste Classification Guidelines including Part 3: Waste Containing Radioactive Material.

Radioactive material must be placarded, consigned, packed and loaded for transport and transported in accordance with the Radiation Control Act 1990 (and Radiation Control Regulation 2013).

Recommendation

The proponent be required to consult with the Environment Protection Authority in regard to the management of radioactive waste.

3.3 Clinical and related waste

The EPA is unclear whether activities associated with the proposed research facilities will be of a type that generates 'clinical and related waste'. 'Clinical and related waste' is defined under the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997. Clinical and related waste includes clinical waste; cytotoxic waste; pharmaceutical, drug or medicine waste; and sharps waste.

Clause 113 to Protection of the Environment Operations (Waste) Regulation 2014 prescribes special requirements relating to clinical and related waste which is pre-classified as a 'special waste'. This allows the EPA to set more stringent and specific requirements for the transport and management of the waste to minimise the risk to the environment and human health.

Waste managers/operators who transport, store, treat or dispose of clinical and related waste should check the details of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act and the Protection of the Environment Operations (Waste) Regulation 2014 and any exemptions that may apply thereto concerning licensing and generic requirements in relation to clinical waste.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to consult with the Environment Protection Authority in regard to proper assessment, handling, storage, transport, treatment and disposal of clinical and related waste arising from operation of the new facilities.

3.4 Water Conservation


The EPA emphasises that water conservation is an essential component of ecologically sustainable development particularly pursuant to the principle of inter-generational equity.

The EPA considers the design stage of the project to be the optimum time to integrate measures to achieve water conservation through stormwater collection, treatment and re-use for non-potable purposes.

3.7 Energy Efficiency

The EPA emphasises that energy efficiency is an essential component of ecologically sustainable development particularly pursuant to the principle of inter-generational equity.

The EPA considers the design stage of the project to be the optimum time to integrate measures to achieve passive and active energy efficiency throughout the new facilities.



Idea leuconoe

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

The **paper kite**, **rice paper**, or **large tree nymph**^[1] butterfly (*Idea leuconoe*) is known especially for its presence in butterfly greenhouses and live butterfly expositions. The paper kite is of Southeast Asian origin.

Larvae feed on *Parsonsia* species, *Tylophora hispida*, *Parsonsia helicandra*, *Parsonsia spiralis*, and *Cynanchum formosanum*.^[2]

Contents

- 1 Subspecies
- 2 Gallery
- 3 References
- 4 External links

Subspecies

Listed alphabetically.^[2]

- I. l. atthesis* Fruhstorfer, 1911
- I. l. caesena* Fruhstorfer, 1911
- I. l. chersonesia* (Fruhstorfer, 1898)
- I. l. clara* (Butler, 1867)
- I. l. engania* (Doherty, 1891)
- I. l. esanga* Fruhstorfer, 1898
- I. l. fregela* Fruhstorfer, 1911
- I. l. godmani* Oberthür, 1878
- I. l. gordita* Fruhstorfer, 1911
- I. l. javana* Fruhstorfer, 1896
- I. l. kwashotoensis* (Sonan, 1928)
- I. l. lasiaka* van Eecke, 1913
- I. l. leuconoe* Erichson, 1834
- I. l. moira* Fruhstorfer, 1910
- I. l. natunensis* Snellen, 1895
- I. l. nigriana* Grose-Smith, 1895
- I. l. obscura* Staudinger, 1889
- I. l. princesa* Staudinger, 1889
- I. l. samara* Fruhstorfer, 1910
- I. l. siamensis* (Godfrey, 1916)
- I. l. solyma* Fruhstorfer, 1910
- I. l. vedana* Fruhstorfer, 1906
- I. l. vicetia* Fruhstorfer, 1911

Gallery

Paper kite



Dorsal view



Ventral view

Scientific classification

Kingdom:	Animalia
Phylum:	Arthropoda
Class:	Insecta
Order:	Lepidoptera
Family:	Nymphalidae
Genus:	<i>Idea</i>
Species:	<i>I. leuconoe</i>

Binomial name

Idea leuconoe
Erichson, 1834





Pupa



Dorsal view



Ventral view

References

1. Cutler, David (2002). *Butterflies and Moths* (Second American ed.). London: Dorling Kindersley. ISBN 0-7894-8983-X.
2. *Idea* (<http://www.funet.fi/pub/sci/bio/life/insecta/lepidoptera/ditrysia/papilionoidea/nymphalidae/danainae/idea/index.html>), funet.fi

External links

- Captain's Guide (<http://www.butterfly-guide.co.uk/farms/danaid/dan2.htm>)
- *Idea leuconoe* page on the Butterfly Pavilion's site (<http://www.butterflies.org/lvstk.cfm?lvstkID=23>)



Wikimedia Commons has media related to ***Idea leuconoe***.



Wikispecies has information related to: ***Idea leuconoe***

Retrieved from "https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Idea_leuconoe&oldid=641488541"

Categories: Insects described in 1834 | Idea (genus) | Butterflies of Indonesia | Butterflies of Malaysia | Butterflies of Indochina | Danainae stubs

- This page was last modified on 7 January 2015, at 22:31.
- Text is available under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike License; additional terms may apply. By using this site, you agree to the Terms of Use and Privacy Policy. Wikipedia® is a registered trademark of the Wikimedia Foundation, Inc., a non-profit organization.