

**Port Botany Expansion  
Community Consultative Committee**

**Date:** 17<sup>th</sup> June, 2009

**Meeting number:** 23

**Attendees:**

Roberta Ryan (RR) - Chairperson  
 Nancy Hillier (NH) - Community Representative  
 John Burgess (JB) - Community Representative  
 Neil Melvin (NM) - Community Representative  
 Mick Costelloe (MCo) - Community Representative  
 Paul Shepherd (PS) - City of Botany Bay Council  
 Linda Armstrong (LA) - Baulderstone  
 Vince Newton (VN) - Baulderstone  
 Margaret Harvie (MH) - Baulderstone  
 Quentin Pitts (QP) - Baulderstone  
 Peter O'Leary (PO) - Sydney Ports Corporation  
 Marika Calfas (MC) - Sydney Ports Corporation  
 Peter Zangari (PZ) - Sydney Ports Corporation  
 Kathy Lloyd (KL) - Sydney Ports Corporation  
 Matthew Flugge (MF) - Sydney Ports Corporation  
 Shane Hobday (SH) – Sydney Ports Corporation  
 Annette Cameron (AC) - Baulderstone

**Apologies:** Paul Pickering

**Not present:** Neil Brener, Bronwyn Englaro

Item	Issue	Action	By whom	When
1	<b>Minutes of last meeting</b>			
1.1	Matthew Flugge, Senior Manager, Corporate Affairs, SPC and Annette Cameron, Community Relation Coordinator Baulderstone were introduced to the meeting.			
1.2	Item 5.2 is in regard to the distribution of relevant documents from the Port expansion to council libraries. KL has contacted the librarian for Botany and is currently trying to contact the librarian for Randwick. Material is being compiled to forward to the libraries. NH reported that council's had received copies of the minutes, but these had not gone to the libraries. PS indicated that Q&A sheets should also be forwarded to libraries.	KL will organise to have Q&A sheets forwarded to the libraries.		

2	<b>Update on construction and activities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Dredging outside the silt curtain</b></li> </ul>			
2.1	<u>Presentation by BH-JDN (VN)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foreshore Rd/Millstream landscaping is being finalised.</li> <li>• Cladding has been carried out to the amenities building at the boatramp and fitouts is taking place.</li> <li>• Revetments around the boatramp are underway.</li> <li>• Casting of concrete elements at the boat ramp has commenced.</li> <li>• At the new terminal access bridge at Foreshore Rd the shoulder has been removed, concrete pours continue.</li> <li>• Landscaping is ongoing at the estuary</li> <li>• Interterminal access corridor revetments commencing, work will be done in June and July</li> <li>• The first counterfort unit has been completed.</li> <li>• The De Bougainville, a trailing hopper suction dredge has arrived and is currently working in the Bay. It is in the turning basin and continues to bring sand to the reclamation area. It will remain here until the end of July, with the Marco Polo a cutter suction dredge due here in August.</li> <li>• A second Section 96 amendment to the dredging approval has been made to the DoP to extend dredging at the eastern end of the swing basin.</li> <li>• The shear leg barge is due to come to site by end June which will be used to lift the counterfort and place into the water and Brotherson Dock transition units into place.</li> <li>• Foreshore Rd nightworks will be continue for installation of water mains electrical cables During</li> </ul>			

	<p>July nightworks will be required for the installation of pedestrian bridge girders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Services works at Tupia St are due recommence. Notification will be issued to the affected resident prior to works starting back up.</li> </ul>			
	Questions and discussion			
2.2	<p>NM asked about the number of right turns on Foreshore Rd. How would the right and left turns at the deceleration lane be managed?</p> <p>VN replied that this would be signalised. All right turn points would be signalised. There is no right turn at Millstream. JB suggested there may be another potential signalised intersection for the extension of Hale St, if it goes ahead.</p>			
2.3	<p>PS reported that as part of landscaping works, council was in discussion with SPC for additional kerb and gutter works on Foreshore Rd.</p> <p>MC reported that Boulderstone had been asked to provide cost estimates to SPC. It would then be subject to negotiation.</p>			
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Environmental monitoring Monthly Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Annual Environmental Audit – NSW Department of Planning</b></li> </ul>			
3.1	<p><u>Presentation by BJ-JDN (QP)</u></p> <p>The April monitoring report has been sent out to members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summary of April and May 2009</li> <li>The first annual environmental audit has been undertaken by an independent auditor approved by NSW DOP. No non conformances were found. The final audit report is expected next week.</li> <li>Positive feedback was also received from DECC regarding inspections that were recently conducted in June 2009.</li> <li>Environmental monitoring for April and May found no acid</li> </ul>			

	<p>sulphate soils and no increase in bird strike hazard species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was one dust non conformance at one site but was not found to be attributed to project works. However, a nonconformance was raised in accordance with our environmental management systems.</li> <li>• Marine mammals: the NZ fur seal has returned and hanging out on the rocks near the silt curtain.</li> <li>• A sea turtle was sighted near the seagrass area in late April but has not been seen again.</li> <li>• One daytime noise complaint was received due to piling works in April from a shift worker and a night time complaint related to roadworks.</li> <li>• There have been no other noise complaints in May or June—and no complaints have been received due to additional nightworks on Foreshore Rd.</li> <li>• The saltmarsh is doing well and additional planting will be undertaken this winter.</li> <li>• There have been no turbidity impacts on seagrass.</li> <li>• Shorebird numbers have been decreasing, monitoring is ongoing.</li> <li>• Water quality monitoring has shown no exceedences from dredging outside the silt curtain.</li> <li>• Generally all environmental issues are going well to date.</li> </ul>			
	<p>Questions and discussion</p>			
<p>3.2</p>	<p>PS asked given that dredging outside the silt curtain has not caused problems, why is this method of dredging not used throughout. VN replied this was a smaller capacity, mobile dredge, ideal for the swing basin. It is not suitable for moving larger quantities of sand over greater</p>			

	distances.			
3.3	<p>PS asked what percentage of dredging has taken place, given the timeframe for the counterfort wall.</p> <p>VN replied that about 25% of dredging had been completed. The trailing hopper suction dredge would remain for a further 6 months after the installation of counterfort bases next month.</p> <p>SH noted that 30 bases are ready, and the intention is to produce one complete counterfort unit per day.</p>			
4	<b>Update on communication activities including complaints</b>			
4.1	<p><u>Presentation by BH-JDN (LA)</u></p> <p>CCC members have received the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Community Notice regarding Foreshore Rd nightworks.</li> <li>• A email regarding dynamic compaction activities</li> <li>• A marine notice update related to the Du Bouganville</li> <li>• An update on dredging and reclamation works</li> <li>• A further community notification regarding Foreshore Rd night works.</li> <li>• A dredging update around approval modification (sent out by SPC)</li> <li>• The complaints report</li> <li>• The activities and issues update</li> <li>• The Section 96 application and approval.(sent out by SPC)</li> </ul> <p>Complaints Report – A complaint was received from an unknown resident in Tupia St by fax. It was responded to by fax. There was concern around the condition of Tupia St. Works are ongoing, but there was also some concerns related to other disrepair issues unrelated to the project.</p> <p>Another complaint was around issues for the beaching area for boats adjacent to the existing boatramp. More area has subsequently been created.</p>			

	<p>There were issues around fencing in the carpark taking over existing bays. As there are rocks being stockpiled and deliveries of pipes, this needs to remain as is at present. Once this works package is complete the issue will be revisited. This should be in about 6 weeks.</p> <p>There have also been problems with staff from other non SPC related projects parking in the carpark and launching boats. Efforts are being made to talk with these organisations. Noted though that this is a public car park.</p> <p>An issue regarding buoys and adjoining ropes – the ropes have been removed but buoys left in place to warn against running aground.</p> <p>Statistics Report – there have been a lot of general inquiries about the project.</p>			
	Questions and discussion			
4.2	<p>JB noted that regarding the fenced off carpark area, Baulderstone had been asked if the fence could be moved 1-2 meters. He indicated he had seen little activity in this fenced off area for several months, and the consequential narrowing of the roadway had impacted on boat user traffic access and egress. He believes the area was prematurely shut off but acknowledged that over the past week the storage of materials in the fenced off area had commenced. Notwithstanding he believed there was still scope for the road to be widened by moving the fence inwards slightly. LA replied that the issue came up in April. Trucks require the area to maneuver for deliveries. The area has been used intermittently as a lay down area. It cannot be addressed until the current package of works ie rock revetment in that area is completed.</p>			
4.3	<p>Regarding the Section 96 amendment to the proposed dredging area, PS noted as he hadn't been present at the previous meeting, there was some confusion regarding the time for comment. As it has now gone to the</p>			

	DoP has the opportunity for comment now passed? MC replied this was the case.			
4.4	<p>JB sought to clarify whether the second amendment to Section 96 had been submitted but not yet approved. He suggested that previously he had suggested it would be appropriate to widen the channel at Molineaux Point but was told it couldn't happen. However, it appeared something similar was now being proposed. He also suggested it made sense to run the channel in a straight line, rather than as proposed with a hip so that the channel could be moved further southwards away from Molineaux Point which was an iconic fishing location.</p> <p>SH responded that the Caltex pipeline placed limitations on the Molineaux Cut. There were also practicalities and business considerations to take into account.</p> <p>MCo asked whether dredging would deepen the area.</p> <p>SH replied that the minimum depth would be 15.5m although some localized areas will be dredged deeper.</p>			
<b>5</b>	<p><b>Update on planning activities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Section 96 amendments</b></li> <li>• <b>Navigation aids</b></li> </ul>			
5.1	<p><u>Presentation by SPC (MC) – Section 96 amendments</u></p> <p>The first modification (Section 96) was approved and the additional dredging in the swing basin is now underway. The dredging in the swing basin has proved successful, so an extra modification is being sought to take additional sand. The second modification (Section 96) for additional dredging of the high spot off Molineux Point has been lodged with the Department of Planning. Draft conditions of approval have been received. Final approval is anticipated soon.</p>			
	Questions and discussion			

5.2	<p>JB noted that in supporting documents for the Section 96 modification, assessments of seagrass activity were based on 2002 studies. He considered that as a matter of good science, the area should have been physically re-examined to make an assessment of marine biota changes – including seagrass if any - over the ensuing 7 year period.</p> <p>MC responded that the assessment identified depths that seagrass would be expected to grow at. These assumptions wouldn't have changed over time. Dredging took place in deeper areas than this.</p> <p>NM noted that in support of JB's position, there had been surprises related to areas of seagrass growth in the last few years.</p> <p>MC replied that it was more to do with the rapid decline in seagrass areas and again in shallow areas of the Bay.</p>			
5.3	<p><u>Navigation Aids</u></p> <p>MC reported that there was a need to construct navigation leads in Sir Joseph Banks Park. The reason for the leads is so that ships berthing at the new terminal know the distance off the wharf face for maneuvering purposes. The original proposal was for two in the water and two on the beach. But this gives insufficient distance between the leads to provide the required accuracy and for the 8,000 TEU vessels the height of the leads was not adequate. Photo montages were distributed to show the location and height of the proposed cardinal markers in the park. Negotiations have taken place with council regarding positioning.</p>			
	Questions and Discussion			
5.4	<p>NH asked whether there would be a possibility for vandalism of the markers. SH replied the only vandalism possible would be perhaps graffiti on the pole.</p>			
5.5	<p>PS reported that as a community offset for the leads SPC had agreed to build access ramps over the SWOOS</p>			



5.6	<p>PS asked whether property owners potentially affected had commented. MC reported that they had not yet been advised. Community notifications would advise residents before construction. It was not intended consultation would take place as the options for locating the leads were very limited and this is a navigation safety issue.</p>			
<b>6</b>	<b>Proposed RTA Vehicle Inspection Station</b>			
6.1	<p>MC reported to the meeting that RTA was proposing the construction of a heavy vehicle inspection station on Foreshore Rd to check for violations on trucks leaving the Port. It was expected that if it goes ahead, there would be approximately 7 encroachment into the new vegetation area. It would require RTA to enter into a lease agreement with NSW Maritime, and there would need to be negotiation with council. It does not require approval from Council or the Department of Planning as it would be an approval done by the RTA. SPC would form a view on the proposal, but noted that if it went ahead landscaping works that had already been paid for and in some areas completed would be removed.</p>			
	Questions and discussion			
6.2	<p>NM asked what would be the likely distance from the bike path. MC replied it would probably be a couple of meters at the closet point. NM indicated the purpose of improvements here were for the benefit of the community. It would now become a series of massive trucks. PS noted that council has supported in principle the idea of a weigh station for outgoing vehicles, but as they haven't seen any plan, would need to consider their position. NH asked whether it was envisaged that pedestrians would use Foreshore Rd. She asked what would be the</p>			

	<p>procedure for getting vehicles into the station.</p> <p>SH replied it was not intended for pedestrians to use Foreshore Rd.</p> <p>PS suggested the usual practice is to have heavy vehicles travel in the left lane, then inspectors signal trucks in.</p> <p>NH asked if trailers would ever park on Foreshore Rd again and if not, where have they gone.</p> <p>SH responded they would not.</p> <p>PS noted trailers were parking all over the area, sometimes illegally.</p> <p>MCo asked that as we cannot guarantee the weight of containers coming from overseas, what happens if they are overweight.</p> <p>SH suggested they would probably have to go back to an unpacking facility and be repacked.</p> <p>JB indicated his view was to push for the station to be located on SACL land as part of a much needed truck rest and off road trailer parking amenity. He noted the instability of the land in question, noting a previous road collapse due to a truck pulling over in this area. It would also be over a fuel line. He also suggested that the Council land on the northern side of Foreshore used as a waste depot could be used for an inspection site. PS responded that this was not an option and the station needed to be on the exit side of the port roads.</p> <p>It was suggested that after consideration, CCC members send their views and those of the organizations they represent directly to the Minister for Roads, and that these views be copied to council and SPC.</p>			
<b>7</b>	<b>Other Matters/next meeting</b>			
7.1	<p>JB asked whether people who had been posing as police and maritime authorities at Molineaux Point for the purpose of extorting had been seen again in the area.</p> <p>SH replied that the matter had been forwarded to police and extra patrolling</p>			

	was being undertaken and no other instances had been reported.			
7.2	Next meeting will be on Tuesday 28 <sup>th</sup> July at 3.30pm.			
7.3	MC tended her apologies for the next meeting.			

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'R Ryan', followed by a horizontal line extending to the right.