

**Port Botany Expansion
Community Consultative Committee**

Date: October 9, 2007

Meeting number: 7

Attendees:

Roberta Ryan – Chair
 Jill Yeomans – Minute taker
 Bronwyn Englaro (BE) – Randwick City Council
 Sarah Deards (SD) – City of Botany Bay Council
 Paul Pickering (PP) – Community Representative
 Nancy Hillier (NH) – Community Representative
 Neil Brener (NB) – Business Representative
 John Burgess (JB) – Community Representative
 Neil Melvin (NM) – Community Representative
 Patrick Williams (PW) – Community Representative
 Kamini Parashar (KP) – Sydney Ports Corporation
 Christa Sams (CS) – Sydney Ports Corporation
 Colin Rudd (CR) – Sydney Ports Corporation

Apologies:

Paul Shepherd – City of Botany Bay Council
 Paul Jerogin – Sydney Ports Corporation

Item	Issue	Action	By whom	When
1	Minutes of last meeting – Chair			
	<i>Matters arising from previous minutes</i>			
1.1	Response to item 2.1 of previous minutes Map requested showing information about the potential pipelines in Botany Bay. KP provided a map outlining the Port development dredging area, the Caltex Oil pipeline and the proposed Energy Australia cable route and desalination pipeline.	Provided at meeting.		Completed
1.2	Response to item 2.5 of previous minutes Responsibility for maintenance of boat ramp. CR reported that from 1 July 2007 control of the boat ramp reverted to SPC. Now being maintained by SPC. There will not be a lot of upgrading to this boat ramp due to the relocation scheduled as part of constructing the new boat ramp. Regular safety maintenance will continue. PP requested that the rubber buffers that were on the boat ramp, which seem to be missing at the moment be replaced.	SPC to follow up	SPC	
1.3	Response to item 3 of previous minutes Offset package is now on the website. No comments have been received.	SPC to come back with expected timing for finalisation.	SPC	
1.4	Response to item 5.1 of previous minutes Changes to the Mill Stream lookout to include parking. KP has distributed drawings of these to members PW questioned need for RTA approval. KP clarified this was for			Completed

	access off Foreshore road			
1.5	Response to item 5.3 of previous minutes SACL land – access to land by community.	Hold over until next meeting	Paul Shepherd	
1.6	Discussion regarding meeting with Orica – to be discussed later in this meeting	Agenda item 6		
1.7	Members have been sent the review forms. Waiting for some forms to be returned.	Members who have not sent back forms to complete and send back to KP.	Members	Since completed

2	<p>Update on Project – SPC Colin Rudd</p> <p>Tenders closed on 14 August. The evaluation is now coming to a conclusion and the contract should be awarded by the end of 2007. Major works onsite should begin June/July 2008. Will take 2 ½ years to complete main infrastructure. First berths should start operation either late 2011 or early 2012 Background environmental monitoring is currently being done e.g. seagrass and wave monitoring. There were four modifications to original conditions of consent. All have been approved. The CCC has discussed these at previous meetings. The Port is still quite busy. Busiest month ever was August. This is being driven by increasing imports.</p>			
	Questions and discussion			
2.1	<p>PP raised the issue of an increase in parking on Bunnerong Road by heavy vehicles and raised a question regarding any plan for provision of off-street parking. NB questioned whether when everything is finalised in 2012, will there be an increase in trucks and will this get progressively worse? NB noted it currently seems to be getting progressively worse now without the expansion. CR stated there are no short term answers. The Enfield Intermodal Logistics Centre has been approved and will be operational from 2010. Extensions to the M4 will also assist. CS said there was a meeting held with Randwick Council where this issue was discussed in detail. JB questioned whether there would be any offsite storage for trucks. KP stated that Botany Council was looking at a particular site for a facilities site for truck drivers, but was not sure about the status. CR advised that SPC has no plans to have any offsite facilities. NB stated that there are three issues – increased traffic, increased need for parking and road safety issues. If there is nothing that can be done to improve the first two issues, what can be done to improve the third issue?</p>	<p>KP will distribute changes to traffic arrangements when received shortly.</p> <p>Further discussion on these issues next meeting.</p> <p>Action: Agenda item for next committee meeting.</p>	<p>SPC</p> <p>SPC</p>	

	<p>CR stated that providing facilities and dealing with the truck parking issues is of strong interest to SPC who are looking for a long term solution. In the meantime this is a logistics issue that needs policing and regulating.</p> <p>JB recommended that people read the IPART papers for further information and context regarding this issue.</p> <p>RR stated that all agree this is an important issue to everyone; however there are no answers to this question at this time and the committee may wish to pursue this further at subsequent meetings.</p> <p>KP recommended the next meeting concentrate on traffic, rail, logistics etc.</p> <p>CR stated that there is increasing awareness regarding these issues and this will lead to solutions.</p>			
2.2	NH requested that someone from Rail come to a meeting and discuss issues relevant to the Port expansion.	SPC to invite a Rail representative to attend a future meeting	SPC	
3	<p>Noise study and outcomes during EIS and COI – SPC Christa Sams CS presented to the Committee on a number of issues that have been raised in previous meetings, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments and questions in CCC #6, • Noise Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport noise • Operation noise • Summary of consent conditions 	The power point presentation will be distributed with these minutes		
	Questions and discussion			
3.1	<p>JB raised that truck numbers have increased by a large number since the recordings in 2002.</p> <p>CS stated that the actual volume change that is predicted is a maximum of 0.6dB. CS stated that the only way to get a significant increase in noise would be a doubling of truck movements.</p> <p>PP pointed out that noise is also related to speed – not just an increase in the number of trucks. Questioned if there has been any research done into a lowering of the speed limit and the positive impact that might have on noise levels.</p> <p>CS stated that a Port traffic noise management plan will be implemented, providing mitigation measures.</p> <p>NB asked what the increase in noise would be over 2002-2007-2011.</p> <p>CS responded that this increase due to the port expansion will be no more than 0.6dB.</p> <p>CS clarified that the change in noise will not be noticeable as it is a small change and the background noise level is quite high.</p>			


	PP stated that the community believes different.			
3.2	<p>PP raised that there is a requirement for a Port Traffic and Rail Noise Management Plan, why was there a need for a Rail Noise Working Group.</p> <p>CS stated that the Plan is to be developed by the port operator and is related to trying to minimise road and rail noise, and is a condition of consent for only the new terminal. There are other requirements that apply to the existing terminals. The Rail Noise Working Group is to bring together all parties involved with addressing rail noise including operators and authorities.</p>			
	<p>NH asked who would be responsible for housing noise mitigation on Botany Road due to the noise associated with the Port.</p> <p>CS stated that this is not a requirement of any parties. There is an effort to increase the use of Foreshore Road by the trucks, and therefore have them diverted from Botany Road.</p> <p>CR said this is an issue that has been previously discussed. The predictions of noise levels do not exceed the threshold that would require the Port to provide noise mitigation treatments and thus there is no requirement.</p> <p>PP questioned what will happen if the science is incorrect and the noise is higher than predicted.</p> <p>CS stated that measurement and monitoring will be reported to the DOP in accordance with the consent conditions.</p>			
	<p>PP questioned whether an increase in noise and traffic in the area outside the SPC site will be held as the responsibility of SPC.</p> <p>JB stated that this is outside the scope of SPC and is not their problem.</p> <p>RR clarified that the NSW Government is held accountable for approvals.</p> <p>NH asked what the penalties are going to be if the noise levels exceed what is approved.</p> <p>RR stated that this information will be available.</p>	SPC to provide information on penalties for works exceeding recommended noise levels.		
3.3	<p>JB expressed frustration with a perceived lack of outcomes from the meetings and questioned whether the discussions are making any progress. JB feels that the outcomes of the meeting are compromising him and does not feel he will attend any future meetings.</p> <p>RR referred members to the Terms Of Reference of the committee whose main role is in working on construction issues. JB and each member of the committee were given briefings in advance of them joining the committee to enable them to realise that this committee has no role in opposing the expansion of the Port. It is understandable that some members might find the limitations of the Terms of Reference of the Committee frustrating. The main business of the committee will not really begin until construction begins.</p> <p>NB raised the point that members may be better off being in the committee than not.</p> <p>PP stated that he believes the committee has made some</p>			

	<p>achievements already. Eg in relation to the boat ramp, motor flushing, parking changes etc.</p> <p>NB stated that if JB were not in the meetings a lot of issues and awareness would not be raised.</p> <p>NH stated that there will not be any outright wins.</p> <p>CR commented that the Port expansion has been approved, but being on this committee provides an opportunity for the community to influence many of the outcomes and for Sydney Ports to have an opportunity to hear directly from the community.</p>			
4	<p>Update on environmental monitoring – SPC</p> <p>KP distributed a handout updating the Environmental Monitoring Status</p> <p>KP stated that there is already some monitoring information available on the website.</p>	<p>Hand out to be distributed with the minutes.</p> <p>Any questions to be forwarded to KP</p>		
	<p>Questions and discussion</p>			
4.1	<p>PP questioned whether some work being done by NSW Maritime will affect the end result of the Foreshore Road works. The extent and need of these works was clarified, and that they are being done to stabilise the beach and the stabilization area will ultimately and will end up behind the new rock wall as part of the expansion works.</p>			
5	<p>Issues raised by community members for discussion – Paul Pickering</p> <p>Letter received from two local residents. Issues raised are the current and future increase in noise, health effects of noise; recommended responses (sound barriers, resurfacing Foreshore Road, sound-proofed houses, lowering of speed limits etc). The letter states that residents are intimidated by large trucks and feel there should be more policing and a decrease in the speed limit.</p> <p>PP requested SPC comment on the letter and the recommendations stated within. PP acknowledged that increased policing and decreased speed limits have already been raised by SPC.</p>	<p>SPC to address the key issues raised in the letter and respond directly as well as provide response to the Committee members.</p>		
5.1	<p>CR stated that the construction of sound barriers etc on Foreshore Road was investigated and found not to be effective. There would only be a lowering of noise by 1dB which would not be noticeable by residents.</p>			
5.2	<p>PP raised that if there are street lights on Foreshore Drive it would become a town road, rather than a country road, and allow more policing of the trucks.</p> <p>KP advised that rezoning would only allow a change in parking provisions.</p> <p>JB clarified that the rezoning will not go ahead after a discussion with the Minister. Foreshore Drive will remain a country road.</p> <p>CR raised that until broader logistics issues are solved, this will continue to be an issue as the trucks still require somewhere to</p>			

	park.			
5.3	PP asked whether concrete roads are noisier and if resurfacing would reduce noise.	SPC to investigate into the cost of resurfacing Foreshore road and to identify if this would lead to reductions in noise.		
5.4	JB stated that lowering speed limits marks an increase in air pollution.			
	<p>PW stated that everything that has been opposed by the community is now happening. ICI is now hiring people to do things that were required 16 years ago. PW believes the same issue faces the Port expansion. PW stated that there will always be noise on Botany Road. Foreshore Road was built to guide the traffic off Botany and Military Roads.</p> <p>CR stated that a development application is being prepared for the Hale St Development by an independent party. Members agreed that this development has potential to assist some concerns of local residents.</p> <p>CR stated there are some issues surrounding the DA however it is supported by SPC.</p> <p>RR stated that the committee can review the documentation and submit a response.</p>	Hale Street DA documentation to be distributed to members as soon as it is available. PP to report discussion back to residents and refer to the minutes.		
5.5	<p>NH stated that the issues raised by the residents have been raised previously by Council and the Committee.</p> <p>RR raised that the points are important and new residents who have recently moved in..</p>			
5.6	NM noted that similar issues have been raised in other areas and improvements in noise levels have been made (e.g. Bay Street). NM believes that the only way noise levels will reduce is if the number of trucks are reduced.			
5.7	<p>PP raised letter from a member of the community to Randwick Council on the perceived requirement for a safe bicycle track through the SPC site. PP acknowledged that SPC does not want bicycles on SPC property due to safety concerns, however requested that this be readdressed. PP has discussed this with RTA staff – other sites have shown there are safe options available, and this is at the community's interest.</p> <p>KP asked if Randwick Council had any further cycle path plans. BE stated that Council is trying to guide people to use Military Road as a preference.</p> <p>CR stated this is also the preference of SPC.</p> <p>PP stated there is still a need for a cycle/pedestrian way through Bumborah Point Road as it is the most direct route. PP stated that access through to La Perouse from Randwick etc is currently restricted.</p> <p>BE stated that getting across Botany Road seems to be one of</p>	KP/PP to draft a note to the member of the community with response.		

	<p>the major issues. This is an RTA road.</p> <p>KP stated that it would be irresponsible of SPC to allow bicycle paths through the Port. There is no preferred route. SPC would like to work with Council to see what the best possible routes are. Southern Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils have identified a preferred route.</p> <p>PP believes this is not the best route and was done without adequate consultation.</p>			
5.8	Letter from Paul Shepherd discussing CCC feedback distributed	To be discussed at the next meeting		
6	<p>Discussion about combined workshop with Orica - All</p> <p>KP stated that the possibility of this workshop has been raised at previous meetings. There have not been any items brought forward for the agenda and at the previous CCC meeting it was agreed that it is currently too early for this workshop as the contractor needs to begin before it is appropriate. KP requested confirmation on this with members of the CCC.</p> <p>The CCC decided that it was not appropriate to hold a joint workshop at this point with Orica.</p>	<p>CCC agreed that the contractor is required prior to this meeting taking place.</p> <p>If Orica has a pressing issue, it is requested this be given to the CCC in writing.</p>		
6.1	<p>PP raised that Orica are lowering the water table by drawing water away for treatment. The runoff through the Southlands and Orica site is not running off as the site is being dewatered. Thus, any testing for Botany Bay is not a true reflection of what is happening on the site.</p> <p>JB agreed that the Hydraulic containment line is currently working most of the time. JB stated that conditions have been affected by a lack of rain. Because the contamination levels have come down, there is no leeching into the surface drains and the amount of contamination into Penrhyn Estuary is considerably lower.</p> <p>PP questioned what would happen if heavy rain came through. JB stated an understanding that even heavy rains would not increase the contamination significantly. The amount that this would occur is incidental. The only thing that could potentially cause a problem is the carpark encapsulation issue.</p>			
8	Other matters			
8.1	<p>CR stated that the desalination project is moving forward – are any members involved with this project?</p> <p>JB is involved in the Energy Australia cable and the Desalination project. JB noted that the issue is with further dredging for cables as there is little space left.</p> <p>CR stated that Energy Australia and SPC have discussed predicted sizes of ships coming in and Energy Australia will dig a minimum of three meters below this.</p>			
8.3	KP suggested a lunchtime meeting before Christmas to be followed up with a regular meeting in February.	KP to send a note around to the CCC		
9	Next Meeting/s- agenda items			

	February 12 2008, 3.30pm			
--	--------------------------	--	--	--

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



Port Botany Expansion

PORT BOTANY

BOTANY BAY

YARRA BAY

KURNELL

CENTRE LINE OF NAVIGATION CHANNEL
CHANNEL LIMITS
CHANNEL LIMITS

-  Port Development Dredging Area
-  Energy Australia Cable Route (proposed)
-  Caltex Oil Pipeline
-  Desalination Pipeline (proposed)

Environmental Monitoring Status

(In Accordance with Penrhyn Estuary Habitat Enhancement Plan)

Monitoring	Completed	Current	Future
Shorebird Monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-construction Peak Season Monitoring Dec 2006 – April 2007 • Pre-construction Off-season Monitoring April 2007 – August 2007 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-construction Peak Season Monitoring Sept 2007 – April 2008 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D&C Contractor to monitoring during construction • SPC Ongoing monitoring during construction and post construction
Benthos Monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Pre-construction baseline monitoring March 2007 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nil 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd Pre-construction baseline monitoring November 2007 • 3rd preconstruction baseline monitoring March 2008 (possible)
Seagrass Mapping & Monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seagrass mapping Feb 2007 • Reference Site Selection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nil 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seagrass Mapping to be brought forward – Oct 2007 • Spring (Oct 2007) & Autumn 2008 seagrass monitoring & nekton field work dependent on Oct 2007 Seagrass Mapping results
Seagrass (<i>Posidonia</i>) Transplanting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-transplant <i>Posidonia</i> mapping Feb 2007 • Selection of recipient site (with Dept Fisheries) at Quibray bay 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nil 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October seagrass mapping • Spring 2007 transplanting (if <i>Posidonia</i> still present)
Saltmarsh Monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 2007 mapping • Autumn monitoring including reference sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nil 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spring 2007 Monitoring • Feb 2008 monitoring
Hydrodynamic Monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install directional and non-directional buoys • Install long wave recorder 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing data gathering 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install telemetry for long wave recorder
Beach survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summer 2006 / 2007 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nil 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summer 2007 / 2008
Ground Water Level Monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing bores commence monitoring Dec 2006 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New bore to be installed spring 2007 with data loggers

Tuesday 9 October 2007

Port Botany Expansion Noise Assessment

Christa Sams
Sydney Ports Corporation

Outline of Presentation

Response to:

- Comments and questions in CCC #6

Key issues covered:

- Noise Assessment Outcomes
- Consent Conditions
- Mitigation Measures

Noise Assessment

Undertaken by acoustic consultant - Wilkinson Murray

Based on NSW DECC Policies

- Industrial Noise Policy – INP (Terminal Operations)
- Environmental Criteria for Road Traffic Noise – ECRTN (Offsite Trucks)
- Environmental Noise Control Manual– ENCM (Construction and Offsite Rail)

& City of Botany Bay Noise Policy

Assessment Method

- Background Monitoring - unattended & attended (9 locations)
- Determine project criteria
- Model 'worst case' scenario for operation and construction
- Predict based on ships, trains, trucks, operational and construction equipment
- Compare model outcomes to criteria
- Evaluate and select mitigation options

Road Traffic Noise Outcomes

- Major truck routes assessed (Foreshore, Botany, Beauchamp roads)
- Existing road traffic noise exceeds the ECRTN at all assessment locations
- Increase due to PBE determined to be less than 2dB criteria in ECRTN (max 0.6dB in an hour)
- There would need to be an overall doubling of movements for a change of 3 dBA to occur
- No significant impact on roads beyond major truck routes
- Port Traffic Noise Management Plan to be implemented

Construction Noise Outcomes

- Some predicted exceedances - piling
- Terminal barrier to be constructed as soon as possible during construction
- Post-approval reassessment of noise from night-time dredging operations (new criteria)
- Noise management plan and night-time noise management protocol to be implemented
- Construction traffic to use Foreshore Road

Operation Noise Outcomes

Predicted Night Time Noise at Residences from New Terminal with Noise Mitigation (Noise Barrier and Equipment Control)

Location	Criterion (dBA)	L _{AEQ} Predicted Noise Level (dBA)	Complies with Criteria (Exceedance in dBA)
Location 1: Chelmsford Ave	40	38 ¹	Yes
		35 ²	Yes
Location 2: Dent Street	40	43	Exceeds by 3
		41	Exceeds by 1
Livingstone Avenue	40	41	Exceeds by 1
		38	Yes
Tupa Street	40	41	Exceeds by 1
		39	Yes
Waratah Road	40	42	Exceeds by 2
		40	Yes
Location 3: Jennings Street	39	27	Yes
		34	Yes
Location 4: North of Golf Course	40	43	Exceeds by 3
		45	Exceeds by 5
Location 5: Australia Avenue	38	25	Yes
		33	Yes
Location 6: Military Road	40	31	Yes
		40	Yes

Weather conditions: 1) Isothermal; 2) NW Wind

Operation Noise Outcomes – Cont.

- Primary noise sources from the new terminal are from ships
- Noise predicted at nearby non-residential receivers, including schools, churches and recreation areas such as the golf course complied with the relevant non-residential criteria
- Additional noise generated by the operation of the new terminal over that from existing port amounts to 1 dBA at the most
- Upper end of the range of maximum noise levels exceeded the 'sleep arousal criterion' by 1 to 2 dBA at residences

Summary of Consent Conditions

- Limited construction hours
- Construction Noise Management Plan & Night-Time Works Noise Management Protocol
- Alarm noise minimisation
- Construction noise goals & night-time dredging noise criteria
- Terminal noise barrier
- Early implementation of noise mitigation
- No blasting
- Port Traffic and Rail Noise Management Plan
- Operation Noise Management Plan
- Operation noise limits and monitoring
- Rail noise working group

EIS Mitigation Commitments

- Selection of quiet equipment or implement noise controls on equipment
- Barrier on terminal – 4m high, N & NE
- Operation Noise Management Plan
 - Control of alarms
 - Machinery maintenance
 - Operator training and awareness
 - Complaints handling
 - Monitoring
- Traffic Noise Management Plan
- Construction Noise Management Plan

Further Noise Mitigation Considered

Road Barrier

- Additional 400m barrier north of Foreshore Road (4m high mounding or wall opposite intersection) will not affect noise levels from terminal operations
- Will slightly reduce overall traffic noise levels north of the Golf Course by 0.5dBA and Foreshore Road traffic by 1dBA
- Development already meets DECC traffic noise criteria
- Consideration of potential adverse impacts and constraints
- Not considered effective

Further Noise Mitigation Considered

- Future improvement in Noise Control – eg operational equipment; vessels
- Treatment of houses – eg double glazed windows, insulation (not feasible or reasonable)

Conclusion

- Proposal assessed according to relevant guidelines
- All reasonable and feasible mitigation measures incorporated
- Conservative assumptions (e.g. equipment and ship noise levels) made for 20 years into future
- With mitigation, total noise levels from all terminal operations (existing plus new terminal) would be no more than 1dBA above current port at future capacity