

**Meeting:** Port Botany Community Consultative Committee – Meeting No. 22

**Held:** Tuesday 5 February 2019, 5.30pm-7.30pm  
Ground Floor Meeting Room, Brotherson Dock, NSW Ports

**Present:**

John Burgess (JB) – Community	Marie Gibbs (MG) – Patrick Stevedores
Lynda Newnam (LN) – Community	Michael Martin (MM) – Vopak
Paul Pickering (PP) – Community	Aldo Costabile (AC) – Elgas Limited
Peter Fagan (PF) – Community	Gary McKay (GM) – Caltex
Marcus Dwyer (MD) – Botany Bay Business Enterprise Centre	Karen Jones (KJ) – Orora
Patrick Medway (PM) – Bayside Chamber of Commerce	Trevor Brown (TB) – NSW Ports
Bronwyn Englaro (BE) – Randwick Council	Alison Wedgwood (AWe) – NSW Ports
Clare Harley (CH) – Bayside Council	Natalia McGregor (NM) – NSW Ports
Sandi Chick (SC) – Electorate Offices for Member for Maroubra	Adriane Whiley (AWh) – NSW Ports
Lachlan McGrath (LM) – Electorate Offices for Member for Kingsford Smith	Roberta Ryan (RR) – Chairperson
Brad Milner (BM) – Port Authority of NSW	Sandra Spate (SS) – Minute taker

**Apologies:** Greg Walls – NSW Ports, Jonathon Lafforgue – NSW Ports, Catherine Blaine – Port Authority of NSW, Ryan Bennett – Port Authority of NSW, Lyndon Reeves – Elgas, Erin Barker – EPA representative, Charles Abela – Community, Mark Walker – Qenos, Jamil Kharoude – Vopak, Jos Kusters – Caltex

Item	Description	Action/Responsibility
1	<b>Apologies and Introductions</b> The chair welcomed attendees. AWe introduced Natalia McGregor and Adriane Whiley from NSW Ports. Natalia standing in for AWe while she is on maternity leave.	
2	<b>Accept minutes of last meeting</b> Acceptance of the minutes from November 2018 was moved by JB and seconded by PM. The minutes were accepted.	
3	<b>Port Botany Community Assets</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Update on Cruise Passenger Terminal</li> <li>- Update on Foreshore Beach/Penrhyn Estuary</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	
3.1	<u>Update on Foreshore Beach/Penrhyn Estuary</u>  BM reported Port Authority is awaiting on Cardno's monitoring report. It will be shared with the CCC when available. Seagrass monitoring will continue for the next two years. The next round will start in coming months.  PP asked whether seagrass is affected by sewerage overflow. JB suggested movement of sand rather than sewerage is the problem as it blocks sunlight. BM agrees. Port Authority is aware of sand issues. Work on groynes was to prevent further damage. Continued monitoring is to gauge	Port Authority to forward the consolidated monitoring report to NSW Ports for distribution to the CCC if available prior to the next meeting.

	<p>success. There have been positive signs. Results of monitoring will continue to be shared.</p> <p>JB asked when the Cardno report is due. BM indicated Port Authority expects the report in March and should be able to share it at the next meeting.</p> <p>PP asked whether Port Authority monitors water quality at Foreshore Beach which is the only beach in Botany. BM replied while they don't monitor water quality they do monitor flora and fauna which linked to water quality. He will check if water samples have been taken as part of this. Port Authority worked with Sydney Water on the groynes. AWe noted water quality monitoring was part of original Conditions of Consent but the deadline has passed. The wrap up report should include a water quality component. PP asked if Sydney Water is responsible. He noted sewerage after Malabar sewerage works. LN noted OEH responsibility. JB said coastal councils monitor beaches. The sewerage system designed 80 years ago was to cope with the population then. During heavy rain it overflows at Botany swamps and Malabar.</p>	
3.2	<p><u>Update on Cruise Passenger Terminal</u></p> <p>BM summarised the role of Port Authority of NSW as a state owned corporation with a team of marine operational staff involved in marine operations. The NSW Government is committed to growing our cruise industry to support tourism, jobs and economic growth. The NSW government released the Cruise Development Plan (CDP) on 29 July 2018. The CDP can be accessed at:</p> <p><a href="https://www.industry.nsw.gov.au/development/industry-opportunities/tourism/cruise">https://www.industry.nsw.gov.au/development/industry-opportunities/tourism/cruise</a></p> <p>One of the key actions from the NSW Government's Cruise Development Plan is the development of a Strategic Business Case to assess the viability of Molineux Point/Botany bay and Yarra Bay as potential sites for a new passenger cruise terminal.</p> <p>RR and PP asked what the likely timeline is for the business case and what the implications may be from a possible change of government at the upcoming elections. Port Authority indicated the Strategic Business Case assesses the high-level viability of these locations and considers whether further work is needed. No investment decision for Botany has been made by Government. While there has been preliminary work on economic benefits as significant volume of work on impacts such as noise, traffic, environment, indigenous heritage and air quality would need to be assessed.</p> <p>PF asked who has currently seen the draft business case. His concern is that the community has to vote March. A lot may depend on what happens with business case for the cruise terminal. People want to know what Port Authority's plans are. He suggested the Liberal candidate for Maroubra has seen the draft business case. He doesn't understand why he has been allowed to see it but elected representatives such as local State and Federal members, local mayors and council staff haven't been able to. The Government should be beholden to make it available.</p>	

	<p>Port Authority indicated the business case process is being managed by the Port Authority of NSW in conjunction with NSW Treasury. Before any decision is made the NSW Government will consult extensively with the community and undertake technical and environmental studies most likely through an Environmental Impact Statement under the EPA Act.</p> <p>Regarding opportunities for consultation MG suggested face to face with community, with industry through the website and submissions. As an industry representative she wants to know the impacts on 24/7 terminal operations of people sleeping on board cruise ships. We need to know what we are responding to so companies need information.</p> <p>JB noted a request from a previous meeting that CCC representatives be on the taskforce to review and provide input before the draft business case is released as a public document. It now won't be released before the election and people will have to guess who will do best for the community. Then the fight will be on about how it will go ahead. Using spare capacity within Port would be some relief for the community but not for business trying to protect investment with future growth capacity.</p> <p>AWe said from a NSW Ports view of the role of this committee, the Port Authority is a stakeholder and should provide updates to the CCC but shouldn't rely on this as the community consultation process. It needs to be greater and this committee doesn't have the capacity to comprehensively respond to the issues.</p> <p>PF speaking for the Save Yarra Bay group said progress so far on Yarra Bay and Molineux Point should be made public. Make clear what government has in mind. He wants to see the draft business case a month before the elections so people can make up their minds. The Liberal candidate for Maroubra thinks there are extreme implications for the environment and the community. The government should make this available now.</p> <p>BM reiterated there is no investment decision and a commitment to detailed consultation before a decision is made.</p> <p>LN noted amendments to the NSW Environment Planning and Assessment Act (EP&amp;A) require consultation upfront. Transparency and accountability are not in evidence here.</p> <p>JB referred to an article about a container terminal at Newcastle citing the NSW Ports CEO that there is underutilised capacity here. This leaves the door open to the possibility of capacity being used for cruise operations.</p> <p>TB replied as Port Manager that NSW Ports is owned by long term investors and super funds. They take the long view on economic needs of the state for cargo handling to drive the economy as the primary focus. An earlier statement indicated NSW Ports would support a cruise terminal only on the proviso it didn't impact this priority as outlined in the 30 Year Plan.</p> <p>PP asked whether the terminal would be a seasonal overflow terminal. MG noted shipping is also a seasonal industry occurring at the same time.</p> <p>CH reported Bayside Council is currently preparing local strategic planning statements (LSPS) to inform council LEPs and DCPs. Council needs a long term view to balance port, airport and environmental</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>considerations. The future of any cruise terminal is important to understanding the long term. The sooner we get information the better. Summer is also peak airport season. Council needs to take a long term view including economic opportunities and local impacts. The White Bay community have to absorb impacts and but didn't see local economic opportunities. There may be impacts on air quality, noise and traffic without seeing benefits locally. The business case needs to look at what the local impacts are as well as local economic opportunities. Council is going to the community in July. A deliberative panel is being held in March/April as part of the LSPS process and studies are now underway to feed into this. Council needs to understand what is coming. BE said strategic planning statements need to be finalised by the end of the year.</p> <p>MG suggested economic benefit can be elsewhere e.g. cruise liners on-board goods and employment elsewhere. People on board hop off to take pictures then hop back on. There needs to be economic transparency as to the benefit of the local community.</p> <p>RR suggests the cruise terminal be an ongoing agenda item.</p> <p>PF said when the petition was debated in Parliament the government threw numbers around about the benefit to the community. He doesn't trust these numbers. He suggests Port Authority be very careful regarding claims that are made.</p>	
3.3	<p><u>Save Yarra Bay group presentation</u></p> <p>PF presented to the meeting four photos taken on busy days at Yarra Bay over summer. These are shown on the group's website (see <a href="https://saveyarrabay.com/">https://saveyarrabay.com/</a>) and show this is not a lonely, forsaken beach but heavily used. He asked who present would be happy to lose their favourite beach to a cruise terminal. Yarra Bay is not the sort of recreational asset the community can afford to lose and they will fight tooth and nail to retain.</p>	
3.4	<p>JB reported there will be no new moorings in La Perouse and Yarra Bay and current moorings will not be renewed as they expire. There is a total of 27 moorings.</p>	
<b>4</b>	<b>Actions arising from previous minutes</b>	
4.1	<p>Action 10.3 August 2018. AW to follow up with Bayside Council to find out whether Bayside Council offers commercial recycling. CH reported the manager of waste said no commercial recycling is currently being taken as Council is trying to deal with existing recycling. This may change.</p> <p>BE reported Randwick Council is meeting NSW Ports next week to discuss issues and operations. Waste is one topic and Council will see if it can take some material.</p> <p>AWe asked tenants to provide estimates of volumes and types of materials to TB.</p> <p>The action is closed</p>	
4.2	<p><u>Action 7.1 November 2018.</u> PANSW to present a detailed consolidated summary of the Penrhyn Estuary monitoring program at the next meeting.</p>	This action remains open. PANSW
4.3	<p><u>Action 7.2 November 2018.</u> EPA to provide a response to the question of perceived sewerage odours at Millstream outfall and water quality at Foreshore Beach.</p> <p>As no representative from EPA was present EB will address this at the next meeting.</p>	This action remains open. NSW EPA

<b>5</b>	<b>NSW Ports Update</b>	
5.1	<p><u>Patrick Rail Investment Project</u></p> <p>Hard copies of the media release were available at the meeting. These were previously emailed to members.</p> <p>TB stressed the importance of rail in providing capacity for movement of container freight in and out of Port Botany. NSW Ports is working in partnership with Patrick to increase handling of rail containers in and out and will co-invest in the expansion of the rail facility at Patrick. The offer is open to other terminals. \$120m will be used to extend sidings to 600m so trains no longer have to be broken and shunted. This is more efficient and complements the duplication of the line. It will be undertaken as a cost recovery exercise recognising the long term future of boxes on rail. TB is proud of this exciting initiative.</p> <p>PF asked whether this is not needed at the other terminals.</p> <p>TB said that NSW Ports is willing to co-invest in rail infrastructure with DP World and Hutchison as well.</p> <p>JB asked whether the \$3.08 wharfage fee applies whether containers go by rail or truck.</p> <p>TB confirmed it was on all modes in and out of port. The cost is spread across the supply chain.</p> <p>JB is delighted the stevedore has taken this up. He recalls stevedores saying at the tribunal that hell will freeze over before they move containers by rail.</p> <p>TB suggested the tide is turning with massive investment in the Moorebank intermodal. Credit to Patrick and the owners that they are willing to invest.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<p><b>NSW Ports Sustainability Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Report on Sustainability Plan – AWe</li> <li>- Update on Brotherson Dock Life Extension Project - AWe</li> </ul>	
6.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Report on Sustainability Plan</li> </ul> <p>AWe reported on Sustainability Plan progress as per presentation (attached to minutes). This will go to a board strategy workshop at the end of February. Feedback is requested by the end of the month particularly on goals and indicators.</p>	<p>NSW Ports to email to CCC members the presentation on the progress of the Sustainability Plan.</p> <p>CCC members to provide feedback by the end of February.</p>
6.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Update on Brotherson Dock Life Extension Project</li> </ul> <p>AWe said the project is progressing well. A new compound has been established on the DP World side of the dock in addition to that at Patrick. Waste contractors previously engaged were not meeting requirements to demonstrate appropriate levels of recycling. A new contractor has been engaged and reports are positive. The body of evidence will be submitted to the Sustainability Council and NSW Ports hopes for an interim rating. There have been no major incidents or complaints.</p>	
<b>7</b>	<p><b>Development and Operational Activities in the Port</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Port Botany Expansion and other Port Tenant Developments and operational update</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NSW Ports developments – AWh</li> <li>- Planning and legislation update – AWh</li> </ul>	
7.1	<b>Hutchison</b> Nothing to report.	
7.2	<b>Patrick</b> No developments to report.	
7.3	<b>DP World</b> TB noted new quay cranes were delivered late last year.	
7.4	<b>Vopak</b> MM reported DPE recommendations were finalised in December and a new set of conditions issued. Construction can commence. MM reported he is finishing at Port Botany at the end of this month to take up a position overseas. The CCC thanked MM for his contribution to the committee and congratulated him on his new appointment.	
7.5	<b>Elgas</b> Nothing to report.	
7.6	<b>Caltex</b> Nothing to report.	
7.7	<b>Origin</b> Nothing to report.	
7.8	<b>Terminals</b> Nothing to report	
7.9	<b>Orora</b> KJ reported demolition of building B7, which was decommissioned in 2012, is finished. A noise wall was built from containers stacked four high.	
7.10	<b>NSW Ports developments</b> AWh reported the administrative Mod 17 is pending determination by the Department of Planning.	
7.11	<b>Planning and legislation update</b> AWh reported amendments to the Three Ports SEPP has not progressed further.	
<b>8</b>	<b>Port Botany Noise Update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Port Botany Expansion Rail Noise (as per CoA 2.28)</li> </ul>	
8.1	There have been no rail issues associated with Port Botany Expansion.	
<b>9</b>	<b>Safety and Environmental Incidents/Complaints</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Biosecurity update: Biosecurity Port Levy Update</li> <li>- Summary of complaints</li> </ul>	
9.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Biosecurity update</li> </ul> AWe reported Ports Australia attended workshops on the port biosecurity levy. There is a proposal to move the charge from stevedores to shipping operators. This is still under discussion and has not been confirmed. NSW Ports will pass on any updates from Ports Australia to tenants. There is no clarification from DAWR on how the money will be rolled out and legislating starts this month.	
9.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Summary of complaints</li> </ul> There have been no complaints.	
<b>10</b>	<b>General Business/Next meeting:</b> The next meeting is 7 May 2019.	
10.1	JB raised problems with security contractors and lights being off at the boat ramp.	AWe to provide contact details for Catherine Blaine to JB.
10.2	TB reported NSW Ports has undertaken a three year partnership with Maroubra Surf Life Saving Club to support the nippers program. It matches a similar relationship NSW Ports has with Port Kembla Surf Club.	

	<p>LN asked whether NSW Ports sponsors Yarra Bay Sailing Club as the port impacts them directly. She thinks as a general rule industry should support people directly impacted.</p> <p>AWe said they don't currently but is looking at what can be done to reach out more to the local community as part of the Sustainability Plan. She expects progress on this in future.</p> <p>LN said NSW Ports needs to be more proactive. No complaints may reflect people have given up complaining.</p>	
10.3	The CCC thanked AWe for her work with the CCC and wished her well for her maternity leave.	
	<p><b>These minutes have been endorsed by the meeting Chair</b></p> <p><b>Signed:</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Date:</b></span></p>	



**Meeting:** Port Botany Community Consultative Committee – Meeting No. 23

**Held:** Tuesday 7 May 2019, 5.30pm-7.30pm  
Ground Floor Meeting Room, Brotherson House – NSW Ports

**Present:**

Charles Abela (CA) – Community	Marie Gibbs (MG) – Patrick Stevedores
John Burgess (JB) – Community	Ralf Genutis (RG) – Vopak
Paul Pickering (PP) – Community	Lyndon Reeves (LR) – Elgas Limited
Peter Fagan (PF) – Community	Gary McKay (GM) – Caltex
Marcus Dwyer (MD) – Botany Bay Business Enterprise Centre	Blair Moses (BM) – Hutchison
Patrick Medway (PM) – Bexley Chamber of Commerce	Karen Jones (KJ) – Orora
Bronwyn Englaro (BE) – Randwick Council	Rick Sciarrone (RC) – STA Port Botany Bus Depot
Clare Harley (CH) – Bayside Council	Trevor Brown (TB) – NSW Ports
Ryan Bennett (RB) – Port Authority of NSW	Jonathan Lafforgue (JL) – NSW Ports
Erin Barker (EB) – NSW EPA	Natalia McGregor (NM) – NSW Ports
Roberta Ryan (RR) – Chairperson	Adriane Whiley (AWH) – NSW Ports
Sandra Spate (SS) – Minute taker	Vida Cheeseman (VC) – NSW Ports

**Apologies:** Lynda Newnam – Community, Lachlan McGrath – Electorate Offices for Member for Kingsford Smith, Aldo Costabile – Elgas Limited, Daniel Flannery – ACFS, Jos Kusters (JK) – Caltex, Jamil Kharoudeh – Vopak, Mal Jagdev-Imrich - Community


Item	Description	Action/Responsibility
1	<b>Apologies and Introductions</b> Apologies as listed above.	
2	<b>Accept minutes of last meeting</b> Acceptance of the minutes from February 2019 was moved by PM and seconded by BM. The minutes were accepted.	
3	<b>Actions arising from previous minutes</b>	
3.1	Action 3.1 February 2019. Port Authority to forward the consolidated monitoring report to NSW Ports for distribution to the CCC if available prior to the next meeting. See discussion under agenda item 4.	The action remains open.
3.2	Action 7.1 November 2018. PANSW to present a detailed consolidated summary of the Penhryn Estuary monitoring program at the next meeting. See discussion under agenda item 4.	The action remains open.
3.3	Action 7.2 November 2018. EPA to provide a response to the question of perceived sewerage odours at Millstream outfall and water quality at Foreshore Beach.  EB reported the EPA is aware of regularly poor water quality at the Millstream outfall. This may be due to wet weather overflows from the Malabar sewerage treatment system. Millpond is part of that system. The EPA has a condition on the Sydney Water licence for a study to	EB to take the issue of odours at Millpond during dry weather back to the EPA and discuss the issue with



	<p>better understand overflows and EPA is working with Sydney Water on an abatement program for high priority overflow points.</p> <p>CA and PP noted bad odours in dry weather. CA has rung the EPA hotline but received no response.</p> <p>JB suggested a historical issue which is particularly bad at low tide indicating it is more than a sewerage overflow issue. It may be partly due to a build-up of organic matter in stream and pondage sediments which gives off odours when exposed to sun and air. Odours are present 24/7 in any time other than high tide. He suggested a combination of issues including drains from the airport which also feed into the area. He has previously raised a fish kill issue in the stream near the discharge pipe from the airport fire training area. PFAS has since been raised.</p> <p>EB will take this feedback to the EPA and talk to Bayside Council for a follow up report at the next meeting.</p>	Bayside Council and provide further information to the following meeting.
3.4	<p><u>Action 6.1 February 2019.</u> NSW Ports to email CCC members the presentation on the progress of the Sustainability Plan. CCC members to provide feedback by the end of February.</p> <p>This was done. The action is closed. See discussion under agenda item 5.</p>	
3.5	<p><u>Action 10.1 February 2019.</u> AWe to provide contact details for Catherine Blaine to JB.</p> <p>The action is closed.</p>	
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Port Botany Community Assets</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Update on Foreshore Beach/Penrhyn Estuary monitoring program</li> </ul>	
4.1	<p>RB reported the new boat ramp maintenance contract has been awarded to the incumbent. Steam cleaning no less than monthly at low tide.</p> <p>Ongoing raking of Foreshore Beach is proceeding fortnightly and is removing a large amount of material.</p> <p>Additional seagrass monitoring, which is in its second year, is pending and an update on monitoring results can be provided to the next meeting.</p> <p>Dragonfly, the vegetation management contractor, continues their work including the removal of some dead trees in the near future.</p> <p>Fox baiting continues.</p> <p>Regarding ecological monitoring, all shorebird summary reports are on the website reporting off peak and peak season. The last off peak available is 2018. The last seagrass monitoring summary is on line.</p> <p>Outstanding is the 2017 annual report which is awaiting correction of some administrative errors. The 2018 shorebird annual report is in draft form requiring some revision to include all remaining data. Following this the end of project monitoring report can be finalised hopefully prior to the next meeting.</p>	
<b>5</b>	<p><b>NSW Ports Sustainability Program</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Progress Update on Sustainability Plan – TB</li> </ul>	
5.1	<p>TB reported on progress towards the final draft which will then go for Board approval.</p> <p>A summary of key points included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NSW Ports is committed to reporting on sustainability on an annual basis with more detailed three yearly updates.</li> <li>• A sustainable procurement policy is being developed.</li> <li>• Update of the port risk strategy.</li> <li>• Upgrade of development codes to sustainable development codes for developments on Ports' land.</li> <li>• Energy audits and identification of improvements for energy efficiency.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continued engagement with government regarding road connections to port.</li> <li>Update economic benefit studies.</li> <li>Investigate the issue of fire-fighting foams at port and options for replacement.</li> <li>Whole of port activity noise monitoring.</li> <li>A whole of port greenhouse emissions inventory to provide a good overall perspective for environmental management.</li> <li>Continuing community sponsorship and grants.</li> <li>Review function of CCCs regularly.</li> <li>A stakeholder perception survey to reach the broader community.</li> <li>A development program for undergraduate work experience.</li> </ul> <p>The aim is to release the Sustainability Plan in the next couple of months.</p>	
5.2	<p>MD asked whether NSW Ports foam contains PFAS and is Ports looking to replace PFAS. Are other types of foam available?</p> <p>TB replied NSW Ports still have stocks of foam containing PFAS. They need foam to be effective particularly at bulk liquid berths but are mindful of environmental considerations. NSW Ports will proceed with expert advice. Foam needs to be effective and able to be used with NSW Ports' equipment.</p> <p>JL reported weekly training events don't use the foam but the foam needs to be able to protect lives.</p> <p>MD asked when a changeover is likely as this is a high priority issue. TB said an update should be available before the end of the year.</p> <p>JB reported on serious health issues affecting trainers at the airport which some people have linked to use of PFAS.</p>	
5.3	<p>CA asked whether NSW Ports has a Disaster Plan and if this is part of the Sustainability Plan.</p> <p>TB replied NSW Ports is looking to upgrade their Emergency Plan. There is a broad piece on risk management in the Sustainability Plan.</p> <p>CA asked if the Sustainability Plan includes a timeframe for the review of the emergency management plan.</p> <p>TB said this will be done in FY2020.</p>	
5.4	<p>PP asked whether NSW Ports has a role in jetties around Botany Bay.</p> <p>JB said RMS and local councils are responsible. Dredging of the port to make it deeper and usable for shipping has created issues with movement of sand at areas including the Brighton/San Souci beach front land locking the existing Dolls Point jetty rendering it unusable, shallowing the entrance to the opening of the Georges River and encroaching on the Ramsar wetlands in the National Park. Sections of mangroves are starting to die as a result of movement of sand and silting up.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<p><b>Operational and Development Activities in the Port</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Port Botany Expansion operational update – MG, BM, TB</li> <li>Tenant Developments – round the table</li> <li>NSW Ports developments – GW</li> <li>Update on Port Botany Cruise Proposal Business Case – CB/RB</li> <li>Planning and legislation update – GW</li> </ul>	
6.1	<p><b>Hutchison</b></p> <p>There are no expansion updates. The sand stockpile is still there. There are no operational changes.</p>	
6.2	<p><b>Patrick</b></p> <p>A draft of the Operational Environmental Management Plan has gone to NSW Ports. It will then go the DPE and then be placed on the website.</p>	
6.3	<p><b>DP World</b></p> <p>No representative in attendance.</p>	

6.4	<b><u>Vopak</u></b> No developments to report.	
6.5	<b><u>Elgas</u></b> No developments to report.	
6.6	<b><u>Caltex</u></b> No developments to report.	
6.7	<b><u>Origin Energy</u></b> No representative present.	
6.8	<b><u>Terminals</u></b> No representative present.	
6.9	<b><u>Orora</u></b> No developments to report.	
6.10	<b><u>NSW Ports developments</u></b> GW reported the Brotherson Dock project is proceeding well.	
6.11	<b><u>Update on Port Botany Cruise Proposal Business Case</u></b> RB said there is no update on that previously given. The Strategic Business Case has been prepared and provided to Government. The next step for government assessment. Pending that assessment, the next step would be for Government to require a Detailed Business Case. PF asked when the Strategic Business case will be available to the community. RB can forward the question. CA understands Pat Farmer, the local candidate, saw the business case and suggested it makes no sense. CA said White Bay can hold two ships but rarely does. Small ships often use the terminal at Circular Quay. If they went to White Bay this would make room for bigger ships at Circular Quay. There has been talk of mooring ships off the beach but they need a vast marshalling area for trucks, food and passengers. This would have to be where the cemetery is now. But the cemetery has a DA in for expansion. JB would love to see the report. He noted there is not universal support for the proposal from the cruise industry with only one operator pushing for it. He doubts Yarra Bay Beach would be used as it is controversial and unworkable. If it goes ahead he would expect it to use parts of the existing port which are not at full capacity. ALP candidates have indicated the proposal won't get past first base. If they come to government federally they will re-examine the Garden Island option. PF tabled two resolutions passed unanimously by Randwick Council on 30 April opposing a passenger cruise terminal at Yarra Bay or Molineux Point. The resolutions foreshadow action by Council to assist the campaign against the terminal and commencement of a process to seek National Heritage Listing for Yarra Bay. PF reiterated that the motions were passed unanimously by Councillors from all groupings (Liberal, Labor, The Greens and Independent). He could not imagine a clearer statement to NSW Ports and PANSW that the Randwick community is united in opposition to a cruise terminal in Yarra Bay (copies of the motions are appended to these minutes). CA reported on information shared at a Council meeting that many Australian Air Force fields are shared by commercial aircraft and there is no reason Garden Island can't also be shared.	
<b>7</b>	<b><u>Port Botany Noise Update</u></b> - Port Botany Expansion Rail Noise (as per CoA 2.28) – TB	
7.1	TB reported there have been no complaints regarding rail since the last meeting. He noted CCC members could also register issues at the meeting.	
7.2	JB asked about timing for the rail duplication. JL replied it is 2021. Planning has started. Two components are the Cabramatta loop and then the duplication.	

	<p>JB hopes current earthworks for access to the airport include enough room for another track at the underpass. MG confirmed it is wide enough for a double track. GW reported the EIS for that project is on exhibition soon and includes the corridor for the bridge.</p>	
<b>8</b>	<p><b>Safety and Environmental Incidents/Complaints</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Biosecurity update – TB</li> <li>- Summary of complaints – TB</li> </ul>	
8.1	<p>TB reported it is brown marmorated stink bug season. NSW Ports is engaged with regulators around the issue to ensure it isn't introduced into Australia. Customers at Enfield are looking at establishing fumigation facilities there. All port facilities are required to finalise bio security management to get declarations. These will go to the Department of Agriculture and Water in coming weeks.</p>	
<b>12</b>	<p><b>General Business/Next meeting :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Environmental Incentive for Shipping Update - TB</li> <li>- Clean Up Australia Day - NMCG</li> <li>- World Environment Day Tree Planting Event - NMCG</li> <li>- New NSW Ports Corporate Affairs Team - TB</li> </ul>	
12.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Environmental Incentive for Shipping Update</li> </ul> <p>TB reported over 160 vessels have submitted registration details for shipping incentives. NSW Ports has paid out the first round of rebates. This has attracted additional attention and strong interest. Numbers around reduction in air emissions can be looked at in 12 months' time.</p>	
12.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clean Up Australia Day</li> </ul> <p>NMCG thanked volunteers who participated. 40 bags of rubbish were collected at Yarra Bay and Molineux Point. 30 volunteers participated.</p>	
12.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- World Environment Day Tree Planting Event</li> </ul> <p>NMCG reported NSW Ports has registered for a team event on 5 June. 10 volunteers have been recruited for tree planting at Sir Joseph Banks. JB suggested bitou bush needs removing first. TB said NSW Ports is actively engaged with Conservation Volunteers Australia and Bayside Council in stripping out bitou bush and other weeds.</p>	
12.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New NSW Ports Corporate Affairs Team</li> </ul> <p>TB introduced Vida Cheeseman, the new Corporate Affairs lead who has been working on the Sustainability Plan. VC reported on her background prior NSW Ports. Having worked with Asciano she is looking forward to resuming ports related work. The Chair welcomed VC to the CCC.</p>	
	<p><b>Next meeting.</b> The next meeting is Tuesday 6 August, 2019.</p>	
	<p><b>These minutes have been endorsed by the meeting Chair</b></p> <p>Signed:  Date: 27.5.2019</p>	

**NM18/19 Motion Pursuant to Notice - Notice of Motion from Cr Said - Update on  
Opposition to Proposed Passenger Cruise Ship Terminal (F2014/00125)**

**RESOLUTION: (Said/Da Rocha)** considering the recent NSW State Election and the re-election of

This is page 9 of the Minutes of the Ordinary Council held on 30 April 2019

Minutes of ORDINARY COUNCIL

30 APRIL 2019

the Berejiklian Government, Randwick City Council:

1. identify the NSW Minister responsible for Ports and/or the proposed cruise terminal at Yarra Bay or Molineux Point and associated activities;
2. write to the NSW Premier, and the new Minister responsible for ports reiterating Council's strong opposition to a proposed passenger cruise-ship terminal at either Yarra Bay or Molineux Point, highlighting Council's strong concerns about the negative impact a passenger terminal would have on the area including traffic congestion, environmental destruction, loss of open green space and flow-on land-use pressures;
3. invite the Minister to attend a meeting of Council to address these concerns and, if unable to attend, then Councillor representatives arrange a meeting with the Minister;
4. invite representatives from the 'Save Yarra Bay' group, State and Federal MPs, representatives from surrounding councils, members of the Local Aboriginal Land Council and identified concerned residents to a special briefing from council staff on the potential negative impacts of the cruise terminal being located in the LGA; and
5. provide an update to Council on the matters outlined in the previous Council resolution NM63/18 dated 28 August 2018.

**MOTION: (Said/Da Rocha) CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY - SEE RESOLUTION.**

**NM19/19 Motion Pursuant to Notice - Notice of Motion from Cr Said - Apply for National Heritage Listing and Grant Program (F2005/00185)**

**RESOLUTION: (Said/Da Rocha) that:**

1. based on the comprehensive research collected, Council Officers are to bring back a report on the possibility of applying to the Department of the Environment and Energy to add Yarra Bay and Frenchman's Beach to the National Heritage List (of which Kurnell is already listed); and
2. Council Officers to investigate applying for funds through the, 'Australian Heritage Grant Program' and are to advise Council of the outcome.

**MOTION: (Said/Da Rocha) CARRIED - SEE RESOLUTION.**



**Meeting:** Port Botany Community Consultative Committee – Meeting No. 24

**Held:** Tuesday 6 August 2019, 5.30pm-7.30pm  
McNevin Room, Prince Henry Centre – 2 Coast Hospital Rd, Little Bay

**Present:**

Charles Abela (CA) – Community	Marie Gibbs (MG) – Patrick Stevedores
John Burgess (JB) – Community	Peter Fielder (PeF) – Patrick Stevedores
Marcus Dwyer (MD) – Botany Bay Business Enterprise Centre	Neville Johnstone (NJ) – DP World
Patrick Medway (PM) – Bayside Chamber of Commerce	Umair Savul (US) – DP World
Bronwyn Englaro (BE) – Randwick Council	Michael Kinnell (MK) – Origin
Dylan Parker (DP) – Electorate Offices for Member for Maroubra	Ralf Genuttis (RG) – Vopak
Leigh Heaney (LH) – Electorate Offices for Member for Kingsford Smith	Alan Chambers (Ach) – Vopak
Erin Barker (EB) – EPA	Lyndon Reeves – Elgas Limited
Ingrid Emergy (IE) – Port Authority of NSW	Gary McKay (GM) – Caltex
Roberta Ryan (RR) – Chairperson	Jos Kusters (JK) – Caltex
Sandra Spate (SS) – Minute taker	Jennifer Stevenson (JS) – Hutchison
Stella Cimarosti (SC) – Minute taker	Rory Grieves (RS) – Hutchison
	Karen Jones – Orora
	Trevor Brown (TB) – NSW Ports
	Jonathan Lafforgue (JL) – NSW Ports
	Natalia McGregor (NM) – NSW Ports
	Adriane Whiley (AWH) – NSW Ports

**Apologies:** Aldo Costabile – Elgas, Peter Fagan – Community, Ryan Bennett – Port Authority of NSW, Catherine Blaine – Port Authority of NSW, Lynda Newnam, Paul Pickering – Community, Lachlan McGrath – Electorate Offices for Member for Kingsford Smith, Greg Walls – NSW Ports, Jamil Kharoude – Vopak, Clare Harley – Bayside Council

Item	Description	Action/Responsibility
1	<b>Apologies and Introductions</b> Noted apologies as above.	
2	<b>Presentation – to introduce the community to Patrick’s Port Botany Rail Project (aka Sydney AutoStrad Botany Rail Expansion i.e. SABRE)</b>	
2.1	Presentation attached to minutes. Key points: Construction to start shortly. Presently carrying out environmental assessments. Construction hours will include: Monday – Friday 7am-5pm Saturday 7am -3pm.	
2.2	<b>Questions following Patrick’s presentation</b> JB - will the length of the trains be shortened? PeF - Trains will be shortened to make them more efficient. Trains will be 600metres long. Long trains are currently split between the three	




<p>terminals. These will have a single arrival and a single departure point. PeF - Civil works are about to start in Botany. Cranes will arrive in mid-February – March. Cranes are being manufactured in China. Automation of the cranes being manufactured in Europe. Control system is being manufactured by Patrick. Cranes will be operational by the end of the third quarter of next year. About two years of work on the roads following this with a 2023 completion date.</p> <p>JB – Will duplication of the line go all the way to Moorebank? PeF – Yes. JL – most of the line is duplicated with only one section around Mascot to still be done.</p> <p>JB – I read somewhere that this was costing \$300 million. Where is the 300m coming from and how is the remainder, after the Patricks component of the project, to be spent?</p> <p>PeF – \$124 million is being invested by NSW Ports and \$70 million from Patrick. Similar deals are being offered to other terminal operators who will continue to use the existing rail line for now. JL - This is phase one in the upgrade process.</p> <p>JB – As I understand it the percentage of transport by rail has dropped from around 20% to 17%? The carrot and stick approach hasn't worked. JL – The percentage of modal share has dropped largely due to a significant drought as it's driven by rural export. Import growth has grown faster than regional export growth. The actual volume of rail has grown it just hasn't kept pace with the amount of import growth.</p> <p>JB is concerned the 40% rail target by 2020 as part of the original agreement for the port expansion and the maximum 3.2 mill TEU capacity changed with the sale of the port. The most recent target by government was 28% by 2021. At 17.7% we are 10% short of that with around a year to go. It needs to be asked whether the government will reset that target or take punitive action. TB – That is the NSW Government's target. NSW Ports has set a target of 3m TEU on rail by 2045. JL – We have seen organic rail growth up to now but terminals are at capacity. Moorebank will be on line next year. There are stepped changes. Everything going to Moorebank was by road but will now be by rail.</p> <p>MD - Does Patrick raise the funds from the public? PeF – Patrick's is a private company owned by Qube and Brookfield. No public funds have been raised for this project by Patrick.</p> <p>CA - Concerned about noise reaching residents. When a container lands on the train will that be controlled by a computer or manually? PeF - A computer will control this movement. The automation should reduce the banging. CA - Can the machine control the speed? PeF – Yes and the height.</p> <p>TB - Is it fair to say there will be less noise after this project? PeF - Yes. This concept reduces the need for breaking etc. It will be a calmer and more managed operation that should have noise benefits.</p> <p>JB - Will trains be running more frequently? Time patterns? PeF – Yes the number of windows will increase.</p>	
---	--

	<p>JB – This is a concern for the residents living adjacent to the trains with more frequency and presumably 24 hour operation.</p> <p>PeF – The number of windows will increase but the intention is to bring in full trains and full trains out. There will be one locomotive per train instead of two or three. They will be quieter trains so we do not expect increased noise impacts.</p>	
<b>3</b>	<b>Accept minutes of last meeting</b>	
3.1	Acceptance of the minutes from May 2019 was moved by MD and seconded by JB.	
<b>4</b>	<b>Actions arising from previous minutes</b>	
4.1	<p><u>Action 3.1 February 2019.</u> Port Authority to forward the consolidated monitoring report to NSW Ports for distribution to the CCC if available prior to the next meeting.</p> <p>Foreshore Beach additional seagrass monitoring IE – Preliminary results of the second (of three) additional seagrass survey, undertaken in May 2019, were encouraging. The dense and healthy Zostera patch at the south-eastern part of the site has almost doubled again in size since the 2018 survey. The report is expected soon and will go on Port Authority website as soon as it is reviewed and finalised.</p>	Remains open
4.2	<p><u>Action 7.1 November 2018.</u> PANSW to present a detailed consolidated summary of the Penhryn Estuary monitoring program at the next meeting.</p> <p>IE – As mentioned at the last meeting, all monitoring associated with the Penrhyn Estuary Habitat Enhancement Program (PEHEP) was completed in early November 2018. All reporting is now online, except for the final shorebird reporting at the End of Project report. Drafts of these two final reports have now been received by Port Authority and are being reviewed. Port Authority will be in a position to report on them to the CCC at the next meeting.</p>	Remains open
4.3	<p><u>Action 3.3 May 2019.</u> EB to take the issue of odours at Millpond during dry weather back to the EPA and discuss the issue with Bayside Council and provide further information to the following meeting.</p> <p>EB - So far discussions have revealed that there is no indication that Dry Weather issues are caused by Sydney Water. Indicates Bayside Council needs to further investigate.</p> <p>JB suggests it a shame Bayside Council not in attendance.</p> <p>BE – Randwick Council did have ongoing regular dry weather issues/overflow 11 years ago. These were reported to Sydney Water at the time.</p> <p>EB – noting the recent successful prosecution of Sydney Water by EPA, the EPA takes overflows very seriously.</p> <p>BE – Noted it might be worth talking to SACL as they undertake water monitoring in the area.</p> <p>EB – Noted difficulties with two regulatory authorities in the space (Council and EPA) however in this instance there is no indication that the EPA has a role.</p> <p>JB – Noted fines in previous cases in the Land and Environment Court</p>	Bayside Council to follow up the issue of dry weather odour.

	<p>were to be set aside for community purposes for reparation works. It was originally said these fines (Sydney Water) would go to consolidated revenue. It is now said Bayside Council will get the bulk based on the court orders. Landcare groups could make good use of the money. He would like to know how the money will be used. Would have been good to see the local community consulted on the uses of money.</p> <p>EB and JB – agreed to chat offline about this concern.</p> <p>CA – Questioned how long odour permeates from council stormwater after it stops raining.</p> <p>EB - Not sure of this. Three weeks after rain would be considered dry weather. It does appear to be a dry weather issue not caused by Sydney Water from issues such as vegetation build up.</p>	
<b>5</b>	<b>Port Botany Community Assets</b>	
5.1	<p>- Update on Foreshore Beach/Penrhyn Estuary</p> <p>IE – General maintenance activities have included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Trimming and mulching older dead trees between Millstream and the Bird Lookout</li> <li>- Increased frequency to fortnightly pressure washing of the boat ramp</li> <li>- Regular cleaning and fortnightly beach grooming.</li> </ul> <p>New bins were installed, however needed to be removed due to coating defect. New date for return to be advised.</p> <p>Currently looking into new plantings for the area of Millstream leading into summer.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<b>NSW Ports Sustainability Update</b>	
	- Release of Sustainability Plan	
6.1	<p>TB - NSW Ports will be releasing sustainability plan shortly. A pdf version will be available and some hard copies. Report will come in a more interactive web format. It will be easy to be updated with new stories over time. TB noted NSW Ports thanks to all for their input into plan. Currently in the final stages of getting approvals. NSW Ports will notify the CCC by email when the report is released.</p>	
<b>7</b>	<b>Operational and Development Activities in the Port</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Port Botany Expansion operational update</li> <li>- Tenant Developments – round table</li> <li>- NSW Ports developments inc. road rehabilitation works – GW</li> <li>- Planning and legislation update – GW</li> <li>- Port Botany Expansion operational update</li> </ul>	
<b>7.1</b>	<b>NSW Ports</b>	
	<p>AWH - Noted that the draft conditions for the Port Botany Expansion administrative modification MOD 17 had been received by DPIE. The application should be finalised and approved in the coming weeks.</p> <p>TB – NSW Ports has submitted the Operational Environmental Management Plan for Hayes Dock. The environmental management plan has been submitted for review.</p>	
<b>7.2</b>	<b>Hutchison</b>	
	<p>JS - Noted that Blair Moses has resigned from Hutchison. For the interim JS will attend these meetings. JS advised that Hutchison has commenced work with the EPA and a contractor to remove the sand pile at the end of the Hutchison berth. Noted that Hutchinson is hopeful the sand pile will be removed by the end of this year. Contractual negotiations are currently being carried out.</p> <p>JB asked if a clearance could be obtained from EPA to use the sand to</p>	<p>JS to take on notice and respond whether the sand pile can be used to replenish Foreshore Beach.</p>

	rebuild Foreshore Beach. It would get rid of a problem for Hutchison and the community could get their beach back.	
7.3	<b><u>Patrick</u></b> Nil to report	
7.4	<b><u>DP World</u></b> Nil to report	
7.5	<b><u>Vopak</u></b> AC– Reported that Vopak has received approval to carry out an expansion. Vopak are currently in the process of closing out the tender and getting approvals. The current plan is to build across the road at Qenos old facility. The next step is detailed design and further information will be provided as the project progresses.	
7.6	<b><u>Elgas</u></b> Nil to report	
7.7	<b><u>Caltex</u></b> Nil to report	
7.8	<b><u>Origin Energy</u></b> Nil to report	
7.9	<b><u>Terminals</u></b> No representative present.	
7.10	<b><u>Orora</u></b> KJ– Reported Orora are finishing construction of engineering warehouse.	
7.11	<b><u>Qenos</u></b> Nil to report	
7.12	<b><u>NSW Ports developments</u></b> JL – reports that some roadwork is currently underway to resurface the road 100m south of Prince of Wales intersection all the way to Friendship Road and up to Charlotte Road intersection. This work is required as the road surface is at the end of its life. Work includes digging the road 600m down and replacing the surface. Work started last Monday with Ward Civil as the contractor. The work will be carried out in phases – one side of the road at a time. Work is being carried out 24/7 to avoid peak container season before Christmas. Work is due to finish around the end of September.  TB - noted that the traffic control starts at Bumborah Point Road. May be some queuing behind traffic control.  CA - questioned if the road is cement or asphalt? JL - responded it is asphalt	
8	<b><u>Port Botany Noise Update</u></b> - Port Botany Expansion Rail Noise (as per CoA 2.28)  TB - noted that NSW Ports have not received any complaints regarding rail noise since the last CCC meeting.	
9	<b><u>Safety and Environmental Incidents/Complaints</u></b> - Summary of complaints – TB  TB – nil complaints	
10	<b><u>General Business/Next meeting</u></b>	
10.1	<b><u>Potential Cruise Terminal – community campaign</u></b> LN forwarded for viewing a link to the community campaign. See link below: <a href="https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=eQ730BA9R8Y&amp;feature=youtu.be">https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=eQ730BA9R8Y&amp;feature=youtu.be</a>  IE – a comprehensive stakeholder and community engagement process to support the next stage of the Cruise capacity project would be delivered once government confirms their timing to progress to	

	<p>consultation. The Port Botany CCC is viewed by the project as a key group for consultation, feedback and input. An overview of the Cruise Capacity project, consultation project, and project timeline would be included as well as one-on-one stakeholder briefings for groups including the Port Botany CCC.</p> <p>JB – Questioned the timing of this?</p> <p>IE – advised this will depend on when the government makes a decision about the project.</p> <p>JB – noted that there has been no consultation to date with the CCC, the community or the local land council.</p> <p>IE – advised that Port Authority is very conscious of that.</p> <p>LH – Questioned if councils and MP's will be kept informed?</p> <p>IE – Yes they will</p>	
10.2	<p><b><u>Environmental Incentive for Shipping Update</u></b></p> <p>TB – advised shipping incentive has been running from 1 Jan this year. As at end of June, 260 vehicles had registered for the incentive. This is a significantly higher uptake in the second quarter- more than doubled registrations. Noted that there is a worldwide trend towards ships improving their emissions. The improvement can be attributed to a combination of incentives/legislation.</p>	
10.3	<p><b><u>NEPM air quality standard</u></b></p> <p>RR – noted that LN provided a link for submissions to the National Environmental Protection Measure air quality standards. This was distributed to the CCC.</p> <p>EB – noted Submissions close tomorrow. NSW EPA was involved in the proposal that has been put to consultation. Victorian EPA is leading the review.</p> <p>BE – reported Randwick Council will make a submission.</p> <p>JB – reported LN requests a presentation and update to the CCC on NEPM standards. He asked whether there is consolidated data from the various air quality monitors in the area (e.g. former Botany Council, Orica). Someone needs to look at the whole. Something that has been raised over 15 years is the inadequacy of the nearest monitor to this industrial area being at UNSW.</p> <p>EB – noted the air quality monitor looks at ambient air quality not hot spots.</p> <p>BE – noted that the Airport master plan, which has recently been published commits to putting an air quality monitoring station in the airport.</p>	
10.4	<p>CA – Noted for information that Botany Cemetery Trust are looking to expand into Bicentennial Park. Questioned this may have an effect on traffic.</p>	
10.5	<p>TB – questioned if everyone was happy with venue?</p> <p>All present were happy. No issues raised.</p>	
	<p><b>Next meeting</b></p> <p>Date: Tuesday 29 October. 5.30pm</p> <p>Prince Henry Centre – McNevin Room</p> <p>2 Coast Hospital Rd, Little Bay NSW 2036</p>	
	<p>RR – This will be Sandra's last meeting. Thank you to Sandra for all of her fantastic work with the group over the years.</p> <p>SS thanks the Chair, NSW Ports, CCC members and particularly community members for the opportunity to work the committee for over ten years.</p>	
	<p><b>These minutes have been endorsed by the meeting Chair</b></p>	

	<div><div>Signed:</div><div>Date: 1/9/2019</div><div></div></div>
--	--

**Meeting:** Port Botany Community Consultative Committee – Meeting No. 25

**Held:** Tuesday 29 October 2019, 5.30pm-7.30pm  
McNevin Room, Prince Henry Centre – 2 Coast Hospital Rd, Little Bay

**Present:**

Charles Abela (CA) – Community	Marie Gibbs (MG) – Patrick Stevedores
John Burgess (JB) – Community	Mark Mercer (MM) - ACFS
Peter Fagan (PF) – Community	Mark Walker (MW) - Qenos
Mal-Jagdev Imrich (MI) - Community	Lyndon Reeves – Elgas Limited
Asim Chohan (AC) – Safe Work NSW	Gary McKay (GM) – Caltex
Patrick Medway (PM) – Bayside Chamber of Commerce	Jos Kusters (JK) – Caltex
Bronwyn Englaro (BE) – Randwick Council	Jennifer Stevenson (JS) – Hutchison
Clare Harley (CH) – Bayside Council	Karen Jones – Orora
Dylan Parker (DP) – Electorate Offices for Member for Maroubra	Sarah Downey (SD) – NSW Ports
Leigh Heaney (LH) – Electorate Offices for Member for Kingsford Smith	Trevor Brown (TB) – NSW Ports
Laura Fayers-Pooley (LF) – Port Authority of NSW	Jonathan Lafforgue (JL) – NSW Ports
Brad Milner (BM) – Port Authority of NSW	Natalia McGregor (NM) – NSW Ports
Ryan Bennett (RB) – Port Authority of NSW	Adriane Whiley (AWH) – NSW Ports
Stephanie Mifsud (SM) - ARTC	Roberta Ryan (RR) – Chairperson
Sophie Lovett (SL) - ARTC	Stella Cimarosti (SC) – Minute taker

**Apologies:** Lynda Newnam – Community, Paul Pickering – Community, Erin Barker – EPA, Neville Johnstone – DP World, Umair Savul – DP World, Michael Kinnell – Origin, Ralf Genuttis – Vopak, Alan Chambers – Vopak, Rory Grieves – Hutchison

Item	Description	Action/Responsibility
1	<b>Apologies and Introductions</b> Noted apologies as above.	
2	<b>Presentation – Botany Rail Duplication project, ARTC</b>	
2.1	Presentation attached to minutes. Key points: Environmental Impact Statement currently on public display. Comments can be made until Wednesday 13 November.	
2.2	<b><u>Questions following ARTC presentation</u></b> LH – What fuel will the locomotives run on? SM – A range of companies run the different locomotives and they choose their own fuel. ARTC operates and is building the infrastructure not the locomotives however; this is assessed in the EIS which has identified that there are no exceedances of the air quality criteria due to the project. LH – If there is an increase in the number of trains wouldn't that lead to an increase in the amount of pollution? SM – There will be an air quality expert present at our next information session who can talk to this in more detail. There is also a full specialist report around this topic in the EIS.	



	<p>LH – Has there been any investigation carried out around noise abatement for surrounding residents?</p> <p>SM – We use the Rail Industry Noise Guidelines when assessing noise impacts associated with the project. The guidelines identify certain criteria for noise. If it is predicted that noise will exceed the criteria we need to investigate mitigation options. A number of different mitigation options are investigated in the EIS and associated Technical Report. Typical mitigation measures might include at property treatments for example, double glazing or repairing cracks in the walls of houses. Other options could also include lubrication of the track. In the EIS we have identified areas where we may exceed the limit. This will be investigated in more detail as the project progresses. We also talk through the potential abatement options on the EIS.</p> <p>LH – Will there be less idling noise after the new line is built?</p> <p>SM – Yes and no. In certain areas the trains idle not because they are waiting for the track to clear. There are certain check points along the route. But yes idling because of waiting for the track to clear will be removed. We will also be able to increase the speed of the track which changes the noise profile somewhat.</p> <p>JB – The project will lead to a dynamic change in the way freight operates in the area. We learnt at the last meeting that these changes in the way freight operates will mean more efficiency, shorter trains, less carbon emissions etc. The downside is that trains will operate 24 hours a day 7 days a week. I appreciate that the noise profile will change but it's important to acknowledge that it will still be noisy. This is a great thing for some operators of the Port but perhaps not for others. What are we doing to motivate operators to move their containers onto rail?</p> <p>MG – Operators don't decide what goes on rail the customers do. If the customer decides that they want their product moved via rail the operator will provide this. It's about turning around their cargo quicker.</p> <p>SM – That question goes much bigger than just this project. This project responds to the policies developed to encourage the rail modal shift. The state and federal Governments are working towards increasing rail operations. They have set significant targets for this. I understand that ARTC engages with customers and talks to them about how they can use rail and be more efficient. The intent of this project is to improve efficiency and reliability which is a motivation for customers. The quicker we can move their products the better. There are a number of projects, not just this one that are focussed around a move to rail and improving operations. The intent of all the work being undertaken as part of these policies is that in the next 10 years freight transport via rail will be more desirable.</p> <p>JB – The growth rate isn't great at the moment. We had an original target of 40% of all transport when the Port was expanded and which was reduced to 28% by 2012 to facilitate the Ports privatisation and sale. We seem to have gone backwards and the current reported rate is 17.6% - down from previous years. I am yet to be convinced that this will be achieved. I am encouraged by the commitment to the rail project by the government but question if the government will take any other corrective action with the likely breach of the rail covenant.</p> <p>JL – Moorebank is a great example of how rail will be used more and more. There potentially is a massive demand amongst importers for rail options.</p> <p>SM – We are seeing a similar response to the Inland Rail program at the moment. It is clear there is interest in more links and intermodals.</p>	
<b>3</b>	<b>Community Engagement Overview – Detailed business case for additional cruise capacity, Port Authority of NSW</b>	
3.1	<p>Key points from BM and LF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Port Authority of NSW is different from NSW Ports. We are a marine services business.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Port Authority will have our own consultation process for the Cruise Terminal. This is not the forum for a detailed discussion about the project.</li> <li>- We have set up a series of consultation meetings for this project. Some have already happened and some we are still organising or are planned.</li> <li>- We have arranged a project update meeting for the tenants of NSW Ports and some surrounding businesses.</li> <li>- We have had a few initial meetings with local councils, key stakeholders and some community groups.</li> <li>- We have already received a strong message from all of the groups we have spoken to that if we are going to have discussions/proper consultation we need to provide details to enable meaningful feedback. We are at the start of this process.</li> <li>- The timeline provided in the ARTC presentation is useful in describing where we are at. We are about two years behind ARTC as discussed before. We are in the very early stages of preparing a detailed business case, which is due back to the Government in 2020. Our consultation will inform the detailed business case</li> <li>- We acknowledge that this project has been difficult and frustrating for the community because we have not been in a position to share tangible details about the project until the formal announcement in September.</li> <li>- We are currently carrying out early consultation so we still don't have a lot of detail at the moment.</li> <li>- The purpose of the consultation at the moment is to draw out how stakeholders and the community use the area of study (between Yarra Bay and Molineux Point). We will build this into how we are shaping the project.</li> <li>- We haven't nailed down a point on a map at this stage however, we are interested in getting community and stakeholder views on this so that we can build this into the business case.</li> <li>- We have already received a lot of rich community feedback that we using to inform early planning and the next stages of the project.</li> <li>- We have committed to holding community information sessions before Christmas. This will allow the community to meet the project team and understand how their feedback is being used to help shape the project.</li> <li>- We have started meeting with council and adjoining land owners.</li> <li>- We holding the NSW Ports tenants update meeting to we can hear the concerns that local businesses may have so that we can feed this into our technical studies.</li> <li>- Our commitment is to share what information we have when we have it available. Unfortunately at this stage we don't have the information that people want.</li> </ul> <p>Next year we intend to carry out a second round of consultation where we will have more certainty about a potential design and narrowed potential location option, and again share the next steps.</p>	
3.2	<p>Questions raised</p> <p>MG – Are we in the design stage or the concept stage?</p> <p>BM – We are in the detailed business case stage where we are looking at the potential for the project and also the need for the project due to the constraints of Sydney Harbour as a cruise terminal.</p> <p>MG – Is this the only place being looked at?</p> <p>BM – This is the only area of study that the detailed business case is exploring.</p> <p>MG – I thought other sites were being considered – Garden Island? Port Kembla?</p>	

<p>BM – In mid-2018 the Government did release a Cruise Development Plan which talked about Botany Bay but also other areas as you have mentioned. Details about regional ports are in this report.</p> <p>MG – So Botany Bay is the only site?</p> <p>BM – Yes.</p> <p>MI – Why Botany Bay given the issues with the site?</p> <p>BM – We are aware of the potential issues of using this site however, given the restrictions of Sydney Harbour its necessary to explore other potential cruise terminals.</p> <p>DP – You mentioned that you are in the initial consultation phase and that feedback will be taken into account before another round of consultation next year. What does the subsequent phase of consultation look like?</p> <p>BM – Last year we worked on a strategic business case which looked at the broader concepts of what this project may be – benefits etc. We are now approved by the Government to develop a detailed business case which has three components that are intertwined. Our contractor RPS has been engaged to develop the detailed business case. The key components are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scoping up technical work that may be required and bringing in technical experts</li> <li>2. Commercial returns and benefits</li> <li>3. Community and stakeholder consultation.</li> </ol> <p>These three parts are very different but are connected and one will work to inform the other.</p> <p>The second round of consultation will be carried out when some of this work has been done. This will allow us to share further information when we know what is feasible.</p> <p>CA – I have never come across a cruise terminal that overlooks a cemetery. There will be a 14 storey ship looking into a cemetery. Has this been taken into account?</p> <p>BM – Yes, this will be taken into account through the work that is being done as part of the detailed business case. It will be included as part of the piece that goes up to the Government. We will definitely need to speak to the cemetery to understand what this means.</p> <p>CA – I believe expanding the cemetery is being considered at the moment so you should start those conversations now.</p> <p>LM – Have you started considering potential commercial partners?</p> <p>BM – Commercial consideration is part of the detailed business case. We have to look at commercial models and potential partners as part of this process. We are setting all of this up now.</p> <p>LM – Any specific companies in the industry?</p> <p>BM – Yes we have spoken to companies</p> <p>LF – To clarify, this phase of industry engagement is not forming partnerships with future proponents or operators. We are talking to specific companies who build and operate cruise terminals around the world as their feedback and ideas are important in what we might develop.</p> <p>LM – Who is the final decision maker?</p> <p>BM – Government will make the final decision. We have been tasked to prepare a business case with NSW Treasury. At the end of this piece of work the NSW Government will need to make a decision.</p> <p>LM – Who in Government makes the decision?</p> <p>BM – I am aware of the requirements of the process – we are working in collaboration with NSW Treasury and following the Infrastructure NSW</p>
--

	<p>(INSW) model however once the business case is submitted I am not sure who in Government the product goes to.</p> <p>MI – What is the cost of this business case?  BM – This information isn't publically available at this stage. The cost is being built at the moment with our consultants. As we are scoping what needs to be done, so the cost will not be determined yet. Port Authority of NSW does have a budget to fund the development of the business case.</p> <p>PF – Save the Bay Coalition reiterates its publicly stated position – there can be no consultation without information. We maintain that the Port Authority must show all stakeholders what they plan to build BEFORE a consultation process can begin.  If what the Port Authority is proposing is not truly awful for most if not all stakeholders, they would not be keeping their plans secret.</p> <p>The Port Authority claim that there is no information to share at this stage cannot be accepted. The Port Authority's initial response to a GIPA request on Monday 28 October 2019 acknowledged the existence of 1800 records (excluding emails).  The implications of the design for port commercial operators are huge. For example, the solid wall breakwater - the Port Authority has admitted to Parliament it would have to build - has huge implications for the shipping channel, for recreational fishers and boaters and for the Caltex berths at Kurnell  The Port Authority's references to stakeholders indicate it is only considering those in close proximity to the Yarra Bay on the northern shore of Botany Bay. The solid wall breakwater would also have huge implications for Kurnell foreshores and Towra Point.</p> <p>JB – The reality is that consultation is such an overused meaningless word here. No matter what level of consultation is carried out there will be opposition. The community will litigate if necessary.</p>	
<b>4</b>	<b>Accept minutes of last meeting</b>	
4.1	Acceptance of the minutes from August 2019 was moved by JB and seconded by MG.	
<b>5</b>	<b>Actions arising from previous minutes</b>	
5.1	Action 3.3 from May 2019 – Dry weather odour.	Remains open. To be picked up offline with CH
5.2	<p>Action 7.2 from August 2019 – Hutchison sand pile  JS – The sand pile is being removed by a contractor who will use it to build cement and other by-products. The approval for moving sand from one location to another is a lengthy process. Hutchison are happy for the Port Authority to approach their contractor to arrange for the sand to be used to replenish foreshore beach.  JB – That would be great given the sand came from Botany Bay  JS – Port Authority can get in touch with JS who will connect them with their contractor.  TB – In the interest of managing expectations here it's worthwhile to note that RB would have to go through a process that would take some time to arrange this, including testing. Given the process to move the sand has already started it may be too late.  JS – Yes we have started the process of moving the sand. We can't move the sand until testing is done – the testing indicated that the sand was natural material.  JB – You would think the process would be the same regardless of where the sand is going.</p>	RB from Port Authority to contact JS
<b>6</b>	<b>Port Botany Community Assets</b>	

6.1	<p>Presentation on Foreshore Beach/Penrhyn Estuary Monitoring Program. Final reporting is online. This included the 2018 shorebird monitoring report and the end of project monitoring report by CARDNO.</p> <p>Port Authority will proceed with all of the recommendations made in the report which are outlined in the presentation.</p> <p>Presentation to be attached to the minutes and link to the reporting on the web.</p>	
6.2	<p>Questions following Presentation</p> <p>JB – Do CARDNO have any engagement with the group responsible for the bird monitoring being done in the Towra Point Nature Reserve?</p> <p>RB – Not sure</p> <p>JB – Perhaps they should as there are reports of similar problems in this area – this is due to the degradation to the reserve habitat because of the same migration and the situation is killing off the shoreline mangroves and causing the inner islands to become part of the greater land mass. Feral cats and dogs have invaded these areas and are killing the wildlife.</p> <p>Perhaps there could be mutual benefit from sharing the intelligence with the reserve managers.</p> <p>RB – We have spoken with relevant parties about this area</p> <p>BE – Will there be future shorebird monitoring?</p> <p>RB – There is none planned at the moment however, we are looking into the possibility of a volunteer program.</p> <p>BE – Council would be happy to assist in advertising such a program as we have many people contact us interested in this issue.</p> <p>MI – Is there any indication as to why there is a decline in the number of birds?</p> <p>RB – Habitat loss is one of the biggest causes of the decline. The birds need an area that isn't developed. We are aware of a mass decrease across the Northern Hemisphere due to development. However, this is not the only issue.</p> <p>JB – Question from Lynda. The current quality and condition of the bird hide and signage is poor.</p> <p>RB – This has been raised with our asset manager. We have someone who looks after this area. We will get this fixed.</p>	<p>BE – To assist with advertising the volunteer monitoring for shorebirds</p> <p>RB – To respond to LN question – regarding signage.</p>
<b>7</b>	<b>NSW Ports Sustainability Update</b>	
7.1	<p>Stakeholder perception survey</p> <p>SD – NSW Ports has recently issued an online survey out to stakeholders and the community to gather feedback on how NSW Ports is perceived and how we engage. This feedback will help inform our future strategy. CCC members should have received an invitation to provide feedback and participate. The consultation period closes this Friday. We encourage you all to participate.</p>	
7.2	<p>Sustainability annual scorecard</p> <p>TB – NSW Ports sustainability program was released this year. We committed to annual reporting on progress in this. We will put out a baseline report for 2019 which will be released in the coming weeks. We will make CCC members aware when the scorecard report is available online.</p>	
<b>8</b>	<b>Operational and development activities in the Port</b>	
8.1	<p>Sydney Autostrad Botany Rail Extension Project (SABRE)</p> <p>MG – We have engaged a contractor and construction has started. Works are ongoing and progressing well. Piles have been completed and paving/utility work is ongoing.</p>	
8.2	Port Botany Expansion Update	

	<p>JS – We have started the process of moving the sand. We can't move the sand until testing is done. All the sand is tested in accordance with the EPA guidelines, and only ENM (Excavated Natural Material) is removed from the terminal.</p> <p>MG – Nothing more from us.</p>	
8.3	<p>NSW Ports Development</p> <p>None to report on.</p> <p>AW – We received correspondence from DPIE regarding the status of the proposed amendments to the Three Ports SEPP. The proposed amendments are still under consideration. However, the proposed rezoning of land at Wentworth Avenue, Botany from IN2 Light Industrial under the <i>Botany Bay Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2013</i> to IN1 General Industrial under the Three Ports SEPP is no longer part of the proposed amendments to the Three Ports SEPP.</p>	
8.4	<p>Tenant Developments</p> <p>Hutchinson – Nil</p> <p>Patrick – Nil</p> <p>DP World – Not present</p> <p>Vopak – Not present. TB advised that Vopak are preparing to start construction on their B4A project. They are currently preparing the construction and traffic management plans for approval. The project involves building three additional tanks.</p> <p>CA – Will any hazardous material be stored in the tanks?</p> <p>TB – I believe they are to be fuel tanks. This would have been identified and assessed in the project planning.</p> <p>Elgas – Nil</p> <p>Caltex – Nil</p> <p>Origin Energy – Nil</p> <p>Terminals – Nil</p> <p>Orora – Orora have started the process of selling their Australasian business – Botany Paper Mill. Sale is expected to be approved and closed out in the first quarter of next year.</p> <p>We are also partnering with Suez to develop a co-generation plan to power the paper mill – this would mean we can convert waste that would be going to land fill to be used in the mill. This proposal is being assessed as a State Significant Development. SEARs have been received by the Government and the EIS will begin early next year. EIS will take around six months to complete. Consultations have started and a briefing will be provided to the CCC early next year.</p> <p>Project webpage – <a href="http://botanycogenerationplant.com.au">botanycogenerationplant.com.au</a></p> <p>Qenos – Nil</p>	
<b>9</b>	<p><b>Port Botany Noise Update</b></p> <p>No complaints received.</p>	
<b>10</b>	<p><b>Safety and environmental incidents/complaints</b></p> <p>No complaints this quarter.</p>	
10.1	<p>TB – One environmental incident recorded. Trucks diesel tank was pierced and ran into the canal. We responded and Fire and Rescue NSW attended. After the incident there was heavy rainfall so we monitored the area and reported this to the EPA. No impact was identified.</p>	
10.2	<p>PF – Can we address the fatality that occurred?</p> <p>TB – Yes, there was a fatality. A worker was crushed while moving containers. We are still waiting on the full incident report for this. Safe Work NSW has made information available on their website including reminders about safe practices.</p> <p>PF – This is the second fatality in the past few years which is concerning.</p> <p>TB – I am not sure about that. Safe handling of containers is an important matter that all operators need to be mindful of. Our tenants have a requirement to manage their safety. At this stage there is no action for</p>	



	<p>NSW Ports to take as a result of this incident however as mentioned we are still waiting for the final report which may make some recommendations.</p> <p>PF – It's important to share these leanings.</p> <p>TB – We have quarterly meetings about safety with our tenants. We have a topic each meeting. We covered container handling as a topic in 2018.</p>	
<b>11</b>	<b>General Business/Next meeting</b>	
11.1	<p>NM – Last week NSW Ports have started a partnership with Council to rehabilitate St Joseph Banks Park. We successfully hosted 30 days' worth of volunteer efforts with 320 volunteers. We planted 6500 seedlings. The catch rate of these seedlings was very high.</p> <p>We are already observing wildlife coming back into the park and a pick up in the community using this space.</p> <p>We will do a presentation on this at the next meeting in 2020.</p>	
11.2	<p>TB – NSW Ports supported the Bayside Business Awards. We sponsored the excellence in education and training services award which was won by a child care facility called "Miracles on Russell" based at Sans Souci.</p>	
11.3	<p>SD – NSW Ports recently celebrated World Maritime Day. The theme this year was empowering women in the maritime industry. NSW Ports took the opportunity to recognise the women in our organisation. 50% of NSW Ports staff and 30% of our leadership team are female including our CEO..</p>	
11.4	<p>PF - Save the Bay Coalition is holding its next Community Forum at Yarra Bay Sailing Club on 17 November at 2 PM. All members of the port community are welcome to attend. We expect a large crowd, so be early if you want to get a seat. Any stakeholder wishing to speak at the forum should let Peter Fagan know as soon as possible.</p>	
11.5	<p>CA – There is a proposal for 9000 apartments to be built on the coast here in Little Bay. The proposal includes 22 storey apartments. This is going to cause a massive increase in traffic.</p>	
11.6	<p>RR – thanks LN for comments and draws CCC member's attention to these on the agenda.</p>	
11.7	<b>Next meeting will be held on 11 February 2020.</b>	
	<p><b>These minutes have been endorsed by the meeting Chair</b></p> <p><b>Signed: ROBERTA RYAN</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Date: 29<sup>TH</sup> November, 2019</b></span></p>	