

**AGENDA
MEETING # 2
Port Botany Neighbourhood Liaison Group**

Location: DP World Boardroom
Date: 18 November 2008
Time: 5.30pm to 7.00pm

Attendees	
<p>Community Members: Charles Abela (CA)– Community Representative John Burgess (JB) – Community Representative Nancy Hillier (NH)– Community Representative Lynda Newnam (LN)– Community Representative Thomas Nolan (TN) – Community Representative Paul Pickering (PP)– Community Representative Tony Steiner (TS)– Community Representative</p> <p>Council Representatives: Karen Armstrong (KAr) – Randwick City Council Paul Shepherd (PS) – City of Botany Bay Council Erika Roka (ER) – Rockdale City Council</p> <p>Minute Taker Sandra Spate</p>	<p>Business Representatives: Doug Eng (DE) – Terminals Pty Ltd James Mather (JM) – DP World Stevedores Paul Burtenshaw (PB)– DP World Stevedores Aldo Costabile (AC) – Elgas Limited Jenny Branighan (JBr) – Origin Energy Glen Davenport (GD) – Vopak Terminals Australia Martijn Fock (MF) – Vopak Terminals Australia</p> <p>Sydney Ports Corporation: Shane Hobday (SH) Jessica Berry (JBe) Karen Allan (KA) Morgan Noon (MN)</p>
Apologies:	

Agenda Items:
<p>1. Accept minutes of last meeting as correct Minutes of the previous meeting were accepted</p>
<p>2. Actions arising from previous minutes</p> <p>Contact list has not yet been circulated. Action: SH will distribute contact list.</p> <p>Upcoming developments will be a standing item on the agenda.</p> <p>SH reported that SPC had attempted unsuccessfully to get a representative from ARTC to the meeting. Morgan Noon was in close contact with them and would attempt to address issues raised. Anything that couldn't be addressed would be taken on notice.</p> <p>Cycle Path KAr reported that the bike plan was yet to be finalised. Randwick Council was attempting to address SPC's safety concerns. LN asked SPC for clarification on what their safety concerns were regarding the bike plan. SH responded that the potential conflict between trucks entering and exiting and cyclists was a concern. There were safety issues with cyclists crossing driveways where large trailers were exiting. PP noted that at six depot entrances where vehicles crossed a cycle/pedestrian lane, small triangular signage indicated that cyclists needed to give way. LN suggested that a number of people rode to work at the port. SH replied that this is an individual decision and is a different case from a dedicated cycleway. PP suggested that the risk without designated cycleway is greater. The use of cycles in areas also used by trucks was being managed elsewhere. He suggested that SPC in not supporting a cycleway was encouraging the intimidation of cyclists by trucks. LN said it was unrealistic to expect cyclists to take a major diversion from Prince of Wales Drive to</p>

Botany. The issue will remain even if there isn't a pedestrian/cycleway as increasing numbers of cyclists would use the area to travel to work.

SH reported that Botany Rd work associated with the Vopak pipeline has been completed. The fencing was being relocated but in a different position to give additional protection to the pipeline corridor. Trees had been interfering with the pipeline below.

LN noted that a fair amount of land had been lost here. There were public perceptions that public land was being lost.

CA reported that on old maps there was meant to be a reserve here.

SH replied this land was all under on SPC ownership.

JB asked when, in view of the deferral and the original plan, could the tug berth be expected to go ahead. He requested that if the area is not to be used in the foreseeable future for a tug berth, could the public have access to this area.

SH replied that while there is no perceived need for a tug berth at present, it may go ahead in the future. Some of the tug berth area will be used as car parking for the boat ramp. No decisions have been made at this stage about other uses. He suggested that there would be community consultation regarding the interim use of the land.

KAr responded by email to a query raised in writing by LN prior to the meeting. The query related to the Council's decision to close the recycling centre, the education centre and the loss of the green waste facility. KAr's response follows.

The centre was closed this year and relocated to an existing Council owned site at Perry Street, Matraville. This was noted in the Southern Courier - Mayor's column on 26 August. The key reasons were the cost of the processing in an increasingly competitive recycling market and compliance issues such as odours on-site. The Perry Street site still accepts materials but now sends these out to other locations for recycling - cardboard, glass bottles, plastics, aluminium cans, steel cans and bulk metals such as whitegoods, oils and is looking at e-waste in future also. The Council continues to have its weekend drop-off of green waste, but now at this Perry Street site. The education centre stayed at the Bumborah Street site and Council is instead investigating some education to be run at other locations such as our Bundock Street community centre.

For more details on our waste services, please contact Council's Waste Manager, Mark Bush on 9399 0738 or look on Council's web at:

http://www.randwick.nsw.gov.au/Looking_after_our_environment/Waste_management/index.aspx

3. Development activities in the port

Sydney Ports

SH reported that a small jetty at the end Brotherston Dock had been completed for pilot vessels. With the closure of the Watsons Bay pilot station, 3 of the 4 vessels would be based at Port Botany. The Government has made the decision to move as part of the NSW Ports Growth Plan, all general cargo operations from Sydney Harbour to Port Kembla. The last car ship left Glebe Island on Saturday, 15th November.

NH asked with the reduction in port activity in Sydney Harbour, who is now financing activity in Sydney Harbour? Does Port Botany support Sydney Harbour?

SH replied that no Port precinct subsidised another. SPC expects to keep wharves at White Bay and some areas of Glebe Island. There is also a large growth in the number of cruise ships.

SH reported that construction of new Operations Centre at the inner end of Brotherston Dock has commenced. It will be a four storey building to accommodate Harbour Control, Pilots and Marine Services Group. The building was approved by Botany Council and is scheduled to be completed by the end of 2009.

PP asked how many workers are expected at this location.

SH replied that as many would be shift workers, a maximum of 30 at any one time. Parking would be a combination of spaces on the Interterminal Access Road and the nearby survey compound.

PP asked whether there would be footpaths and bike access.
SH replied there would be footpaths.

SPC reported that consent had been given by the previous Planning Minister for a second bulk liquids berth. This development is likely to proceed in the short term as traffic at the current berth is increasing and another facility is needed. It would be located adjacent to the existing berth.

LN asked whether any senior management were moving to Port Botany.
SH replied that the Marine Service Group, the Harbour Master and Harbour Control would move to Port Botany but SPC's Head Office would remain in the city area.

Tenants

MF reported that Vopak was currently constructing additional fuel tanks for petrol and jet fuel. These were almost ready and it was anticipated that use of these would commence at the beginning of 2009. They are above ground, and fuel here would supplement product from the refineries. Petrol suppliers such as Shell, Mobil and BP would use these, as well as fuel for mining in the Hunter region.

LN asked why were tanks not built at Newcastle to service the Hunter region.

SH replied that Newcastle doesn't currently have the import facility to accommodate this.

CA asked whether fuel would also be held for small independent petrol suppliers

MF responded there would be. Vopak's Site Bis used by major suppliers and Site A holds fuels for smaller independents who import directly.

PP asked whether added storage of volatile fuel increases the safety line. Is there further risk to residents?

SH replied that the Port Land Use Safety Study modelled the cumulative risk of every site including a fully developed Vopak Site and BLB2 and gave contours. Bunnerong Rd is the boundary of the acceptable risk (1×10^{-6}) contour. There is no extension of the contour with this development.

MF noted that the tanks have a floating roof with no vapours between the product and the roof. This reduces the loss of product and increases safety.

4. Emergency Management

SH reported that the Port Botany Emergency Plan is going well. A meeting was held last week involving the emergency services, tenants and councils. It will be tested with an exercise being scheduled for early next year.

There is an alarm radio at each site tested weekly. These can be used as communication between sites as well as in emergencies.

5. IPART Recommendations

MN reported that there were 18 recommendations from IPART. The government formed two logistic teams to improve the interface between rail and road and improve operational efficiency. The rail logistic team has been formed. The Port Roads Taskforce has 6 different working groups working on issues. It is working with road transport operators and the container terminals, Patrick and DP World. It is looking at information systems, and pricing mechanisms to encourage trucks to work outside peak periods. These will be reviewed over the next months. Committees will report to the wider industry group for discussion prior to implementation.

LN asked whether there would be a system of penalties.

MN replied that nothing had been decided as yet on how to implement reforms.

NH asked whether use of noise barriers along the railway had been investigated.

MN responded that a noise working party has to be formed prior to implementation.

NH suggested that a fire break is required alongside the railway between Swinbourne and Banksia St.

Action – MN to respond to the question of a firebreak alongside the railway between Swinbourne and Banks St.

JB expressed doubt that the commitment to 40% of containers travelling by rail by 2010 was likely to be met given the state governments current financial position. This is the target figure that has been quoted in ministerial media releases. This would mean a doubling of rail freight by 2010. How will these recommendations be implemented given that the government is now cutting back on rail infrastructure?

MN replied that while the South West rail link has been shelved the link to Chullora is still to be built. Federal funds have been committed to improve the rail link between Port Botany and Enfield and the

rail track inside Port Botany is due for improvement next year. After that tracks would be built for freight storage at Enfield.

JB asked whether it is still proposed to build a dual line between Botany and Enfield.

MN replied there was Federal government commitment to improve the line to Enfield. On current estimates this would probably be 2015-2016.

NH asked whether the Banksia St overpass was still going ahead.

SH replied that the concept design has been done but there are issues to resolve. Meetings have been held with Botany Council and consultation with the community will commence shortly.

JB asked whether in light of the economic downturn, monetary figures for the Port Botany expansion have been revised.

SH replied that this hasn't affected plans. The Port is self funding. It has borrowed for the expansion based on land holdings and future income.

JB noted falls in Asciano (Patrick Stevedoring parent company) shares and reported they had a \$4 billion debt. He suggested that this raised concerns regarding the viability of the two current port operators and future operators of the new facilities, especially as the operator of the new facility would need to borrow to finance infrastructure.

SH responded that there are five companies have been asked to tender for operation of the new facility.

LN noted that the community had argued for years that road infrastructure did not exist to support the expansion of the port, and that the premise for the expansion was based on the figure of 40% freight being moved by rail.

SH responded that SPC was to investing in Enfield to develop it as an intermodal terminal.

MN noted the 3 aspects of achieving the 40% figure were the need for additional freight lines at the port end, more intermodal terminals to raise capacity, and more rail capacity through the metropolitan area. The target is feasible if rail line capacity is increased, and more terminals and rail infrastructure. Enfield is being looked at first, then Moorebank and others.

LN suggested this was a lot of ifs. In her opinion there wasn't evidence that this could be achieved. Arguments to support the development were based on empty presumptions.

CA reported that 30 years ago the idea was for the port to move over 90% by rail.

SH emphasised that SPC would continue to develop initiatives to achieve the target.

JB noted that there was a IPART briefing held by Sydney Ports recently

KA advised a podcast of the IPART briefing would be available on the Sydney Ports website soon.

NH asked in relation to land for industries related to port activities, how much more land does Port Botany need?

SH replied that land available for supporting facilities would provide a buffer between residents and the Port area. Supporting industries are to be encouraged around the port area.

NH replied that residents don't want them.

LN suggested these would further generate traffic.

SH replied that if these industries are closer to port, the traffic would not have to travel into the broader metropolitan area.

JB reported that he had seen the Sydney Airport Corporation advertising land for lease near the canal on Foreshore Drive under the Southern Cross Drive, near Gate 16. He asked if it was possible to establish a truck area, as there is currently none and although promises have been made, nothing has been delivered. No one has been prepared to invest the money in developing facilities for truckers near the port. Possible sites around the area are fast running out.

PS Indicated that in the Airport Masterplan the area is shown for commercial development.

MN noted that this is one of the issues considered in the IPART review. As part of the pricing regime, some money would go to an infrastructure fund if this is deemed to be needed. There needs to be consideration as to what is an appropriate location for truck marshalling facilities.

PP asked what percentage of cargo coming into the port goes interstate.

SH replied that around 85% went to within 40 kms of the port. Only around 2% would go interstate.

Sydney is trans shipment port, cargo is offloaded, then picked up by another smaller vessel for transport to New Zealand and the islands. There have been ongoing attempts to keep coastal shipping running.

6. Community members agenda items

- Modelling for the new boat ramp (Foreshore Rd) – Tony Steiner

TS indicated that information provided on wave modelling was insufficient. He requested information on how calculations were made regarding wave and swell heights. He noted that some areas were already silting up, and suggested this was probably due to wave action.

Action: SPC to provide more detail from the Port Botany staff that carried out the wave modelling. JB suggested that eradication of seagrass from thousands of metres couple years ago to 317 sq metres suggested evidence of increased wave action associated with the runway rather an reduced wave action as has been suggested. He has grave reservations regarding wave action around the new boat ramp.

- Proposed Transit Zones for the Bay – Tony Steiner

TS raised the issue of NSW Maritime requesting a transit zone in the area of Molineaux Point due to the conflict between larger ships and recreational boaters in the narrow part of the channel. This would mean no anchoring or drifting in this area. As it is currently a shipping channel, recreational boats are currently not allowed to anchor here, and Maritime don't have the resources to police it as is, so what advantage is there in making it a transit zone?

LN indicated that this is major fishing area, one of the few remaining recreational areas.

JB noted there are three cardinal marks 22m from the front of the seawall. This is a key fishing spot. The proposal would draw a line through the cardinal marks and any vessel over the line will be liable for prosecution. This will render the area unfishable. He said recreational fishermen have asked that the cardinal points be moved out, or a 20m buffer zone put in place. In his opinion the best solution would be to extend the channel, but this is unlikely to happen. There are only up to 4 vessels a day past here. This is not the same situation as the busy traffic on Sydney Harbour.

SH replied there were 10 ship movements a day on average in the Bay. Pilots were having a difficulty with little room to move in the area and there were concerns for the safety of recreational boaters. He cited the example of an accident in Melbourne where a recreational boat was run over.

TS asked if this transit zone does eventuate, are there any plans to extend it to the oil wharf?

SH replied that the primary area of concern is the narrow part of the channel adjacent to Molineux Point. Outside that area there is more manoeuvrability. The Marine Pilots have raised this issue. There has been no approach to extend it.

- Use of Super B Doubles – Linda Newnam

LN reported seeing Super B Doubles trucks on Bunnerong Road. She noted an incident where all traffic had to stop to allow the truck to turn. She has video footage of the incident.

MN replied it was more likely to be a B Double, not a Super B. There are restrictions on where Super B Doubles can currently go which is only in the port areas and the adjacent section of Botany Road. They are equipped with GPS to pinpoint where vehicles are, and if they breach restrictions they won't operate again.

Action: LN to provide MN with the video footage of the incident.

CA and LN reported B Doubles u-turning at Botany and Bunnerong Rds and other incidences of these trucks on Bunnerong south of Military Rd.

SH indicated that SPC is definitely discouraging these vehicles from going into those areas.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be 5:30pm on 25 February, 2009 at ACFS Offices Friendship Road Port Botany