

From: [BBACA Chairperson](#)

To: ryan@urbisjhd.com

Cc: [BBACAemail](#)

Sent: Tuesday, August 15, 2006 11:38 PM

Subject: SYDNEY PORTS COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Dear Dr Ryan,

I have been notified by Ms Kamini Parashar that I may apply for selection on the Community Consultative Committee for Sydney Ports Corporation.

I have received an Information Pack which includes an Application Form, Terms of Reference, Participation Protocol, Selection Process, Conditions of Approval for the Project, EIS Summary, and Brochure.

I am responding as chairperson of the Botany Bay and Catchment Alliance(BBACA) and as coordinator of a local group, Botany Bay Explorers.

BBACA is an alliance of 31 groups located within the Botany Bay Catchment - from La Perouse to Campbelltown. The Alliance was formed out of the Botany Bay Program which was a joint project of the Department of Environment and Heritage and the Southern Sydney Region of Councils. All the members of the executive are volunteers.

Members of BBACA have contributed thousands of volunteer hours in research surrounding the Sydney Ports Proposal to physically expand Port Botany. We have attended and presented at the Upper House Inquiry into Ports and at the Commission of Inquiry. For the Commission of Inquiry a number of us gave detailed presentations and we also engaged the services of an ecologist to present on the ecological impacts of the proposal. The 2 community members of the Department of Planning Committee charged with developing a Strategy for Botany Bay, are members of our Alliance.

The report of the Commissioner recommended against the Sydney Ports proposal and stated: **"Port Botany is clearly limited as to its ultimate physical expansion by the third runway and by environmental impacts. It simply does not have the potential to be expanded in a similar way to the Port of Melbourne or the Port of Brisbane."**

The environmental impacts of the Port extend beyond the immediate communities. The opportunity costs affect the whole state. Externalities and cross subsidies have not been evaluated, nor has the full cost of the supporting infrastructure.

An immediate environmental impact will be seen in Penrhyn Estuary. There is so little confidence in success of what Sydney Ports calls its 'Enhancement' that the Minister's determination has already signalled that Green Offsets/Biobanking is firmly on the Agenda.

This is from the Minister's determination for Port Botany development.

"B2.32 PENRHYN ESTUARY HABITAT ENHANCEMENT PLAN -
ALTERNATIVE COMPENSATORY
HABITAT OPTIONS

The applicant is required to identify, in consultation with DEC, appropriate compensatory conservation projects for funding that are consistent with the Green Offsets paper prepared by DEC(EPA, 2002). The identification of suitable projects and funding arrangement would need to be decided on, prior to dredging works or construction works commencing within Penryhn Estuary.

Note: The rationale to this condition is that the Applicant has committed to evaluation of the Stage 1 habitat enhancement works. If it is determined in consultation with DEC that the works have not been successful and that further works would also be unlikely to be successful, the Applicant would then be required to provide funding for compensatory conservation outcomes that are consistent with the Green offsets paper prepared by the DEC(EPA,2002)"

Remember we are talking about habitat for birds, such as Little Terns, which are protected under international agreements signed by the Federal Government.

The recent Finlay and Gillespie report recommending Sydney Ports preferred terminal design considered 44 documents, many of which were submitted to the Commission of Inquiry. Material that was submitted by community groups, including BBACA, was not considered.

We have no confidence in the process:

Firstly, the Minister has overruled the Government's Commission of Inquiry

Secondly, Findlay and Gillespie ignored community input to the Commission of Inquiry in framing their report on the 5th berth.

Thirdly, the guidelines under which the Community Consultative Committee will operate are unacceptable.

For Community Consultation to achieve a level of legitimacy the process must be responsive to community members. In the process outlined, there is no provision for alternate members to attend meetings and there is no provision for observers.

I attend community consultation meetings organised by Orica. At each and every one of these meetings anyone can attend. When it came to the appointment of a new chairperson of one of the Consultative Committees, nominees were interviewed by the committee. There are shortcomings in the process but efforts are made to engage as widely as possible. And there is an expression of appreciation and understanding that the community are

negatively impacted by Orica operations. We have observed some positive cultural change.

Ms Parashar states in her letter that 'the objective of the selection will be to secure participants who have a range of views and experience in community processes and can offer a diversity of perspective on the project.' This is restated in the body of the 'Information Pack' where the following is added: "The involvement of these members in the Committee will result in a better outcome for the project." How can you be confident that your selection will yield a 'better outcome' but moreover how do you define 'better outcome'?

There will be no better outcome for the windsurfers, the canoeists, those who throw in a line at Penrhyn Jetty, the seagrass, the pelicans, etc. It just isn't possible. Anyone who has read the 17kg EIS is fully aware of that.

Dr Ryan, you state on the urbis JHD website that 'proposals should compliment, and not compete, with existing communities'. This statement can only hold up if you define communities as those composed of individuals or companies who stand to profit from this expansion. Indeed, it has been said to me by people who have read the Information Pack that 'what they really want are people to help them build their monstrosity.'

I live close to the Port. I am involved in my local community. Amongst some of my activities, I contribute an Environmental news insert to the local community newsletter. The local group I coordinate undertakes Sydney Water Streamwatch Testing. I coordinate seagrass monitoring. I'm a volunteer for Wires and for Fisheries and I take guided walks in the area for the CSIRO Double Helix club. And as I stated previously, I engage in Community Consultation forums. But I will not be applying to your Community Consultative Committee and BBACA will not be lending its name to this flawed process.

Of course, that is not to suggest for one moment that BBACA is not vitally interested in the Port development. We are very interested in both the development and the committee. We will follow the workings of the committee through the minutes which Sydney Ports will publish on their website. And we will engage in other forums.

BBACA is very disappointed that Sydney Ports Coporation is not prepared to engage in genuine Community Consultation. Sydney Ports Corporation has the full backing of the Premier, NSW Treasury and a Planning Minister prepared to overrule the Government's own Commission of Inquiry, and yet it doesn't have the confidence to engage with the people it so severely impacts in what could be an open and transparent forum.

With Regards,

Lynda Newnam
Botany Bay and Catchment Alliance
chairperson@botanybay.info
www.botanybay.info

PROTECTING ENVIRONMENT= PROTECTING PEOPLE

