SEARS	Sub-Reference	Condition	Transport Cluster Response
4	a	Use the background growth models developed by RMS for the Liverpool/Moorebank area;	**Not addressed:** The proponent has advised that they are still refining their analysis of the impact of the proposal on the State Road Network and will present to TfNSW / RMS in February 2017. Accordingly, the SEARS are not met. Transport Cluster notes EIS Sections 1.8 *Reference Traffic Study Data and Modelling*, 1.9 *Consultation with Key Stakeholders* and 4.1 *Future background traffic growth* of the TIA.
	b	provide details of the current daily and peak hour light and heavy vehicle, public transport, pedestrian and bicycle movements and existing traffic and transport facilities provided on the road network located adjacent to the proposed development;	**Not addressed:** Further information required by RMS. Transport cluster noted Section 3.1 *Daily Traffic Volumes* and 3.2 *Peak Hour Volumes* of the TIA.
	c	undertake a realistic and justified range of daily peak hour generation scenarios (to be determined in consultation with TfNSW, RMS and Liverpool City Council) including assumptions about light and heavy vehicle movements and the proportion of deliveries by railway and road;	**Not addressed:** Further information required by RMS. Transport cluster noted 1.9 *Consultation with Key Stakeholders* and 5.1 *Trip Generation from the Proposal* of the TIA
	d	Undertake detailed modelling analysis to assess network operation in consultation with RMS and identify intersection upgrade requirements. The modelling package is to be determined by RMS;	**Not addressed:** The proponent has advised that they are still refining their analysis of the impact of the proposal on the State Road Network and will present to TfNSW / RMS in February 2017. Accordingly the SEARS are not met. Transport Cluster notes Sections 5.4.1 *Moorebank Avenue / Anzac Road Intersection Upgrade*, 5.4.3 *M5 Motorway / Moorebank Avenue intersection*, 5.4.4 *M5 Motorway / Hume Highway Intersection*, 5.4.5 Moorebank Avenue / *Newbridge Road Intersection*, 5.4.6 *Moorebank Avenue / Heathcote Road Intersection*, 5.4.7 *M5 Motorway / Heathcote Road Intersection.*

SEARS	Sub-Reference	Condition	Transport Cluster Response
4	e	consider the constructability constraints of proposed upgrade(s) at key intersections, such as vehicle swept paths, geometry and sight lines;	**Not addressed**: The proponent has advised that they are still refining their analysis of the impact of the proposal on the State Road Network and will present to TfNSW / RMS in February 2017. Accordingly the SEARS are not met. Transport cluster notes Section 5.4 *Proposed Site Access and Network Upgrade,* Section 6.1 *Potential Infrastructure Upgrade.*
	f	provide details of the number of parking spaces, and justification of proposed parking against relevant guidelines / standards and Australian Standards;	**Adequately addressed:** See section 5.9.1 proposing 983 car parking spaces based on RMS parking standards.
	g	provide details of proposed staff and heavy vehicle accesses (including intersection location, design and site distance) and layout of the internal road network;	**Not addressed:** The proponent has advised that they are still refining their analysis of the impact of the proposal on the State Road Network and will present to TfNSW / RMS in February 2017. Accordingly the SEARS are not met. Transport Cluster notes Section 5.4.
	h	demonstrate appropriate provision, design and location of on-site bicycle parking, and how bicycle provision will be integrated with the existing bicycle network;	**Adequately addressed:** See Section 5.9.2 *Bicycle Facilities Provision*
	i	provide details of service vehicle movements and site access arrangements (including vehicle type and likely arrival and departure times of service vehicles);	**Not addressed:** Not considered as addressed in the sections nominated by the proponent i.e. Section 1.5, Section 1.6, Section 1.7 and Section 5.1.

SEARS	Sub-Reference	Condition	Transport Cluster Response
	j	provide details of sustainable travel initiatives for workers and visitors, particularly for the provision of end-of-trip facilities, pedestrian and cyclist facilities in secure, convenient, accessible areas close to main entrances, incorporating lighting and passive surveillance	**Adequately addressed:** See Section 5.9.2 *Bicycle Facilities Provision.*

SEARS	Sub-Reference	Condition	Transport Cluster Response
	k	assess construction traffic impacts, which may include a draft Construction Traffic Management Plan including: i. the identification of haulage routes and the details of existing traffic situation on these routes; ii. an assessment of construction traffic volumes (including spoil haulage/delivery of materials and equipment to the road corridor and ancillary facilities); iii. an assessment of potential impacts to the regional and local road network (including safety and level of service) and potential disruption to existing public transport services, pedestrians and cyclist movements and access to properties and businesses; iv. an assessment of cumulative impacts associated with other construction activities (if any); v. details of peak hour and daily truck movements, hours of operation, access arrangements at all stages of construction and traffic control measures for all demolition / construction activities; vi. an assessment of construction road safety at key intersections and locations subject to pedestrian / vehicle / bicycle conflicts; vii. details of any required temporary cycling and pedestrian access during construction; viii. details of access arrangements for workers to / from the site, including pedestrian and public transport linkages, emergency vehicles and service vehicle movements; and ix. details of mitigation measures for the identified impacts (if any).	**Not addressed:** Further information required by RMS. Transport cluster notes *Moorebank Precinct West (MPW) – Stage 2 Proposal Construction Traffic Impact Assessment*

SEARS	Sub-Reference	Condition	Transport Cluster Response
	l	assess operational traffic and transport impacts to the local and regional road network, including: i. changes to local road connectivity and impacts on local traffic arrangements including Cambridge Avenue, road capacity/safety; ii. an assessment of the cumulative impacts associated with other planned and approved developments in the Moorebank precinct; iii. traffic capacity of the road network and its ability to cater for predicted future growth; and iv. details of mitigation measures for the identified impacts (if any) including how heavy vehicles would be prevented from using Moorebank Avenue south.	**Not addressed:** The proponent has advised that they are still refining their analysis of the impact of the proposal on the State Road Network and will present to TfNSW / RMS in February 2017. Accordingly the SEARS are not met.
	m	Consider the use of heavy vehicles able to move two 40 foot containers;	**Not addressed:** The submitted design drawing for the intersection of Moorebank Avenue/Anzac Road is currently being amended by the proponent following a meeting with RMS on 13 December 2016, and subject to finalisation of the traffic modelling. Transport cluster notes Section 4.3.3 Construction methods (p.78) identifies that modifications to the intersections of Moorebank Avenue/Anzac Road and Moorebank Avenue/Bapaume Road would be designed to accommodate an A-Double (which can move two 40 foot containers). Section 4.4.1 Intermodal terminal facility (p.88) states that "The IMT facility would also have capacity to accept heavy vehicles, up to 'double road train' in size".

SEARS	Sub-Reference	Condition	Transport Cluster Response
	n	Consider the need for a bus stop on Moorebank Avenue	**Adequately addressed:** TfNSW supports the potential provision of additional Transit Stop Numbers (TSN) on Moorebank Avenue; however the proponent is in favour of diverting bus services off Moorebank Avenue onto internal roads (page 81). Therefore, TfNSW would need to consider the infrastructure and whether it could accommodate bus services on these internal roads. It is requested that the proponent provides TfNSW with these details.
	o	provide an updated Traffic Management and Accessibility Plan for the operation of the facility including: measures to prevent heavy vehicles accessing residential streets to maintain the residential amenity of the local community details of public transport services and facilities; details of cyclist facilities; and details of driver code of conduct.	*Preliminary Operational Traffic Management Plan* was reviewed. **Not addressed:** measures to prevent heavy vehicles accessing residential streets to maintain the residential amenity of the local community **Adequately addressed:** details of public transport services and facilities; **Adequately addressed:** details of cyclist facilities **Adequately addressed:** Strategic outline of driver code of conduct at 5.2
	6	Projects carried out under this staged development consent are to be assessed with the objective of not exceeding the capacity of the transport network, including the local, regional and State road network.	**Not addressed:** The proponent has advised that they are still refining their analysis of the impact of the proposal on the State Road Network and will present to TfNSW / RMS in February 2017. Accordingly, the Limits of Approval are not met.
	7	Concept approval is granted for interstate terminal container freight with a throughput of up to 500,000 TEU p.a.	**Adequately addressed**

Limits of Approval	Sub-Reference	Condition	Transport Cluster Response
	8	For the IMEX terminal, concept approval is granted for the movement of container freight by up to: a) initially, 250,000 TEU p.a. if the consent authority is satisfied that the Traffic Impact Assessment demonstrates the proposal would not exceed the capacity of the transport network with or without mitigation measures/upgrades; b) after the facility has been in operation, an increase of up to an additional 300,000 TEU p.a. if the consent authority is satisfied that monitoring and modelling of the operation of the IMEX terminal demonstrates that traffic movements resulting from the proposed increase in TEU will achieve the objective of not exceeding the capacity of the transport network; and c) after the facility has been in operation, a further increase up to an additional 500,000 TEU p.a. if the combined approved movement of container freight by road on the Subject Site and the adjacent SIMTA Site (the subject of Concept Plan approval MP10_0193) does not exceed 1.55 million TEU p.a.	**Not addressed:** The proponent has advised that they are still refining their analysis of the impact of the proposal on the State Road Network and will present to TfNSW / RMS in February 2017. Accordingly, the Limits of Approval are not met.

Limits of Approval	Sub-Reference	Condition	Transport Cluster Response
	9	Concept approval is granted for the rail terminals (IMEX and interstate) incorporating either: a) the rail link; or b) if a rail link is under construction or has been constructed associated with the SIMTA development as identified in development application MP10_0193, then only a short connection from the IMEX/interstate terminals to the SIMTA rail connection on the eastern side of the Georges River.	**Not addressed:** Sydney Trains is currently considering the material provided including Appendix F *Rail Access Report and drawings* and will advise if this condition is met.
	10	Port shuttle operations must use: a) locomotives that incorporate available best practice technologies or technologies as agreed through the best practice review and implementation process in accordance with Condition E3 of Schedule 4; and b) permanently coupled 'multi-pack' steering wagons. The wagons shall use Electronically Controlled Pneumatic (ECP) braking with a wire based distributed power system (or better practice technology).	**Not addressed:** Response contained in EIS section 8.2.3 Best Practice Review (p.232). • Agree that the rail link conditions were subject to the MPE Stage 1 proposal but the PAC was clear that the above rail operations that use the link are the responsibility of the individual proponent/proposal, noting that it applies to port shuttle operations only. • The EIS is regarded as incorrect in stating that "Wagons on the Rail link incorporate available best practice technologies for reducing wheel squeal, such as permanently coupled "multi-pack" steering wagons using Electronically Controlled Pneumatic braking with a wire based distributed power system" as interstate operations would also use the link.

Limits of Approval	Sub-Reference	Condition	Transport Cluster Response
	11	The Applicant shall install and maintain a rail noise monitoring system on the rail link at the commencement of operation to continuously monitor the noise from rail operations. The system shall capture the noise from each individual train passby, and include information to identify: c) Time and date of freight train passbys; d) Imagery or video to enable identification of the rolling stock during day and night; e) LAeq(15hour) and LAeq(9hour) from rail operations; and f) LAF(max) and SEL of individual train passbys, measured in accordance with ISO3095; or g) Other alternative information as agreed with the Secretary. The results from the noise monitoring system shall be publicly accessible from a website maintained by the Applicant. The noise results from each train shall be available on the website ideally within 24 hours of it passing the monitor. The LAeq(15hour) and LAeq(9hr) results from each day shall be available on the website ideally within 24 hours of the period ending but within a reasonable timeframe. The Applicant shall provide an annual report to the Secretary with the results of monitoring for a period of 5 years, or as otherwise agreed with the Secretary, from the commencement of operation of either the IMEX or interstate terminal (whichever operates first). The Secretary shall consider the need for further reporting following a review of the results for year 5.	**Not addressed:** Port shuttle operations must use: a) locomotives that incorporate available best practice technologies or technologies as agreed through the best practice review and implementation process in accordance with Condition E3 of Schedule 4; and b) permanently coupled 'multi-pack' steering wagons. The wagons shall use Electronically Controlled Pneumatic (ECP) braking with a wire based distributed power system (or better practice technology). • The rationale for the requirements is as follows: o Locomotives that perform as well as possible in terms of noise and emissions o Permanently coupled Multi Pack wagons to alleviate stretching and bunching noise o Steering to alleviate wheel squeal o ECP to alleviate brake noise as well as bunching and stretching noise • It needs to be remembered that utilising high performing rollingstock will have mitigation effects beyond the precinct boundaries. This is particularly relevant as the port shuttles traverse a range of densely populated suburbs between the port and Moorebank. It is important therefore that any noise and emissions requirements reflect best practice in terms of rollingstock design and operations. Given there is one overall precinct the above conditions should be standardised with those applied by the Planning Assessment Commission on 12 December 2016 for the SIMTA Development, in particular Condition G6. Consideration should also be given to requiring compliance from all rolling stock accessing the facility.

Limits of Approval	Sub-Reference	Condition	Transport Cluster Response
	12	Prior to submitting any Development Application for either the IMEX or interstate terminal, the Applicant shall convene a meeting with regard to proposed traffic assumptions and mitigation measures. The Applicant must: a) Invite SIMTA, TfNSW, RMS, Liverpool City Council and Campbelltown City Council. Each Council may also invite a maximum of two community representatives to attend. b) At the meeting, present the scope and assumptions of the mesoscopic/microsimulation traffic modelling, the draft Traffic Impact Assessment and any proposed mitigation measures including timing on the delivery of any proposed measures; c) Publish the meeting minutes and a schedule of action items arising from the meeting, including responsibilities and timeframes on its website; d) Prepare a written report responding to the action items and consult with RMS on the action items and final mitigation measures; and e) Provide details of the undertaking and outcomes of this condition in the EIS.	**Not addressed:** Meeting occurred 31 August 2016 however mitigation measures as per sub-section (b) were not adequately addressed. As detailed above The proponent has advised that they are still refining their analysis of the impact of the proposal on the State Road Network and will present to TfNSW / RMS in February 2017. Accordingly, the SEARS are not met.

Limits of Approval	Sub-Reference	Condition	Transport Cluster Response
	13	Containers must be transferred between the site and Port Botany by rail only, unless where unforeseen circumstances have occurred (eg an incident, breakdown, derailment or emergency maintenance on the rail line). Rail transfers shall recommence as soon as practicable following such circumstances occurring.	**Not addressed:** Appendix A of the EIS states that this condition of approval is addressed in Section 14 of the EIS. However section 14 outlines the hazard and risk assessment undertaken to identify potential hazards and risks from the construction and operation of the Proposal and does not address this condition of approval. The PAC condition is very clear and it should be explicitly stated in the EIS, noting it also only applies to containers from Port Botany.
	14	Operation of warehousing cannot commence until a rail connection to the SSFL is operational.	**Not addressed:** Section 4 of the EIS and in particular section 4.2.3 *Warehousing* was reviewed. Not considered to be specifically addressed in the EIS although it contains a comprehensive description of how the rail connection will be constructed. Section 4.2.3 states the proposal seeks approval for the construction and operation of warehouses. Considered that the approval for the construction of the warehouses should be different to the approval for their operation or dependant on key milestones for the rail connection being made.

Limits of Approval	Sub-Reference	Condition	Transport Cluster Response
	18	The layout of the site shall not prevent a possible future pedestrian connection to Casula Railway Station.	**Not addressed:** This has not been addressed by the proposal. It only refers public transport access services by the bus feeder service route 901. However, page 52 indicates that the site boundary is on the bank of the Georges River, with Casula Station on the opposite site. The proponent should a strategic study of a pedestrian link between the proposal and Casula Railway that includes the identification of a 'footprint' for the pedestrian bridge on the proponent's site free from environmental and other constraints that can be quarantined from intermodal related development.
	19	The layout of the site shall be designed to ensure heavy vehicles associated with the operation of the terminals can be accommodated on site in the event of an incident blocking access to the M5 Motorway/ Moorebank Avenue to avoid queuing on public roads.	**Not addressed:** Specific response to this SEAR not noted although it would generally be expected that significant capacity for truck storage would exist within the site street network and warehouses.

Traffic	Sub-Reference	Condition	Transport Cluster Response
	E10	Development Applications for either the IMEX or interstate terminal shall include documentation demonstrating how Condition 14 of this approval has been satisfied.	**Not addressed:** As with Condition 14 it is considered that the approval for the construction of the warehouses should be separated from the approval for the operation of the warehouses. Alternatively warehouse construction / operation approval could be made dependant on key milestones for the IMEX and Interstate Terminal have being met prior.
	E11	All future Development Applications shall include a Traffic Impact Assessment based on background growth models developed by RMS for the Liverpool/Moorebank area (if applicable).	**Not addressed:** The proponent has advised that they are still refining their analysis of the impact of the proposal on the State Road Network and will present to TfNSW / RMS in February 2017. Accordingly, the sub-reference is not met.
	E12	All future Development Applications shall demonstrate how the main access to the site has been designed to prevent heavy vehicles associated with the facility from using Moorebank Avenue south, and should be accompanied by a detailed engineering drawing(s).	**Not addressed:** Yet to be fully addressed. Index at pg 23 of the Operational Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment states this issue is addressed at Section 5.2 of same. Section 5.2 predicts traffic generation it does not demonstrate how the main access to the site has been designed to prevent heavy vehicles associated with the facility from using Moorebank Avenue south. It does not cross reference to detailed engineering drawing(s).

Public Transport	Sub-Reference	Condition	Transport Cluster Response
	E14	All future Development Applications shall consider the need for a bus stop on Moorebank Avenue (including direct pedestrian access from the warehousing to the bus stop), and associated turnaround facility suitable for a 14.5 metre long non-rear steer bus.	**Adequately addressed:** The proposal states that additional Transit Stop Number's (TSN) would be required to Service the entire site, which is acknowledged by TfNSW. Provision should be made for this infrastructure to be provided such as reserved space for bus stops (3.0m width) and 3.5m road width to be made available. It would be then possible to consider diverting route 901 to ensure service coverage.

REMM	Sub-Reference	Condition	Transport Cluster Response
	4A	The Project team would continue to liaise with the Australian Rail Track Corporation, Transport for NSW and other stakeholders responsible for the management of the rail freight network regarding the capacity of the network related to the project.	**Adequately addressed**: As outlined in Section 6 of the EIS the proponent has consulted extensively to date and there is confidence this will continue in the future.
	4B	As part of the Stage 2 SSD approval(s) process further analysis would be undertaken to determine likely demand distribution and capacity across the rail freight network as it relates to the project.	**Adequately addressed:** Section 6 of the EIS details consultation with ARTC and Sydney Trains. Freight Rail network access is administered by ARTC.
	4C	Install a variable message signage system within the Project site to direct heavy vehicles and facilitate safe and efficient access and navigation.	**Adequately addressed:** Detailed at Section 5.1 and 5.5 of *the Preliminary Operational Traffic Management Plan*.
	4D	Consider the provision of pedestrian and cyclist connections from Moorebank Avenue into the Project site.	**Adequately addressed:** For example Figure 3-3 *Proposed Pedestrian and Cyclist Connectivity* pg 21 Preliminary Operational Traffic Management Plan
	4E	Consider the provision of staff storage and shower areas to promote cycling, jogging and walking as modes of transport.	**Adequately addressed:** Section 7.4 discusses the provision of these facilities in the warehouses and defers this consideration to detailed design.
	4F	Negotiate with bus operators for the provision of additional bus stops and increased bus services between the Project site and nearby public transport interchange hubs to reduce the volume of light vehicles generated by staff. This would be determined based on staff numbers and likely patronage numbers.	**Adequately addressed:** TfNSW would determine if increased service frequencies were warranted.

REMM	Sub-Reference	Condition	Transport Cluster Response
	4H	Prior to all future development application stages, in consultation with Transport for NSW and other relevant agencies of NSW Government, ensure that adequate arrangements are in place to ensure that: • The impacts of additional traffic associated with the future development application stages will minimise Project related traffic impacts and consider the capacity of the road network, taking account of background traffic growth and planned road network improvements. • Arrangements are in place (irrespective of funding source) for the on-time delivery of the necessary road network improvements referred to in point 1 above. The contribution of MIC towards road network improvements as envisaged by this mitigation measure would be subject to the following conditions: • That certain throughput levels at the terminal had been achieved. These throughputs are outlined in column 1 of Table 7.20 of the Response to Submissions report. • That it can be further demonstrated (as part of any subsequent planning approval stage) that the intersection performance would have deteriorated to a Level of Service E or worse (where previously operating at a LoS D or above) were it not for the implementation of the upgrades outlined in Table 7.20 of the Response to Submissions report.	**Not addressed:** The proponent has advised that they are still refining their analysis of the impact of the proposal on the State Road Network and will present to TfNSW / RMS in February 2017. Accordingly, the SEARS are not met. Transport Cluster notes Sections 5.4.1 *Moorebank Avenue / Anzac Road Intersection Upgrade*, 5.4.3 *M5 Motorway / Moorebank Avenue intersection*, 5.4.4 *M5 Motorway / Hume Highway Intersection*, 5.4.5 Moorebank Avenue / Newbridge Road Intersection, 5.4.6 Moorebank Avenue / Heathcote Road Intersection, 5.4.7 *M5 Motorway / Heathcote Road Intersection.*

REMM	Sub-Reference	Condition	Transport Cluster Response
	4I	Reducing the volumes of construction vehicles travelling during peak periods, especially if the increase in traffic generated by construction activities impedes on the operation of Moorebank Avenue.	**Not addressed:** Proponent's response identifies this issue as addressed at Section 4 and Section 5 of the *Construction Traffic Impact Report.* This section relies on predictive analysis to show the impacts at peak times are manageable. The proponent should commit to reducing peak period truck movements if the RMS is of the view that construction activities impede the operation of Moorebank Avenue and particularly the M5/Moorebank Avenue intersection.
	4K	In addition to the Community Engagement Plan (or equivalent) (Refer to 2A), a communication plan will be developed to provide information to the relevant authorities and bus operators in addition to the local community. The communication plan will need to incorporate a contact list with the chain of command.	**Adequately addressed**: Section 6 of the EIS, Appendix L
	4L	Implement relevant traffic control measures to inform drivers of the construction activities and locations of heavy vehicle access locations.	**Adequately addressed:** Section 7 of the EIS, Appendix M
	4M	Obtain Road Occupancy Licences (ROLs) as necessary.	**Adequately addressed**: Section 7 of the EIS, Appendix M
	4N	Develop an emergency response plan for the modification of Moorebank Avenue. During this phase, emergency vehicles using Moorebank Avenue as a transport route would need to be considered, as well as emergency access to adjoining properties.	**Adequately addressed:** Section 7 of the EIS, Appendix M
	4P	Modify access locations in response to the development of the Moorebank Avenue modification.	**Adequately addressed**: Section 7 of the EIS, Appendix M

REMM	Sub-Reference	Condition	Transport Cluster Response
	4Q	Provision of alternate suitable pedestrian and cycle and facilities during the construction of Moorebank Avenue modifications retaining well defined and well signed routes and paths.	**Not addressed:** Only noted mention of alternative routes was in relation to motorists at 5.4 of construction management plan not addressed for pedestrians and cyclists.
	10AE	The following proposals would be considered as part of an effective and integrated strategic management plan: • investigation of the feasibility of increasing the proportion of container traffic that moves by rail; • implementation of terminal appointment systems and appropriate time slots for Project site access for truck and rail deliveries to avoid unnecessary onsite air emissions during peak periods; • minimisation of the potential for fluctuating demand forecasts for equipment among carriers, railways and the terminal through effective communication; • utilisation of the latest information technologies such as Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) applied to transportation operations which can result in improved transportation efficiency and a reduced environmental impact; and • use of a virtual container yard to assist with incorporating onsite operational efficiencies to ensure air emissions are minimised.	**Adequately addressed:** Section 7 and 8 of the EIS with an expectation it will be further addressed as part of the detailed design of MPW stage 2.
	19A	The intersection treatments and delivery timing for all cumulative scenarios are presented in Table 7.37 of the Response to Submission report; a number of these treatments would be required for a Moorebank project only scenario by 2030.	**Not addressed:** The proponent has advised that they are still refining their analysis of the impact of the proposal on the State Road Network and will present to TfNSW / RMS in February 2017. Accordingly, the REMM's are not met.