

# Meeting minutes

## WESTERN DISTRIBUTOR COMMUNITY LIAISON GROUP

Date:	6 October 2016	Time:	5.30 pm – 7.30pm
Place:	Maribyrnong Town Hall, 61 Napier St, Footscray VIC 3011	Meeting number:	Six
Chair:	Jim Williamson (JW)	Minutes:	Emily Dooley

### Attendees

Name	Membership	Name	Membership
Monique Perry (MP)	Concerned Locals of Yarraville (Proxy for Scott Ellerton)	Deidre Anderson (DA)	Maribyrnong City Council
Richard Smithers (RS)	City of Melbourne (Proxy for Emma Appleton)	Christine Harris (CH)	Spotswood
Dwayne Singleton (DS)	Altona	Stephen Zelez (SZ)	Hobsons Bay City Council
Steven Wilson (SW)	Friends of Stony Creek	Jenni Forrester (JF)	Project Team
Michael Ingram (MI)	Kensington, North and West Melbourne	Bruce Dawson (BD)	Project team
Greg Cain (GC)	VTA	Victoria Jessop (VJ)	Project team
Dave Jones (DJ)	RACV	Samantha Aitchison (SAI)	Project team
Philip Dearman (PD)	MTAG	Frank Fleeer (FF)	Project team
Jessica Christian-Franks (JCF)	Footscray	Gary West (GW)	Project team
Simon Birch (SB)	Spotswood	Jim Carden (JC)	Project team
Craig Rowley (CR)	LeadWest	Emily Dooley (ED)	Project team
Margaret O'Loughlin (MO)	Yarraville	Robin Miles (RM)	Facilitator
Geoff Mitchellmore (GM)	Friends of Kororoit Creek	Kathryn Friday (KF)	Chair - EES Technical Reference Group, DELWP

## Agenda items

Time	#	Item detail
5.35pm	1	Welcome, introductions and apologies
5.40pm	2	Address previous minutes and actions arising <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Document summarising CLG input – discuss and endorse</li><li>• Role of the CLG</li></ul>
6.00pm	3	<b>EES study profile – air quality</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Hear from Frank Fleer who is leading the Air Quality assessment for the WD EES. Frank will explain what is assessed, how it is assessed (including how air modelling works) and what to expect to see in the EES.</li><li>• Facilitated group discussion / questions</li></ul>
6.40pm	4	<b>WD community engagement update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Update on the WD ‘tour of the west’ which saw the project team visit suburbs from Werribee to Docklands. Hear about what’s been happening.</li></ul>
6.55pm	5	<b>Short presentations by members</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Craig Williams, Seddon</li><li>• Greg Cain, VTA</li></ul>
7.15pm	6	Suggested items for discussion by members <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• December site tour with presentations from members</li></ul>
7.20pm	7	Other items and feedback
7.25pm	8	Meeting action summary
7.30pm	9	Meeting close

## Minutes

#	Description
1	<b>Welcome, introductions and apologies</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• JW - noted any apologies</li><li>• JW - welcome to Victoria Jessop, Jenni Forrester and Frank Flier</li><li>• JW - notes Kathryn Friday the Chair of the EES Technical Reference Group from DELWP is here to observe</li></ul>
2	<b>Previous minutes and actions arising</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Record of actions completed from previous meeting</li><li>• No changes to previous minutes</li></ul> <b>Document summarising CLG input – discuss and endorse</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• JW – invites JC to discuss consolidated CLG summary document. Confirms there is an opportunity for members to provide an additional statement outlining their community's comments as relates to the project.</li><li>• JC – Outlines the purpose of the document and that it will be passed to tenders and specialists working on the EES specialist reports.</li><li>• JC – explained who would also receive the document other than tenders and EES specialists, for example, the Victorian State Government. Confirmed it is an important document for the Govt to read. The intention is to also place it on the CLG website page.</li><li>• JF – this document will also go to 17 specialists working on the EES and they are subject to confidentiality arrangements</li><li>• KF – the Technical Reference Group (TRG) would also like to see this document</li><li>• JC – explains how tenders will use the document. The document captures the topics of conversation had in CLG meetings to provide to tenders. They will read it and look at sections where they know the impact is quite high, and they can take note of the opportunities and concerns you have listed as a group in these areas</li><li>• DA – Noted that Council is in election caretaker mode, thus they cannot be attributed to this document in any way that states their position on this document</li><li>• RS – This is the same for COM – we could potentially remove all reference to Councils in the document</li><li>• JC – for now the document will go to tenders with a disclaimer next to council names and we will hold off publishing this online until election caretaker period has concluded.</li><li>• JC – asks group for comments on the content</li><li>• JCF – suggests a summary page for key themes the group agrees upon, also suggests some of the messaging is a little soft – words like “interested” should be changed to “concerns” where necessary</li><li>• CW – suggests health impact be made a topic of interest, feels as though it is lost in the document</li><li>• DA – lists minor addition to the document</li><li>• JC – states that the project team will recirculate the document tomorrow morning and they need feedback by midday at the latest to get it to tenders in time. It is also agreed upon that if all members do not endorse the summary page then it will not be included in the final document</li><li>• CR – could we also have a statement in there that lists the differences in perceptions of members? CR to see ED on this change</li></ul>
3	<b>EES study profile – air quality</b>

#	Description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• RM – provides background to FF and BD and their roles with the project</li><li>• Air quality specialists video plays to the group</li><li>• FF – provides the group with context and background on air quality and what factors influence the air we breathe.</li><li>• FF – talks about the objectives of the air quality study. They look at what air quality is like in the area and get a baseline for the project to compare against. The idea is to develop performance criteria for both ambient air quality and in-tunnel air quality</li><li>• FF – explains what performance requirements are and talks about examples of performance requirements for similar projects:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Tunnel ventilation system that meets best practice and design criteria requirements</li><li>– Zero portal emissions</li><li>– In-tunnel air quality requirements</li><li>– Undertake before/after ambient (outside) air quality monitoring program</li><li>– Undertake monitoring of in-tunnel air quality and take remedial action if standards exceeded</li><li>– During construction: comply with EPA Publication No. 480 <i>Guidelines for Major Construction Sites</i> to maintain air quality to a standard that does not prejudice the air quality of nearby residents, open spaces and community facilities</li></ul></li><li>• FF – outlines the legislation that the team needs to comply with</li><li>• FF – mentioned what pollutants will be assessed in the air quality study and explains the size of particles such as PM10 and PM2.5</li><li>• FF – explains how they use air quality modelling to predict future air quality levels. Surface roads and the tunnels are modelled separately. For the tunnel they will look at gridded and discrete sensitive receptors over a wide area, together with a worst case congested condition (three lanes). For both surface roads and tunnel modelling traffic volume predictions for 2022 and 2031 will be assessed.</li><li>• GW – explains that the tunnel is two lanes with a third lane that will only open in an emergency. The air quality specialists look at worst case scenarios such as congested traffic travelling on all three lanes 24 hours a day, which is highly unlikely</li><li>• FF – mentioned that vehicle fleet emissions also tend to improve over time, so we would expect to see a significantly better outcome. These models look at the percentage of passenger vehicles, light commercials, trucks and their respective emission factors</li><li>• FF – explains that EPA Victoria's regulatory model AERMOD is used to assess air emissions from tunnel ventilation structures. The model looks at gridded and discrete receptors such as kinder and schools. There is an outer 10 km x 10 km grid across the whole project, with an inner 3 km x 3 km grid spaced at 25 metres, so it doesn't matter whether all discrete receptors are included as they are considered anyway.</li><li>• FF - The model considers:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– topographical information</li><li>– meteorological data</li><li>– Background pollutant concentrations:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– EPA Footscray ambient air quality monitoring station - for PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub> and CO for 2009 to 2013</li><li>– EPA data for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylene isomers, formaldehyde, 1,3 butadiene and PAHs</li></ul></li><li>– traffic volume and mix projections</li><li>– vehicle emission factors</li></ul></li></ul>

#	Description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• DS – asks why is the Brooklyn monitoring station not included in the data</li><li>• BD –EPA requirement is that 5 years of consistent data is collected, and with Brooklyn site there is not 5 year’s worth of data. However, we have compared the Footscray data with Brooklyn, Francis St and Alphington data. The comparison with Alphington shows that background air quality across Melbourne doesn’t vary significantly.</li><li>• FF – states that it is unusual for us to model the number of roads we are modelling</li><li>• FF – explains what happens in a road tunnel with vehicle emissions</li><li>• FF – explains how we model surface roads</li><li>• PD – asks about the other roads that could be affected</li><li>• FF – explains that they will look at major changes to other roads in the west such as Buckley St, Moore St, Williamstown Rd and Hyde St etc. Anything that stands to have significant impacts</li><li>• FF – shows a visual which looks at an example output - 24 hour PM10 time series and explains this to the group</li><li>• FF – talks about the local air quality monitoring program, explaining that that we have worked with regulators to select five sites, which provide a representative sample of current air quality conditions across the project area. Not all stations are in place yet as it has been hard to get approvals etc.</li><li>• - presentation ends -</li><li>• RM – invites group to discuss the presentation in groups</li><li>• SW – asks what if it turns out worse than you predict?</li><li>• FF – modelling has a lot of conservative assumptions – explains that in his 35 years of consulting he has never been surprised by the monitoring results compared with the modelled predictions</li><li>• BD – adds that we have to ensure it meets regulations, so if that meant making modifications to the design then we would have to do this.</li><li>• GW – asks people to go to the CityLink website and look at the monthly air quality reports, in particular how far below the EPA licence limits the emissions are, due to the conservative nature of the predicted emissions</li><li>• JW – Makes statement that project team must look at widening of road in Brooklyn and the effect this will have on air quality. Brooklyn has historic issues that haven’t been adequately addressed by Government</li><li>• CW – asks if standards are in relation to a healthy adult – when you look at children they are more vulnerable than adults</li><li>• FF – states that standards are not based on a healthy adult, they are designed to protect the elderly, young and infirm.</li></ul>
4	<b>WD community engagement update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• RM – seeks agreement with group that one item on agenda needs to be carried over to next meeting. Group agrees to hear from CLG members and reschedule the engagement update for the next meeting.</li></ul>
5	<b>Short presentations by members</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>CW – Seddon</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Explains that they don’t form part of the project route but will be effected by any additional truck bans applied in Yarraville</li><li>– Main concern is health impacts, traffic redistribution onto local Seddon roads</li><li>– Has a background in radiography and sonography and hears about health issues all the</li></ul></li></ul>

#	Description
	<p>time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Concerns redistribution of trucks coming through Williamstown and Buckley St and more – potential increase in health impacts if there are no other measures in place here</li><li>– Also concerns about amenity loss – addition truck traffic will have direct effect on Victoria St the café community. It will become less appealing with trucks travelling along this 24hrs a day</li><li>– We have heard about air quality and health impacts - WHO has stated that there is no safe level of these pollutants</li><li>– is there something we can do to better air quality impacts from trucks, if it means looking at freight fleet is there some we can do to make it greener</li></ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• GW – This needs a holistic view – as a project we know there are air quality issues but this is bigger than the Western Distributor Project, however we are doing our best to look at this</li><li>• <b>GC - VTA</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Talks about VTA history, been around for 114 years and represents over 800 freight and logistics countries</li><li>– Important to understand that VTA are very much about trying to get productivity right and get supply chains right</li><li>– Keep in perspective the port and other areas contribute very much through our country – regionally and state based</li><li>– Want effectively managed traffic to avoid congestion, efficiency to and from the port is the main objective. Congestion and curfews are causing a major issue in production</li><li>– What to highlight that VTA are about productivity but we don't want to compromise on safety, compliance on safety is really high</li><li>– Big interest in the project is tolls and costs</li></ul></li><li>• GW – mentioned that the state is lucky to have Peter Anderson the CEO of VTA, as he recognises the importance of freight in community and he wants a solution to get freight away from community</li><li>• CR – there are 30,000 people working in the freight industry that live in the west and it is important that we look after these people</li></ul>
5	<p><b>Suggested items for discussion by members</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• JW – discusses next meeting, seeking agreement on 10 November with noise as a specialist area for discussion together with the engagement presentation</li><li>• JW – seeks agreement that December will be a site visit for the CLG and members can present at their location</li><li>• JW - raises CLG individual presentations and sought confirmation to set time aside at future meetings for members to make short presentations to explain their interest in the project.</li></ul>
6	<p><b>Meeting action summary</b></p> <p>Outlined below (page 7)</p>
7	<p>Meeting closed at 7.35pm</p>

## Actions

#	Action detail	Owner	Status
1	Provide a summary page within the consolidate CLG feedback to outline the five key themes that the CLG group is most interested in. CLG summary document to be recirculated and agreed upon by members	Secretariat	Complete
2	CLG summary document ism provided to tenderers and EES technical specialists for consideration	Secretariat	Complete

## Next meeting

Date:	Monday 7 November 2016
Time:	5.30pm – 7.30pm
Place:	Maribyrnong Town Hall
Chair:	Jim Williamson

Minutes prepared by: Emily Dooley

Minutes approved by: Jim Williamson



Approval signature

24/10/16

Approval date