

**Meeting:** Port Botany Community Consultative Committee – Meeting No. 3

**Held:** Tuesday 20 May 2014, 5.30pm-7.30pm  
SICTL Offices, 1 Sirius Road (Port Botany Expansion)

**Present:**

Roberta Ryan (RR) – Chair	Jonathan Lafforgue – DP World
Charles Abela (CA) – Community	Richard Pollock (RP) – Patricks Stevedores
John Burgess (JB) – Community	Tine Birkemose (TM) – Patrick Stevedores
Lynda Newnam (LN) – Community	Nathan Barnes (NB) – Vopak
Tom Nolan (TN) – Community	Glen Davenport (GD) – Vopak
Ross Salter (RS) – Community Business Representative (Kingsford Timber Mitre 10)	Andrew Hogg (AH) – Terminals Pty Ltd
Lisa Williams (LW) – Electorate Offices for Member for Maroubra	Michael Selleck (MS) – Terminals Pty Ltd
James Goodwin (JG) – EPA representative	Aldo Constabile (AC) – Elgas Limited
Jacqueline Roberts (JR) – EPA representative	Cliff Bell (CB) – Caltex Terminal Operations Manager at Banksmeadow
Janice Dennany (JD) – Randwick Council	Karl McCarthy (KMc) – SICTL Stevedores
Sandra Spate (SSp) – Minutetaker	John Ieroklis (JI) – SICTL Stevedores
Shane Hobday (SH) – NSW Ports	Dave Condon (JC) – Burton Contracting (SICTL)
Adem Long (AL) – NSW Ports	Kieren Mooney – SICTL Stevedores
Alison Wedgwood (AW) – NSW Ports	Trevor Ballantyne – SICTL Stevedores
Daniela Vujic (DV) – NSW Ports	Melissa Pollock (MP) – Orora
	Leigh Heany – Electorate Offices for Member for Kingsford-Smith

**Apologies:** Ryan Bennett – Sydney Ports Corporation, Neil Truskett – Patrick Stevedores, Mark Walker – Qenos, George Tanevski – Origin Energy, Steve Poulton (SP) – City of Botany Bay, DP&E representative, Bronwyn Englaro (BE) – Randwick Council

Item	Description	Action/Responsibility
1	<b>Apologies and Introductions</b> The Chair welcomed attendees and thanked SICTL for hosting the meeting. LN asked that regulation of emissions from ships at Port Botany be addressed in the meeting.	
2	<b>Accept minutes of last meeting</b> Acceptance of the minutes from meeting 3 was moved LN and seconded by JB and the minutes were accepted by the meeting.	
3	<b>Actions arising from previous minutes</b>	
3.1	Item 5.5: NSW Ports to invite DP&E to the next meeting to provide more information about the Ports SEPP amendments. DV reported that Department of Planning and Environment (DP&E) was invited and had intended to come but are now unable to. She suggested that if CCC members send specific questions on the Port SEPP to her within a month she will pass these on to DP&E (Daniela.vujic@nswportsbotany.com.au). DV is not aware of any	CCC members to email DV Port SEPP questions by 23 <sup>rd</sup> June. DV to pass on questions to DP&E for a

	proposal to change the Port SEPP boundary, but amendments to the SEPP discussed last meeting are due to be introduced on May 31, 2014.	response at the next meeting.
3.2	Item 6.4: EPA to take back to the noise working group the issue of establishing noise criteria. To be discussed under agenda item.	
3.3	Item 6.5: EPA to take back to the noise working group the CCC request for a community representative. To be discussed under the agenda item.	
3.4	Item 8.2: SPC to take on notice providing a surface on groynes that people can walk on. As RB was an apology, AW reported on behalf of SPC that they had completed the engineering design of the two groynes which are intended as rock groynes with sheet pile extensions. The sheet pile will not be publicly accessible. LN suggested this ridiculous and asked why. The community is losing more beach and continuously facing reduced access. JB asked to lodge a formal protest as walkable groynes have been requested over a long time. He asked for information on what they will look like, where they are, how big and why when the community requested they be publicly accessible they are not.	AW to take feedback on groynes to SPC and that information on design be provided to the CCC between meetings.
3.5	Item 8.4: SPC to circulate Penrhyn Estuary monitoring results to the CCC when available. AW reported the second yearly report is due in the next couple of months. The CCC will be notified as soon as it is available. This action remains open.	Action from previous meeting, SPC to circulate Penrhyn Estuary monitoring results to the CCC when available, remains open
3.6	Item 9.2 JI to ask KMc to forward a SICTL construction update to be attached to the minutes. This has been circulated to the CCC. The action is closed.	
3.7	Item 12.2: RB (SPC) to look at providing historical meeting minutes to NSW Ports or on the Sydney Ports website. LN has had discussions with AL and will talk to RB outside the meeting.	
<b>4</b>	<b><u>NSW Ports/SPC developments</u></b>	
4.1	SH reported the main development as the Enfield Intermodal Terminal. NSW Ports works are now complete and the Intermodal Terminal section of the site was handed to Hutchison in April who intend it to be operational in Qtr 4 2014.. NSW Ports is in the market to look for other port related tenants for the remainder of the land parcels available at Enfield and has received strong interest. The vast majority of freight movements between Enfield from Port will be by rail.	
4.2	<b><u>Elgas</u></b> AC reported that work on the proposed pipeline to Qenos is still awaiting development approval, but it is hoped work will start in June and is expected to be finished early October 2014.	
4.3	<b><u>Terminals Pty Ltd</u></b> AH reported Terminals is in the process of building 14 new tanks to store combustible products. The first stage involving six tanks is expected to be finished in September or October 2014.	
4.4	<b><u>Vopak</u></b> GD, the National Operations Manager from Vopak overseeing the three terminals in Australia, delivered a presentation to the meeting. The recently constructed bitumen terminal consists of 3x7,000 tonne tanks containing three grades of bitumen. There is in-line blending from the	

	<p>three tanks on the way to the truck. The first shipment arrived on April 7 and the second on April 21. What is being stored is classified as non-hazardous. It is Dangerous Goods class 9 due to the heat factor. It is classified as Combustible Goods, not Flammable.</p> <p>Vopak Odour Incidents: Odours were first experienced on April 21 and were more than expected and Vopak moved quickly to install black mesh to stop the wind flow and also shrouding around the vent. The temperature of the product (approximately 160°C) was lowered but it takes a while to cool. The temperature has now started to reduce. The vapour combustor unit is operating 24/7. The shroud reduces the gap around the vent. The original design was open to the atmosphere. During design the focus was on a potential over pressure event, with the orifice being suitable for a pressure event. There is continuous gas monitoring on site and all readings are within exposure standards. If readings are good on site then they will be within standards off site. Readings indicate less than 1 part per million and the exposure standard is over 10 parts per million or 8 parts per million over 8 hours. It is odourous but not hazardous. The shrouding is not a long term solution. With a redesign the original vent will go and be replaced with a plate with goose neck vents to reduce airflow. June 3 is the goal for completion and work is currently ahead of schedule. The management team is focused on addressing odour and is deeply sorry for the impact on the community. Vopak is a committed part of the community, with an excellent safety record. Vopak wants to address the vent issue, and is working in conjunction with EPA and NSW Ports to do so. CA suggested that there were odours of hydrogen sulphide which is harmful in any concentration. How can Vopak say it is not harmful to health? He noted there was the smell of burning tyres. GD replied that they are not emitting harmful amounts from the terminal, the concentrations within the site are well below the permissible levels under the Australian Standards but acknowledged CA's viewpoint. He noted complaints from La Perouse and Little Bay. LN asked what media exposure there had been to let people know. GD replied there was a letterbox drop at La Perouse, Matraville and Yarra Bay. He confirmed that residents had been informed of finalising the vent in early June. Odour is stable at the moment but there may be potential short term impacts when the existing vents are lifted off to be replaced with the new structure. A newsletter was issued. LN advised that she is at La Perouse and hadn't received notification. She asked whether Vopak has considered an advertorial in the Southern Courier. GD replied they will consider an advertorial.</p>	<p>Attach the Vopak newsletter to the minutes. (Vopak and RR).</p>
<p>4.5</p>	<p><b>Caltex</b> CB, Caltex Terminal Operations Manager at Banksmeadow, advised the meeting that while still under professional privilege, he was happy to share what he can of the learnings and actions from the spill on July 12 2013. After the spill Caltex was initially issued with three improvement notices. One was for an independent inspection on the tank valve which has been completed. The second was for a review of procedures for tasks being performing at the time. Caltex had already initiated this as there were admitted failings with procedures. Changes to procedures as a result of the incident review have now been adopted across the country.</p>	

<p>The third was a review of emergency response procedures which is completed.</p> <p>CB reported an increase in engagement with emergency services following the spill which had revealed a comparative lack of familiarity with the site by emergency services. There is continuing engagement with the Botany, Matraville, Mascot and Maroubra Fire and Rescue NSW stations.</p> <p>Caltex was involved in the Hazmat conference in Melbourne at their invitation.</p> <p>There was an immediate improvement in the level of fire equipment on site. Prior to the event, this type of spill was not recognised as a likely event. There are now additional foam stocks and capacity to deliver them. And an arrangement has been formally confirmed to call on equipment and response from Kurnell if needed.</p> <p>He participated in the Port Botany Emergency Management Committee whose follow up meeting in February reviewed the Port Botany Emergency Plan including a detailed summary of emergency equipment in the precinct. Emergency services also have additional information. An updated plan came out this week.</p> <p>CB has presented throughout Australia sharing details of the incident and learnings, encouraging others to look at the event and related process controls.</p> <p>An incident report was completed after the spill and provided to regulators with a number of findings. There was a third party forensic assessment of equipment. The principle failing involved human factors and led to modification of controls.</p> <p>JB raised another major spill on March 24 at Kurnell in which the oil spill spread around the Bay and into Sydney Harbour. He said the Port Authority was slow to react, taking two hours, the EPA went to the wrong place and the way Caltex handled the matter was appalling. He suggested Caltex look closer to their own backyard as the so called improved incident handling procedures did not work at all well for this latest incident at Kurnell. He suggested that while the media reported the incident as minor it was in fact a major spill and by the time the EPA and Maritime arrived on the scene the slick had moved north to La Perouse, Bare Island, Congi, Cape Banks and was heading out to sea towards Sydney Harbour due to the outgoing tide and prevailing strong southerly wind. JB was not impressed that the incident was down played. The following day all focus was on a reported minor oil slick in Sydney Harbour which it is believed may have come from the Caltex leak. All available services were employed to clean up the Harbour and Minister Duncan Gay spoke in Parliament to assure the public that every measure had been taken to protect the harbour environment and find the source of the slick. No mention was made of the Kurnell Caltex incident and the likely link to the Harbour slick because apparently no one had made the Minister aware of the Kurnell incident. Botany Bay is seemingly treated as a poor cousin. CB can't comment on the incident as it was related to Kurnell. He has some awareness of the event but is not in a position to comment as he represents Caltex's Banksmeadow Terminal.</p> <p>AL notes the role of this committee is in relation to Port Botany and CB represents Caltex, Banksmeadow on the committee.</p> <p>JB retracted his comments in relation to CB, but let his comments stand on record in regards to the Caltex operations at Kurnell.</p> <p>CB is happy to take the committee's concerns back to Kurnell.</p> <p>CA, as a representative from La Perouse, asked about the amount of foam on site at the time of the July spill.</p> <p>CB replied it was 2,500 litres of foam.</p>	
---	--

	<p>CA asked whether procedures said there should be more.          CB replied that they had on site what was in procedures but the event exposed a need for additional stocks. There are also hydrants and small foam stocks at these locations.          CA asked why the increase.          CB replied that in developing procedures they look at what is the potential for something occurring and then look at the likelihood of it happening then mitigate the risk. As a consequence of the spill we can no longer say it is an unlikely event. They have to hold the stocks not just at this location but across the industry. They take provisions to mitigate risks.          CA suggested he would have thought the amount of foam held would be to deal with fire not based on risks.          CB replied that most fires would be expected in the tanks, so measures were in place for this type of event.          LN noted going back to the August minutes and having raised it with AW that residents talked about how close they got to the event and that they didn't know what had happened. She has read in relation to their citations, the accounts of officers involved and they presented it as a life and death situation but at the August meeting it was downplayed. It was noted that no one from Caltex attended the August meeting. LN replied that the committee should then get an update when the information is available.          CB said some of the learnings from the investigation weren't immediately apparent and some of the information is still under professional privilege.          LN noted the Incident Report was done within three months. There was a meeting in August. We have ongoing dialogue with residents who have been asking what happened. She suggested it would be good to get the information into newspapers and the general milieu. There was a communication problem regarding the March incident at Kurnell which was referred to as sheen in the media. LN was making a general point that we do not have good communication and follow up around what happens in the region.          CB noted he will share everything with the CCC when he is able to do so.          LN noted positive changes to the disaster plan and more attention from Fire and Rescue NSW.          CB suggested a tremendous vote of thanks to the Port Botany Emergency Plan and Botany Precinct Plan. Without such robust plans ready to go the ability of emergency services to manage it would have been much less effective.          LN reiterated that residents were able to get close to the incident which she regards as a failing in the plan.          SH noted that the police manage the area outside the Port in relation to road closures and exclusion zones. Residents got to the Beauchamp Road bridge which was later closed by police but it takes time to carry out these closures.</p>	
	<p><b><u>Other port developments:</u></b>          DV reported to the group that Patrick Port Services are proposing to install a new car park and truck entrance on Friendship Rd and Qenos are awaiting planning approval to demolish storage tanks and relocate their flare.</p>	
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>Update on Randwick Council Port Botany Forum</b>          JD reported that following a resolution from Council that a Port Botany forum be set up, Council has contacted stakeholders for interest in participating in the forum. There was some feedback that this may be overkill with this group and other strategy groups already meeting. A</p>	<p>Provide an update on the status of the Randwick Council Port</p>



	<p>decision hasn't yet been made on whether it will go ahead, but will be made when Council has received all the feedback. CA asked whether there would be community people on the forum. JD replied there would be two community members on the forum if it goes ahead.</p>	<p>Botany Forum at the next meeting.</p>
<b>6</b>	<b>Port Botany Noise Update</b>	
6.1	<p>- Update on EPA Noise Working Group</p> <p>JG reported the working group came out of recognition towards the end of last year that a more coordinated approach was needed to manage noise issues in area. The group including EPA, the two Councils, NSW Ports, NSW Health, Transport for NSW, ARTC, and the Department of Planning and Environment is looking to develop a noise strategy. They are seeking to have RMS (roads) also in the group. It is a voluntary group with a range of opinions trying to work collaboratively. It is at the point where the organisations involved need to decide to commit or walk away. Most organisations recognise the benefits. With no clear lead organisation EPA has fallen into chairing it. Since last meeting the two areas of progress are around what the Strategy would look like and discussion around inclusion of what precincts. A smaller technical working group to be set up would look at what noise modelling/mapping should be included and where. The group will meet over the next couple of months with the broader group meeting on July 22 to make decisions around whether the strategy proceeds. JG took back to the group the request for community representation. The working group wants to use PB CCC for community engagement, circulate documents out of session and work with existing mechanisms.</p> <p>LN said this working group is like a subcommittee of the broader committee. If a community person was on the noise working group community members would have lot more confidence. As a result there would be less time taken up in this Committee, as under current arrangements we will have to quiz EPA at each meeting.</p> <p>JG noted EPA is undertaking a structural review of its website. While that is happening, it is hard to put anything new up, but they do want to put general information on noise issues on the webpage and identify the most effective channels for providing important updates to the community. It is the view of the group that working with the Port Botany CCC is a good mechanism for engaging with the community and testing issues that may arise.</p> <p>LN doesn't find this arrangement satisfactory and suggested the community impacted won't find it satisfactory.</p> <p>RS suggested the community is the end purpose and wants whatever it takes to achieve to reduce impacts on the community. But the challenge is to get there. He doesn't think the community will accept it if it takes years. The community is quite disturbed about noise.</p> <p>CA suggested it best to have community representatives otherwise the process will be under suspicion.</p> <p>JB thought it essential community be represented for transparency.</p> <p>JG will take this back as a strong recommendation from this committee for community representation on the working group.</p> <p>Regarding questions from RS at the last meeting around establishing noise criteria, JG reported having had a number of communications with RS and as a result the EPA website has been updated.</p> <p>JG reported regarding the Vopak incident that EPA had issued a prevention notice to make actions and community communication legally enforceable.</p> <p>RS noted the EPA had extended opportunities for himself and another</p>	<p>JG to take back to the noise working group a strong recommendation from this committee for community representation on the noise working group.</p> <p>JG to provide an update to the next meeting on the noise working group.</p>

	<p>community member to meet with their representatives. LN asked whether something about the regulatory framework for Ports could go on the Ports website. JG is happy to have this discussion outside the meeting. The Chair thanked JG for his contribution.</p>	
<p>6.2</p>	<p>- Port Botany Expansion Rail Noise</p> <p>SH noted a Condition of Consent for the expansion was the establishment of a rail noise working group prior to the rail terminal operations commencing. SICTL are planning for operations to commence in July. Rail noise is one component of issues around noise. It is proposed to include the rail noise working group considerations as part of the noise strategy and to use the CCC as the consultation mechanism. NSW Ports will write to the Department of Planning &amp; Environment to seek permission for this process to meet the Condition of Consent.</p> <p>LN noted the EPA wasn't at the rail noise working group meeting. This was a problem as there was community representation which asked whether there was an avenue for the group to look at noise port wide and have community representation. It was unfortunate the EPA was not there.</p> <p>SH noted that as per the conditions of consent, the EPA was not required to attend.</p> <p>LN said the intent of the Condition of Consent is about amenity and the intent needs to be addressed.</p> <p>DV confirmed a commitment to include PBE rail noise as a standing agenda item on this committee. She noted that at the rail noise working group meeting, that except for one member of this committee, working group attendees didn't necessarily wish to attend another working group that had the narrower remit of PBE rail noise only.</p> <p>JB was unable to attend the rail noise working group meeting and understands the first meeting will be the last. Community concerns will come back through either the collaborative group or PBCCC. But his concerns are that rail noise could get lost in the cracks. Rail traffic will have to grow substantially over time and rail noise will have serious implications. We need to keep a watching brief on this.</p> <p>DV suggested a reference to the rail noise Conditions of Approval be clearly stated on the agenda of these meetings so it doesn't get lost or collapsed into other discussions. NSW Ports wants to ensure a specific discussion and agenda item and JI is committed to providing updates regarding PBE rail operations.</p>	<p>AW to include a reference to CoA 2.28 of the PBE approval regarding PBE rail noise discussions.</p>
<p>6.3</p>	<p>- Report from tenants on reversing beeper changeover status</p> <p>AW reported that arising from a large number of complaints NSW Ports has asked tenants to change from beepers to quackers when leases expire. NSW Ports is collating information on the status of this as a table to provide to the community. She asked tenants present for an update.</p> <p>LN reported from her Facebook feedback that people don't know who to ring.</p> <p>AW replied that NSW Ports doesn't have a 24 hour manned number. They have a message service on the 1300 number with a commitment to contact the person on the next business day. NSW Ports doesn't have the physical resources to man a 24/7 number.</p> <p>LN noted that if the complaint is on Friday night it is not answered till Monday morning.</p> <p>DV and AW reported EPA and Council can be contacted if not port related, or the Harbourmaster for waterside related noise (e.g. from ships).</p>	<p>AW to circulate a table summarising the status of reversing beepers on all port tenant sites with the final minutes.</p>


<p>JD asked whether NSW Ports would consider setting up a 24/7 manned number that would also investigate complaints. SH replied they weren't at this time due to costs and resourcing. RS reported a suggestion from the community for flashing lights instead of beepers or quackers. AW acknowledged this as a viable alternative to reversing beepers but is highly dependent on risk assessment because safety of workers is the highest priority.</p> <p><b><u>Vopak</u></b></p> <p>NB reported the single forklift at site B and the bitumen tanks has been converted.</p> <p><b><u>Patrick</u></b></p> <p>RP reported they had received no direct complaints or notifications from EPA about reversing beepers. Their equipment includes stackers and forklifts with reversing beepers. Manual straddles have movement alarms but will be replaced by Autostrads in 2015. Small commercial vehicles and construction vehicles on site have reversing alarms. Cranes have wind sirens and railway gate signals won't change. Patrick is licensed by the EPA. Noise monitoring shows a lot of different noise happening but reversing beepers haven't been identified.</p> <p><b><u>DP World</u></b></p> <p>JL reported a fatality today in Melbourne involving heavy equipment as a reminder why the equipment has the reversing beepers. DP World is looking at replacing reversing beepers but will look at legislative requirements. The safety of employees will always be primary.</p> <p><b><u>Qube</u></b></p> <p>AL reporting reversing lights installed at Qube on Botany Road for night time operations - but had to undergo a risk assessment as they are not covered by regulations regarding beepers and quackers. There has been positive feedback from staff on site.</p> <p>JB reported hearing reversing beepers at La Perouse around 5.30pm this week and a major drop of a container. As jet noise was bad, this masked some noise from Port. CA reported containers being dropped all night on that night. SH noted they receive more noise complaints in winter due to prevailing wind directions.</p> <p><b><u>Caltex</u></b></p> <p>CB reported no conversions.</p> <p><b><u>Orora</u></b></p> <p>MP reported that all equipment was retro fitted last year and Orora will maintain quackers and lights.</p> <p><b><u>Elgas</u></b></p> <p>AC reported one forklift which is not converted.</p> <p><b><u>Terminals</u></b></p> <p>AH reported two forklifts not converted, but 95% of use is during the day.</p> <p><b><u>SICTL</u></b></p> <p>TB reported all forklifts, straddles and quay cranes are fitted with</p>	
--	--



	quackers. A risk assessment determined flashing lights alone was not sufficient. Automatic Stacking Cranes and quay cranes only use alarms during long travel.	
<b>7</b>	<b>Port Traffic and Safety</b>	
7.1	<p>- Traffic impacts of Banksmeadow Waste Transfer Facility</p> <p>DV noted that the proposed development is not being undertaken on NSW Ports' land and that the proponent is not a NSW Port tenant. The consent authority for the development is the Department of Planning and Environment. There have been questions raised about traffic numbers. She understand there will be 355 garbage trucks to the site per day at full capacity, 16 normal trucks and 25 staff per day. If those are added and doubled for movement in and out it comes to just under 800 movements a day. The majority of vehicles are normal garbage trucks and there will be one train movement a day to Goulburn.</p> <p>LN noted there will be 800 vehicle movements a day, 80% of which will be from the south into Beauchamp Road. It is in the Port SEPP area which is to facilitate trade and it is not Port traffic. The intent of this area being covered by the Port SEPP is to protect the Port and not allow a lot of development to compete with traffic moving in and out of Port.</p> <p>DV reported the essence of the Port SEPP previously existed under the Major Developments SEPP and covered a similar area. It is up to the Department of Planning &amp; Environment to ensure development is consistent with the Port SEPP and the land use zone objectives. It is in an industrial zone and it is subject to the Department's assessment. She suggests these issues can be raised as part of a submission to DP&amp;E by community members. It is likely that the focus of NSW Ports' submission will be traffic.</p> <p>RS reported there is a lot of community concern regarding impacts. Is NSW Ports in a position to produce a press release on the Banksmeadow Transfer Facility? The community is concerned about the cumulative impact and is interested to see whether NSW Ports considers this a problem.</p> <p>SH and DV noted the NSW Ports submission will be publicly available on the Department of Planning &amp; Environment's website and it will not be making a press release on this matter.</p> <p>CA also raised concern of odour issues as he spoke to a warehouse 400m from the Clyde facility (the same distance as the proposed facility) who have said odour is continuous and in summer horrendous.</p> <p>DV replied the main concern for NSW Ports is traffic. NSW Ports will review all information provided and will rely on the expert assessments provided. If they had concerns with the assumptions made in the assessments NSW Ports would raise it where it had the potential to impact on port tenants and / or operations.</p> <p>CA noted when the Clyde facility was approved odour contours were acceptable.</p>	
7.2	<p>- Cycling and pedestrian access</p> <p>LN distributed the Premier's Workplace Travel Plan document. The website link is <a href="http://www.pcal.nsw.gov.au/workplace_travel_plan">www.pcal.nsw.gov.au/workplace_travel_plan</a> LN has a Facebook page 'Bikes Botany Bay' which is building up as an advocacy group. They are concerned that West Connex align with the cycle strategy.</p>	
7.3	<p>SH reported City of Botany Bay Council works at the intersection of Botany Road and Foreshore Road to move the parking lane adjacent to the Botany Bay Hotel to the other side of the road and the provision of improved pedestrian access as well as improved traffic flows south on</p>	

	<p>Botany Road. This work is part funded by NSW Ports, Council, SPC, RMS and development contributions. LN suggested there has been poor engagement by Council with businesses along Botany Rd.</p>	
<b>8</b>	<b>Port Botany Community Assets</b>	
8.1	<p>- Update on Prince of Wales Drive gates</p> <p>SH updated the CCC that NSW Ports plans to progress installation of an additional set of gates to address anti social behaviour at the unlit carpark. The gates won't be regularly closed at this stage, but can be if needed in consultation with police. This would be like the La Perouse circuit which shuts on occasions. And NSW Ports will install additional lighting to also help address the issue. He noted the costs of destroyed bins and the impact of other vandalism.</p> <p>JB raised concerns that with two sets of gates, one which shuts at sunset and another which may be shut, fishers and other users who don't cause harm may be shut out. He said this will also just move the anti social behaviour to other areas such as La Perouse, Little Bay, Malabar which are residential locations. At least Prince of Wales Drive is well away from residential precincts. If there is a problem it needs to be dealt with by involving the local police. Shutting off the area is not an acceptable solution. He approves of additional lighting, but once the extra gate is shut there is no access to that site after dark as there is nowhere else to park within kilometres of Molineax Point.</p> <p>SH noted gates will not be shut on a regular basis, just to manage difficulties if they arise.</p> <p>JB asked why then put in the gate.</p> <p>LN suggested regular users can't predict when the gate will be closed. Some may make a planned visit for fishing or a night dive and not be able to do it when they get there. With the lack of community access to the groynes on Foreshore Beach this is two blows against the community.</p> <p>SH noted gates would only be closed in conjunction with police if needed.</p>	
<b>9</b>	<b>Port Botany Expansion Operational Update</b>	
9.1	<p>- SICTL</p> <p>Jl reported normal operations are continuing. 100 new staff have been employed in 2014. SICTL has new customers with larger ships of between 4,000 and 4,500 TEU. Trade is slowly increasing.</p> <p>The first formal visit by emergency services was in April and they were pleased with most of the emergency planning.</p> <p>SICTL attended their first Port Botany Emergency Management Committee meeting in February.</p> <p>The rail siding is expected to be completed in the third quarter of 2014.</p> <p>The next round of noise monitoring will be undertaken next month and results available on the website.</p> <p>Water monitoring conducted as per the Environmental Protection licence and has been submitted to EPA.</p>	
<b>10</b>	<b>Safety and Environmental Incidents</b>	
10.1	<p>- SICTL diesel spill</p> <p>Jl reported that at 2.30am on Tuesday a truck which didn't follow standard arrangements mounted the median strip and ruptured the fuel tank resulting in loss of diesel. This was managed by SICTL, the Fire &amp; Rescue NSW and Hazmat. As it was raining at the time of the incident</p>	

	<p>some diesel was conveyed into the stormwater system but most was captured. There was a small discharge to Penrhyn Estuary before the manual shut off system was activated which resulted in mandatory notifications. The spill was managed on-site by SICTL and off-site by Sydney Ports. The vehicle was removed at 21.30 hours on Tuesday. JB asked whether there was environmental damage. JG replied that EPA is investigating this. JB is surprised that a small amount got through as he wouldn't have expected it to get past containment lines. TB reported that there had been heavy rainfall so tanks were quite full and it was in the worst possible position, right next to the estuary. Later on in the day there was no visible evidence in the Estuary after Sydney Ports responded. JI reported that the drainage systems in place performed but required additional activation of manual systems. Contaminated water was captured and is being pumped out by contractors. SH reported an absorbent boom had been put out by Sydney Ports around the outlet into the Estuary. JB suggested that the diesel spill at SICTL was a minor one. The entrapment devices are state of the art and his concern is that even though there was heavy rain it was not major flooding. He is concerned that if there is a major spill with flooding what will happen when what is in place didn't work under minor conditions. It is a question of typical capacity competency. It should operate under extreme conditions. KMc replied that the area of the incident was the closest area of the Terminal to the Estuary and the shutdown valves are manually activated devices. The truck was on the estuary side of the Terminal and there is a lag to manually activate so the start of the spill got through. JB accepts that, but a fuel tanker holds only a couple of hundreds of litres. What if capture devices don't work when dealing with thousands of litres during a period of heavy local flooding. Engineers typically insist capture devices work. KMc replied that the manually activated system is base line compliant, but SICTL has recognised the additional risk of the area where tanktainers are stored. Areas which operate with higher fuel volumes have a different system that provides additional capture systems to deal with the greater risk. With the automated system there is automatic shut down. The default position of the drain is permanently closed. Water goes through sensors that can detect 98% of all liquids. If anything but water is detected it remains shut. This technology is over and above to deal with the larger volume on in tanktainers. It has to pass a test to open. But the fuel tanker was right on the estuary where there is a manually operated system.</p>	
10.2	<p>JG reported the EPA was advised yesterday of a spill of diesel at a non licensed premises on Military road. The fire service attended and EPA will work with Randwick Council to address any diesel potentially captured in low points.</p>	
<b>11</b>	<p><b>Port Botany Expansion Construction Update</b> - Update on construction activities - SICTL and Patrick - Environmental monitoring - SICTL monthly reports</p>	
11.1	<p><b>SICTL</b> KMc reported the new building and Phase 1 is close to completion. The final stage is tidying around the building, pavement works, and the main rail line tie in. Shipping has commenced earlier than expected. Phase 2 is smaller, with three more automatic stacking areas. The CEMP was approved last year and works will begin in the next two weeks. Enfield should be operating in the next few months. LW asked how long phase 2 would be.</p>	

	<p>KMc replied it would be for 12months. KMc introduced Dave Condon from Burtons who are the contractors for phase 2. Laing O'Rourke was the contractor for Phase 1 and are finishing up on site.</p>	
11.2	<p><b>Patrick</b> RP reported that ramp D is now complete providing a roadway into the terminal although it is currently only being used as construction access. The contractor has been commissioned for the knuckle works. The area will be used initially for the commissioning of the new Autostrads. Existing terminal works involves major civil works for installation of facilities due for completion in October. This is new buildings, a new control tower and administration building due for finish in August and the maintenance building in October. Major construction is due to finish in November. The OEMP will be supplied to authorities in mid July. Monitoring reports on are on the website and will be transferred to a new website with updated links on the NSW Ports website.</p>	
11.3	<p><b>Environmental Monitoring</b> KMc reported a joint effort for ongoing monitoring with Patrick around adjacent works, with sharing information and feedback to monthly reports. SICTL will endeavour to get up reports up on a monthly basis but there may be some lag as a result of the change in contractors. LN asked whether there is a ports wide monitoring of wildlife as a tool for ongoing staff engagement. AW noted SPC's Penhryn Estuary monitoring program and the identification by Laing O'Rourke staff of Little Tern nesting. KMc reported that as part of the CEMP there are induction programs for all employees to look for wildlife. There are flyers of different types of birds in the lunch rooms and people on site have given feedback which is then investigated. LN asked whether this is then being captured. KMc replied it is captured on site as that is the audience, but SICTL is happy to talk to the wider community. She noted a Facebook page for recording wildlife observations <a href="https://www.facebook.com/Portbanywildlife">https://www.facebook.com/Portbanywildlife</a></p>	
<b>12</b>	<p><b>General Business/Next meeting (August 2014):</b></p>	
	<p>- NSW Ports report on Business Clean Up Australia event (25 February) and next business day AW reported that National Tree Day is at the end of July and asked the community and tenants for suggestions or expressions of interest to get involved.</p>	
	<p><b>Next meeting Tuesday August 26</b></p>	
	<p><b>These minutes have been endorsed by the meeting Chair</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">  </p> <p><b>Signed:</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Date:</b> 5 June 2014</span></p>	