



## **TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING**

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

### **APPLICANT MEETING**

|                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>PANEL:</b>                         | ANDREW MILLS (Chair)                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| <b>OFFICE OF THE IPC:</b>             | KENDALL CLYDSDALE<br>TAHLIA HUTCHINSON                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <b>APPLICANT<br/>REPRESENTATIVES:</b> | ANJA MORGAN (NSW Ports)<br>GREG WALLS (NSW Ports)<br>PETER HYND (Bellgrove Advisory) in relation<br>to Port Botany Equalisation Project<br>JORDAN HOWARD (NSW Ports) in relation to<br>Port Botany Expansion Modification 18 |
| <b>LOCATION:</b>                      | ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| <b>DATE &amp; TIME:</b>               | 11:30AM – 12:15PM<br>THURSDAY, 27 <sup>th</sup> AUGUST 2026                                                                                                                                                                  |

**<THE MEETING COMMENCED**

**MS ANJA MORGAN:** Morning.

5 **MR ANDREW MILLS:** Good morning.

**KENDALL CLYDSDALE:** Morning.

10 **UNKNOWN SPEAKER:** Good morning.

**MR MILLS:** All right, terrific, everyone's here, good. Good morning, and welcome. Sorry, I'll stop noise going off in the background. Before we begin, I'd like of all to firstly acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Gadigal land and I'd like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the Gadigal people and of all the people from the lands, various lands, on which we meet.

Welcome to the meeting to discuss the Port Botany Quayline Equalisation Project and the Port Botany Expansion Modification 18, the applications which are before the Commission at the moment. The Port Botany Quayline Equalisation Project is a state significant infrastructure application and seeks consent to construct an extended quayline on the southern side of Brotherson Dock and reclaim land adjacent to the extended quayline, to demolish the existing bulk liquids berth 1 and associated pipeline infrastructure, and construct and operate a new bulk liquids berth (BLB3) and associated pipeline and bulk handling infrastructure. The Port Botany Expansion Modification 18 application is seeking approval to make operational and administrative amendments.

My name is Andrew Mills. I am Chair of the Independent Planning Commission and of this single-member panel. We are also joined by Kendall Clydsdale and Tahlia Hutchinson from the office of the Independent Planning Commission.

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

This 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 make its determinations.

It's important for the Commission to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues wherever it's considered necessary or appropriate. If you are asked a question and not able to answer it immediately, 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. And any subsequent response or information provided to the Commission will of course be published on our website.

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

So, let us begin. Perhaps Peter and Jordan, you're new to the members of the Commission at the office and perhaps if you might just like to introduce yourselves.

5       **MR PETER HYND:** Hi, I'll go first. I'm Peter Hynd, I'm an Executive Director with Bellgrove Advisory and I was working or engaged by NSW Ports as the Project Director for the Port Botany Equalisation Project, so supporting NSW Ports in the preparation of the Environmental Impact Assessment, the community consultation, and then the subsequent review of submissions/Submissions Report and that was submitted  
10       to the Department of Planning.

**MR MILLS:** Thank you.

15       **MR JORDAN HOWARD:** And hi, I'm Jordan Howard. I'm a Planning Officer here at NSW Ports, so I sit under Anja Morgan, and I've been assisting in the preparation of the documentation for Modification 18.

20       **MR MILLS:** Fantastic. Thank you very much, both. We're going to start with the Quayline Equalisation Project, and perhaps should I hand to NSW Ports in order to take us through some of the issues that we put onto the agenda.

25       **MR GREG WALLS:** Yes, that's fine, thank you, Commissioner. Happy to be in your hands. In general though, as you've described the project, it is about extending that southern berth of Port Botany. Our key drivers around that project are to make sure that the tenant on that southern side has access to equal quayline length, equivalent to the other two stevedores, and to be able to compete commercially with them.

30       The issues that you've raised in the agenda around water quality, contamination, ecology, and hazards and risks will obviously come up through the consultation process, and were all investigated as part of the EIS and subsequent responses. So, any specifics, Peter, we might be able to hand over to you to run through any questions.

35       **MR MILLS:** Sure. And so, in relation to both the development and the ongoing operation, I guess the concerns that have been expressed in various submissions both to the Department and to us is the impact of those. And when on site, we did talk about what was going to happen in terms of the removal of BLB1, then the work that needs to be done in order to extend the quay, and the way in which that any impact on the surface bed and the potential for plumes are the kinds of things that have been raised. So, for the record perhaps it might be just worthwhile saying, indicating how that will  
40       be managed.

45       **MR WALLS:** Yes, and Peter, just for your information, on site we spoke a little bit about the removal of the piles and the operation of the silt curtains as well, how and when they would come into play and under what scenarios.

**MR HYND:** Yes, yes, okay, no problem. Yes, I did read the transcript as well, Commissioner, so I'll endeavour to answer what I think the queries were out on site and also as raised by others.

So, you're correct, the staging of the project requires, and the construction of the new bulk liquids berth while operations are maintained on bulk liquids berth 1, and then operations would switch over to bulk liquids berth 3 and then allowing the removal of bulk liquids berth 1. The intention was always that any existing piles that sat within the footprint of the new wharf reclamation area would be left in the seabed because they'll obviously have the rock revetment and then the dredged material placed on top of those.

Best practice is to remove any existing piles that sit outside of that area within the port operations area. And so, they would – the typical technique is to reach down with equipment onto the pile and then gently vibrate it out and pull it out in one piece. So, the assessment indicated that that was unlikely to result in any material plumes or the like from that. We do note from the testing that we did too, which was captured in a lot of the Response to Submissions Report and the final conditions, is that the first layers of the material that sits on the seabed is where a lot of the finer silt is, so that's where we would be managing very closely.

The silt curtains would be in place around the reclamation area., So, once the clutter suction dredge is dredging the roughly 600 cubic metres of material that's been identified as required to be dredged from the existing Brotherson Dock Berth area, that would be, yes, would be dredged and then placed inside of the rock revetment, and the silt curtains are in place around the rock revetment for both the placement of the rock but also for the discharge of the water that comes out, which is sort of effectively the byproduct from the placement of the material. So, that manages any silting or turbidity that's caused by those activities.

What was agreed and worked through very closely with the Department and also the EPA and others, including the Harbour Master, is the dredging strategy has very specific trigger levels for turbidity in the water and in the water column. And then very clear monitoring as well such that as the dredging occurs, if those trigger levels are getting close to being met, then obviously the dredging activities can change, so be reduced or moved to different areas such that the intention would be to never hit those trigger levels as well.

So, there's a range of mitigation measures. There's also the filtration and the like that occurs on all modern dredges as well these days as well that would manage the sort of general risk around siltation and turbidity in the water column more broadly.

**MR MILLS:** Terrific. Okay, thank you for that. And given the nature of what's on the seabed, I guess, the risk of contamination that might arise in relation to all of that work.

**MR HYND:** Yes, I'm happy to – and look, that was really when we held community information sessions, while we didn't have a huge number of members of the community turn up to the sessions, we did get some really good insights from the community which helped our assessment, particularly with regards to some of the lessons learnt from the Kamay Ferry Wharves which were around – which was a recent project built around at La Pouse.

And so, we adopted an assessment strategy and approach that addressed a number of concerns, we feel, from the community. And that was really about bringing on the independent EPA accredited site auditor in the assessment process, so that they could actually review the interim results and the proposed mitigations and contamination management strategies as part of the assessment process and provide that independent advice to the Department and the EPA, which was a point of difference from that previous assessment that I referred to for the project around the corner.

What that identified is that we, that there are lower-level contaminants and there are some that do reach sort of trigger levels but not of a material concern or risk to human health or ecology. They are expected contaminants, I'd say, and we did focus heavily on also making sure we tested for PFAS and the like, which was identified in the community as being a material concern.

So, we were very confident that the testing that's been done and then the conditions that were set by the Department and the EPA effectively manage contamination risk. And obviously ensuring that there's an EPA accredited site auditor that's monitoring all of the activities should the application be approved and works commence, all the way through the process, so that there's a constant audit trail and such that requisite certificates are issued by the auditor throughout the process to give transparency that works are being managed.

It's important to note as well that all of the material that will be taken out will be placed within that bunt and the revetment area, so will be managed appropriately as well.

**MR MILLS:** Just as a follow up in relation to that. I mean, a lot of the concern that is the submissions is around the beaches, in particular those that are going to be accessed by the public. In that assessment, is there – and apologies if this is blatantly put out there and I've just overlooked it or forgotten it – but is there an assessment of what the currents are and how they're affected by the shipping as well as the work that's being done?

**MR HYND:** Oh yes, that's the coastal process? Yes, there was an assessment done of the processes as well, so all of the –

**MR MILLS:** Yes, oh, sorry, the currents within the bay that [cross-talk 00:13:32].

**MR HYND:** Yes, there is. And look, that's another area that we placed a lot of emphasis and focus on. We were very aware of, and I know it came up again with Randwick Council just about the impact that has been from storm effects and the like in and around the bay and on the beaches with regards to loss of community assets and beaches from those. So, we put a lot of effort into doing the assessment around the broader coastal processes' baseline and also then what that looks like after the project was – if it was to be built.

And we had all of that peer reviewed as well. We were quite deliberate in having that peer reviewed by Manly Hydraulics Lab, who had actually done the broader study of the bay for Bayside Council. And so, that was quite a deliberate peer review that we

had done of our assessment, to give confidence to particularly Bayside but also Randwick Council and the community around the kind of tidal impacts and movement of the tides and coastal processes in and around the bay, both before and after the project.

5

**MR MILLS:** Thank you. Just in terms of the aquatic ecology, I think the main question here is around what – the offsets, the location of the offsets in particular, given that disturbance will occur. Is the intention to try and – and I'll also repeat that if this is a question for you or of Anja and the team – is the intention to try and have those offsets within the bay?

10

**MR HYND:** Greg, do you want to answer that or ...

**MR WALLS:** Yes. So, Peter might talk to how they were calculated in the first place, but yes, the intention would be to make them as relevant as possible. In and around the port itself is tricky because of the disturbed nature of the environment and the need to maintain operations. But the intent would be something within the port, if that was appropriate, as identified through the offset strategy.

15

**MR HYND:** Yes.

20

**MR MILLS:** Yes. And I think I was just a little concerned about the, you know, if appropriate or where possible and all the rest of it, but I really wanted to get behind – if you can't do it immediately within the port area, is it, well, you could do it within the bay area more broadly, I guess.

25

**MR WALLS:** Yes.

**MR HYND:** Yes. If I may, Commissioner. Yes, and look, the engagement we had with NSW Fisheries was done early and quite closely on that, and there's obviously a very clear policy and strategy for how Fisheries likes to see offset, and obviously it does work down from a hierarchy which is around offsetting, where possible, close to the project initially, and then moving progressively down the sort of chain from there.

30

But the intention would be, as Greg's alluded to, is to work very closely with NSW Fisheries to ensure that that type 3 habitat offset is in kind, works in and around where the loss is, firstly, and then working down through that process. And that's really where the final condition recommended by the Department of Planning sits; that there needs to be a full offset strategy agreed with NSW Fisheries prior to works commencing, so. And that – yes.

35

40

**MR MILLS:** All right. So, one of the things that struck us in terms of the stages of construction and so on, the first of course is demolish where the tugboats are. So, where are the tugboats going to be berthed?

45

**MR WALLS:** Yes, I'll take that one. So, under the ... A couple of things. First of all, there are two tug operators in Port Botany, as you would have seen on your site visit. So, we have Svitzer who are at head of Brotherson Dock and they're not impacted by this proposal. And as I mentioned at the time, they've got four or five tugs and any

ship that's traversing in and out of the port needs two, sometimes three tugs, sometimes four, depending on weather conditions. So, currently we could operate with one tug operator, so I'll just make that point first.

Secondly, we're currently working with the current tug operator that is around in the area covered by this application to relocate them to the, what we call the Hayes Dock Services Area, which is the northern end of the Port Botany Expansion Area which we're about to talk about. Sometimes it's referred to in that documentation as the Services Area. Under the Port Botany Expansion approval from 20-odd years ago, it was always envisaged that tugs would be berthed over at that area, and that's something we're currently working through now. Regardless of PBQEP, or the Quayline Equalisation Project progressing, that's something we're looking at regardless.

**MR MILLS:** Okay, thank you.

**MR CLYDSDALE:** Commissioner, I've just put an image of that Hayes Dock in the chat for everyone to refer to.

**MR WALLS:** That's perfect. It's that aqua area at that northern area, the Hayes Dock Services Area, which we use for port services such as lines boats, smaller tugs that we call class C tugs, and ultimately the tugs that we're talking about here.

**MR MILLS:** Okay. Thank you. Okay. Some of the concerns that have been expressed around noise and vibration, in particular the impact on workers in the port while this work is going on. The levels have been assessed under the assessment from the Department. Have you received anything in relation to, either through the unions or others who work in the dock area, concerns in relation to noise and vibration in particular?

**MR HYND:** I'll answer that, Greg. No, there wasn't any submissions in relation to those specific items. But we did focus initially on looking at noise and vibration modelling, particularly with regards to sensitive receivers, but considering workforce as well. As you can appreciate, the port is 24/7 operations and is a relatively noisy place, and associated uses. So, we did consider obviously background noise but also then, as I said, sensitive receivers around it.

Noise and vibration for construction wasn't a prominent issue across the submissions, but we did obviously work with the EPA and the Department on setting kind of hours of work and particular activities, but also conscious of noisy activities as well. I think, as the application is seeking what would otherwise be regarded as out-of-hours working for the dredging, but particularly because that occurs in and around the operating port and the berths, so we need to operate around shipping. But the remainder of the time is the aim to have working in normal working hours with suitable respites and trigger levels as well with regards to noise as it may impact on sensitive receivers.

**MR MILLS:** Thank you. The Bird Hazard Management Plan – sorry, just ... It's proposed that it's implemented until the reclamation activities have ceased. And we've

had a question from at least one submitter as to is there any reason why that should not be an ongoing requirement?

**MR HYND:** Greg, do you want to answer that one?

**MR WALLS:** Peter, if you could talk on the background and then I'll talk about operations, yes, yes, yes.

**MR HYND:** Yes, yes. Look, Commissioner, this was, in discussion with Sydney Airport, there was some discussion that we had particularly through the dredging activities around, their initial concern was whether there would be organic material that came up with the dredged material that might attract birds in and around the reclamation.

They were relatively comfortable after we walked through with them the detail about the type of equipment that would be used and how it would filter out organic material. They were mainly worried about the attraction of birds with regards to then bird strike risk for aircraft taking off and landing, which is entirely reasonable for them to prosecute that risk with us. So, that was the principal driver for that management plan, was the management of the dredging with regard to the attraction of birds in and around the port, but as it related to the potential risk to bird strike for aircraft.

So, we initially implemented that – or recommended the implementation of the management plan, notwithstanding the in-built controls of the dredging equipment that would be used that would filter out organic material before it was placed, to mitigate that risk to the satisfaction of Sydney Airport.

**MR WALLS:** And the other element I'd just add to that is then operationally as a port, we have some requirements in what essentially sits as our DCP within the port, which is our Sustainable Development Code which is around assessing aspects of operational development and operations that could attract bird species, again in consultation with the airport. We consider through design anything that might be a potential for increased roosting on roofs or light poles or site areas. So, a lot of that equipment is designed with the airport's requirements in mind, and that development code that we adhere to and push through to our tenants is that – how we enforce that.

**MR MILLS:** All right, okay. Thank you for that. They're the questions, I think, that we had on Quayline unless, Kendall or Tahlia, I've overlooked something? No?

**MR CLYDSDALE:** No, thank you.

**MR MILLS:** So, perhaps we can now move to Mod 8. And on that, I wasn't sure whether Peter would be staying or ...

**MR WALLS:** He's free to drop off, I think, actually, Peter, so ...

**MR HYND:** I may. Thank you, thank you for your time.

**MR MILLS:** Thank you. Thanks, Peter.

**MR WALLS:** Thanks, mate.

5 **MR MILLS:** So, I just want to talk broadly about the rationale behind the proposed amendments. And I appreciate that there's some level of modernisation in relation to – but a lot of it is quite administrative and so on, so perhaps it's a question to get some context around why you've gone down this path.

10 **MR WALLS:** Yes. Essentially, thanks Commissioner, and essentially the initial purpose of this application, and it's been kind of hanging around for a long time relatively speaking, was to modernise the approval as you've mentioned. It was an older approval, and we now have a situation where conditions of consent that were attracting for newer developments are a lot more flexible or a lot more responsive to the environment in which we're operating.

15 So, our initial driver was to modernise the application itself – the approval itself, I should say. We had some issues with what was called, what was it, the Buyozo outcomes, or something like that, where we weren't able to modify it then at one point because there weren't any physical changes. That then got rectified through changes to the legislation. So, this thing's been floating around for quite a while because of some of those holdups.

20 As part of that, we then had discussions with the Department to do some administrative changes as well that you'd see in any modification; updates of names and councils and things like that. But the key driver was to modernise it. We have a lot of approvals around our assets that are sort of older Part 3A's or, even this one pre-dates Part 3A, is a major project, Part 4. And in a way, we were trying to, I guess, pilot this process as well to see how we could modernise some of those other approvals that we have. But that was the key driver.

30 The other thing I guess I'd add to this preamble is it's a complicated approval as well in that multiple parties are operating under the approval, and the original applicant doesn't exist anymore. So, if I just refer to Kendall's image there, for instance, the blue area is leased by Hutchison, the red area is leased by Patrick, that Services Area that I mentioned is licensed to multiple operators for lines, tugs, and the like. And then any community assets that are covered by the conditions of approval, such as the boat ramp or Penrhyn Estuary, sit with the Port Authority of NSW. And then over there on top of all that, NSW Ports hold the lease. So, you've got four or five layers of people operating under the approval, so, it was getting very difficult. But that's kind of the place which we were coming from.

40 **MR MILLS:** So, in that sense, you're clarifying who's responsible for what?

45 **MR WALLS:** There was a – we were seeking to do a little bit of that. I think that was the approach with the removal of some of the conditions that don't – that we thought weren't operational anymore. But essentially, the conditions apply as equally to Patrick as they would to Hutchison, for example.

5 **MR MILLS:** And just on that, in some of the deletion of conditions, some of them – they’re completed in one sense, but at the same time, they are sort of fundamental to the approval in the first place. So, while they’re completed, if you were to change something in the future ... So, for example, the bridge over the road and that kind of thing. The approval, to delete it, I guess, just would mean that if it completely fell into disrepair and fell down, then it’s no longer part of the conditions of the consent and the ongoing nature of it. Now, I’ve used a bad example, because what the Department’s suggesting is you actually put it into the front of what the approval’s all about. But you get where I’m coming from in terms of the nature of some of those things. Do we lose anything, I guess, is my question, Greg, in terms of ensuring that those things that are being deleted aren’t lost completely?

15 **MR WALLS:** Yes, and that’s probably been the main discussion that’s occurred over the period. It is being conditioned by conditions, specific conditions around are we losing something by this condition. And I think your example is actually a fine one, because that discussion was exactly as it’s turned out, oh, we may be losing something here, there is a responsibility to have this bit of community infrastructure, therefore how can we deal with this in a better way. It is constructed, therefore let’s put it as part of the project. So, it’s not our view or now the Department’s view, having now been through this process, I guess, that we are losing anything.

25 The other point I’d make too is that we’re under a very different planning regime now as well at the port. There’s a SEPP that sits over the port that’s unique to ports in NSW, and this, as I mentioned earlier, it was approved under old legislation. So, any new development at Hutchison or Patrick or the Services Area would be subject, I guess, to the new SEPP, provided it wasn’t inconsistent with that approval sitting there. And we didn’t believe that any – the removal of any of the conditions would result in any inconsistency that wouldn’t otherwise be able to be picked up through other planning processes, i.e. a new DA or a new compliant development pathway.

30 **MR MILLS:** Given that there is dredging ongoing, why remove the dredging related activities aspect of it?

35 **MR WALLS:** Yes. So, the dredging related activities in regards to this project were to establish the depths alongside at the Port Botany Expansion Area. We have at Port Botany, there’s an agreement called the Channel User Licence Agreement, which is an agreement between Government and NSW Ports. That document sets what’s called the specified depth around the port. So, it says at this part of the port, you must have a depth of 16 metres, over here it must be 15 metres, just historically what had been set as that specified depth. Under the Channel User Licence Agreement, the depths alongside at Brotherson – sorry, the Port Botany Expansion Area have now been set and specified under that legislation.

45 So, from that perspective, the capital dredging, which is dredging below any specified depth, has been completed. Under our legislation, we then have pathways for what’s called maintenance dredging, which is any dredging that gets you down to that specified depth. So, with the buildup of silt above, let’s call it 20 metres, if the depth comes back to 19 or 18 metres, any maintenance dredging activities would be to get it back to that 20-metre specified depth. If we were to go beyond the specified depth,

then it's capital dredging, it triggers SSIs or SSDs under the legislation anyway, so we would be going down that path.

5 So, I guess that's a long way of saying that capital dredging associated with the Port Botany Expansion approval has been complete. Now, we're in a maintenance dredging face, and if we were to increase those depths, so specified depths, then we would trigger a new approval regardless of what was in the PBE approval.

10 **MR MILLS:** Okay, all right. So, yes, I think I've got that. That's fine. The other thing with the Community Consultative Committee.

**MR WALLS:** Yes.

15 **MR MILLS:** And I'm thinking about this from the point of the community. So, I get some of the other changes – the reductions in numbers from [unintelligible 00:33:33] requirement is, in terms of staff time and everything else. But why reduce the consultative members by one – sorry, the community members by one?

20 **MR WALLS:** The current consent says, and I'll just get my guys to confirm as I talk, the current consent says at least three reps from the local community. Our proposal was to change that to three reps from the local community, so getting rid of the 'at least'. I think our concern in drafting that was – sorry, our concern in reviewing the original approval was that there may come a point where we can't attract three members of the community to the CCC, which is what we experience at our other  
25 Community Consultative Committee at Enfield.

30 It wasn't our intent to limit it, and in fact the Community Consultative Committee Guidelines for State Significant Projects say up to seven. We're not proposing to cap it, we were just trying to put some flexibility into the minimum numbers, I guess. So, I guess all in all, we would still be comfortable with 'at least three', we just had one eye on the fact that it's becoming increasingly difficult for us to attract community members to that committee.

35 **MR MILLS:** Yes. I thought you had four at the moment, but ...

**MR WALLS:** No, I think it says 'at least three' currently.

**MR MILLS:** In fact, you had four. Is that not the case?

40 **MR WALLS:** Yes, at the time we had – yes, that's right. So, at the time, we had four, we now have an additional two, so I think there's six members of the community on the CCC. Those two were added in the last 12 months, so post the preparation of this documentation.

45 **MR MILLS:** Okay. Thank you. All right, that's good.

**MR WALLS:** So, just to be clear, our intent wasn't to remove one of those four by stating three reps from the community, it was just to make sure that we weren't going to breach that consent if we were to drop down below three. That was our main

concern. So, as I said, we're happy for that to be at least three reps from the local community approved by the secretary. But we've just got one eye on that compliance risk, I guess.

5       **MR MILLS:** Okay, all right. But changing it to three, that doesn't change that, does it, it just means that you've actually got three, and then the consent would have the actually three, but ...

10       **MR WALLS:** Well, the wording was 'at least three'. I guess we were concerned if we got two, we would then be breaching the condition.

**MR MILLS:** But weren't you proposing to change it to delete the words 'at least'?

15       **MR WALLS:** That's right.

**MR MILLS:** So, you still have a requirement – sorry, I'm just trying to understand this. You still have a requirement then to have three community members.

20       **MR WALLS:** Yes, that's true. Let's just keep it as 'at least'. As I said, we're comfortable with it staying as 'at least', and it's probably caused more confusion amongst everyone, so ...

25       **MR MILLS:** Yes, and look, I suspect the community members who wrote in and expressed some concern may have thought it was a backdoor way of trying to reduce community participation.

**MR WALLS:** Yes, sure.

30       **MR MILLS:** I suspect that's where that concern came from.

**MR WALLS:** Yes.

35       **MR MILLS:** All right. And thank you for that, that clarifies it. What else have I got? I think that we've just – I think we've covered most of the things. Kendall, have I ...?

**MR WALLS:** You did just have one agenda point about relationship between projects, and I wasn't quite sure what that was, so I couldn't talk to it. But if there were any questions on that, I was happy to take them.

40       **MR CLYDSDALE:** Thanks, Andrew and Greg. I think that was just if the Applicant had anything they wanted to discuss in that context; is there any overlap that we should be aware of or is there anything associated with Mod 18 that might impact upon the Quayline Extension and vice versa.

45       **MR WALLS:** Oh, okay, sure. Apart from the tug relocation, which isn't really subject to Mod 18 anyway, that's probably the extent to that interaction, yes.

**MR MILLS:** And then the only other thing was do you have any comments in relation to the Department's Assessment Report and recommendations in terms of the way in which the conditions operate?

5       **MR WALLS:** I'll open it up to my guys in a second, but again, I'll just reiterate around that condition on the reps, I'm comfortable for it to be amended to 'at least three', that's fine with us. Anja, did you have any additional on the Department's Assessment Report?

10       **MS MORGAN:** No, I haven't. I think we're happy with the Department's Assessment Report in the way that it reads, and we did have a lot of discussions with the Department back and forwards going through the conditions of consent, to make sure that they're workable. I think that's about it.

15       **MR MILLS:** Yes. Thank you. If there's no other comments or questions that you would like to add or leave the Commission with, we can draw this to a close, that's great.

20       **MS MORGAN:** Apologies, Commissioner. We'd just like to add that a big part of the Community Consultation Committee was that Randwick Council be added as one of the council representatives. And that's something that we have recommended and is in the conditions of consent, which I believe also addresses Randwick Council's concerns which I know they have raised.

25       **MR MILLS:** Yes, yes, thank you. Okay. If there's nothing else, nothing from my colleagues at the office, no, then I think we can draw it to a close. Thank you very much for your time, I appreciate that, and for bearing with us through those questions.

30       **MR WALLS:** Thanks, Commissioner, appreciated.

**MR MILLS:** Thank you.

**>THE MEETING CONCLUDED**