

**Port Botany Expansion  
Community Consultative Committee  
Minutes**

**Date:** 11 September 2012

**Meeting number:** 41

**Attendees:**

Roberta Ryan – Chairperson  
 Neil Melvin – Community Representative  
 John Burgess – Community Representative  
 Nancy Hillier – Community Representative  
 Paul Pickering – Community Representative  
 Michael Kavanagh – Business Representative  
 Steven Poulton – City of Botany Bay Council  
 Kieran Mooney – Sydney International Container Terminals Ltd  
 Jason Ambler – Laing O'Rourke  
 Richard Pollock – Patrick Terminals  
 Raju Divakarla – Patrick Terminals  
 Peter Engelen – Sydney Ports Corporation  
 Paul Jerogin – Sydney Ports Corporation  
 Shane Hobday – Sydney Ports Corporation  
 Frank van den Brink – Sydney Ports Corporation  
 Alison Karwaj – Sydney Ports Corporation  
 Bob de la Lande – Sydney Ports Corporation  
 Sandra Spate – Minutetaker  
 Simon Graham – Downer EDI  
 Anand Reddy – Downer EDI  
 Rocco Versace – Downer EDI

**Jason McGregor**

**Apologies:** Vanessa Tieman – Baulderstone, Marika Calfas – Sydney Ports Corporation, Daniel Banovic – Baulderstone

Item	Issue	Action	By whom	When
1	<b>Welcome, introductions and apologies</b>			
	The Chair welcomed attendees and introductions were made.			
2	<b>Update on construction and activities</b>			
2.1	<u>Grade Separation Works – Presentation by SPC</u> FvdB reported a 'soft opening' of the grade separation for inbound traffic is expected in a couple of weeks. The date will be decided on Friday, but is currently being			

	<p>planned for the week commencing Monday 24 September. Flyers will be distributed to truck drivers via Patrick, Caltex and the One Stop truck email based warning system. There will be a night time start with inbound traffic lanes over the structure separated from outbound traffic which will continue under the grade separation structure.</p> <p>Traffic controllers will be in place and speed limits will be monitored. There will be some inconvenience to Caltex while the inbound lane from Penrhyn Rd is closed to complete the connection from the new Caltex access road to the new Penryhn Rd ramp.</p> <p>All traffic will travel over the structure when fully opened.</p> <p>For pedestrians there will be three routes as now. There will be only one signalized pedestrian crossing at Foreshore Road then pedestrians would move on to a dedicated footpath on the ramp. They will be protected from traffic by concrete barriers. To get to Caltex they will follow the footpath as now. The footpaths will be shared pedestrian/cycle paths.</p>			
	<p>Questions and discussion</p>			
<p>2.2.</p>	<p>NH asked whether feeder roads are now flowing more freely as a result of all the traffic changes. She suggested car traffic is also horrendous.</p> <p>FvdB noted that traffic coming to the Ports Precinct is only approximately 6% of the total traffic on Foreshore Rd. When the level crossing shuts, queuing will be alleviated as there will be no queuing on ramps. Trucks will enter the new SICTL terminal via the new access bridge. There is only 300-400 staff at the Port so this shouldn't cause traffic problems.</p> <p>SH noted there haven't been significant congestion problems recently on Foreshore Road from trucks coming to</p>			

	Port.			
2.3	<p>PP asked what the impacts would be on Caltex when fully operational.</p> <p>FvdB replied that when fully opened outbound traffic will use the roundabout , but during the soft opening period trucks to Caltex would be sent via the existing Enabling Road. There will be a full opening for outbound traffic three or four days after the soft opening.</p>			
2.4	<p>NM asked whether the pedestrian access arrangement to Caltex would be temporary.</p> <p>FdvB replied that it is temporary at the moment. He noted that the situation hasn't been made worse by the grade separation..</p> <p>MK sought to clarify that the existing level crossing won't exist.</p> <p>FvdB replied that it could in the future serve as an emergency egress crossing only, subject to negotiations with ARTC.</p>			
2.5	<p>PP asked whether there is the potential for another pedestrian crossing linking Foreshore and Botany Roads.</p> <p>FvdB replied this is not part of the Port Precinct but is Botany Council area. Caltex has never had a dedicated access path.</p> <p>PP notes this means bicycles traveling from Botany to Randwick will still have to mix it with trucks. This is a long standing issue which has been a concern for residents for a long time.</p> <p>NH asked whether Botany Council had much input into traffic arrangements.</p> <p>SP replied that Council traffic engineers have looked at all changes closely. Traffic engineers have approved frequent signage changes.</p> <p>PP asked whether Botany Council has input into another crossing between Botany Rd and Foreshore Rd at the lights.</p> <p>SP replied this would come under Roads and Maritime Services. Council has not made any representations on this. As far as he knows there have been no</p>			

	<p>representations to Council. Council would raise it if a representation was made to them.</p> <p>PP reports he has referred a lot of letters to the Mayor and Council asking for this missing link so people there are not at risk. It has been discussed here many times but has not been followed up.</p> <p>SP suggests correspondence on this be sent to Council's General Manager.</p>			
2.6	<p>NM noted the difference between traffic flows now and six years ago when the expansion project started. It took an hour to get back into Penrhyn Road after a site tour, and often used to take three or four traffic light changes to get across. This hasn't been happening lately and traffic changes seem to have worked well.</p> <p>FvdB replied that Cargo Link trucks go to Simblist Road first and get called up electronically. Next week a penalty system for early arriving trucks will start. The truck marshalling yard has been established for about 50 trucks and they will also be called up to the respective terminal electronically.</p>			
2.7	<p><u>Short presentation from Downer EDI on the scope of their works</u></p> <p>SG outlined Downer EDI's zero harm policy.</p> <p>The scope of works they will be undertaking for Terminal 3 includes an 11kv power supply to the Terminal 3, construction of a substation, cable trenches and commissioning and testing of the substation.</p> <p>There will be one trench and set of cables with two sections of work. One on the grade separation side and the other the Terminal side. 95% of access would be through the Laing O'Rourke site (via the new access bridge), but some access for work nearer the grade separation will be via the Penrhyn Road entry.</p> <p>There are Noise and Vibration Management Plans. Construction will be within normal construction hours with no</p>			

	<p>night work or work on Sundays or Public Holidays expected. If this needs to be varied application will be made for this.</p> <p>Noise reduction includes use of quackers for reversing alarms.</p> <p>Air and Dust Management involves use of water carts and stockpiles will be covered.</p> <p>Dust monitoring will be undertaken.</p> <p>Operations will cease in high winds.</p> <p>There will be erosion and sediment control with trenching being backfilled the same day.</p> <p>Water quality testing will be undertaken.</p>			
	Questions and discussion			
2.8	<p>The Chair asked what the timeframe is likely to be and what the likelihood of out of hours work is.</p> <p>SG replied work will take 6 to 8 months and out of hours work is unlikely.</p> <p>The Chair requested the CCC be notified if out of hours work should be required.</p>			
2.9	<p><u><i>Banksia St – Presentation by SPC</i></u></p> <p>SH reported that the pedestrian bridge opened on 3 July and has improved the amenity of residents as trains no longer sound the horn or slow down and speed up as they did on approaching the level crossing .</p> <p>Discussions are proceeding with Botany Bay Council regarding a handover of the bridge to them.</p>			
2.10	<p>NH thinks it is a much needed structure.</p> <p>PP asked whether this had resulted in more traffic on the rail line.</p> <p>SH replied that last year 14% of containers were moved by rail. The government has a target of 28%.</p> <p>NH asked about plans for duplication of the line.</p> <p>SH replied this would happen when needed but there is current capacity on the existing line.</p> <p>PP noted he thinks containers should be moved by barge.</p>			
2.11	<u><i>Port Botany boat ramp – Presentation by</i></u>			

	<p><u>SPC</u> SH reported the southern pontoon has been moved to the south at the urging of the boating community to give 4 lanes between pontoons for maneuvering of larger vessels. Work is about 85% complete and is expected to be finished around September 21<sup>st</sup>.</p>			
2.12	<p>MK asked if there is any impediment in Port to rail traffic. SH replied there isn't. The main issue is proving to people that moving containers by rail is viable. The target for the completion of the Enfield Intermodal Terminal is mid 2014 which will make rail movement of containers from Port more reliable and build confidence. Moorebank intermodal is a medium to long term prospect and there is discussion of another intermodal terminal at Eastern Creek in the long term. JB read out projections for truck movements cited at the NLG meeting which he suggests cannot work if taken together with a proposed lifting of the TEU cap. PP reported there had been talk in the media of road trains to the city. He asked if this is likely. SH replied that Super B doubles currently carry 2x40ft containers or 4x20ft containers within the port precinct. PP asked whether Botany Road is part of the Port precinct as during discussions on whether a crossing could link Foreshore and Botany Roads it was reported it isn't. He said the community needs this link. The issue of who controls this needs to be clarified. SH replied that while SPC is not in charge of Botany Road they have approval for trucks to run from one side of Port to the other. PP suggests this puts cyclists at risk.</p>			
2.13	<p>SH updated the CCC on government plans for a 99 year lease of Port Botany</p>			

	(including the Enfield Intermodal Terminal and Cooks River container storage facility) and Port Kembla			
2.14	<p><u>Sydney International Container Terminal Works – Presentation by SICTL</u></p> <p>JA reported that approvals have been given and Laing O'Rourke is currently bringing sheds on to site. Early works will commence next week. Relocation of some saltmarsh will be required and this will be done with the existing contractor Dragonfly International. More substantial works will commence later this year. Community communications will be provided to the CCC. This may be as a monthly community update.</p>			
2.15	<p><u>Patrick development – Patrick</u></p> <p>RP reported that works for the new knuckle section at Patrick is at the planning and design stage. Work on the site is not likely to start till the new year. Patrick is currently preparing documentation for a stormwater modification to improve drainage to the Bay. This will involve the installation of SQIDS similar to those for the SICTL site. There will be no drainage from the Patrick site into Penrhyn Estuary. The documents for this modification will be sent to CCC members with the minutes. Comments on these can be forwarded through the Chair. RP suggests that as they are looking to be on site next year and foreshadowed the need for a CCC meeting to consider Construction Management Plans in October before the formal approval of Plans.</p>	<p>Attach the Patrick stormwater modification documents to be attached to the minutes.</p> <p>A meeting of the CCC to be held in October/November to consider Patrick Construction Management Plans.</p>	<p>Patrick (RP) and the Chair</p> <p>Patrick/ the Chair.</p>	
<b>3</b>	<b>Environmental monitoring monthly reports</b>			
3.1	No environmental monitoring requirements or issues since the last meeting.			
<b>4</b>	<b>Update on communication activities including complaints</b>			

4.1	SH and KJ reported there have been no complaints.			
<b>5</b>	<b>Update on recruiting replacement members for the CCC</b>			
5.1	<p>RR reported that no responses have been received to date for expressions of interest for membership to the CCC advertised in the local paper. She asked that suggestions by members be forwarded to her.</p> <p>JB suggested that contempt has been shown by the government for the community in relation to rail targets and lifting of the number of TEUs.</p> <p>RR said that the input from the CCC in the process has led to a better outcome for the community in relation to the construction management outcomes.</p> <p>JB suggested there were better outcomes in some small ways and CCC participants are part of a committee set up as part of the terms of approval for the site. Now we are in the second part of the process (for construction of the new terminals) all the rules set up as part of the approval process have been thrown out. We are supposed to sit down and be quiet about it (the proposal by government for the long term lease of the site).</p> <p>RR notes that the planning framework and legislative framework haven't changed and the benefit to the community will still be here. The project has benefited from the community member's involvement in the approvals process.</p> <p>NH thinks the committee has worked well and made changes that are important for the community in the area. We have achieved improvements for the future. When the Port was first built in the 70s there weren't even traffic counts.</p>			
5.2	PP notes he has raised the issue of the missing link for pedestrians and cyclists and keeps being ignored. A lot of changes have taken place and the issue is still	Council representatives to report back to Council General		

	<p>ignored. There has been a letter from council to say that they were considering extending the path to link up. This means a crossing is required from Foreshore to Botany Rd.</p> <p>NH asks whether Council representatives' report back on what is discussed at this committee and how the Councils intend to respond. These messages need to be conveyed to the new mayor.</p>	<p>Managers on issues raised at CCC meetings, particularly feedback around the missing pedestrian/ cycle link from Botany to La Perouse.</p>		
5.3	<p>PP asked who will manage erosion on Foreshore Beach with the potential long term lease of Port Botany.</p> <p>SH replied that Penrhyn Estuary, Foreshore Beach and the boat ramp will remain with SPC. SPC is responsible for any necessary remedial works at the beach and is currently looking at options which they will bring to the CCC.</p>	<p>SPC to report to the CCC on proposed options for remediation of erosion at Foreshore Beach.</p>	SPC	
<b>6</b>	<b>Accept minutes of last meeting</b>			
6.1	Minutes from the June 2012 meeting were accepted.			
	<b>Actions</b>			
<b>6.2</b>	<p>Action 3.4. SICTL (JG) to forward Construction and Management Plans to the CCC as soon as possible.</p> <p>Action 4.4.RR to follow up possibilities for recruitment of an additional community representative for the CCC.</p> <p>The two actions from the previous meeting were dealt with under agenda items.</p>			
<b>7</b>	<b>Other Matters/next meeting</b>			
	Next meeting is in November, date to be confirmed.			

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

