

# Meeting note

## SIMTA

**Date** 17 February 2020

**Time** 6pm

**Purpose** CCC Meeting

**Chair** Dr Col Gellatly

**Recorder** Steve Nguyen

**Attendees** Kieran Mooney – KM  
Scott Warren – SW  
Fiona McNaught – FM  
Michael Russell – MR  
Ian Pryde – IP  
Jeffery Thornton – JT  
Sharyn Cullis – SC  
Erik Rakowski – ER  
Luke Oste – LO  
Ed Cooper - EC

**Apologies** John Anderson  
Chris Guthrie

Item	Discussion Point	Actions
1. Greeting from The Chair and apologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>» The Chair welcomed the CCC and introduces new attendees</li><li>» Note – Erik Rakowski VP of RAID Moorebank is attending on behalf of John Anderson</li><li>» Note – Going forward Luke Oste is replacing Chris Guthrie of Liverpool Council</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>» LO to confirm whether Liverpool Council committee will be shutting down?</li></ul>
2. Actions from last meeting	<p><b>Presentation of Biodiversity offsets</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>» EC from Arcadis presented biodiversity offsets. Ed informed that offsetting is the last resort according to the hierarchy of biodiversity management. There is first a need to avoid and minimise impacts to vegetation and habitat and then to mitigate the impact. The residual impacts are then offset through the protection and management of vegetation, including weed control, management of feral and overabundant native species and protection of threatened species.</li><li>» SC questioned why Arcadis decided to go with the nest box rather than salvaging tree hollows as part of the biodiversity management?</li><li>» EC responded that the project team used a combination of both introducing nest boxes and salvaging tree hollows. Those trees that were deemed salvageable and practical to do so were salvaged and returned to the offset area. The team had to be careful of what can be reintroduced back into the offset area so that it would benefit the species.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>»</li></ul>

- 
- » SC expressed concerns about offset management hierarchy and wanted to know where are the sites that translocation will occur?
  - » EC informed that the location has not been determined. Furthermore, the *Hibbertia fumana* cuttings which were collected are being propagated and is still at Mount Annan. The project team is considering a number of locations but these locations are yet to be determined.
  - » SC asked what can the project team do to help manage the koalas' movement on-site or around the site?
  - » EC responded that under the condition of consent for MPW Stage 2, there is a requirement for a Koala Plan of Management which is currently being drafted and will be made available once it is ready.
  - » SC asked what can be done to modify the koala habitat?
  - » SW informed that in December 2018, Cumberland Ecology, using a specialised sniffer dog inspected the entire MPW site for any trace of koala's skats for a period of a week. Cumberland Ecology found minor traces of koala's skats near MPW entrance from two male koalas that were transient and moving through the area. Through their search and findings, Cumberland Ecology determined MPW is not a prone koala habitat and that no significant occupation by koalas in MPW.
  - » SC expressed concerns that development of the project does not leave enough natural habitat for connection of species or species movement.
  - » ER asked, is there a way to look at where the railway line is and create a passage or corridor of any kind for koala to move around.
  - » SW noted ER question and responded that NSW government approval process does not take into consideration what ER has asked and that the project team is meeting that approval.
  - » EC added that the impact of connectivity had on the project from the Bootland interface with Holsworthy bushland has not been affected and remains largely the same. Furthermore, the rail bridge underpass abutment on MPW provides room for connectivity between East and West of the Georges River. EC reiterated that no koala skats were found along the river bank. The remaining vegetation along the Georges River leads to the M5 motorway and has limited connectivity value to other patches of bushland.
  - » The chair asked if there were any mechanisms for interest members to provide further input and feedback?
  - » SW responded that interest members can make submissions when SSDs are exhibited for input
  - » SW reminded the CCC that government approval is given which Qube is required to adhere to and that this committee is not a productive forum for discussion about disagreements with general NSW government decision-making or policy.
-

- 
- » The Chair asked if the process of the Koala Plan of Management will be publicly exhibited?
  - » EC is unsure if this will happen. A consultation with OEH was done and comments were compiled and sent to OEH
  - » SC asked if the koala credits can still be effectively used on site?
  - » EC responded that no decision has been made by the landowner to generate koala credits for MLP
  - » ER asked, what is the government application policy around land that would have never been developed and how does the MLP get to claim it as biobank offsets if it was never going to be developed?
  - » EC informed that it is considered a type of "additionality" and that existing management obligations or land that is already protected by other means may be subject to discounting of credit yield. EC could not advise on the application of additionality regarding the BA341 site as this was a matter for DPIE EES and the 'Landowner'.
  - » IP asked about the offsets area outside of the site and wanted to know where these areas are?
  - » EC explained that the offsets site public register does not show this information. All offsite offset credits have been acquired in accordance with the like-for-like offset rules in the NSW Biodiversity Offsets Policy for Major Projects (2014).

---

3. PFAS management update

- » SW informed the CCC that outcomes from SC enquiry and subsequent to the last meeting have been mainly Q&A via email and that the project team has exhausted what the team are able to explain. Through email correspondences, if anyone has any further questions, it can be referred to the relevant party responsible. »
  - » SC requested that the minutes include the number of PFAS ponds and the progress in managing them.
  - » KM corrected that the site contains 11 erosion sediment basins (ESB) and not PFAS ponds. These basins exist to manage rain stormwater events. Under erosion sediment control requirement, the project team is required to manage the collected water before it is let off-site. Subsequently, the project team has engaged a specialist water treatment contractor to be on-site to undertake water treatment works and manage water treatment for over 12 months. The team continually monitor the water basins after every rain event. the testing of these basins has found that the water is gradually reducing below the recommended PFAS threshold. KM added that the team is continuing to test and treat the water as needed.
  - » SC asked, how does the team manage the groundwater that is coming from site?
  - » KM advised that while it is difficult to determine where the groundwater run-off will be, there are various measures being drafted into the PFAS management plans. The project
-

team is also in discussion with EPA site auditor and working through to find what is the best way to manage the water run-off with the Environmental Representative.

- » ER asked what is the process for introducing fill while the surface contained PFAS? And at what level of dilution is acceptable for the surface to be covered with fill?
- » KM advised that recent testing has shown that surface water exhibit low level of PFAS and that up until now, the project team has been conducting demolition and remediation package across MPW site. Part of this work required processes set up to manage the by-product of the demolition and remediation, which PFAS is part of this by-product.
- » SW also advised that the management of the basin is to treat any contaminants in the water before it is discharged and not just relating to PFAS management.
- » ER asked, is laying the dirt over the top of the surface a mitigation measure?
- » KM advised that laying dirt over the top is one form of mitigation measure that the team is implementing. This helps to cap the surface run-off. In addition, the team is treating the water captured on-site so it can be disposed of safely; KM emphasised that the project team is not at the PFAS remediation stage yet.

---

4. January 20 storm impacts

- » SW informed the CCC about the container noise barrier falling during the January 20<sup>th</sup> freak supercell storm. A number of container stacks on MPE IMEX terminal fell due to the damaging wind which occurred during the storm. As a result, NSW Police, Fire & Rescue NSW, Safework and Qube Logistics attended and investigated the incident to ensure that it won't happen again.
- » A number of recommendations resulted from the investigation
  - Improved methodology for stacking of containers
  - Stacking the containers lower
  - Stacking the containers full instead of empty
  - And reinforcing the higher stacks with support from lower stacks backing.
- » SC questioned, what is the highest level which the containers can be stacked?
- » KM advised that they can stack the containers as high as the operation of the terminal. Typically this is between 4-6 level high depending on the design of the pavement underneath, at Moorebank the upper limit is 5 high.
- » FM commented that it was fortunate that the incident happened now, while improvement can still be implemented before the terminal is fully operational.

- » The project team to include an explanation about the container noise wall methodology in future newsletter to inform the community

- 
- » FM asked if the information about the outcomes of the investigation into the containers falling can be shared with the community
  - » SW responded, yes. Scott also apologises for the disruption and inconvenience the incident has caused.
- 

5. Quarterly report

KM provided an update on the past three months of works undertaken on site.

Package 1 – Import – Export (IMEX No. 1)

- » Major milestone reached with the delivery of 2 of the 4 cranes
- » Warehouse 3 and 4 is almost complete
- » Continuation of the earthwork on MPE and preparing for construction of future warehouses
- » Installation of internal and lead- in services
- » Internal road works continuing

- » Include photos of the delivery of the terminal cranes in future newsletter

No warehouse tenants have been announced at this stage

MPW Stage 1 continuing

- » Main compound complete and contractors moved in
- » BMD started works on Moorebank Ave
- » Ongoing earthworks across site

Discussion

- » ER asked which direction will the warehouses on MPE be facing?
- » KM advised that the warehouse main access will be north and south and is within the terminal access road
- » ER also asked where does the road diversion start?
- » KM advised that the Moorebank Ave road diversion starts just south of Anzac Road

Air quality monitoring

- » KM advised that air quality monitoring data returned abnormal results during the bush fire months (Oct to Dec). KM noted that the data showed elevated high level. However, overall, over the 12 months, the level is below the average recorded. Despite the last few months which was affected by the bush fire.
- » No noise exceedance to report since the last meeting

Complaints

---

- 
- » SW advised that complaints were mainly related to storm and containers falling
  - » No dust complaints since last meeting
  - » No noise complaints since last meeting

#### Discussion

- » MR asked whether there was any major impact to the site from the big storm?
- » KM advised that there were increases in the level of water collected on-site. Moorebank Avenue was flooded and closed for a couple of days. No major impacts to MLP.
- » SC asked what is the OSD design capability?
- » KM advised that permanent on-site OSD has been designed to cater for 1 in 100 years storm or greater
- » ER asked about Bapaume Road stormwater system
- » KM advised that the current stormwater system at Bapaume Road is council-owned and council controlled. The project team is in discussion with council to come up with a temporary solution about the water pooling during storm events. Long term, new drainage will be installed as part of the road upgrade.
- » SW advised that previously, the team had to deploy vacuum trucks to clear the drainage as the drain is prone to flooding
- » ER asked, what is MLP long term plan for big storm events similar to those experiences recently?
- » KM responded that it all depends on the severity of the storm and the impact that it could cause to the terminal operation. The operator will base their decision on safety and risk analysis. KM advised that he is confident that MLP will be able to manage similar storm events in future.
- » The Chair introduced Liz Young, who spoke about employment and career opportunity in the local area. Liz invites businesses in the area to future round table conversation with the community to explore opportunity for skilled workforce accessing local employment.

---

#### 6. General Business

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» IP mentioned that RMS is proposing road upgrade for M5 west and questioned whether the motorway operator is moving the toll gate?</li> <li>» JT requested the project team to look at installing pump up light poles for MPW to manage the light spill and if the tip of the light pole could be painted in a natural colour to aesthetically blend in with the background.</li> <li>» KM advised that the current MPE light pole are temporary and will be removed once the IMEX terminal is transitioning to automation. With respect to MPW, KM took JT request on notice.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» The chair to explore the possibility of inviting an RMS representative to the CCC meeting</li> <li>» The chair to invite a MIC representative to the next CCC meeting</li> </ul> |
|---|---|
-

- 
- » LO mentioned that Liverpool council is building a cycleway from Liverpool to Campbelltown. Part of the cycleway goes under Casula train station and onto MPW site. Liverpool council request whether there is any way they can install the connection path for this cycleway through MPW land. »
  - » SC mentioned that Goodman is looking at acquiring MLP and as such, she would like to know what impact will this acquisition have on the intermodal?
  - » SC also questioned whether the trees will be replaced once Moorebank Avenue upgrade is complete?
  - » SW advised that no proposed plan to replace the trees on Moorebank Avenue
  - » JT wanted to know the number of visitors to SIMTA website
  - » SW responded that the team do not track website traffic
  - » JT wanted confirmation that no truck movement will go down Cambridge Ave
  - » KM confirmed that current TMP is still in effect
  - » ER asked if the air monitor data around the site were for the whole site?
  - » KM confirmed that the data was for the overall whole site
  - » ER asked about the proposed footbridge to Casula station
  - » SW informed that the Federal Government has rejected the proposal
  - » The chair noted that Peter Hicks is no longer the CEO of MIC
  - » JT asked about the number of trains coming into the IMEX
  - » KM advised that currently, one train a day is operating
  - » ER asked if the terminal operation change ownership, then how will this impact the intermodal conditions of operations?
  - » SW advised that the condition of operations do not change because of a change of ownership. A new owner of any project would inherit the conditions. Conditions of operation pertain to the project, not the owner.

- 
- |                 |   |                                    |
|-----------------|---|------------------------------------|
| 7. Next meeting | » The next meeting will be held at 6pm Monday 11 May 2020 | » Elton to coordinate room booking |
|-----------------|---|------------------------------------|
-