

4 October 2017

# meeting minutes

<b>Meeting</b>	NorthConnex Air Quality Community Consultative Committee (AQCCC)	<b>Meeting No.</b>	2
<b>Location</b>	NorthConnex Boardroom Level 2, Building D 55 Coonarra Avenue, West Pennant Hills	<b>Date</b>	Tuesday 3 October 2017
<b>Independent Chair</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abigail Goldberg (minute taker)</li> </ul>		
<b>Committee members</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AQCCC community representative: Graham Strauss</li> <li>AQCCC community representative: Edward Caruana</li> <li>AQCCC community representative: David Avery</li> <li>AQCCC community representative: Paige Chowdhury</li> <li>Hills Shire Council representative: Daniel Giffney (Environmental Health Coordinator)</li> <li>Parramatta City Council representative: Stuart Pike (Team Leader, Health)</li> </ul>		
<b>In attendance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Todoroski Air Sciences: Aleks Todoroski (Air Quality Consultant)</li> <li>Roads and Maritime Project Manager: Sonja Shand</li> <li>NorthConnex Project Co. Environment Manager: Ryan Butler</li> <li>NorthConnex Communications and Stakeholder Manager: Damien Wilson</li> <li>NorthConnex Senior Communications and Stakeholder Advisor: Emily Frost</li> <li>Lendlease Bouygues Joint Venture Construction Director: Andrew Johnson</li> <li>Lendlease Bouygues Joint Venture Environment &amp; Sustainability Director: Grant Sainsbery</li> </ul>		
<b>Apologies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NorthConnex Project Co. Project Director: Daniel Banovic</li> <li>Hornsby Shire Council representative: Dr Ross McPherson (Chief Environmental Scientist)</li> <li>Ku-ring-gai Council representative: Anne Seaton (Manager, Compliance &amp; Regulation)</li> </ul>		

Item	Subject	Action
1.0	<p><b>Welcome and introductions</b></p> <p>The meeting was opened at 5:30pm. The Chair welcomed participants to the second meeting of the AQCCC, and invited participants to introduce themselves.</p> <p>Apologies were noted.</p>	
2.0	<p><b>Declaration of interests</b></p> <p>No interests were noted.</p>	

Item	Subject	Action
3.0	<p><b>Overview of work to date to identify locations for air quality monitoring stations</b></p> <p>The Chair introduced Aleks Todoroski, Air Quality Consultant. Andrew Johnson, JV Construction Director, outlined Mr Todoroski's credentials and brief. Mr Johnson also noted that comment on potential air quality monitoring station locations had been provided from the point of view of the JV team in the Memorandum circulated with the meeting agenda.</p> <p>Mr Todoroski spoke to his report 'North Connex Project: Recommended Ambient Air Monitoring Locations', 20 September 2017), as circulated with the meeting agenda. A brief overview of the principles applied to location selection was provided.</p> <p>Descriptions of potential locations were then provided for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Along road monitoring (one monitoring station required by the project conditions of consent).</li> <li>• Background monitoring (one monitoring station required).</li> <li>• Outlet monitoring South (two monitoring stations required).</li> <li>• Outlet monitoring North (two monitoring stations required).</li> </ul> <p>Particular reference was made to Table 5.1 in the Todoroski report, which summarises the recommended monitoring locations.</p>	
4.0	<p><b>Committee discussion on proposed locations of six ambient air quality stations</b></p> <p>A number of questions were raised by Community Representatives regarding recommended locations, including with regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design of the ventilation stacks and use of fans.</li> <li>• Response required in case of power failure.</li> <li>• Impacts of weather, including rain, on air particle dispersion.</li> <li>• Locational benefits in relation to housing and population density in various locations.</li> <li>• Locational benefits of sites used previously for EIS monitoring.</li> <li>• Impacts of vegetation on monitoring stations.</li> <li>• Impact of topography/slopes on pollution dispersion.</li> <li>• Implications of land being in private or public ownership. Particular issues regarding potential school locations.</li> <li>• Potential impact of major intersections on monitoring results.</li> </ul> <p>Technical requirements of monitoring stations were also discussed, with attention to the advantages and disadvantages of larger 'walk-in' monitoring stations, which are enclosed and air conditioned vs. smaller 'lean-to' stations that are not enclosed.</p> <p>Following discussion, there was agreement by Community Representatives to the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brickpit/ Golf driving range, Thornleigh for the 'along road' monitoring station.</li> <li>• Headen Sports Park for the 'background' monitoring station.</li> </ul> <p>With regard to the South monitoring stations, Community Representatives noted the challenges of the various listed location options, and noted that in addition to these options, there are a</p>	<p>Project team to note AQCCC agreement to locations for the 'along road' and 'background' monitoring stations.</p>

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>number of small parks where monitoring stations could potentially be located. No preference was expressed for any particular location, and the project team was invited to progress investigations into both the feasibility and technical advantages/disadvantages of all options.</p> <p>With regard to the North monitoring stations, Community Representatives noted the challenges of the various listed location options, and observed that there are not as many parkland options in the North as the South. Specific challenges related to the school were discussed, and advice was noted that the school is also now undergoing renovation, which could further inhibit available space as well as introducing dust and particulate matter to the site.</p> <p>No preference was expressed for any particular Northern location, and the project team was invited to progress investigations into both the feasibility and technical advantages/disadvantages of all options.</p> <p>It was suggested that the project team also consider whether there are location options on State owned land, e.g. RMS land. The RMS representative offered to assist with investigations into this.</p> <p>With regard to the type of monitoring stations (larger 'walk-in' vs. smaller 'lean-to'), Community Representatives agreed that this should be further considered in response to the characteristics of each location. No preference was expressed for either type.</p>	<p>Project team to further investigate options for location of South monitoring stations.</p> <p>Project team to further investigate options for location of North monitoring stations.</p> <p>Project team to consider location options on State owned land. RMS representative to assist with these investigations.</p> <p>Project team to advise further on type of monitoring station in response to location characteristics.</p>
5.0	<p><b>Other business</b></p> <p>No other business matters were raised.</p> <p>The Chair confirmed that, subject to the project team being able to progress their investigations, the next meeting would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5:30pm – 7:00pm on Tuesday 31 October 2017, at the same location.</li> </ul> <p>At this stage, Community Representatives noted that site visits were not likely to be needed, as Representatives are familiar with the areas and locations under consideration.</p> <p>The meeting was closed at 7:26pm.</p>	<p>Participants to diarise forthcoming meeting.</p>