

**Minutes of Meeting
Port Botany Expansion
Community Consultative Committee**

Date: 21st September, 2006

Meeting number: 1

Attendees:

Neil Brener (NB) – Business Representative
 John Burgess (JB) – Community Representative
 Nancy Hillier (NH) – Community Representative
 Neil Melvin (NM) – Community Representative
 Lauren Wolfram (LW) – Community Representative (for Pat Williams)
 Robyn Eiserman (RE) – Randwick City Council
 Roberta Ryan – Chairperson
 Sandra Spate – Minutes taker
 Colin Rudd (CR) – Sydney Ports Corporation
 Kamini Parashar (KP) – Sydney Ports Corporation
 Marika Calfas (MC) – Sydney Ports Corporation

Apologies:

Paul Pickering – Community Representative
 Paul Shepherd – City of Botany Bay Council
 Patrick Williams – Community Representative

Not present:

Item	Issue	Action	By whom	When
1	Site Tour – Sydney Ports			
2	Welcome, Introductions – Roles and Responsibilities			
2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome by Chair – introductions, minutes • Objectives of the Committee and Terms of Reference – Chair • Roles – Members, Chair, Sydney Ports, Councils – Chair • Conduct of meetings, communications and support – guiding protocols – Chair • Communications with committee constituents and stakeholders – Chair <p>Chair outlined major points contained in the terms of reference document, which members have received. The Minister's Conditions of Approval document is also available to members. The committee is constrained by the terms of reference of the Minister's Conditions. The committee has an advisory role, not an approval role.</p> <p>The chair outlined the process for selection of committee members as guided by the</p>			

	<p>Minister's Conditions. Members were asked that they attend at least 4 meetings per year. Live minutes will be taken at meetings. Members were asked to sign the protocol agreement and ensure its return to the chair.</p> <p>The chair has a role in dispute resolution. Meetings would aim to start and finish on time and notes would be distributed to members in a timely manner. The chair drew attention to protocols covering public statements and statements to the media. No member can speak on behalf of the group in the public arena. Members can only speak as individuals or as representatives of other groups – not as part of the CCC if they are speaking with the media.</p> <p>All members were asked to consider carefully the role of the CCC, the expectations of them as members before signing the protocol document.</p>			
	<p>Questions and discussion</p>			
<p>2.2</p>	<p>JB indicated that as he regularly speaks to the media he would have difficulty abiding with this protocol if it meant that he could not speak to the media. He would not speak on behalf of the committee, but is involved in representing a recreational fishing committee and other committees and is often sought out by the media.</p> <p>Chair clarified speaking to the media is fine as long as members do not seek to represent themselves as part of the CCC. No one could speak about the business of the group unless it is on the public record.</p> <p>NH asked how could it be determined what was on the public record, indicating she had similar issues as JB.</p> <p>Chair indicated that the group would be informed about what is not on the public record, and that this protocol was in order to allow frank and open discussions to take place within the group without members concern that their views would be discussed without their agreement.</p> <p>CR suggested that there would be little discussed in the committee that wouldn't be</p>			

	<p>public, minutes will go on website, so most issues will be on the public record.</p> <p>NH indicated that if this was so, when things do go wrong, the committee should be told about them. The group expects honesty.</p>			
2.3	<p>NB asked whether the development was likely to controversial, generating press interest.</p> <p>JB responded that he thought there would be a lot of public interest in the project as he hadn't heard of support for the project from the public or organisations.</p> <p>LW questioned whether this was the majority of the community.</p> <p>Chair noted the role of the committee is to look forward, a decision to expand port has been made, and the role of the group now is to expedite the construction of the project in the best way possible. She asked members to think about their commitment to the terms of reference and indicated that this was likely to be for a number of years.</p> <p>She noted her own role as an independent chair.</p>			
2.4	<p>NM noted the agendas sent out differed from those received at the meeting, particularly in relation to the attendance of community members.</p> <p>LW replied that she was attending tonight in place of PW.</p> <p>Chair indicated for future reference that there was no provision for alternates to attend; noting that consistency of attendance was required.</p> <p>Chair noted she would make sure members received protocol agreement.</p>	<p>Chair to ensure all members have the protocol agreement and that it is returned signed.</p>	<p>Chair</p>	
2.5	<p>JB queried the selection criteria.</p> <p>Chair outlined that the intention was to bring in a wide range of representatives, including people who lived nearby, not just representatives of organizations.</p>			

2.6	<p>KP indicated that the consultation plan would be presented at the next meeting.</p> <p>Communications would go out via a variety of means including a newsletter and the website and the design and construction tender will be required to have a consultation process in place.</p>			
3	Project Orientation – Sydney Ports			
3.1	<p>Presentation by Colin Rudd – Project Director</p> <p>Final planning approval and funding approval has been issued. Tenders for the contract will start in February 2007, contracts will be determined by the middle of the year and construction will begin in 2008. Construction will be completed 2011 and the port will become operational the same year. The dredging contract is part of the main contract. Geotechnical study information will be given to the group by the next meeting.</p> <p>Most of the rest of the area apart from Penrhyn Estuary is not heavily contaminated. Two phases for the project are: 1, the construction phase with construction and noise impacts, and dredging impacts; 2, operational phase impacts. The aim was to minimize impacts as much as possible. He noted that community feedback was an important element in this.</p>			
	Questions and discussion			
3.2	<p>JB noted that contamination is currently at a low level, but this may increase if containment lines prove inadequate. The dredging process may also affect this.</p> <p>NH asked whether the piles would be driven deeper than holes for geotechnical exploration.</p> <p>CR replied they wouldn't.</p>			
3.3	<p>LW asked whether the design and construction contractor be able to sub-contract work.</p> <p>CR replied that tenders would be required to provide information about which contractors would be used as part of the tender process.</p> <p>NM asked whether there were tenders other than the two major players.</p> <p>CR replied there would be.</p>			
3.4	LW requested information about the			

	<p>consultation process.</p> <p>CR replied that Sydney Ports will hold on to the overall consultation process, and the contracted company would be required to provide information to inform the community.</p>			
<p>3.5</p>	<p>NB asked what the biggest risk to the area was posed by the project.</p> <p>CR replied it was probably a geotechnical risk i.e. ground conditions on which structure is built.</p> <p>JB noted problems encountered with the third runway.</p> <p>NB asked about risks to local residents.</p> <p>CR suggested there may be some danger to environmental habitat. Care is taken but there aren't guarantees (eg seagrass regeneration). There may be some limited and short term turbidity. There may be construction risks.</p> <p>MC indicated residents may be exposed to noise and construction impacts over a protracted period due to the requirement to limit construction hours.</p> <p>JB suggested structural impacts could be managed, but transportation issues would pose major problems in future, citing the example of trucks queuing on the road today. With the nature of Botany changing due to high-rise, residents may be exposed to operational impacts and dioxin emissions.</p> <p>NH noted proposed dredging would be closer to residents this time than previously, and asked whether deeper water posed a danger.</p> <p>CR responded noting 2 points. One was groundwater. Previously the discharge point was moved further out and groundwater rose in Dent St. This time the shoreline would not be extended and therefore groundwater would not rise. However, the expansion may affect ground water. The other issue may be plumes. Analysis of water quality was done assuming plumes would come through. Containment lines will be an improvement on what was initially</p>			

	<p>assumed.</p> <p>JB noted that water quality coming from discharge drains was improving.</p> <p>NH suggested water would be deeper than now and closer to the residents and asked whether this would pose dangers to residents and children (from drowning)</p> <p>MC replied that the water would be deeper a couple of hundred metres from shore, and that the drop is gradual, that contour plans would be presented to the next meeting.</p> <p>JB suggested that with the reclamation process, the beach would be enhanced.</p> <p>NH asked how close the sewerage overflow was to the beach.</p> <p>CR stated that water quality in the area wasn't particularly good at present, and Sydney Water has been undertaking remediation work.</p> <p>He reiterated the aim of the group in minimizing impacts from the project.</p> <p>JB noted the necessity of infrastructure to support the project.</p>	Dredging Contour plan to be presented	SPC (MC)	Next meeting.
4	Next Meeting/s – agenda items, venue and timing			
	<p>Next meeting will be Tuesday October 17, 4.00pm.</p> <p>Items will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation Plan Dredging information Beach drop contours plans Plans for Penrhyn Estuary and Visual Amenity Plan. 			

These minutes have been endorsed by the Chair, Roberta Ryan.

