

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PAC Enquiries Mailbox](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Attn: David & Robert / Re: Moorebank
Date: Saturday, 2 December 2017 8:09:01 PM
Attachments: [EMAIL_NEXT-01.png](#)
[PAC_2018.pdf](#)

Dear David

As per our telephone conversation on Friday Nov 24th.
Please see the attached letter below addressed to the Chair requesting a postponement of the Dec12th Meeting.

As discussed then: with yet another new set of commission members assigned to review this project, it is important to point out that members of our community have been engaged with these projects in one guise or another for over seven years, and for some, that number is over ten years. The upcoming referrals will be the third interaction with the Planning and Assessment Commission, which does not count the multitude of emails and phone calls, above and beyond; or about the Public Meetings held.

We are a strong [federally created] community with professional and vocational expertise relevant to this project and industry. Including but not limited to residents who have been transport workers through to traffic modellers, with decades of collective theoretical knowledge and on boots on the ground know how. Many have lived in and around the area for 20 plus years, and yet at every turn the community has been given little regard and ignored despite clear credential and authority on the subject matter. Effectively treated as uninformed “nimby’s” and repeatedly disqualified by our purported “self-interest”: a truly flabbergasting, upside down, back-to-front pathway for public policy.

Seven years in with one’s incredulity beyond description, it multiplies still more, when in sharp contrast it appears par for course that the public good, public health and environmental health and sustainability are forced to take a back seat to the self-interest of politicians chasing the next election or powerful benefactors chasing the next public/private monopoly. With such phenomena taking place in a climate of charged political ideology, whereby career academics fear for their jobs and abandon scientific method or abandon public service altogether – we have cause to be deeply concerned by “box-ticking” exercises.

Far too many times over the past 5 years, the publicly made political talking points attached to this project, supplied by its proponents, expose the very hypocrisy described herein. Much of the public relations spin utilised, has been founded on knowing falsehoods and regurgitated by elected representatives.

In this context it is difficult to see how 10min speeches [from 30 plus residents for example] are given sufficient and appropriate weight. Nor is it easy to reconcile how one public meeting can compete with multiple private meetings PAC undertakes with proponents without an open audience or opportunity for redress . This PAC can correct this time round by ensuring community stakeholders are invited to all site / follow up visits.

Independent of seeing fault with the process or its determinations; it is essential that the impacted community be given every chance to engage with the process and its life changing outcomes.

Thus we to ask that you postpone the December 12th Public Meeting to a more appropriate time, in early 2018, and or when the delegation for the cumulative adjacent project is made.

Sincerely

**RESIDENTS
AGAINST
INTERMODAL
DEVELOPMENT
MOOREBANK**

ERIK RAKOWSKI
SECRETARY +
COMMUNICATIONS

[REDACTED]
www.raidmoorebank.org

PAC MEETING DECEMBER 12th

25.11.2017

Moorebank Intermodal Precinct East Stage 2 & Concept Plan Modification 2 - D495/17

Dear Commission Chair Lynelle Briggs and Delegation Chair Annabelle Pegrum AM

We write to ask that you postpone the December 12th Public Meeting to a more appropriate time, in early 2018, and or when the delegation for the cumulative adjacent project is made. In support of this request we ask that you each consider this briefly itemised list of macro and micro factors.

- **Planning and Assessment Commission does not have any statutory requirement on timeframe** for undertaking public meeting[s] and or assessment. Advised by PAC staff.
- **Land & Environment Court – Merits Appeal of PAC Determination for Stage 1 SSD 6766.** Court Proceedings took place 25th – 27^h October and a judgement is not expected from Commissioner Dixon before Christmas. Whatever the outcome it will have direct impact on this referral. Therefore proceeding now would be premature.
- **The Department of Planning and Environment has only referred 2 of the 4 “precinct” applications**, while it waits on “more information required” for assessing the cumulative adjacent project across the road. This runs counter to PAC’s 2014 report which states: *“The Commission is disappointed that the recommended master plan for the site was never undertaken, particularly as there are now two competing proposals causing both uncertainty and alarm in the community about the cumulative impacts should both proceed.”* Therefore proceeding now without the capacity to assess cumulative impacts lacks necessary diligent best practice and contradicts PAC’s own perspective.
- **The \$3.4 Million Dollar Traffic Network Study conducted by the RMS has not been supplied or made public.** This study was confirmed as existing in Sept 2016 and confirmed as complete in Oct 2017 Not providing it to the Community, the DPE’s Independent Consultant or to PAC contradicts Aurecon’s recommendation in 2015 *“It is considered that this modeling must be completed as a matter of urgency and with maximum transparency, so that the Planning approvals process can progress effectively”*. Proceeding now without access to this study – for all stakeholders – would fundamentally undermine this PAC process and any future determinations.



- **Allowing only three weeks to review a further [approx.] 2000 pages across almost 40 documents is not realistic.** To read and compare this new information to one's own previous submissions and the 3500+ previous pages of technical reports, associated with these modifications, and then formulate a speech or submission is near impossible. To proceed now without providing sufficient time for the public to review the required reading, is to confirm that genuine engagement and comment is not sought.
- **During the two previous processes "Response to Submissions" were publically available on the DPE Major Project website for months prior to referral and setting a public meeting.** This allowed the public to comment further on RtS, while this time round only Government Agencies were asked to comment [concurrent with L&E Merits Appeal].
- **Conducting just one meeting or in other words soliciting a single 5-10 minute speech to cover 4 applications relating to "Australia's Largest Intermodal Facility is also problematic.** While this would be preferable to splitting the applications into two separate processes, it is still not a responsible course of action. Four connected / consecutive meetings would be the better solution, and or an extended deadline for written submissions for those whom cannot take time off work.
- **Expecting the general public to take time off work or study at this crucial period of the year, with only three weeks notice is also unrealistic.** The short turnaround is further complicated by the 'silly season' as many rush to meet deadlines and targets before the holidays hit. Thereby restricting numbers and attendance due to scheduling not interest level.
- **9:30am on a Tuesday.** As an aside the location in Liverpool is much better than Bankstown for the last PAC, but worse than holding it in Wattle Grove for the first PAC. It has previously been suggested that the PAC considers undertaking a series of meetings from 2pm to 8pm to consider the community stakeholders and audience. Of course such action would be based on the number of registered parties, but as already stated the time and location can have a retarding effect on registration numbers. This final point is offered as a suggestion for how it might conduct the hopefully postponed meeting.

RAID

RESIDENTS
AGAINST
INTERMODAL
DEVELOPMENT
MOOREBANK

SPEECH – INTRODUCTION

DEC 2017

Good Morning – Madam Chairperson Annabelle Pegrum and Commission Members Peter Duncan and Steve O’connor – Welcome to Liverpool.

I rise today to speak on behalf of Residents Against Intermodal Development Moorebank and the wider community: a community with professional and vocational expertise relevant to this project and industry. Including but not limited to residents who have been transport workers through to traffic modellers, with decades of collective theoretical knowledge and on boots on the ground know how.

I also rise today to speak on behalf of my mother who has to work and cannot be here today. Like 8000 others she bought land and built a house in wattle grove for its location and lifestyle. She did so safe in the fact that the defence force promised there would only ever be low impact long-term storage activities at the sites adjacent. For a single parent family with no intergenerational wealth the sad reality is the family home represents my mother’s superannuation. Unwilling to be forced out by these projects my mother’s future is at risk.

Lastly I rise today to speak for myself as lifetime resident of South West Sydney and a Resident of Wattle Grove for 21 years. With 7 years experience in the transport industry and having retrained as a designer I have a strong interest genuine solutions for real problems. So I thank you for this opportunity to raise issues not heard, not considered or not addressed.

Candidly I must reiterate the deep frustration at having this process again scheduled in and around Christmas, this time with only 3 weeks notice. It is the reason why there are 14 speakers not 40. With only 3 weeks to review and respond to 1900 pages, on top of 3500 pages in the original applications, concise comments will have to be supplied in written submission.

Beyond frustration there is genuine anger and disillusion in the community. Almost into our 8th year opposing these projects it is clear that political brinkmanship is the sole reason this white elephant has achieved its current status. This assessment is supported by two further written submissions that should be supplied to you within the week.



Roughly 200 pages long these submissions are based on federal and state policies and papers and that of their respective agencies. A significant portion is drawn directly from the proponent's own applications in concert with other independent academic studies.

With your indulgence I will use what time I have to briefly touch on some condensed points from these submissions to provide some context for them and support other presentations you hear to today and any other submissions you receive through the week.

RAID

RESIDENTS
AGAINST
INTERMODAL
DEVELOPMENT
MOOREBANK

SPEECH – FREIGHT POLICY

DEC 2017

Almost 18 years since Eastern Creek and Moorebank Intermodals entered the planning zeitgeist;
Almost 14 years since private interests and political party benefactors pushed for Moorebank;
Almost 9 years since the opposite party, under political instruction, put forward another adjacent and competing project across the road and almost 8 years since the Moorebank Project Office was formally announced, and far too many have lost sight of the true public policy goal, it is has been buried in process and hidden behind guidelines and greed.

As at 2005, when the Freight Industry Advisory Board produced its one and only report, the rail freight share was assessed at:

2005	Rail Share: 19%	Target: 40% by 2011
2010	Rail Share: 14%	Target: 28% by 2020
2015	Rail Share: 12 ~ 14%	Target: Dropped - N/A

In ARTC's Freight Strategy of October 2015 it states that: *"More recent strategy documents have not restated this objective but have reiterated the importance of rail as an element of government policy."*

This is where the rhetoric around Moorebank breaks down.

RAID

RESIDENTS
AGAINST
INTERMODAL
DEVELOPMENT
MOOREBANK

SPEECH – FIRST PRINCIPLE JUSTIFICATIONS

DEC 2017

If you have been told Moorebank fulfils government policy you have been misled

- **Moorebank IMT cannot increase Sydney's rail freight mode share.** Only rail capacity infrastructure projects at Port Botany and across the MFN and listed by the ARTC, are relevant to this task. This is made abundantly clear in NSW Ports reporting, which states that throughput at Port is limited to 1,000,000 TEU p.a. even after upgrades. Further study of the ARTC Strategy shows that the natural growth at existing terminals and the announcement of Villawood will put Sydney intermodal capacity at almost 2Mil **and that's without Moorebank**. Conversely building Moorebank IMT will in fact retard the SSFL thereby undermining the billion-dollar rail project. Forcing the need to duplicate the SSFL, a project that has been nominated by the NSW Govt.

If you have been told Moorebank will reduce congestion at Port Botany you have been misled

- **Moorebank IMT cannot reduce current congestion at Port Botany.** In 2030, the governments modelling produced by Parsons Brinkerhoff, indicates that there will be 4608 trucks accessing or leaving Port Botany. This is an increase of 2346 trucks from 2018 levels. Therefore; even if 1507 trucks are successfully transplanted to Moorebank, an extra 745 trucks will still be attempting to access Port Botany; Foreshore Rd, General Holmes and the M5 East. As such can one conclude that building any Intermodal, anywhere in Sydney cannot strictly improve congestion at Port Botany; only opening up Port of Newcastle and Port Kembla can portside and landside congestion.

If you have been told Moorebank will reduce road freight congestion you have been misled

- **Moorebank IMT cannot reduce road freight on Sydney's congested road network,** in point of fact it increases congestion. It effectively transplants the road freight to a different heavily congested section of the road network. Upgrades to which, have not been costed into any business case created to date. This fact is quickly discernible from applicant's own statements: 3000 trucks removed at Port Botany, to create a minimum of 8160+ trucks at Moorebank.



If you have been told Moorebank will cut 3000 trucks off the M5 you have been misled

- **Moorebank IMT cannot remove trucks that do not exist.** There are not currently 3000 trucks travelling to Moorebank nor will there ever be. Based on 2018 demand / journeys – pg 18 of Part G of Appendix E of the Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment; Table 3.2 titled “Daily Truck Movements – Round Trips”, the real world best-case ‘road to rail’ mode shift offered by an intermodal facility at Moorebank is only 10% or 292 of the claimed 3000 trucks, the rest will be double handled.

If you have been told Moorebank will meet future demand you have been misled

- **Moorebank IMT cannot service demand that does not exist.** A build and they will come philosophy is fuzzy logic that ignores the reality of market demand. The TTIA numbers of 148 round trips or 292 trucks represents only **6.5% of all Port Botany Road Freight** in 2018. Independent modelling using NSW BTS Statistics factored out to 2031, inclusive of West Connex puts the trips past the **toll plaza at 6.7%** with demand of containerised freight in Moorebank / Liverpool at only 0.1 to 0.6% of all Port Botany Road Freight. In part because the growth market is in and around Eastern Creek where demand is expected to reach 30% or more by 2031.

If you have been told Moorebank will only have a minimal impact on the transport network you have been misled

- **Moorebank IMT does NOT represent 3% impact of local and regional traffic network.** Instead the aforementioned TTIA report specifically states that the increase in peak heavy vehicle impact is 57.72% and the average peak across 24 hours is 19.5%. This is because almost 80% of the 8000+ trucks generated by a terminal at Moorebank simply re-join the road network to head north toward Eastern Creek to meet market demand.

If you have been told Moorebank will reduce traffic accidents you have been misled

- **Moorebank IMT cannot reduce accidents and associated costs.** Government Bureaucrats have made the audacious claim that the Container Terminal would reduce accidents and save millions of dollars from reduced accidents. This is not supported by fact or experience. SIMTA's own studies show that between one 5 year study (2004-2009) and the next 5 year study (2009-



2013) the number of Heavy Vehicle Crashes went up about 20% and the number of injuries went up almost 20%. One can assume the potential human cost and fiscal costs have also risen over the past 4 years and likely to take another 20%-60% bump if Moorebank IMT is built. Moreover any gains made on Foreshore Rd and General Holmes Dr. will be swallowed up by the losses on the M5 and the Hume Hwy. The first being a traffic blackspot almost 40 x RMS guidelines and the second being the No.1 accident hotspot in NSW in 2014.

If you have been told Moorebank will reduce emissions you have been misled

- **Moorebank IMT would not reduce emissions; in reality it would generate more emissions than it could ever remove.** The most recent TTIA reports, "...the 'Project Case' results in a reduction of articulated truck [VKT] vehicle kilometres travelled of **36,185.**" Yet by applying Deloitte's nominal average round trip of 30km the actual [VKT] Vehicle Kilometres Travelled for 8160 trucks generated by the project is **122,400.** 3 to 4 times more than the terminal is projected to remove. Furthermore the 36,000km figure is an unlikely projection as it assumes all 1,050,000 TEU will be successfully railed out of Port Botany directly to Moorebank, a prospect already proven to be impossible at the first hurdle – the port itself.

If you have been told Moorebank will create 6800 jobs you have been misled two fold

- **Moorebank IMT will waste 100's hectares of riverfront land and create a huge jobs deficit.** Based on applicants' own reports and assessments of the twin intermodals the realistic best-case scenario; may produce 1700 to 2400 jobs [32.4% Unskilled, 49.4% Vocational Certificate, 18.2% Tertiary Qualifications]. 4000 to 5000 less than the inflated projection of 6800 and considerably less high value employment. In turn this is significantly less than plans initiated by LCC in 2003; and astronomically less than alternative uses would generate now in 2017; such that one can surmise Moorebank IMT would steal away the opportunity to create 15,000 to 50,000 more jobs for Liverpool and South West Sydney.

Any one of these nine points is sufficient cause to knock this project on the head and start again where the project is better placed. And still there is one misdirection that may be worse than all the rest – the fiscal cost to the local, state and federal taxpayer.



The symmetry is breathtaking: a project that has been touted as representing \$9 to \$11 billion in economic benefit over 30 years will instead cost over \$11 billion in real money over 30 years. And still the project is incapable of even the smallest dint in current congestion at Port Botany.

There is not sufficient time in this setting to walk you through the government's own traffic, employment and economic reports. Thus I make the empathetic request that you take follow up meetings to review the big picture and the granular detail.

SPEECH – DIESEL LOCOMOTIVES

DEC 2017

TO BE CLEAR WE ARE NOT OPPOSED TO RAIL FREIGHT

In fact we would support it wholeheartedly if there were emissions standards for Diesel Locomotives.

However according to a report by Environ in March 2013 for the NSW EPA, there are no emission standards anywhere in the country. As such there is no way to quantify and assess the impact of Diesel Locomotives and their emissions, specifically the noxious particulates PM2.5 and PM10. It follows then that there are no standards for measurement and data collection and no way to set relevant conditions or enforce compliance trigger points. Truly this is a glaring oversight.

One missed by all levels of government and their respective agencies.

At “full build” Moorebank Intermodal [2025-30] is projected to solicit 300 train movements a week, to and from Port Botany. Beginning with 10 per day it will become 2 every hour by 2025. It is unclear at this time how many interstate trains would add to the early daily number. Based on NSW Ports reporting of daily trains movements, this one project could effectively account for a **250% increase in diesel locomotives in the Sydney Metro Area**. The overall cumulative impact is unknown as the increase cannot factor in planned growth for movements to existing terminals or the announcement of expansion at Chullora and Enfield Intermodals and an Intermodal at Villawood, which all travel the one freight line through Sydney.

As already detailed it is unlikely that there will be capacity on the rail freight network for Moorebank to solicit 10 trains let alone 42 trains per day. Nevertheless it is incredibly irresponsible, bordering on negligent to approve Moorebank or any other intermodal project or expansion without any knowledge or application of standardised measurement and assessment of carcinogenic emissions. Conducting assessment and planning in this manner is counter to World Health Organisation Recommendations, the NEPM's and the State's Clear Air for NSW Policy Paper.

Frankly the absence of this data point undermines all previous assessments, determinations and consents, such that rescinding them and starting again is the best option. At a minimum we ask the Commission to consider how it will add appropriate conditions to the Concept, Stage 1 or Stage 2.

RAID

RESIDENTS
AGAINST
INTERMODAL
DEVELOPMENT
MOOREBANK

SPEECH – MODIFYING A CONCEPT

DEC 2017

Written submissions will articulate more than these three foundational considerations.

To understand why each of is worthy of your review and why each is more relevant than ever, is to understand that **the applicant** is choosing to go back to beginning. **It is the applicant** that wishes to change the concept rather than strictly present how it plans to meet the conditions set down in the original 2014 determination. By doing so the applicant is requiring that all stakeholders including the DPE, the PAC and the impacted community, to not only review how the particular modifications stack up against the original elements, but also how this new revision stacks up to the project and conditions as a whole.

Likewise, not only is it vital to compare and contrast the changes and their impacts on the MPE Concept, Stage 1 and Stage 2, it is the PAC's own recommendation that demands a cumulative process is followed and all evaluations are undertaken from a precinct wide perspective.

To that end the importation of 2.2 million cubic metres of dirt via 350 to 450,000 dump truck and dogs is an astronomical change. Under Section 79 of the Act one has to seriously question the suitability of the site and perhaps more importantly in the cumulative context: under Section 96A one quickly comes to the conclusion that the modifications do not pass the significantly same test. Putting aside the issue of non-existent dust suppression or even the providence of the dirt, adding that many trucks to local and regional road network over a two-year period is hugely significant. Even more so, when one realises that this number of additional trucks was never modelled in the original concept.

Like us, this project has been dumped in your lap just before Christmas and like us you are being told what to think about it – with draft conditions already written up for you – waiting for you to sign on the dotted line. 100s if not 1000s of people before you ought to have made better decisions and curtailed the influence of politics on planning.

We see no reason for you to follow their lead. Instead we ask you to set your own scope, follow the PAC's own recommendations and review the whole project, the whole precinct and how it relates back to integrated land use planning, environmental protections, freight policy and fiscal cost.

RAiD

RESIDENTS
AGAINST
INTERMODAL
DEVELOPMENT
MOOREBANK

SPEECH – CONSENT + COMPLIANCE

DEC 2017

From both the cumulative and singular perspective, there is a concern that the applicant does not have standing to submit any modification, as all previous consents are in fact defunct, due to non-compliance with conditions. I refer you to the original conditions of consent, specifically limits of approval 1.6 and 1.7. Therein is a clear restriction “*not to exceed the capacity of the transport network, including the local, regional and State road network.*”

Modelling undertaken by SIMTA was first exhibited for its initial proposal in 2012. The proposal was re-exhibited in 2013 and then went to the Planning and Assessment Commission in 2014. It has been well established that this modelling is faulty. Put simply the use of HCM 2000 [1 volume] instead of the HCM 2010 [4 volume] undermines the methodology, conclusions and extrapolations made.

Therefore the aforementioned modelling was not to standard and was not fit-for-purpose; it was not acceptable for the purpose of an independent PAC deliberation and determination. Accordingly the conceptual consent for MP10_1903 ought be vacated.

From the point of conditional conceptual approval Moorebank Intermodal Company and SIMTA engage in a muddled process whereby cumulative traffic assessments were undertaken by MIC and its consultant. This in turn makes it hard to interpret or apply 1.7.

How is it the Commission would restrict throughput on one project to 250,000 TEU with the option to double up to 500,000 TEU **after** monitoring operation at 250,000 TEU. Only to give away another 250,000 TEU to a parallel but separate project right across the road? How is that not a contradiction? How is that not a contravention of the Commissions own conditions?

To remedy any misunderstanding and prevent any future confusion it would be of great utility to know exactly how the DPE and or the PAC interprets and expects to enforce its own conditions assigned to MP10_0193. It is also of specific importance to know exactly how the DPE and or the PAC interprets and expects to enforce its own conditional consents for SSD 6766 & 5066.



For instance are they:

- Two competing consents for the same 250,000 TEU
- Two concurrent consents that add up to 500,000 TEU total
 - With two separate frameworks for compliance?
- One cumulative consent that add up to 500,000 TEU total
 - With one combined framework for compliance?
- One single consent with one single Stage 1 cap of 250,000 TEU
 - With one combined framework for compliance?

With regard to SSD 6766 and 5066 according to Aurecon the independent consultant for the DPE: the Federal Government's consultant, Parsons Brinkerhoff, identified in one of its reports [in 2011]; that in order to assess both the local and regional impacts, three levels of modeling would be employed, including strategic modeling, micro-simulation modeling, and intersection modeling. However, by the time of the EIS [2014], the TTIA did not include micro-simulation modeling, and instead relied on SIDRA intersection modeling, with inputs from the STM.

Thus a critical method identified in 2011 is missing from all traffic studies submitted in 2014 and resubmitted in 2015. Only after a second try at Response to Submissions does the applicant agree to produce and supply micro-simulation modelling, which it already knew was required. The applicant also conceded to produce and supply mesoscopic modelling as well. A clear indication that the applicant was aware of the flaws in its own modelling.

On this point alone the traffic modelling supplied to the DPE and PAC for their deliberation was and is incapable of meeting the standard set out in the conditional approval of MP10_0193. This is cause enough to vacate the consents for SSD 6766 and SSD 5066.

RAID

RESIDENTS
AGAINST
INTERMODAL
DEVELOPMENT
MOOREBANK

SPEECH – ASSESSMENT + CONDITIONS

DEC 2017

As compliance and enforcement is the role of the DPE, it would appear that the Department, the Secretary and perhaps even the previous Minister have failed both the Commission and our Community, by not listening to us and not interrogating past traffic modelling appropriately.

There was much hope of a correction after members of the community met with the Department in March. But having now referred one part of the precinct, in isolation, the department appears to be breaking with its own recommendations for a cumulative approach, and may be compounding its previous errors.

For this current assessment the Department has not used the same Traffic Consultant: Aurecon, it has not included Aurecon's report or other independent studies for review by the new consultant. Most concerning of all, it does not appear that the DPE has supplied the \$3.4 million dollar RMS Study to its consultant or to the Commission. Community Stakeholders not received a copy either in spite of the recommendation that *"this modeling must be completed as a matter of urgency and with maximum transparency, so that the Planning approvals process can progress effectively."*

Without access to this crucial modelling – that was to be the foundation of all traffic assessments, all road upgrade commitments and costing, you as members of the commission would be denied the opportunity to make an informed determination. This is of grave concern as the previous PAC determination was challenged in the Land & Environment Court in large part because the commission did not have access to crucial information.

Without it – local and regional communities cannot trust that the delegation has been able to truly assess the impacts of 100,000s of dump trucks traversing the M5 to import 2.2mil cubic metres of dirt from WestConnex. Potentially contaminated fill from WestConnex is also a scary prospect especially given that there is already PFAS contamination onsite and said contamination has been excluded from the Defence Departments investigation program.



Moreover with some if not all of the dirt being supplied by Westconnex at no cost there is a real danger of a conflict of interest. It is unclear how any state body could independently review a project in its jurisdiction when another department and or state government business enterprise is a contractual party to the project under review.

These and many other issues are too complex for this setting and require significant background reading – so what's next?

RAID

RESIDENTS
AGAINST
INTERMODAL
DEVELOPMENT
MOOREBANK

SPEECH – WHATS NEXT?

DEC 2017

With 8 years of research and development we have a well-matured well-considered alternative solution centred on better locations for this project and better projects for this location. We would be more than happy to share said solution as it marries up with NSW Governments Integrated Design Policy aptly name: Better Placed.

In this setting we would make a single recommendation:

Rescind the current twin SSD consents, and reject the current twin modifications and advise the Department, the Secretary, the Minister and Qube Logistics to begin work **on one single precinct wide SSD application**. One that is fully costed and incorporates all the elements that have been missed or deficient; specifically the appropriate Traffic Studies, Ecological Studies, Public Health Studies and Feasibility Studies of Rail / Noise redesign.

Lastly we make the following requests independent of whether you are willing or able to adopt our recommendation:

First: please take up the offer for follow up meetings. In fact as with most of the key stakeholders in the room today you could collect details and set meetings for the New Year or as needed. This would be consistent with the opportunity offered to the Applicants as they have taken multiple follow up meetings with the Commission through both of the previous PAC processes.

Second: please ensure that the next delegation of MPW is allocated to the same Commission Members and;

Third: please ensure that sufficient time is given between delegation, notification and schedule of the subsequent public meeting.

Thank you for you time and attention this morning.

I look forward to following up with each of you on any and all matters raised.