WestConnex Community Reference Group

Central – Meeting 3

Meeting: WestConnex Community Reference Group - Central
Date: Tuesday 04 December 2018
Time: 5.45 pm for 6.00 pm start
Location: 7-15 Wetherill Street, Leichhardt Service Centre

Attendees:

- Independent Chair (IC)
  - Stephen Lancken
  - Susan Hayes
  - Vivian Shen-Edwards

- Associate
- Notetaker

- Community (Coalition of Glebe Groups – COGG)
  - Jan Wilson
  - Murray Jewell
  - Christina Valentine

- Community (Leichhardt Against WestConnex - LAW)
  - Jennifer Aaron (substitute for Catherine Gemmell)
  - Nick O’Dwyer
  - Anne-Therese King

- Community (White Bay Strata)
  - Ben Prag
  - Dr Lesley Treleaven

- Community (P&C Vice President, Sydney Secondary College Leichhardt)

- Community (P&C President, Rozelle Public School)

- Community Member (Camperdown Residents Against WestConnex – CRAW)

- Community (Balmain Chamber of Commerce President)
  - Greg Pattison (substitute for Kate Moriarty)

- City of Sydney
  - Elise Webster

- Inner West Council (IWC)
  - Kendall Banfield
  - Maree Liang

- Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) WestConnex Project Director
  - Andrew Mckindlay
  - Kirralee Phillips
  - Dan Silburn-Evans

- Roads and Maritime Services

- Department of Planning and Environment (DPE)
  - Rob Sherry

- Environment Protection Authority (EPA)
  - Claire Miles
Meeting Notes

Key Matters Discussed and Presented

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Welcome, introductions, the purpose of WestConnex Community Reference Groups (WCRGs) and meeting protocols, presented by Independent Chair (IC)

1.2 It was noted that the Agenda had been slightly re-ordered so Lendlease Samsung Bouygues Joint Venture (LSBJV) would present first, answer community questions, then leave the meeting.

1.3 Are there any technical workers from LSBJV present at this meeting?

1.3.1 Yes, the Project Director, Tunnel Project Manager, and Environmental Approvals Manager are present.

1.4 The Community Members expressed that it is great to get information and presentations prior to meetings and noted that sometimes the Actions Arising list is not covered when the meeting runs overtime.

1.5 How can the Community members resolve items on the Actions Arising list if they are not covered by the end of the meeting?

1.5.1 The IC suggested ten minutes is allocated for Community members to raise outstanding issues at the end of the meeting.

1.6 The Community is concerned that there is no point asking questions if the contractors leave after the presentations.

1.6.1 It was agreed that LSBJV would go through their presentation and address issues and questions before they leave the meeting.
2 PROJECT UPDATES BY LSBJV AND RMS

Questions and Comments

2.1 How many properties are impacted in the area of the Pyrmont Bridge tunnelling site?
   2.1.1 There are around 3,000 properties within a 200 metre radius of the Pyrmont Bridge tunnelling site that are considered sensitive receivers due to the proximity to the site.

2.2 Are the letters to inform residents in respect of this stage only?
   2.2.1 Yes, it is only for the properties within 50 meters of the M4-M5 Link Tunnels alignment.

2.3 It was noted that the current temporary project information office will be moved to a permanent location on corner of Alt Street and Parramatta Road in early 2019.

2.4 It was noted by LSBJV that the presentation sent out prior to the meeting to all Community members contained an error. The average tunnel depth was noted in that presentation as 45 metres. The correct depth is 35 metres. The updated presentation will be included as an attachment to the Meeting Notes when distributed.

2.5 The Community noted that the tunnel depth presented in the presentation contradicts the original Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that they commented on. The Community is concerned that the tunnels are much shallower than the EIS stated and they were not consulted on the changes.

2.6 How will the change in the depth of the tunnel influence the air quality in the tunnel? Who will be responsible for any issues arising from the change?
   2.6.1 LSBJV noted that the tunnel is not as steep as outlined in the EIS, which will optimise construction and reduce overall emission from trucks travelling at a gentler grade.
   2.6.2 The process for Air quality monitoring will be completed as in accordance with the Conditions of Approval (E20-E26)
   2.6.3 [Provided post meeting] The Conditions of Approval outline the process for monitoring air quality, including E26, which states: ‘commence monitoring for at least 12 continuous months prior to operation and continue monitoring for at least two (2) years following the commencement of operation’.

2.7 The Community is concerned about property damage claims in Stages 1 and 2 of the project. Are there any differences in the ground conditions and construction of the tunnel in Stage 3, compared to Stages 1 and 2? What will be done to ensure damage will not occur?
   2.7.1 LSBJV stated that generally speaking ground conditions are expected to be similar. Road headers, rock bolts and fibre reinforced shotcrete are used and the same construction techniques utilised.
   2.7.2 LSBJV stated that property, utilities and workforce on the surface must be protected. The
settlement could typically be 5-10 millimetres. When excavating close to the surface in soft soils / shale different types of tunnel supports may be used including canopy tubes and lattice girders which provide support while excavation is carried out.

2.7.3 RMS stated that that they are still investigating issues on Stage 1 and 2.

2.8 The Community does not believe that it is sufficient for contractors or RMS to answer with “generally speaking”. To be reassured of that property damage will not occur.

2.8.1 LSBJV stated that the use of the term “general” is to ensure that information provided is not misleading and is as accurate as possible. Sandstone is not uniform, and ‘generally speaking’ was used as we cannot be specific when comparing a 7.5km tunnelling corridor to other projects.

2.9 The Community is very concerned and requests reassurance that heritage homes will not be disturbed, and the tunnel will not collapse.

2.8.1 LSBJV is aware of the Community’s concern about potential impact on heritage homes. LSBJV will tailor tunnel support design in line with the varying ground conditions e.g. at the St Peter’s Interchange and Wattle Street ramps where the ground is shallower and they will be tunnelling through shale. Majority of the tunnel alignment is in good competent rock.

2.10 The Community requested geotechnical evidence such as a geological map or a graph that displays the sandstone grade and location, to provide reassurance that the risk of property damage will be properly mitigated.

2.10.1 Appendix T of the M4-M5 Link EIS contains various geotech data from along the alignment.

2.10.2 The Community raised issues with flooding from Hawthorn Parade canal area where a flood zone already exists. Work has been completed to prevent flooding, how will this work be impacted?

2.10.2 LSBJV advised due to depth of their work no impact is expected on recent surface work.

2.11 The Community is very concerned about public property damage where they believe the government is not accountable for liabilities and the onus is on residents to prove that damage is due to tunnelling. What guarantees are there that these concerns of the Community are considered and genuinely taken seriously?

2.11.1 LSBJV noted the Community’s concern but they cannot speak about what occurred on other stages of the project. Reassurance was given that any concerns about LSBJV’s work will be investigated and a response provided. A further Condition of Approval (see slide 15 for wording of CoA E109) requires an Independent Property Assessment Panel that can be used to resolve disputes. If a property owner is not satisfied with the response from the contractor the matter can be referred to The Panel by the property owner for resolution.
2.12 Pioneer Memorial Park was formerly a war cemetery. The tunnelling depth under the Park is 56 metres according to the EIS, and 39 metres according to the presentation. What investigations have been undertaken into possible disturbance to the graveyard? Will tunnelling occur under the Park?

2.12.1 It was noted that all headstones have been previously removed. Tunnelling underneath will not cause any impact because there is no visible element of a cemetery remaining. The tunnelling will be at a depth that is not expected to disturb any remains buried on the site.

2.13 The Community believes the tunnelling tool on the WestConnex website is inappropriate in that it requires users to agree to an indemnification caveat. The tool shows the location of residences in relation to the alignment of the M4-M5 Link Tunnel. However, if the information in the tool can’t be relied on as true and correct, it is useless. The Community believes the caveat should be taken down, or if the tool is not correct it should be taken down.

2.13.1 The concern was noted and RMS is investigating.

2.14 Is Pyrmont Bridge Road tunnelling site to be used by “truck and dog” traffic? How will the trucks be accessing the entry on Parramatta Road from White Bay?

2.14.1 LSBJV advised they do not plan to utilise White Bay as a truck marshalling area. It is instead proposed to be utilised as a carpark for workers. A shuttle bus for workers is then proposed to run from White Bay to Pyrmont Bridge Road. “Truck and dog” traffic will come to the site from the west down Parramatta Road.

2.15 The Community is concerned about the possible bank-up of trucks on Parramatta Road. The slide shows eight trucks with “dogs” attached. There is no space for more than eight. Where will trucks go if there are more than eight banked up and what actions will be taken to prevent bank-up of trucks on Parramatta Road?

2.15.1 The truck vehicle movements will operate on a cycle of around three to four minutes in and out of the construction site. All trucks have GPS locaters and the movement of trucks into and out of the site will be monitored, which should mitigate occurrence of bank-up If for some reason a bank-up of trucks starts to occur, trucks can be stopped until the bank up is resolved. How they will be stopped and where will depend on individual situation.

2.16 The Community is concerned that trucks do not get past the lights in time and the traffic lights are not attuned to the length of the trucks. Local business people and customers are finding it increasingly difficult to gain access onto Parramatta Road. Are there going to be changes in traffic management conditions at the intersection of Pyrmont Bridge and Parramatta Roads to minimise the bank-up of traffic?

2.16.1 LSBJV states that the Virtual Superintendent Program can be used to monitor trucks and can stop trucks entering congested areas as required. RMS will look in to the traffic light phasing
at the intersection.

2.17 There is a clearway from 5 am to 10 am on Parramatta Road outside the bus stop. If a bank-up of traffic occurs and trucks cannot get into the construction zone, where will they go? Is there a protocol for stopping the bank-up of trucks on Parramatta Road outside the bus stop?

2.17.1 The Community requested that protocols for all situations be made available to them.

See 2.16.1 above.

2.18 The Community is concerned that their experience of previous traffic bank-up incidents will reoccur and would like reassurance that LSBJV will manage the situation differently in the next stage?

2.18.1 LSBJV cannot comment on other stages of the project, however, they have taken on lessons learnt and stated that the number of vehicle spaces available at the site demonstrates that residents’ concerns have been considered. The current site has more parking than was available for previous stages of the project, mitigating against a bank-up of traffic on Parramatta Road.

2.18.2 LSBJV states that there is a Virtual Superintendent Program to monitor trucks and it can be used to stop trucks entering congested areas. All trucks, speed limits and rest times are monitored. Even though there is an approval for 24-hour haulage on the site, LSBJV does not currently intend to use the haulage route 24 hours a day, seven days a week. This may change.

2.19 At a previous meeting, a request was made for all trucks to carry signage that identifies them. Will trucks used by the contractor and sub-contractors have identifying markers on all four sides of the vehicle and a complaints line number so the community can act on any issues with trucks on local roads?

2.19.1 Spoil trucks for the M4-M5 Link Tunnels project will have identifying markers, though not necessarily on all four sides of the vehicle. LSBJV will provide further details, once available.

2.20 Will GPS tracking monitor truck speeds? What action will be taken if a ‘truck and dog’ is found speeding?

2.20.1 LSBJV may elect to terminate the contractor or the individual depending on the incident. LSBJV has specific obligations under the chain of responsibility regulations.

2.21 What is the contingency plan for managing a bank-up of trucks on public roads?

2.21.1 There is a contingency route that trucks should take if there is bank-up and it will not be on any local roads. Furthermore, existing weight and size restrictions could attract significant penalties from Council (up to $15 000) for truck owners going north of Bignell Lane.

2.22 Is the old bank building on Parramatta Road considered heritage and will it be saved?

2.22.1 It is not currently listed as heritage with the Heritage Office and is due to be demolished.
LSBJV does not have any role in the determination of heritage value.

2.23 The Community complained that had not received notification regarding after-hours jack hammer and drilling work undertaken at Cardigan Lane on a specified date (Monday 3 December 2018).

2.23.1 LSBJV confirmed that no work was carried out on that date as it was a rostered day off for all workers (Builders Picnic Day).

2.24 What are the ground condition at the Wattle Street and St Peters tunnelling sites (tunnel entrance and exits)?

2.24.1 It is shale and soft soil. There will be additional heavier ground support, such as canopy tubes to mitigate settlement. At these locations tunnels will be excavated slower and supports installed. Settlement can be minimised, not completely prevented.

2.26 If settlement occurs and property is damaged, will contractors be accountable?

2.26.1 Daily readings are taken to record settlement and compare data therefore LSBJV will know before residents if there is an issue and, in that case, will cease all work. Under the Conditions of Approval, independent geotechnical monitoring will be conducted [E104].

2.27 The Community is concerned about property owners being advised to seek a property condition report prior to construction. If and when properties are damaged, the property condition report is assessed by contractors. If it is decided that the damage is not caused by the project, property owners are asked to prove that damages are a result of construction. This means that if owners do not have, or refuse to spend, thousands of dollars to get another property condition report, nothing will be done. The Community believes that the RMS, as proponent, is responsible for contractors. How can home owners address this situation and get their properties repaired?

2.27.1 RMS noted that it is up to contractors to mitigate the project and contractors need to take responsibility for their own actions. RMS advised that if residents are not satisfied with the result or outcome, then they can raise their case with the Independent Property Impact Assessment Panel and contact RMS to take further action and conduct a review. To contact RMS please email info.westconnex@rms.nsw.gov.au or call 1800 660 248 and request to be transferred to the RMS Stakeholder and Community Engagement team regarding unsatisfactory resolution of property damage. [Contact information provided post meeting]

2.28 The Community considers that independent assessors completing the property condition surveys are not independent because they are paid for by the contractor.

2.28.1 Noted.

2.29 The Community is concerned that if funds are low, then property owners will not be compensated. What happens when funds are low or there is a delay and contractor issues? Are project funds
allocated per stage or for the entire project? Is there a guarantee on the contract?

2.29.1 There is an approximate 10% bank guarantee of the overall design and construct contract value, but that amount is not specific to property.

2.30 How much is the 10% bond valued at?

2.30.1 It is approximately $300 million.

2.31 Is the contractor’s liability waived if they use the proper engineering practice, even if it is shown that property damage is caused by tunnelling? Would contractors be responsible whether it is negligence or not?

2.31.1 This would likely be an insurance issue that would be assigned to the contractors insurance company.

2.32 Will it be possible for tax payers to know the conditions under which this project is conducted?

2.32.1 Yes. There are published commercial documents, Terms and Conditions, along with a summary of project documents. Details are available via


2.33 Has asbestos been found during the demolition of the Pyrmont Bridge Road buildings?

2.33.1 Some bonded asbestos has been found and removed. A hazardous material demolition assessment has been conducted and an asbestos management plan is in place.

2.34 Will trucks be washed down?

2.34.1 No. This is not necessary for dealing with bonded asbestos.

2.35 What mitigation plans are in place to manage rats caused by demolition?

2.35.1 LSBJV will investigate and provide further details on vermin management measures.

2.36 How will Bignell Lane be realigned and reinstated?

2.36.1 Bignell Lane must be reinstated to its original alignment at completion of all work. All buildings between the terrace houses and James Squire will be demolished.

2.37 Regarding the Terms of Reference and WCRG membership, what happens when a Community member needs to take leave? A Community member requested that a substitute representative should be elected by the community represented, not the government or contractor.

2.37.1 Noted. The IC confirmed that Community representatives are nominated by the community they represent (e.g. Camperdown). The IC also noted that membership is being addressed as part of the WCRG Review.

2.38 The reduction of lanes at the City West Link where three lanes are reduced to two, poses a dangerous risk to traffic and has caused an increase in traffic. There is no median strip and the lanes become a
blind corner when trucks are turning. The road continuously floods, which reduces the road capacity. The Community expressed concerns that no community consultation was undertaken. The Community would like to know how the changes on City West Link were approved.

2.38 RMS stated that an extra lane has been added eastbound for storage capacity, not traffic flow. There are temporary line marks, new line marking will be completed soon. The project is an RMS run project, and was approved based on the planning process required for the type of work. When carrying out the work RMS noted some of the drainage was blocked, which contributed to flooding. This has now been rectified.

2.38.2 The speed limit has been permanently reduced to 60 km/hr. The size of lanes is consistent with standard lane widths for 60 km/hr zones.

2.39 The Community raised the issue of required notice of drilling, as at the previous meeting. A request had been made for a standard of two weeks’ notice, a change from the current five business days of notice given. Was this feedback given to LSBJV and has it been taken into consideration?

2.39.1 This request has been taken into consideration and passed on to LSBJV. The current minimum requirement is five business days or seven calendar days’ notice. This is to balance the possibility of construction program changing with provision of timely and accurate notice. If notification is given too early, the situation and construction schedule may change, and two weeks’ notice may be counter-productive. However, LSBJV and RMS will try to ensure a longer period of advance notice will be given, whenever possible.

2.40 Will residents above the tunnelling activity be notified as the tunnelling progresses?

2.40.1 Yes, contractors are not allowed to tunnel if the sub stratum land is not owned by RMS. RMS is required to acquire the land under property (sub-stratum) and transfer it to the contractor. The first subsurface acquisition notification letters have been sent out to properties, with the rest being sent to property owners over the next 18 months, depending on their location along the alignment and ahead of the tunnelling schedule. The first letters sent from the RMS Communications Team notify property owners that the land below them will be acquired by RMS. A second, legal, letter will be sent by the RMS property team to clarify that ownership of surface property is not affected, and that only the land underneath is acquired. Contact details for information about acquisition are provided in letters to homeowners. LSBJV will notify the community about the tunnelling progress. Additional real time information about the progress will be available via the M4-M5 Link tunnelling tool (westconnex.com.au/tunnelling)

2.41 Who does the door knocking and correspondence delivery?

2.41.1 There will be no door knocking for RMS sub stratum acquisition. Notification of pre-condition
survey offers will be completed by LSBJV.

2.41.2 Before tunnelling starts at Pyrmont Bridge Road, notifications will be distributed to residents on either side of the tunnel.

2.41.3 Community members commented that no notification has been received.

2.42 When will property condition surveys be available?

2.42.1 To date, over 900 letters offering property condition surveys have been sent out and a number of property condition surveys have been completed. If there is no response to both the initial letter offering a property condition survey and a second follow up letter, door-knocking will be undertaken by LSBJV.

2.43 What is the cost of the property condition report and who is paying for the reports on the approximately 4,500 properties?

2.43.1 LSBJV will incur the cost. The cost of the property condition report depends on the property type and size and varies from a few hundred to a couple of thousand dollars.

2.43.2 The Community requested an overall estimated contract figure.

2.43.3 The RMS stated that contractors are responsible for the reports. The contract is commercial in confidence. An overall estimated cost cannot be provided.

2.44 Why is the contractor’s contract estimated figure not provided?

2.44.1 RMS does not think it is relevant for Community members to know how much the contractor pays for the surveys in total.

2.45 What noise mitigation strategies will be used at Pyrmont Bridge Road?

2.45.1 Each site and site establishment is required to have a construction noise and vibration statement. If out of hours work is to be carried out, set criteria will have to be met and a set scale of mitigation measures are applied when criteria is breached.

2.46 The Community requested details of dust and noise mitigation plans for the Pyrmont Bridge Road site.

2.46.1 The Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) and Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP) are available online. The links are 
[Links provided post meeting] Mitigation measures include hosing down demolition activity, acoustic sheds with closed doors, ceasing work in wind conditions and covering work trucks that are going off site.

2.47 Who can residents contact if there are any issues with dust and noise?
2.47.1 Residents can call 1800 660 248 and request to be transferred to LSBJV regarding their dust and noise complaint. [Provided post meeting]

2.48 How many carpark spaces will be available at the White Bay facility and is the access via James Craig Road not Robert Street?
2.48.1 Approximately 150-200 car spaces will be available. Access to the car park will be via James Craig Road.

2.49 How does the carpark at White Bay impact Stage 3B?
2.49.1 There will be no impact. There is a separate area specific for 3A.

2.50 Will LSBJV be attending future meetings?
2.50.1 LSBJV is willing to attend, if invited.
2.50.2 The Community noted that they appreciate LSBJV attending the meeting and would like their attendance at all future meetings.

2.51 LSBJV contractors left the meeting at this point.

3 UPDATE ON WESTCONNEX M4-M5 LINK PROJECT PRESENTED BY RMS

Questions and Comments

3.1 Is the project on track?
3.1.1 Yes, it is still on track. [Information provided post meeting] On Friday 14 December 2018 John Holland CPB Contractors was awarded the design and construction contract for the Rozelle Interchange and Iron Cove Link.

3.2 The Community is concerned that major contracts may be signed just before the current government goes into caretaker mode before the NSW State Election in March 2019, which could result in a change of government. The Community believes that there is no point in continuing construction of the Rozelle Interchange if a new government decides there is to be no Western Harbour Tunnel. Will a change of government impact project delivery?
3.2.1 RMS notes the community’s concerns.
3.2.2 The IC noted that it is not appropriate to ask RMS to comment on any potential change of government.

3.3 There have been disturbances at City West Link caused by night works. Why was the community not notified of these night works? The Community would like to be informed of the upcoming night works schedule?
3.3.1 The RMS undertook to investigate notification of nightworks to residents and reassured the Community that it is only sheeting works (i.e. not drilling) that are currently underway. These
works are likely to be completed by early February.

3.3.2 RMS undertook to add any residents in the area, on request, to the distribution list for notification of night works.

3.4 What specialists will be involved in the Property Impact Assessment Panel and what qualifications do they have?

3.4.1 [See Slide 16] RMS is currently in the process of selecting this panel. The Panel will comprise geotechnical and engineering experts independent of the design and construction team.

3.5 How many people will on the Panel? Can we have information about their powers? Will their powers be limited to making recommendations?

3.5.1 The Panel’s powers will be determined by the Conditions of Approval [E105-E109]. The Panel will comprise of geotechnical and engineering experts independent of the design and construction team, as required by Conditions of Approval E109.

3.6 What is happening at Taverners Hill?

3.6.1 This is RMS road works, not a WestConnex project. The works are at pre-approval stage and will potentially involve work on up to 600 metres of Parramatta Road, Tavern’s Hill.

[Provided post meeting] Work on Parramatta Road between Sloane Street, Haberfield and Flood Street, Leichhardt will commence on Friday 4 January. Information about the project is available via www.rms.nsw.gov.au/PRTH

3.7 When is the construction at Taverners Hill likely to happen?

3.7.1 Work will commence on Friday 4 January 2019, and is expected to be completed by late March 2019. [Information provided post meeting]

3.8 Will the Taverners Hill construction happen at the same time as the WestConnex project?

3.8.1 [See above notes regarding construction work at Taverners Hill]

3.9 At the last meeting, the Community requested that bench-marking be undertaken prior to any construction around Glebe and Forest Lodge. However, there is already construction happening at The Crescent. Will RMS investigate? The Community are concerned with heavy truck traffic causing private cars to “rat run” through the local roads.

3.9.1 [Provided post meeting] Inner West Council has provided RMS with the Local Area Improvement Strategy (LAIS), including The Crescent, Annandale. RMS is reviewing the LAIS to ensure alignment with its proposed Network Integration Plan. RMS will work with Inner West Council to ensure appropriate mitigation measures and implemented.

3.10 What is the timeline and advance notice period for residents receiving sub-stratum property


acquisition notices?
3.10.1 The first notice is a letter explaining the acquisition process and timeline. The second notice, a formal Property Acquisition Notice, has to be sent out at least three months in advance of any works commencing. [See note 2.1]

4 PROPOSAL TO RE-ORGANISE WCRGs FOR 2019

4.1 RMS are conscious of the large size of the Central WCRG. The New M4 is due to be completed in early 2019 and there has been difficulty in finding representatives from Kingsgrove and Arncliffe for the Southern WCRG. This CRG currently has a very small composition of Community representatives. It is therefore proposed to consolidate the current three WCRGs into two groups. The two WCRGs would be made up as follows:

(i) WCRG 1 - the M4 East, New M5 and M4-M5 Link Tunnels, with Community representatives from (in general) Leichhardt, Haberfield, Ashfield, St Peters, Glebe and Camperdown; and

(ii) WCRG 2 - the Rozelle Interchange and Iron Cove Link, with Community representatives from (in general) Lilyfield, Rozelle and Balmain.

Eight meetings in total will be held in 2019, four meetings for each CRG. [See slide 16]

4.2 RMS recognised that Leichhardt is affected by tunnelling from both projects. It was therefore suggested that the Leichhardt Community representatives would attend WCRG 1 and be invited to attend the WCRG 2 meeting when issues relevant to them is on the agenda.

4.2.1 The Community members generally agreed with the proposal and stated that they are not interested in going to twice as many meetings.

4.2.2 RMS suggested that the WCRG 2 meeting agendas could be distributed to WCRG 1 members for review. Members of WCRG 1 could then inform the IC if they wish to attend.

5 OTHER BUSINESS

5.1 The IC requested that Community members notify via email of any Actions Arising they consider to be unresolved. The IC undertook to provide any questions to RMS (and LSBJV through RMS) to respond before the end of December.

5.2 A Community member requested that the contractors for the Rozelle Interchange be invited to WCRG meetings in 2019?

5.2.1 RMS explained that attendance at WCRG meetings is not a condition of contract. However, RMS undertook to invite the contractor.

5.3 A Community member noted that in the past the consultation process had been less than adequate and Community members had not felt heard.
It was suggested that if certain representatives are not present at meetings, it does not mean that they are not interested.

A Community member commented that the WCRG is an important group that can feed information back to the community.

The Community members wished to have noted that they were very pleased with the willingness of LSBJV and RMS to respond to questions. The Community requests genuine consultation from the government and contractor.

6 **NEXT MEETINGS**
The following meeting dates are *yet to be confirmed*, subject to the reorganisation of WCRGs and meeting space availability.

- WCRG 1 (Leichhardt, Haberfield, St Peters, Glebe and Camperdown representatives)
  - 26 February, 7 May, 6 August, 5 November 2019 (Location TBA)

- WCRG 2 (Lilyfield, Rozelle and Balmain representatives)
  - 5 March, 14 May, 13 August, 12 November 2019 (Location TBA)

**Meeting closed at 8:12pm**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Actions Arising</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Responsibility / Status Update</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>RMS to provide documents relating to the process for dealing with property damage impacts.</td>
<td>Once selection process is complete</td>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>RMS is in the process of selecting the Independent Property Impact Assessment Panel members. Once selected, the process for escalating unresolved property damage disputes will be confirmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>LSBJV to provide an updated presentation with correct tunnel depth of 35 metres</td>
<td>Attached</td>
<td>Negocio to share</td>
<td>See attached presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The Community requested geotechnical evidence such as a geological map or a graph that displays the sandstone grade and location</td>
<td>Before next meeting</td>
<td>LSBJV</td>
<td>LSBJV will look at developing a cross section long plot that shows tunnel depth relative to the surface with generic geotechnical composition. Hope to have it available before the next CRG meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>LSBJV to provide mitigation plan for vermin, spiders, etc. during demolition</td>
<td>Complete – see Response</td>
<td>LSBJV</td>
<td>It is possible that during demolition work rodents flee the area into neighbouring properties. LSBJV have not received any reports about increased vermin numbers from neighbouring properties since demolition work started. LSBJV will increase site observations to identify any issues and apply pest control measures, as required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Actions Arising</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Responsibility / Status Update</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>What identifying markers will be on vehicles associated with the project</td>
<td>Complete – see Response</td>
<td>LSBJV</td>
<td>Spoil trucks will have WestConnex M4-M5 Link Tunnels project stickers on 2 sides along with the 1800 number and SSI number.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These minutes were accepted on 14 January 2019 by

[Signature]

Stephen Lancken

Independent Chair
Roads & Maritime Services
Faster. Safer. More reliable

WestConnex Central CRG
Tuesday 4 December 2018
Agenda

1. Project Update by M4-M5 Link Main Tunnel contractor - LSB JV

2. Update on WestConnex M4-M5 Link Project
   • Rozelle Interchange and Iron Cove Link

3. Other projects in the area
   • City West Link

4. Outstanding actions

5. Other Business
   • CRG meetings in 2019
WestConnex M4-M5 Link Tunnels
M4-M5 Link Tunnels

Tunnel alignment
M4-M5 Link Tunnels

Tunnel alignment – central

To Haberfield

Mainline tunnels

Pyrmont Bridge Road tunnelling site

Access tunnel

Roads & Maritime Services
Pyrmont Bridge Road tunnelling site

Construction program

*Indicative schedule of work. Timeframes are subject to change.
Pyrmont Bridge Road tunnelling site

Planned layout
Pyrmont Bridge Road tunnelling site

Vehicle access
Pyrmont Bridge Road tunnelling site

Current focus

Site establishment activity
- Demolition
- Utilities work
- Installing site sheds & offices, ancillary facilities, on-site parking
- Geotechnical investigation (drilling)
- Procurement

Engagement
- Notifications
- Property condition surveys
- Interface with Councils, Utility owners, and adjacent projects
- Community Information Sessions
- Community Information Centre
- Meetings, briefings and doorknocks

Planning and approval
- Construction Environmental Management Plan
- Environmental Protection Licence
- Construction Parking and Access Strategy
- EIS modification

Upcoming work
- On-street parking removal & relocation of bus stop
- Construction of acoustic shed
- Excavate tunnel access ramp
- Tunnelling starts mid-2019
Tunnel depths

- Improved design - tunnels to be less steep, resulting in a smoother ride and reduced emissions
- Deepest point is around 58m
- Average depth is around 35m*
- Shallowest point is around 15m except at either end where it connects to Wattle St and SPI
- Extensive planning carried out to ensure vibration is below limits likely to cause damage
- No specific depth below ground where damage to property is expected
- Good quality sandstone composition
- Regular above ground & in tunnel monitoring during and after excavation through an area
- Tunnel support (shotcrete and rock bolts)
M4-M5 Link Tunnels

How to contact us

Phone 1800 660 248
Email info@m4-m5linktunnels.com.au
Rozelle Interchange and Iron Cove Link
Project update

• Award of contract is expected in late-December 2018

• Site handover (Rozelle Railyards and Iron Cove) to awarded contractor will be completed in early 2019

• Most investigation work (such as geotech) has been completed

• Roads and Maritime Service will continue to advise residents and businesses around investigation sites, if any additional work is required

• Most business on acquired sites have relocated and moved from their former sites. The remaining few will relocate in the coming months.
WestConnex M4-M5 Link
Exhibition of the M4-M5 Link Modification report

The M4-M5 Link Modification was on public exhibition from 12 September – 26 September 2018.

41 submissions were received by the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) for consideration.

A submissions report responding to each submission has been submitted to DPE.

The Modification is currently under review by DP&E and we expect a determination to be reached in December 2018 or January 2019.
Property Impact Assessment Panel update

Condition of Approval E109:

The Proponent must establish an Independent Property Impact Assessment Panel before works that have the potential to result in property impacts commence...

The Panel will be responsible for independently reviewing Condition Survey Reports undertaken under Conditions E105 and E106, the resolution of property damage disputes, and the establishment of ongoing settlement and vibration monitoring requirements.…

Either the affected owner or the Proponent may refer unresolved disputes arising from potential and/or actual property impacts to the Panel for resolution. All costs incurred in establishing and implementing the Panel must be borne by the Proponent regardless of which party makes a referral to the Panel.

RMS is currently in the process of selecting this panel, which will review Condition Survey Reports undertaken by both the LSB JV and the Rozelle Interchange contractor.
City West Link

**Upcoming Milestones**

- Project complete - early 2019
- Currently undertaking noise assessments within the project area
WestConnex CRGs

2019 meeting schedule

• RMS commits to at least eight meetings in 2019.

• RMS is in the process of securing a chairperson for these meetings.

• Negocio Resolutions is completing a review of the 2018 meetings to help inform the operation of the CRGs moving forward.

• M4 East opens in early 2019, reducing construction impacts in this corridor.

• Potential opportunity to consolidate into two groups, to provide consistency over the coming years of construction and maximise the time that community representatives have with project directors responsible for work in their community. For example:
  • Representatives from Haberfield, St Peters and Glebe/Camperdown (focussing on M4 East, New M5 and M4-M5 Link Tunnels)
  • Representatives from Lilyfield, Rozelle and Balmain (focussing on Rozelle Interchange and Iron Cove Link)

Potential dates for 2019 – pending location availability:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haberfield, St Peters, Leichhardt, Glebe and Camperdown</th>
<th>Lilyfield, Rozelle and Balmain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 March</td>
<td>26 February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 May</td>
<td>7 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 August</td>
<td>6 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 November</td>
<td>5 November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>