

**Port Botany Expansion
Community Consultative Committee**

Date: July 3, 2007

Meeting number: 6

Attendees:

Paul Shepherd (PS) – City of Botany Bay Council
 Bronwyn Englaro (BE) – Randwick City Council
 Nancy Hillier (NH) – Community Representative
 Paul Pickering (PP) – Community Representative
 John Burgess (JB) – Community Representative
 Neil Melvin (NM) – Community Representative
 Marika Calfas (MC) – Sydney Ports Corporation
 Kamini Parashar (KP) – Sydney Ports Corporation
 Neil Brener (NB) – Business Representative
 Roberta Ryan – Chairperson
 Jill Yeomans – Minute taker

Apologies: Patrick Williams, Colin Rudd.

Not present:

Item	Issue	Action	By whom	When
1	Welcome and introductions by Chair			
2	Actions Arising			
	Questions and discussion			
2.1	<p>Map of Botany Bay was provided showing Desalination pipeline and Energy Australia cable. NH requested a master plan map and that this item remain open on the list of action.</p> <p>KP said NSW Maritime had been contacted and the map provided was the best available. The desire for a master map with additional information is noted but it is unlikely that this will be released as it may contain sensitive information.</p> <p>JB provided a map showing the preferred routes for the desal and cable lines and the existing caltex fuel line from Kurnell to the airport.</p>	SPC to follow up on the request for a map with additional information.	SPC	
2.2	<p>Response to item 8.5 re ballast water. JB noted the international ballast protocol has been released. MC responded that this has not been</p>			

	<p>ratified by enough countries to come into effect and noted that Australia is a world leader in ballast management.</p> <p>JB pointed out that some ships take on and discharge ballast during the loading process for balance. Exotic species have been introduced to the port from ballast and bilge.</p> <p>MC pointed that in general 70% of all pest introductions have been due to biofouling, only 30% is due to ballast and bilge.</p>			
2.3	<p>Request for Botany Bay trail study. KP provided the August 2006 study which is the most recent.</p> <p>PP asked for confirmation that this will be a shared trail. The route of the conceptual longer term option is similar to the suggestion from the last minutes. There is support from community to run the trail down Bumborah Point Road because it is the most direct and shortest route between Botany and Yarra Bay, rather than Military Rd as shown on the map.</p> <p>KP stated that the Port does not want a cyclist path on Port property due to safety concerns with trucks.</p> <p>PS confirmed Botany Bay Council has a similar policy. He advised that the plan was developed in conjunction with Ports.</p> <p>BE confirmed that council is in discussion with Ports re the development of pathways.</p> <p>PP noted the other side of Bumborah Point Rd could be used.</p> <p>MC responded that this is still Ports property and has the same issues.</p> <p>The chair indicated that PP's suggestions have been raised with Ports and the Councils and their position is clear.</p>			
2.4	<p>Banksias on Foreshore Road. Unfortunately many of these were lost due to recent storms. NSW Maritime is working to conserve those that are left in their works for protection of the beach.</p>			
2.5	Meeting 5, Item 2.3 re responsibility for the	SPC to report on		

	<p>existing boat ramp. PS requested an update. . MC noted that some arrangements have been made to address existing issues. The transfer of the land from NSW Maritime to SPC has occurred however the distribution of tasks is yet to be confirmed.</p>	<p>progress of transfer of responsibility for existing boat ramp.</p>		
2.6	<p>Meeting 5, item 4.1 regarding provision of hard copy of PEHEP. PS thanked SPC and noted the copy had been received.</p>			
3	<p>Issues raised by community members A community member had requested that the offset package be placed on the website. The offset package is a 'back up' to the habitat plan. MC has received all comments on this except for one government agency. These are being examined and will be incorporated along with SPC's response. KP noted that the document has been circulated to the CCC for comment. Concerns were raised that this information is not being passed on to the broader community by CCC members. It is desirable that this is passed on by members rather than via the website as this means there are no accompanying explanatory comments.</p> <p>PS stated that it is difficult for members to distribute this information to people outside the direct network and suggested that documents of this nature should be released on the website for comment.</p> <p>BE also stated that the document should be put on the website as a draft for comment.</p> <p>MC stated that the habitat plan should be read with the offset package for all the information to be understood, otherwise some feedback may be misinformed. JB and BE pointed out that most people who would provide feedback would read all information.</p>	<p>The Offsets Package document will now be put onto the website, with comments received going back to members of the CCC.</p>	SPC	

	<p>KP will be putting a regular column into the newspaper which can be used to direct people to information.</p>			
3.2	<p>PP asked about progress on the salt marsh. MC confirmed this will do better once the mangroves are removed. The seagrass is not recovering due to overburden from moving sand deposits. JB pointed out that recent wave reports showed major sand movement on the bay seabed. The fuel line which was originally covered with a 1m overburden is now exposed in many locations due to wave action with the displaced sand shifting to the north - western side of the bay and burying everything. He suggested that the northern side has seen a progressive destruction of seagrass since the airport and port developments.</p>			
3.3	<p>Mercury testing JB has communicated concerns to KP about the levels of mercury particularly in the Penrhyn Estuary. He is concerned that the distance between sediment test locations is not showing all information.</p> <p>The highest concentration measured of 6.1mg/kg is far outside the standard.</p> <p>MC confirmed that CCC members were given details of all sediment test results. The mercury results were not a surprise following previous detections of mercury in the Estuary. Previous data from Orica sampling has found higher results than this in the Estuary sediments.</p> <p>Mercury has been detected in the upper levels of sediments. Sampling in the dredged area indicated lower levels. Out of the total 110 tests, 12 tests had an exceedance of the mercury guideline, seven of these (from four locations) were outside of Penrhyn Estuary. These had</p>			

	<p>much lower mercury concentrations (highest was 0.33mg/kg).</p> <p>When dredging, the first half metre, if suitable, will be essentially buried (i.e. placed in the reclaimed area first) and there is a low risk of mercury being detached from the sediment.</p> <p>JB has written on behalf of the Orica CLC expressing concerns about the health risks associated with mercury and other contaminants and has asked for the govt and its agencies to undertake a thorough health risk analysis.</p> <p>PP questioned the possibility of an increase in contamination coming through the drains. MC suggested that it was difficult to forecast. SPC will be looking at indicators such as pH levels, nutrients such as nitrogen and dissolved oxygen to measure water quality.</p>			
4	<p>Update on Project</p> <p>Documents have been finalised and sent out to tenderers. Meetings/workshops have taken place to clarify certain aspects of the project. The closing date for tender is the 14 August. It is expected the preferred tenderer will be signed up by end of the year. It is envisaged that work will be starting onsite around March/April. Once tender is signed information will come to the group, however there will be limited information until then.</p>			
	<p>Questions and discussion</p>			
4.1	<p>PS requested information regarding any variations that have been made to the tenders.</p> <p>MC replied that any information removed from this tender does not mean it is no longer a part of the project. It will be picked up at a later stage separately to this tender. The timing of particular items meant that they were not able to be included in this</p>			

	tender.			
4.2	<p>JB asked when a summary of this information will be provided.</p> <p>KP stated that the closing date for tenders had now been extended until 14 Aug 2007 with review of tenders expected to occur over Dec/ Jan 08. CCC will be provided with summary of preferred tender details once decision has been made.</p>			
4.3	<p>PP asked whether earlier discussions around an acoustic barrier were part of this process.</p> <p>KP confirmed that there will be barriers on the terminal that will protect against operational noise. This will be done by the operator of the terminal and will need to be 4 metres high. The bottom half will be solid and the top two metres will be see-through so as to not interrupt the migration of birds.</p> <p>MC stated that both types will provide the same protection against noise.</p> <p>NH questioned whether sound barriers would be erected.</p> <p>KP confirmed this was a requirement of the development.</p> <p>JB pressed the case for homes in the immediate vicinity of the port to be fitted with sound proofing /double glazing etc before project construction commences. JB acknowledged that this was not a requirement of the development approval but is an issue for SPC to consider as a good corporate citizen to enhance the quality of life for those residents directly affected by the port expansion. JB specifically requested that this issue which he has raised previously be elevated to the Executive of SPC for due consideration and not just simply recorded in the minutes.</p> <p>MC confirmed that SPC has put considerable consideration to the options available to deal with the issue.</p> <p>KP stated that the proposed solution addresses the environmental requirements.</p>	<p>SPC to provide further information on noise barriers and the reason why these have been selected.</p>		

5	<p>Changes to Mill Stream lookout – SPC KP reported that there have been some changes made to previously discussed arrangements to move the lookout onto SPC land from Sydney Airports Corporation land due to approval issues. KP will distribute maps once they have been prepared. This area is now narrower, however still has same facilities and 30 parking spots.</p>			
	<p>Questions and discussion</p>			
5.1	<p>NH questioned the new plan taking away more of the beach. KP confirmed that there will be around 40 metres of the beach taken away. This plan is subject to RTA approval.</p>	<p>SPC to bring changes to lookout to the CCC when more comprehensive drawings are available.</p>		
5.3	<p>JB questioned whether the SACL land will be returned to the public as per the original understanding.</p>	<p>Botany Bay Council (PS) will raise the use of this land with SACL.</p>	<p>Botany Bay Council</p>	
6	<p>Offset Package – consideration of comments received – SPC</p>			
6.1	<p>Discussed in agenda item 3.</p>			
7	<p>Monitoring Reports - SPC Monitoring pre construction has begun as identified in Habitat Enhancement Plan. Data will be put on the website when available. The benthos monitoring, the sampling and the reference site report have been done. There will be no interpretation done until more information is collected. There is insufficient sea grass to enable monitoring. This will be reassessed if there is no improvement. Reference sites have been identified as necessary. The salt marsh mapping has been done – awaiting report. Will commence monitoring soon. Shore bird monitoring is soon to commence. Fortnightly sampling has been undertaken during off-peak season.</p>			

	Hydrodynamic monitoring is also occurring. All devices are now installed. One device is awaiting remote connection, but all others are up and running. All results will be posted on the website when available.			
	Questions and discussion			
7.1	PS commented that reports from Orica on the sea grass is contrary to the SPC reports. MC noted that some sea grass found in Penhryn Estuary 'comes and goes'.			
7.2	PP noted that sea grass seems to be in a loam and questioned the possibility of transplanting sea grass. MC confirmed that posidonia will be transplanted, however there will not be any transplantation within the site due to the condition of the existing sea grass.			
8	Ideas for combined workshop with Orica on groundwater issues – All			
8.1	KP raised the ongoing discussion surrounding a combined session between the Orica CLC and SPC CCC. There is a crossover of issues such as groundwater, mercury and traffic. A suggestion that this be led by Botany Bay Council was made, due to the works being in their jurisdiction. PS stated that this was agreed, however not until after the contractor has been appointed.			
8.2	JB stated that the tenderer should be there due to the technical expertise required. PS referred back to previous minutes for this discussion. Chair questioned whether the appointed contractor needed to be present for these discussions. JB believed this was not necessary as many of the issues were separate from this. PS believed the contractor did need to be involved as it affects the timetable of the project.			

	NB proposed that some key issues could be raised without a need for the contractor, such as inconsistency in monitoring etc.			
8.3	JB stated that a third party should stage this meeting to be able to provide information back to the community that is a consensus of both parties – especially regarding containment and the estuary.			
8.4	JB proposed a meeting between SPC, Orica and City of Botany Bay to draw up an agenda.	CCC members to put forward ideas for this session within the next month. SPC will request feedback from Orica group also.	All SPC	
8.5	NH noted that the Southlands development will also impact this. Contamination will not be removed, only capped.			
9	IPART/Randwick Council - BE Background on this issue – KP advised that the Minister for Ports had requested a review into the booking system for trucking. There were a number of submissions which are on the IPART's website. BE raised the submission by a community member and that this is relevant to the expansion.			
9.1	KP confirmed that traffic management particularly impacts on the port. Sydney Ports has made a submission to the review and this is available on the website. There will be a public hearing so it was recommended that it should be discussed at this time. KP will be able to provide information to those wishing to attend. JB commented that most industry and community submissions to IPART raised common concern about the road/ rail transport logistical problems associated with the port.			
10	One year review of the CCC - All KP noted she is proposing a formal feedback process be undertaken as the	Members to provide feedback to KP regarding	All	

	CCC has been operational for one year. KP requested feedback from members on what performance indicators should be measured in a review process. KP will then put this into a formal feedback document to be completed by all members.	suggested performance indicators for the review process		
10.1	Discussion around accommodation for meetings – new premises will be available once construction office is established			
10.2	NH noted she was impressed with amount of work covered through meetings by the chair and the knowledge of members. A great source of information and a credit to members. The chair noted that the meetings work well due to the cooperation of the members and the information provided by SPC. NH requested a report on what the CCC has done in the last year. KP confirmed this is possible and could be released to wider community.			
10.3	JB raised the issue of ongoing community consultations regarding the boat ramp - would these be reconvened. KP confirmed these will be picked up at a later stage with the contractor – it is a requirement of their contract.			
11	Other matters/ Next Meeting			
11.1	NH raised issues with the rail. She doesn't see action regarding trying to move 40% of containers by rail. There is no news about overpass on Banksia St or the double rail. She requested a timeline and information for movement of the rail and noise attenuation. JB pointed out that the rail and transport issues are addressed in the SPC submission to IPART but based on the contents of that and other reports it was virtually impossible to be sure when the new dual rail links would be commenced or who would finance and construct them. Ideally though the Govt was looking to 2010 as a start date for the Southern dedicated			

	<p>freight line to coincide with its commitment to a 40% rail transport component by 2011. KP replied that SPC has been pushing the 40%, currently at 21%. Government has announced changes to build on this. This is not moving as quickly as SPC would like. The chair summarised that building cannot happen until the approvals process has been done and that this process is in a delicate stage.</p> <p>ARTC is currently reporting that there is no need for further capacity in the rail. KP also stated that there are surveyors currently investigating the logistics of the design for the pedestrian overpass.</p>			
11.2	<p>NH questioned the shunting on the Botany Rail Line.</p> <p>JB quoted SPC in that 90-110 train movements are projected for 2011.</p> <p>NM questioned who would build the overpass.</p> <p>This would be tendered by SPC.</p> <p>NH questioned the environmental impact report on this. MC noted that this is not a requirement.</p> <p>Noise around rail corridor – SPC is unable to comment on this as the rail line is owned by RailCorp and licensed by DEC.</p> <p>PS stated that council has had discussions regarding the need for communication between contractor and the community.</p>			
11.3	<p>Access road to the new boat ramp will now have traffic lights and the need for deceleration / slip lanes along Foreshore Rd will be reduced.</p> <p>Botany Council is now moving to have Foreshore Rd declared a suburban road which will mean that street lights can be installed along the roadway (dispels myth that Airport has been obstacle) and that Council will have jurisdiction over trailer parking along the roadway.</p>			
11.4	2 new S 96 applications were distributed to			

	CCC members. These were for immaterial variations with no objections raised by CCC.			
	Next Meeting: 3.30pm 9th October 2007			

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.