



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

**RE: PORT BOTANY QUAYLINE EQUALISATION PROJECT
(SSI-79878464) AND PORT BOTANY EXPANSION MODIFICATION 18
(DA-494-11-2003i-MOD 18)**

DEPARTMENT MEETING

PANEL: ANDREW MILLS (Chair)

OFFICE OF THE IPC: KENDALL CLYDSDALE
TAHLIA HUTCHINSON

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING, HOUSING
& INFRASTRUCTURE:** GLENN SNOW
MICHAEL YOUNG
DANIEL GORGIOSKI
NICK HEARFIELD

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE & TIME: 3:00PM – 3:45PM
TUESDAY, 18th AUGUST 2026

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

MR ANDREW MILLS: Good afternoon, everyone.

5 **MR MICHAEL YOUNG:** Good afternoon.

10 **MR MILLS:** Welcome. Before we begin, can I first of all acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Gadigal land and I'd like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of all the lands on which we meet virtually, and pay my respects to their Elders past and present.

15 So, welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Port Botany Quayline Equalisation Project and the Port Botany Expansion Modification 18, the applications currently before the Commission for determination. The Port Botany Quayline Equalisation Project is a state significant infrastructure application which seeks consent to construct an extended quayline on the southern side of Brotherson Dock and reclaim land adjacent to the extended quayline, demolish the existing bulk liquids berth (BLB1) and associated pipeline infrastructure, and construct and operate a new bulk liquids berth (BLB3) and associated pipeline and bulk liquids handling infrastructure. The Port Botany Expansion Modification 18 application is seeking approval to make operational and administrative amendments.

25 My name is Andrew Mills. I'm Chair of the Independent Planning Commission and of this single-member commission panel, and I am joined here today by Kendall Clydsdale and Tahlia Hutchinson from the office of the Independent Planning Commission.

30 In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure a full capture of the information, today's meeting is being recorded, and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website.

35 The meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of these matters and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determinations.

40 It's important for the Commission to ask questions of attendees to clarify issues wherever it's considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and are unable to answer it, then you may take the question on notice, but following the meeting the Commission will advise you in writing of any questions taken on notice that the Panel considers requires a formal response. Any subsequent response or information provided to the Commission will then be published on our website.

45 I request that all participants here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other, to ensure accuracy of the transcript.

Glenn, did you just want to go round the table and introduce yourself and everyone else or [cross-talk 00:04:11].

MR GLENN SNOW: Sure. Glenn Snow, Director of Transport and Water Assessments in the Infrastructure Assessments Division at the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure. And I'm joined by Michael Young who is a Team Leader in the branch, and Nick Hearfield and Daniel Gorgioski who are the Senior Planners and Project Leads for the two projects.

MR MILLS: Thank you, and welcome everyone. You have a presentation, is that the best way to jump in?

MR SNOW: Yes, so Michael's going to give the presentation, so I'll hand over to Michael.

MR MILLS: Thank you.

MR YOUNG: Can I ask you if you could open the presentation and share?

MR KENDALL CLYDSDALE: Yes, I won't be a second, Michael. [Pause 00:05:01 to 00:05:18]. So, you've got it there? Great.

MR YOUNG: Yes, thanks very much. Next screen, please. So, just very quickly. This is the outline of the Port Botany Expansion Modification 18. So, the original approval was granted for Stage 1 in October 2005 and it was for the construction and operation of a container terminal with road and rail infrastructure, a boat ramp and enhancement works within the Penrhyn Estuary now under Stage 1. So, the orange is the existing Hutchison Ports and Patrick's container terminals. Within the Hutchison site, there are two areas which are approved for container terminal but not yet developed as a container terminal, so it's vacant land in the centre adjacent to where the label 'Site' and further to the southwest of that site.

So, NSW Ports as the port operator of Port Botany, has sought to modify the existing consent to contemporise a number of conditions, to seek to delete all those conditions related to the dredging and reclamation of land, to adjust the community consultative committee that was established for this project, and to delete a number of other conditions which have been addressed/satisfied following construction and operation of the project.

Next slide, please. So, in terms of the four topics that Ports have requested through this modification, is to contemporise a number of conditions. So, that's to update the conditions to reflect the current planning approach, to undertake administrative updates to align the consent conditions, the consent framework with the contemporary regulatory systems and guidance. So, for example, the Department has more up-to-date standard auditing conditions and that has been proposed to be incorporated with the consent to update the existing auditing and compliance reporting conditions.

Also, the Department has recommended that there are a number of construction and management plans required covering air quality, soil and water, traffic and transport noise. So, as the bulk of the main construction of the site has been completed, with only the vacant land yet to be developed, the Department's view is that rather than having specific management plans for the development of the vacant land which is

primarily construction of hardstand and provision of operational equipment for the approved use as a container terminal, to replace those management plans with performance-based outcomes, so requiring that certain performance standards are addressed through the construction of those portions of the site.

5

The other main area that the Applicant, NSW Ports has requested through this modification is to delete all the dredging related activities' conditions. So, the justification for that being that dredging for the reclamation of the land has been completed, that there is no further capital dredging or reclamation works proposed.

10

And the Department believes that this is justified/warranted and that we are proposing a new condition B2.7A which states that no capital dredging or reclamation works are permitted to occur under this modified consent.

15

So, that basically would mean that any future capital or maintenance dredging proposals would be subject to the provisions of State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) SEPP. And that would require for capital dredging, the thresholds to bring it into state significant infrastructure. And in terms of maintenance dredging, it could be carried out as either exempt and complying development.

20

Next slide, please. The third topic related to the operation of the existing community consultative committee. So, this committee was established before the Department provided its guidelines for the establishment and operation of community consultative committees. So, what the Applicant is seeking is to amend consultation with the community and remove duplication with certain conditions. For example, there's conditions which require a rail noise working group to be established. However, our rail noise is a standing agenda item for the CCC meetings, and the Applicant is proposing that that existing condition requiring a rail noise working group be incorporated as part of the CCC.

25

30

The main issue with this one is that Randwick Council and the community member has raised concerns that they do not support the proposed amendments. Now, we've had a look at this in terms of the Department's guideline and we are of the view that the existing operation of the CCC committee generally aligns with the intent of the Department's guidelines.

35

So, in terms of what the Proponent/Applicant is seeking in this case is to reduce the number of attendees representing the Applicant, to include Randwick City Council member membership of the committee, and to align with the, or to provide for three community representatives on the committee, and also to allow for online meetings to be held in lieu of attending at an in-person meeting. So, overall, the Department generally considers that these proposed amendments are generally consistent with the intent of the CCC guideline.

40

45

And the final topic that the Applicant is seeking to modify is to delete a number of conditions which have been satisfied through both the construction and operation of the project. Now, the majority of these conditions have been addressed as part of the construction, part of submission of various plans and documents to the Planning Secretary for approval, and through the delivery of permanent infrastructure such as noise walls, a pedestrian bridge, and other components of the approved project. So –

MR MILLS: Michael, do you mind if I jump in there. Because the one area that, in particular I guess that has puzzled me, is probably the best way to describe it.

5 **MR YOUNG:** Mm-hm.

MR MILLS: In relation to those particular ones [cross-talk 00:14:21].

MR YOUNG: Yes.

10

MR MILLS: The proposal is to amend the description of the overall development itself.

MR YOUNG: Yes. So –

15

MR MILLS: [Cross-talk 00:14:36] ... one place and we put them in another. And the conditions relating to the establishment of those things, the noise barriers and pedestrian bridge and a few other things, I guess, they sort of, I don't know, it seems to me that they have some kind of ongoing work in the sense of, well, they're there, they were to establish them, if there had to be some amendment to them at some point in the future, then you would need to go back perhaps and put another condition in that would be something like rather than amend the condition that we're now deleting.

20

It just seemed odd, because we're still doing something and it's still there, so why not just leave them as is rather than take them out and then stick them somewhere else anyway? So, I just want to understand the thinking behind that.

25

MR YOUNG: So, one of the 'A' conditions describes what was approved through Stage 1, and that lists a number of dot points, the various components of the approved development. So, it's now 20 plus years since the original consent was granted, the development has been modified over time, and various components of the approved development have been completed, other components have been modified, and there is one component being a rail spur which kind of follows the Foreshore Drive and then a bridge across Penrhyn Estuary to the container terminal.

30

So, our view is that what this consent, what the aim of this consent would be to identify those components of the project that are currently developed and operational, to reflect the changes through the modifications over the years, and to delete those portions of the – or those components of the consent that are not intended to be developed.

35

So, through that 'A' condition, our view would be that that captures the approved development at this point in time. If, say, as you mentioned, that there's a need to either modify or make changes to a noise barrier or a pedestrian bridge, the appropriate mechanism for that would be through a modification of the consent to assess and discuss the proposed change.

40

MR SNOW: Can I add to that? Some of those conditions are somewhat process driven as well, so, and they lead to an outcome. And so, as a – it's a bit of a safeguard because

we wanted to ensure that in the future that these delivered – this delivered infrastructure isn't removed without a modification. So, in a way, we've done this as a safeguard to reflect the outcome of those, I suppose those process-driven conditions.

5 **MR MILLS:** But wouldn't they be safeguarded anyway? I guess this is where I'm struggling. Sorry if I'm a bit slow on the ...

10 **MR SNOW:** Look, I think we took the view that there was a small risk that they could be removed as part of the exempting and complying processes. So, by locking them into the project description, it safeguarded them from those processes. And if the Port Authority wanted to remove that infrastructure, they'd have to make through a mod, so I suppose that was our view and our risk appetite in doing that.

15 **MR MILLS:** Okay. So, it's to ensure – sorry, I'll have a go at it. To ensure that it's not lost [cross-talk 00:19:06] subsequent modification, it's not lost [cross-talk 00:19:09].

MR SNOW: That's correct, yes.

20 **MR CLYDSDALE:** I was just going to say, and not subject to a subsequent planning pathway outside of – which may supersede the development consent.

MR MILLS: Yes, yes.

25 **MR SNOW:** That's correct, yes.

MR MILLS: Yes, okay, thank you for helping with that. I was just struggling with it, as I say.

30 **MR SNOW:** Yes.

MR MILLS: And sorry to interrupt your flow there, Michael.

35 **MR YOUNG:** That's fine. So, I just wanted to close with this deletion of conditions. If we perhaps go to the next slide. So, in terms of the notification of the application, we sought advice from both Bayside Council and Randwick City Council. In terms of Randwick City Council, one of their main concerns was the offset obligations in terms of Penrhyn Estuary and to protect the ecological values of Botany Bay.

40 So, there are two conditions which the Applicant had sought – well, one condition which the Applicant has sought to delete. This related to condition B2.30 and B2.31, which we considered, given that there are still ongoing discussions between NSW DCCEEW and the Port Authority of NSW as the land manager of the Penrhyn Estuary and Foreshore Beach, that those conditions which relate to the Penrhyn Estuary Management Plan be retained until the outcome of those discussions between the two
45 parties have been resolved.

So, in addressing the Council's comments. In terms of Bayside Council, they wanted or sought that the works have been completed and over the time, various documents and plans have been approved by the Planning Secretary, and the Planning Secretary

has confirmed that various condition requirements have been addressed and closed out. In terms of impacts to Lady Robinsons Beach, there was a period of monitoring carried out by both NSW Ports and the Port Authority up to about 2015/2016, and at that time, monitoring ceased and the cessation of the monitoring was approved by the Planning Secretary.

In terms of the feedback raised by the community member, so this feedback was provided during our assessment of the project. And the community member raised concerns about the operation of the community consultative committee, in particular about the proposed modification and conservation of the Botany Bay marine environment.

So, in terms of the community consultation, we were advised by NSW Ports that that was addressed through the CCC committee meeting. And in terms of the comments about conservation of the Botany Bay marine environment, that's really sort outside the scope of this project.

Next slide, please. So, that concludes my presentation of the Mod 18 proposal. Other than the question raised before by the Commissioner, any other questions you'd like to raise with us?

MR MILLS: I think the only thing is to get a sense of is there, you know, there's ongoing, that we're not disturbing, I guess, the ongoing obligations around maintenance and securing the biodiversity of the area. Anything to do with that, their ongoing obligations, that remains in place?

MR YOUNG: That's correct, yes.

MR MILLS: Okay.

MR YOUNG: And that's subject to discussions between DCCEEW and Port Authority of NSW.

MR MILLS: No, that's all I had. Is there anything in addition?

MR CLYDSDALE: No, thank you.

MR YOUNG: Okay. Next slide. We'll talk about the Botany Quayline Project. So, again, this figure just shows I guess in graphic form the proposal. You have the purple area which is where the sediments and material for the reclamation, which is the green area. So, the reclamation involves a 4-hectare reclamation of land and then 1.4-hectare wharf over the Brotherson Dock to provide a wharf space and container terminal operation space.

Then at the southwestern point of Molineaux Point, you have the new bulk liquids berth 3. And then further to the north of that you have the existing bulk liquids berth 2, which is not impact by this project. And then in the yellow area, to the north of that again is the existing BLB1 which will be decommissioned and the land area incorporated or reclaimed for the future container terminal operations.

So, in terms of staging, the demolition of the tugboat jetty to allow for the construction of the BLB3 which will become operational prior to the decommissioning of BLB1. So, there is also associated pipeline infrastructure changes as a result of the changes to the project.

Next slide, please. Oh, probably just before we move on, so this project is only seeking operation of the BLB3, and that the operation of the container terminal, future container terminal would be subject to a planning approval pathway under the Transport and Infrastructure SEPP, chapter 5 of that SEPP.

So, in terms of the key issues that our assessment covered. So, water quality was a key issue in terms of sediment dispersal from dredging operations within Brotherson Dock. So, the main issue here would be that water quality would be impacted by dredging operations, with the dredge material piped to the reclamation area where the slurry would be discharged, and dewatered, and the treated water discharged to Botany Bay.

There is also other minor water quality impacts from construction, including extraction of piles from the tugboat jetty and the BLB1, pile driving associated with the construction of the wharf extension, and placement of the rock bund for the future reclamation area. So, again, through the construction period there would be periods when there may be minor impacts to sediment dispersal within Botany Bay from these different components of construction. But again, the main impact would arise from dredging within Brotherson Dock. The other –

MR MILLS: Michael, if I can just get a deeper understanding.

MR YOUNG: Yes.

MR MILLS: All the piles that are being extracted for BLB1 and the tugboat port, or wharf, how deep do they go into the seabed, do we know?

MR YOUNG: I don't know, but I understand that the proposal is to cut the piles off at seabed level, so that the actual piles won't be extracted from the seabed itself.

MR MILLS: So, it doesn't add to the disturbance.

MR YOUNG: No, that's correct, yes

MR MILLS: Okay, thank you.

MR YOUNG: So, in terms of sediment dispersal, yes, the main issue with that is that yes, the dredging, construction dredging will create sediment loads into Brotherson Dock. However, the extent and concentration of the plume is influenced by existing tidal and wind conditions, catchment inflows from the Georges River and Cooks River, and also storm events within Botany Bay.

Now, the sediments within the Brotherson Dock which is to be extracted for the reclamation material, they do contain contaminants, but we'll talk about that in the

following slides. And the other point to make here is that the project would be subject to an environment protection licence issued by the EPA primarily due to the quantity of dredging for sediments required for the construction of the project.

5 So, if we go to the next slide, please. So, this figure here shows the maximum extent of sediment dispersal from dredging within the Brotherson Dock, so that's the orange-red coloured within the dock itself where the dredging is to be carried out. And as we move further away from Brotherson Dock itself, then the extent or the sediment plumes and the sediment levels reduce further out, and the modelling that was
10 undertaken shows that was the extent of the impact within south of the airport area to the west off Monterey and Brighton, and then south through the opening to Botany Bay and part of Yarra Bay.

15 So, in the worst-case situation, the sediment plume is predicted to extend out of Brotherson Dock. At the peak within Brotherson Dock, you're looking at up to 300 milligrams per litre sediment load. And the Proponent is predicting at the boundary of Brotherson Dock and Botany Bay, you would have a maximum sediment load of 50 milligrams per litre of water. So, within the majority of Botany Bay, total sediment is not expected to exceed 10 milligrams per litre, and that's within the area
20 pictured in the figure.

25 And the Proponent has adopted a 50 milligrams per litre total suspended solids as the criteria within which to measure the impacts of dredging beyond Brotherson Dock itself. And that 50 milligrams per litre total suspended solids criteria has been – is consistent with other recent infrastructure projects that involve dredging works, and the Department considers this to be a reasonable criteria to adopt for this project.

30 Next slide, please. So, to manage these potential sediment dispersal conditions, the Proponent has committed to undertake real-time monitoring and with a conservative trigger of 20 milligrams per litre to basically allow for alterations to the dredging operations to occur, and that could be either through relocation of the dredging within Brotherson Dock or to reduce the rate of dredging output.

35 Silt curtains were considered, however, because of the potential risk of ingestion into the dredge, into the suction dredge, the Department has recommended that the Proponent assess the use of alternative sediment controls solutions and to justify the use or rejection of these alternative solutions.

40 The other issue with the use of silt curtains is that Brotherson Dock is an operational port, so that the dredging operations would be subject to shipping movements, accessing the Patrick's stevedore site, and the DP World stevedore site. So, that was a consideration in terms of whether silt curtains were an appropriate form of control of sediment release. And the EPA has supported the Department's recommended conditions.

45 The conditions also require a Dredging and Reclamation Sub-Plan as part of the Construction and Environment Management Plan, and that has a number of requirements, including measures to maintain total suspended solid concentrations at the dredge overflow to below the 50 milligrams per litre threshold, to undertake a

management approach such as staging and adjusting construction activities, to minimise TSS concentrations, and to implement additional controls for finer material to maintain TSS sediments within the concentration limits committed to in the EIS of 20 milligrams per litre. And also, a Trigger Action Plan for exceedances of threshold limits, and to undertake proactive actions to ensure the threshold limits are not exceeded.

So, before we move onto the next topic, are there any questions you'd like to ask about the water quality?

MR MILLS: Thank you, no.

MR YOUNG: No. Okay. Next slide, please. So, contamination. So, the Applicant/the Proponent has undertaken various investigations both for this project, specific for this project, in 2025 through to mid this year, and also looked at previous contamination or previous investigations of the sediments within Brotherson Dock.

So, one of the requirements of the SEARs was to prepare a Preliminary Site Investigation, which has been undertaken as required in accordance with the EPA methods, and has been endorsed by a site auditor. And the PSI concluded the construction of the project presented a limited contamination risk.

So, within Brotherson Dock there are contaminants of potential concern which are assessed as potentially occurring within the sediments, and these include TBT, total TPH, arsenic, lead, mercury and zinc, organochlorine pesticides. And then additional testing was undertaken in 2025 for the project which detected metals in samples, with exceedances above the Default Guideline. And the table here shows the metal, the Default Guideline value, and the number of exceedances, and the maximum exceedance of those metals.

Next slide, please. The Proponent also carried out elutriate testing to basically work out whether there was a potential for, I guess, leaching or impact to the biophysical environment. And the testing showed that metals were not present above the adopted Default Guideline values, and that testing included organotins, PAH, PCBs and OCPs.

Now, the organotins included TBT, and TBT which is used mainly as anti-fouling on vessels, was detected above the Default Guideline value of 0.009 milligrams per kilogram in four samples with a maximum concentration of 0.137 milligrams per kilogram. Notwithstanding these low levels of exceedances, the PSI concluded that potential mobilisation of contaminants from dredging and reclamation has a medium level of risk, which is reduced to low with the application of mitigation measures.

And these would include an unexpected finds procedure to identify potential contaminants, additional sampling and analysis prior to construction, so this would be prior to dredging operations occurring, managing dredging where possible to reduce impacts to known contaminants. And for the site auditor to review contamination documents and plans, to review the unexpected finds procedure, and to undertake post-remediation validation reports.

Any questions before we move to the next topic?

MR CLYDSDALE: Just, if you don't mind, Chair.

5 **MR MILLS:** Go right ahead.

10 **MR CLYDSDALE:** The Randwick City Council just raised a query around why there wasn't a need to do a further detailed site investigation off the back of the PSI, and noting that there's some recommendations there for some further testing. But, yes, is there any particular reason why the PSI didn't articulate that further detailed investigations were needed at this point?

15 **MR YOUNG:** The PSI that was approved by the site auditor and my understanding is that once a PSI's recommendation has been made, then if there is no recommendation for a more detailed site investigation (a DSI), then that's not required. So, in this case, the site auditor has concluded that the PSI has identified the potential contaminants and that the PSI has concluded that there is a low level, or there is a medium level of risk which is reduced to low when mitigation measures are applied. So, that with the conclusion of the PSI, then a DSI is not required under the EPA's methodology or the
20 EPA's approach to the assessment of contaminants.

MR CLYDSDALE: Thanks, Michael.

25 **MR YOUNG:** Yes. Next slide, please. So, in terms of aquatic ecology. So, there are impacts to the marine environment due to the construction of the project. This ranges from habitat loss through the removal of piles and dredge material, through land reclamation, and aquatic species interaction with suspended solids in the water.

30 So, in terms of the impacts, the EIS looked at impacts the fish, which could result in inhibited predator and prey detection, although there is potential avoidance of the area, or increased mortality for less mobile species.

35 Seagrasses may be reduced, may be impacted by a reduction in light levels due to sediment turbidity, and there are key seagrass species at Foreshore Beach within the Penrhyn Estuary habitat area which could be potentially impacted at levels that may impede growth.

40 In terms of mega-fauna (being whales, dolphins, fur seals), these are expected to either avoid the area of increased sedimentation or minimise time in the affected area.

45 And the other assessment was in terms of underwater noise from piling and dredging, which could have lethal impacts for marine species, and fish species may experience temporary threshold shift where there is a change in hearing and that's within the 925 metres of the construction activities.

Next slide, please. So, to reduce these impacts on aquatic ecology, the Proponent have proposed to implement marine mammal management zones. So, these are zones which radiate out from the dredging operations within Brotherson Dock, and that they are within these zones, there could require a shutdown of marine mammals are observed

with the relevant zones. So, they would have identified various zones which would be where operations, if mammals are detected within those zones, then operations within the dredging area would be either reduced in scale or stopped, depending on the type of mammal and the proximity of the mammal to the construction dredging zone.

5

And the Proponent has also committed to prepare a Marine Biodiversity Offset Strategy to include White's Seahorse identification and relocation if the seahorses are detected within the construction zones.

10

MR MILLS: Michael, can I jump in again?

MR YOUNG: Yes.

15

MR MILLS: Sorry. Maybe it is in the report and I haven't identified it, but the relocation, is it still within Botany Bay?

MR YOUNG: Yes, it would still be within Botany Bay, yes.

20

MR MILLS: Thank you.

MR YOUNG: Because there are seahorse habitats sort of within Yarra Bay.

MR MILLS: Right. Thank you.

25

MR YOUNG: Yes. So, the Department, because of impacts to removal of seabed and other habitat within the construction zone, the Department has recommended the Proponent prepare a Key Fish Habitat Strategy to offset impacts to fish habitat, which outlines the area of harm and offset requirements at a ratio of 2:1, and also to undertake monitoring requirements.

30

The DPIRD Fisheries have provided comments to the Department, and their requirements have been addressed through the Response to Submissions Report and through the proposed conditions of approval.

35

So, our conclusion of impacts to aquatic ecology is that the construction impacts are transitory and that the long-term impacts are acceptable and manageable, and that in the short term there would be a loss of habitat and potential species, but through the establishment of the new infrastructure, then it would be expected that recolonisation of the new infrastructure would occur.

40

Next slide, please. Any questions on aquatic ecology?

MR MILLS: No, thank you.

45

MR YOUNG: No, okay. Hazards and risks. So, this is primarily related to the operation of the bulk liquids berth. The Proponent through the preliminary hazard analysis has undertaken a multi-level risk assessment in accordance with the Department's Hazardous Industry Guidelines. And the water level assessment concluded the overall risk of the project would be low.

The individual risk criterion for industrial use is restricted to the area around BLB3, so that's the red contour line in the figure, and that's purely based around the proposed BLB3 and it extends further to the north to include BLB2 and the pipeline infrastructure.

The Department's Hazard Specialist is satisfied the quantitative risk assessment was prepared in accordance with the Department's guidelines, and the quantitative risk assessment demonstrated the project did not increase the overall risk to workers in the area.

Next slide, please. The hazard analysis was also required to assess the risk of the project to the Port Botany Land Use Safety Study, and the conclusion was that the project's impact would be negligible. So, the study was completed in 1996 and assessed the risks associated with the development in Port Botany. So, the risk results in the study, in the 1996 study, represents the worst-case scenario, which included manufacturing activities within the port area. However, development in the port is primarily focused on container terminals and bulk storage facilities, and manufacturing land uses which have a higher or greater overall risk profile have not developed in Port Botany.

The quantitative risk assessment also looked at the risk of an aircraft crash onto the facility, and that was considered to be an extremely rare incident of the order of one in billions of years. So, based on that occurrence, the risk of aircraft crash onto the premise, onto the facility was excluded or was discounted in the risk assessment. And –

MR MILLS: Michael?

MR YOUNG: Yes.

MR MILLS: Just on that.

MR YOUNG: Yes.

MR MILLS: Randwick Council were quite exercised in relation to this and particularly given that the take offs from the third runway do in fact go over the proposed BLB3.

MR YOUNG: Yes.

MR MILLS: Which I believe was – they claim was not taken into account. Is there something ongoing with CASA in terms of the way in which this will be developed?

MR YOUNG: There are conditions which require the Proponent to consult CASA on various components of the project. Now, in terms of the risk of aircraft strike on the project, that was assessed as part of the preliminary hazard analysis, and our Department's specialist has reviewed that and considered that the conclusions and assumptions used in the preliminary hazard analysis was reasonable and justified.

And that on that basis, given that this is a very extreme and very rare incident and one which would be catastrophic should it occur, in terms of the risks of the operation of the BLB3 in normal everyday operations, that was excluded from that assessment. And also, there are also requirements for land uses adjacent to airport runways. In this case, BLB3 is outside of that area.

MR MILLS: Yes, and that perhaps is the concern, that it's been assessed in a way that perhaps doesn't recognise the fact that the aircraft will go over the top of it, just by virtue of – is it L16? Runway L16? Yes.

MS TAHLIA HUTCHINSON: 16L.

MR MILLS: 16L, wrong way around, sorry.

MR YOUNG: Yes.

MR MILLS: Yes. It's just something, I guess, making sure that it has properly been taken into account and I'm just, from what was presented to us by Randwick Council, they are concerned that it actually wasn't.

MR YOUNG: No. Our Hazard Specialist has reviewed the preliminary hazard analysis and she was ... The preliminary hazard analysis did assess potential aircraft incidents and that based on the extremely rare nature of those incidents, the preliminary hazard analysis in the quantitative risk assessment was appropriate in the assessment of hazards arising from the operation of that facility.

MR MILLS: Okay.

MR YOUNG: So, we are confident that that has been addressed as part of the preliminary hazard analysis. We are satisfied that it has been addressed.

MR MILLS: Okay. Thank you.

MR YOUNG: Yes. And just to close out this section, so we have recommended a suite of hazard-related conditions in terms of the requiring the design of the facility and the safeguards in the facility to be incorporated within the construction. And these include fire safety study, hazard and operability study, a final hazard analysis. And there's also requirements for a fire safety study and also once the facility is operational, then for regular reporting of hazard audits of the facility and its mitigation and safety measures.

Next slide, please. So, again, this is just a very summary of the issues raised by council in terms of Bayside Council, concerns about potential impact of erosion of Lady Robinsons Beach during and post works. Going through the assessment of hydrodynamics and through wave action, the conclusion of the EIS was that there would be little to no impact on erosion impacts at the Lady Robinsons Beach to the northwest of the site.

In terms of aquatic ecology, yes, that's been considered, and there are requirements for biodiversity offset strategy and offsets for key fish habitat, and for any seahorses to be moved from the construction area should they be located. Remove marine pests, so I guess in the removal of the tugboat jetty and BLB1 and then the pests on those piles would be removed from the site. And in terms of any pests within the sediments of Brotherson Dock, then they would be picked up through the dredging operations.

Bayside Council also requested that ongoing community consultation occurred during construction. Again, there is a requirement for a community consultation strategy to be prepared for the construction of the project. And acid sulphate soils, there's a condition there requiring a management plan to be prepared if the acid sulphate soils are impacted.

So, Randwick City Council raised comments on the marine habitat and key fish habitat. And through the assessment, there are requirements through the conditions for offsets to be prepared and DPIRD Fisheries has reviewed and has commented that the conditions are appropriate for the project.

In terms of hazards and risks, that's been –

MR MILLS: Sorry, just on the marine habitat, the marine ecology, that E14 deals with some of that. Again, one of the things, it's a little unclear, but it does talk about in terms of prior to the commencement of instruction that a strategy is developed, and then that includes B provision, or clear out of the proposed area of harm, this is B, E14B, and offset requirements including the need for monitoring.

Is that monitoring the way that you've described it? I had read that as being ongoing monitoring, not just through the construction. Could you just clarify that for me?

MR YOUNG: That is a requirement under the C conditions for a monitoring program to be prepared. So, the Proponent would be required to prepare and submit a monitoring program to the Secretary for approval prior to construction commencing. And that would include monitoring of any marine habitat, and offsets are proposed as part of the project.

MR MILLS: I guess, when you say "part of the project", it's not the operation of the project because the – sorry, the operation post construction, the equalisation, it's because the project is the equalisation and the construction effectively, isn't it? [Cross-talk 01:00:32].

MR YOUNG: It is, yes, yes, yes. So, operation in this case would only relate to the bulk liquids berth 3. So, it would be a case of the monitoring would be required for the duration of construction.

MR MILLS: Yes, okay, thank you for clarifying that.

MR YOUNG: Yes. So, Randwick Council raised concerns about the hazard assessment and impacts to aircraft, which we discussed prior. We also discussed Council's comments regarding the need for a detailed site investigation. And again, we

noted that an independent site auditor has signed off on the PSI, as required through the EPA process.

5 And in terms of noise impacts on nearby residents, so that has also been considered and in this case, the only activity that would be carried out 24 hours a day, 7 days a week would be through dredging operations and disposal of the dredged material to the reclamation area, and operation of vessels supporting the dredging operations. And a noise assessment has assessed that there is minimal impact on – construction impact, noise impact on nearby residents to the east and southeast.

10 In terms of traffic impacts, that was also considered as part of the EIS. And given that there are very large volumes of truck movements within the roads in and around Botany Bay, Foreshore Drive, that the component or the contribution of the construction traffic during the construction period is able to be accommodated within
15 the existing road network with very minimal change to the level of service at the main intersections.

20 And in terms of Council's comments regarding community consultation, again, that's addressed through the requirement of a community consultation strategy being prepared for the project.

25 And I think that's the end of – oh, okay, so, just in conclusion. So, we've considered that the issues of water quality, contamination, marine ecology, hazards and risks being the key issues, noise and traffic have also been addressed, and the potential construction impacts can be managed through both the Proponent's commitments in terms of environmental mitigation measures and through the recommended conditions of consent of approval.

30 So, we also note that the project is consistent with the state's transport and freight strategies of improving freight handling efficiencies, and the port supply chain, and the project would support the economic growth and productivity of the state of NSW.

35 The project delivers port infrastructure that meets changes to international shipping, and that the operation of the bulk liquids berths at the port is maintained during the construction of the project.

And that concludes the assessment. Was there any further questions?

40 **MR MILLS:** No, nothing from our end. Thank you very much for putting up with me interrupting you as you went through all of that.

MR YOUNG: That's fine.

MR MILLS: I think that was a good way of managing the questions as we went.

45 **MR YOUNG:** Yes.

MR MILLS: Nothing else from us. Thank you very much for your time today, it's much appreciated, and the work you put into the Assessment Report. No doubt we'll be back in contact at some point. Sorry, Glenn?

5 **MR SNOW:** Sorry. There's not a hands-up in this program. But I just wanted to, in relation to the hazard analysis, the Response to Submissions did address that particular issue raised by Council, so there's further information in relation to that issue there.

10 **MR MILLS:** I appreciate that. All right. Well, thank you again for your time today.

MR YOUNG: Thank you very much.

[Multiple people say thank you]

15 **>THE MEETING CONCLUDED**