

Chapter 5 Stakeholder and community consultation



Contents

	Page number
5. Stakeholder and community consultation	5-1
5.1 Consultation objectives and strategy	5-3
5.2 Consultation activities undertaken to date	5-3
5.2.1 Level of consultation	5-3
5.2.2 Agency and business/infrastructure stakeholder consultations	5-5
5.2.3 Community consultation	5-10
5.2.4 Indigenous stakeholder consultation	5-13
5.2.5 Biodiversity offsets strategy consultation	5-14
5.3 Summary of issues and concerns	5-14
5.3.1 Agency and business/infrastructure stakeholder issues and concerns	5-14
5.3.2 Community issues/concerns	5-15
5.4 Consultation: the next steps	5-20
5.4.1 Statutory exhibition of the EIS	5-20
5.4.2 Additional community and stakeholder engagement during the exhibition period	5-21
5.4.3 Future community engagement activities	5-22
5.4.4 Citizens' Jury	5-22
5.4.5 Future agency and businesses/infrastructure stakeholder consultations	5-23

List of tables

	Page number
Table 5.1 Relevant Commonwealth EIS Guidelines and NSW SEARs	5-1
Table 5.2 Key stakeholders and level of consultation undertaken	5-4
Table 5.3 Summary of agency and business/infrastructure stakeholder consultations	5-5
Table 5.4 Summary of community information sessions (October 2011)	5-12
Table 5.5 Summary of community information sessions (October and November 2013)	5-13
Table 5.6 Summary of key issues and concerns raised by the community	5-16

5. Stakeholder and community consultation

Chapter 5 provides an overview of the stakeholder and community consultation activities undertaken for the Moorebank Intermodal Terminal (IMT) Project (the Project) leading up to and during preparation of this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The findings and feedback from the stakeholder and communication activities are summarised in this chapter, including responses from the Project Team and the proponent (Moorebank Intermodal Company (MIC)). Planned consultation activities during exhibition of the EIS and future Project phases through to construction are also identified in this chapter.

The chapter and associated appendix (Appendix D in Volume 2) address the Commonwealth Department of the Environment (DoE)'s EIS Guidelines and the Secretary for the NSW Department of Planning & Environment (NSW DP&E)'s Environmental Assessment Requirements (NSW SEARs) as listed in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 Relevant Commonwealth EIS Guidelines and NSW SEARs

Requirement	Where addressed
Commonwealth EIS Guidelines under the Commonwealth <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act)</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outline the methodology that has been (or will be) adopted to identify and mitigate socio-economic impacts of the project and include a list of all persons, community groups, government agencies etc. the proponent has consulted (or proposes to consult). Include information about the consultation that has already taken place, and the results of such consultation (including the proponent's responses regarding how such feedback has been incorporated into the design, construction or operation of the action), and statement(s) outlining the views of the community groups that may be affected. 	<p>Socio-economic impacts are assessed in Chapter 24 – <i>Social and economic impacts</i>.</p> <p>The remaining requirements are covered in Chapter 5 (this chapter) and Volume 2, Appendix D.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DoE notes that this project has thus far received a high level of public interest and strongly encourages the development and implementation of a communication consultation plan describing the design, size, scale and staging of each option/development scenario of the varied proposal. DoE suggest that such a program be implemented as early as possible through the development of the EIS (i.e. prior to public exhibition of the draft EIS) to ensure that all affected stakeholders, particularly those that have previously commented on the proposal, and including but not limited to surrounding residents, businesses and other organisations are afforded ample opportunity prior to public exhibition to the draft EIS to familiarise themselves with the proposed changes. 	<p>Chapter 5 (this chapter) and Volume 2, Appendix D.</p> <p>MIC has developed a communication and consultation plan and further detailed consultation will occur as part of the EIS exhibition process.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The public consultation program must provide opportunities for community involvement and education. It may include interviews with individuals, public meetings, interest group meetings, production of regular summary information and updates, and other consultation mechanisms to encourage and facilitate active public consultation. It should ensure the timing and location of consultation activities best meets community needs. It may require the specific targeting of some groups to ensure their active involvement in the process. 	<p>Chapter 5 (this chapter) and Volume 2, Appendix D.</p>

Requirement	Where addressed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consultation process should aim to achieve extensive notification of the proposal in the local, city wide and regional print media, static displays in public venues e.g. Divisional Offices, libraries (including mobile libraries), State and Federal elected representative offices and local shopping centres. Information should also be provided in local community newsletters such as school and church bulletins. 	Section 5.2 (this chapter).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The public consultation process may cover all issues of concern to local community and interest groups and should extend from project planning through to operations. 	Sections 5.2 to 5.4 (this chapter).
NSW SEARs under the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act)	
<p>The Applicant must undertake a consultation programme as part of the EIS process, including consultation with, but not necessarily limited to the following parties:</p>	Chapter 5 (this chapter) and Volume 2, Appendix D.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> local, State or Commonwealth Government authorities, including the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Commonwealth Department of the Environment; > Environment Protection Authority; > Office of Environment and Heritage; > Transport for NSW; > Department of Primary Industries (Fisheries & Office of Water); > NSW Rural Fire Service; > NSW Health; > Sydney Ports Corporation; > Liverpool City Council; and > Campbelltown City Council. 	Section 5.2.2 (this chapter) and Volume 2, Appendix D.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> service and infrastructure providers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Roads and Maritime Services; > Australian Rail Track Corporation; > Sydney Trains; > Sydney Water Corporation; > Endeavour Energy; > Jemena; > Telstra; and > AGL Upstream Investments Pty Ltd. 	Section 5.2.2 (this chapter) and Volume 2, Appendix D.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> specialist interest groups, including Local Aboriginal Land Councils; and 	Consultation with Local Aboriginal Land Councils is detailed in Chapter 20 – <i>Aboriginal Heritage</i> .
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the public, including community groups and adjoining and affected landowners. 	Section 5.2.3 (this chapter) and Volume 2, Appendix D.
<p>The EIS must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrate effective consultation with stakeholders, and that the level of consultation with each stakeholder is commensurate with their degree of interest/concern or likely impact; 	Section 5.2, including Table 5.2 and section 5.2.4 (this chapter) and Volume 2, Appendix D.

Requirement	Where addressed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> clearly describe the consultation process undertaken for each stakeholder/group including details of the dates of consultation and copies of any information disseminated as part of the consultation process (subject to confidentiality); and 	Section 5.2 and section 5.2.4 (this chapter) and Volume 2, Appendix D.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> describe the issues raised during consultation and how and where these have been addressed in the EIS, including where the design of the development has been amended in response to these issues. Where amendments have not been made to address an issue, a short explanation should be provided. 	Section 5.3 (this chapter) and Volume 2, Appendix D.

5.1 Consultation objectives and strategy

A range of engagement activities has been used to inform stakeholders about the Project and to achieve the following consultation objectives:

- provide clear factual and timely information outlining the consultation and planning approval process;
- raise awareness of the purpose and results of the technical studies and proposed implementation;
- provide an opportunity for stakeholders to learn more about the Project;
- provide opportunities for stakeholders and/or the community to express views or concerns about the Project and its perceived benefits or impacts;
- provide a mechanism for issues to be addressed as they arise, including by ensuring that issues raised by stakeholders and/or the community are relayed to the Project team for consideration;
- build long-term relationships with stakeholder groups and work towards generating a deeper understanding of the Project;
- ensure a comprehensive and transparent consultation process; and
- work in cooperation with the relevant government agencies.

5.2 Consultation activities undertaken to date

5.2.1 Level of consultation

The level of consultation undertaken with stakeholders was reflective of the level of interest/concern shown by the stakeholders regarding the Project and its likely impacts. For those stakeholders with a high degree of interest in the Project – including key agencies such as DoE, NSW DP&E (previously the Department of Planning and Infrastructure), NSW Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH), Liverpool City Council (LCC) and the local community – face-to-face meetings were undertaken. For those stakeholders with a lesser degree of interest in the Project, consultation occurred mainly through email and phone communication during the investigation activities of the Project. Table 5.2 lists the key stakeholders and the level of consultation undertaken to date.

Table 5.2 Key stakeholders and level of consultation undertaken

Level of interest/ concern	Stakeholders	Level of consultation
Key regulators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoE • NSW DP&E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One-on-one meetings and briefings • Letters • Telephone and email communication
High level of interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local community and community groups • LCC • OEH • (NSW) Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) • Department of Defence (Defence) • ABB • Transport for NSW (TfNSW) consisting of Freight and Regional Development and NSW Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) • Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development (DoIRD) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community open days • One-on-one meetings and briefings • Letters • Briefings • Reference group for the health impact assessment • Telephone and email communication • Site visit to the Project site
Medium level of interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sydney Trains (formerly RailCorp) • Australian Rail Track Corporation (ARTC) • (NSW) Department of Primary Industries (DPI) • NSW Rural Fire Service • NSW Health • Infrastructure Australia • Sydney Ports (Corporation (SPC) • Campbelltown City Council (CCC) • Western Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils (WSROC) • Sydney Business Chamber • NSW Business Chamber • Australian Trucking Association • Australian Army Cadets • Local Aboriginal Land Councils and Registered Aboriginal Parties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One-on-one briefings • Telephone and email communication • Site visit to the Project site

Level of interest/ concern	Stakeholders	Level of consultation
Specific infrastructure interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sydney Water Corporation • Telstra • Endeavour Energy (formerly Integral Energy) • Optus • AAPT • Jemena • AGL • APA Group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Telephone and email communication • One-on-one meetings (with Sydney Water Corporation and APA Group) • Letters
Specific governmental interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSW Treasury • (NSW) Department of Premier & Cabinet (DPC) and Ministerial officers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One-on-one meetings

5.2.2 Agency and business/infrastructure stakeholder consultations

Table 5.3 lists the agency and business/infrastructure stakeholders that have been engaged at each key stage of the Project, and identifies the consultation undertaken with each stakeholder group. Dates of individual meetings, the issues raised and level of consultation undertaken are detailed further in Volume 2, Appendix D, along with copies of information disseminated (as appropriate).

Consultation for the Project has been undertaken by both MIC and its predecessors (as identified in Table 5.3). Prior to establishment of MIC in December 2012, the Commonwealth Department of Finance (DoF) was responsible for the Project through a dedicated Project team (the Moorebank Project Office (MPO)), and undertook the consultation activities associated with the investigation and planning for the Project.

Table 5.3 Summary of agency and business/infrastructure stakeholder consultations

Stakeholder group	Organisation	Consultation undertaken
Commonwealth Government	Defence	Meetings have occurred with Defence to provide briefings on the Project and its impact on Defence assets and interests. Meetings were held with Defence between August and September 2011 to discuss the relocation of the School of Military Engineering (SME) (Moorebank Units Relocation (MUR) Project). A subsequent meeting was held in August 2012. MIC also has attended the monthly Moorebank Units Relocation (MUR) Project Control Group meeting since June 2013.
	DoE	Meetings with DoE have been undertaken since June 2012 to address matters including the environmental approvals process, preliminary and formal advice on the adequacy for exhibition of the technical studies undertaken, approach to biodiversity offsets and methods of interfacing between the Commonwealth and NSW environmental and planning approval processes.

Stakeholder group	Organisation	Consultation undertaken
	Infrastructure Australia	<p>A meeting was held with Infrastructure Australia in August 2011 to discuss an overarching strategy between the Australian and NSW Governments for the Project and other infrastructure projects. MIC has also provided briefings to the Infrastructure Australia Executive and Board.</p> <p>In January 2014 Infrastructure Australia attended a site visit (organised by MIC) to the Moorebank IMT Project site.</p>
	Australian Rail Track Corporation (ARTC)	<p>Meetings with ARTC have been held since August 2011 regarding the rail connection between the Project site and the Southern Sydney Freight Line (SSFL), and the likely demand for track capacity for freight movements in and out of the IMT using the SSFL and Metropolitan Freight Network.</p> <p>ARTC also provided a letter to NSW DP&E, providing input into the draft NSW SEARs (refer Volume 2, Appendix D).</p>
	DoIRD	<p>As a shareholder department for the Moorebank IMT Project, DoIRD is kept regularly informed about the Project by MIC.</p> <p>DoIRD also attended monthly meetings (between June 2012 and June 2013) as part of the Planning Approvals and Connections Enabling (PACE) committee. The PACE committee was set up to provide a forum between government departments and agencies to resolve inter-agency issues.</p>
NSW State Government	NSW DP&E	<p>NSW DP&E convened a Planning Focus Meeting (PFM) on 14 December 2011.</p> <p>NSW DP&E was part of the reference group set up for the health impact assessment for the Project.</p> <p>Regular monthly and ad hoc meetings were held during preparation of the EIS, including during the adequacy review process. Ongoing telephone and email communication has occurred with NSW DP&E since 2011.</p>
	TfNSW and its operational agencies Sydney Trains and RMS	<p>Meetings were held with TfNSW and RMS from September 2011 up to exhibition to discuss impacts of the Project on current and future rail capacity, freight movements and the road network. The Moorebank Precinct Traffic Working Group (MIC, TfNSW and RMS) was also established November 2013 to discuss the Moorebank IMT Project and road network impacts.</p> <p>Sydney Trains attended the PFM on 14 December 2011.</p> <p>TfNSW and RMS provided letters to NSW DP&E, providing input into the draft NSW SEARs (refer Volume 2, Appendix D).</p> <p>TfNSW attended the monthly meetings (between June 2012 and June 2013) as part of the PACE committee.</p> <p>In January 2014 TfNSW attended a site visit (organised by MIC) to the Moorebank IMT Project site.</p> <p>Letter sent to Sydney Trains in May 2014 providing an update on the Project and inviting further discussion with MIC.</p>
	EPA	<p>EPA attended the PFM on 14 December 2011. In addition, the EPA attended a briefing and presentation on 10 January 2013 to discuss the methodologies for the air and noise technical assessments.</p> <p>EPA was part of the reference group established for the Project health impact assessment and attended the reference group meetings on 26 July and 13 December 2012. EPA was also invited to attend the workshop in June 2014, but did not attend.</p> <p>The EPA provided a letter to NSW DP&E, providing input into the draft NSW SEARs (refer Volume 2, Appendix D).</p>

Stakeholder group	Organisation	Consultation undertaken
		<p>Following submission of the draft EIS for adequacy review, DoF wrote to the EPA on 2 May 2013 to offer a briefing on the draft EIS to assist it in undertaking its review. A follow up phone call was placed.</p> <p>Letter sent in May 2014 providing an update on the Project and inviting further discussion with MIC.</p> <p>Meeting held with EPA on 24 July 2014 to provide updated details of the Project.</p>
	Infrastructure NSW	<p>Meetings with Infrastructure NSW were held between August and October 2011 to introduce the Project, to provide information on the 'Terms of Reference' for the feasibility study for the Project, and to discuss the methodologies and assumptions for the demand modelling.</p> <p>Infrastructure NSW also attended the first of the monthly PACE committee meetings.</p> <p>MIC met with Infrastructure NSW and the NSW Minister for Roads on 5 April 2013 to provide an overview and update on the Project.</p> <p>Infrastructure NSW attended the site visit to the Project site, organised by MIC and held in January 2014.</p>
	SPC	<p>SPC attended the PFM on 14 December 2011. A subsequent meeting was held with SPC on 15 June 2011 to discuss the development of the Project.</p> <p>SPC also provided a letter to NSW DP&E, providing input into the draft NSW SEARs (refer Volume 2, Appendix D).</p>
	DPI	<p>DPI (Fisheries) attended the PFM on 14 December 2011.</p> <p>DPI provided a letter to NSW DP&E, providing input into the draft NSW SEARs (refer Volume 2, Appendix D).</p> <p>A meeting was held with DPI on 1 July 2013 to discuss the land on the bed of the Georges River.</p> <p>Further consultation was undertaken with DPI (via telephone) on 17 January 2013 as well as ongoing email correspondence.</p> <p>Letter sent in May 2014 providing an update on the Project and inviting further discussion with MIC. A written response was received from DPI (Fisheries) and MIC responded to this via a phone conversation. MIC also provided further details on the status and indicative design for the Project.</p>
	OEH	<p>OEH attended the PFM on 14 December 2011. The OEH Heritage Branch has been involved in developing the Aboriginal and European Heritage methodology. Meetings were held in December 2012.</p> <p>OEH provided a letter to NSW DP&E, providing input into the draft NSW SEARs (refer Volume 2, Appendix D).</p> <p>OEH undertook a site visit on 10 January 2013 with discussion around European heritage items. A follow up phone call and email correspondence occurred on 22 January 2013.</p> <p>A further meeting was held with both OEH and NSW DP&E on 14 November 2013 to discuss the policies and requirements of OEH in relation to the environmental offset requirements for the Project.</p> <p>OEH was also invited to be part of a reference group set up to carry out the health impact assessment for the Project; however, OEH did not attend the reference group meetings held in 2014.</p> <p>A meeting was held with OEH and DP&E on 25 June 2014 to discuss the biodiversity offset strategy for the Project.</p>

Stakeholder group	Organisation	Consultation undertaken
	NSW Rural Fire Service (RFS)	<p>Telephone and email communication was undertaken with RFS during 2012.</p> <p>In addition, the bushfire risk assessment was provided to RFS for comment. RFS noted that a thorough assessment of bushfire risk had been undertaken (refer to Chapter 14 – <i>Hazards and risk</i> and Volume 2, Appendix D).</p> <p>Letter sent in May 2014 providing an update on the Project and inviting further discussion with MIC.</p>
	NSW Health	<p>NSW Health attended the PFM on 14 December 2011.</p> <p>A meeting was held on 10 February 2012 with NSW Health to discuss the approach and methodology for the health impact assessment.</p> <p>NSW Health was part of a reference group set up for the health impact assessment for the Project. NSW Health attended the reference group meetings on 26 July and 13 December 2012 and 24 June 2014.</p>
	NSW Treasury	<p>MPO engaged with Departmental officials and Treasury advisers in May 2012 regarding the long-term lease of Port Botany, overview of the IMT Project and its relationship to the Port Botany lease, the port cap, increased volumes of freight through Port Botany, efficient and effective freight distribution throughout Sydney, congestion and environment management, and supporting infrastructure funding.</p>
	DPC and Ministerial officers	<p>MPO held discussions with DPC in December 2011 regarding the overall Project and how it aligns with NSW objectives, including its role in supporting the long-term lease of Port Botany, efficient and effective freight distribution throughout Sydney, and assisting with congestion and environmental management.</p>
Local government	LCC CCC	<p>A range of meetings was held with elected members and officers of LCC and CCC prior to and during preparation of the EIS. Both CCC and LCC were invited to attend the health impact assessment reference group workshops held on 26 July 2012, 13 December 2012 (only LCC attended) and 24 June 2014.</p> <p>Both LCC and CCC provided a letter to NSW DP&E, providing input into the draft NSW SEARs (refer Volume 2, Appendix D).</p> <p>Following submission of the draft Moorebank EIS for adequacy review, DoF wrote to LCC on 2 May 2013 to offer a briefing on the draft EIS to assist it in its review. A follow up phone call was placed.</p> <p>MIC has subsequently met with LCC on a number of occasions, including in April 2013, May 2013 and January 2014, to discuss the Project and potential impacts.</p>
	WSROC	<p>A meeting was held with the WSROC on 10 July 2012 to provide a briefing on the Project.</p> <p>A further meeting and Project update was held with WSROC on 12 June 2013. At this meeting WSROC reiterated its support of the Project noting that nine out of ten of its member Councils (i.e. all except LCC) are in favour of the Project.</p> <p>Letter sent in May 2014 providing an update on the Project and inviting further discussion with MIC.</p>

Stakeholder group	Organisation	Consultation undertaken
Utility and service providers	Endeavour Energy (formerly Integral Energy) Telstra Optus AAPT Jemena AGL APA Group	Ongoing consultations (via telephone, email or mail) have been held with infrastructure service providers (focused on reference design and construction impacts) and are listed below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endeavour Energy: ongoing consultation over the reference design through to completion of the EIS. Letter sent in May 2014 providing an update on the Project and inviting further discussion with MIC. • Telstra and Optus: consultation in January and February 2013. Email correspondence sent to both Telstra and Optus in June 2014 providing an update on the Project and inviting further discussion with MIC. • Jemena: ongoing consultation during development of the reference design through to January 2013 and regarding hazards and risks, general pipeline protection and gas demand and supply requirements. Letter sent in May 2014 providing an update on the Project and inviting further discussion with MIC. Teleconference held with MIC and Jemena in May 2014 to discuss the gas supply requirements for the Project site. • Letter sent to AGL and APA Group in April 2014 providing details of the project and an opportunity to meet with MIC if required. Meeting held with APA Group in June 2014. Further consultation will be undertaken as the Project progresses (e.g. into the detailed design phase).
	Sydney Water Corporation (SWC)	Telephone and email correspondence was undertaken with SWC during the development of the Project Design in October 2010. Informal communication has also been undertaken with SWC during the development of the Project Design and preliminary assessment of the water and sewer infrastructure. Letter sent in May 2014 providing an update on the Project and inviting further discussion with MIC. MIC met with SWC in June 2014 to provide a Project update.
Business, infrastructure/utility and other organisations	Sydney Business Chamber	MPO met with the Sydney Business Chamber on 20 September 2012 to provide a briefing on the Project.
	NSW Business Chamber	MPO met with the NSW Business Chamber on 20 September 2012 to provide a briefing on the Project. MIC also presented to a NSW Business Chamber Conference on 19 April 2013 on the Future of the Western Sydney Economy. The presentation outlined the scope and rationale for the Project.
	Australian Trucking Association	MPO met with the Australian Trucking Association on 28 June 2012 to provide a briefing on the Project. Australian Trucking Association also provided a letter to NSW DP&E, providing input into the draft NSW SEARs (refer Volume 2, Appendix D).
	Liverpool Chamber of Commerce	A briefing was given to the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce representatives on 21 June 2012 and again on 14 November 2012 to inform them of the Project.
	'No Intermodal Terminal' committee	In July 2014 MIC provided a presentation to the 'No Intermodal Terminal' committee outlining the Project.

Consultation activities undertaken to date have included multiple one-on-one briefings and meetings with many of the stakeholders identified in Table 5.3, telephone briefings, emailed notes and the release of an Information Paper detailing the Project's rationale, potential benefits and processes for approval (circulated to NSW Government, commercial and peak body stakeholders in October 2011). The business case for the Project and summary were also provided on the Project website.

Meetings and communications with key agencies, such as DoE and NSW DP&E, have been ongoing during preparation of this EIS. These agencies have had the opportunity to review the Commonwealth EIS Guidelines and NSW SEARs developed for the Project's EIS, to submit responses that identified the stakeholders' key concerns, to make specific or general recommendations, or to detail any other relevant matters (refer to Volume 2, Appendix D for further details).

Communication with Federal and State Members of Parliament (MPs) representing the electorates surrounding the Project site has been managed by MIC and the MPO in consultation with the Ministers' offices.

In addition to the above, initial engagement with private sector (business) interests in the form of 'market soundings' was undertaken to gauge the general level of interest in the Project and to hear industry views and concerns. A number of market sounding interviews were held with industry participants in February 2011, October 2011 and May/June 2012 to identify and obtain relevant information on potential market demand for the services to be provided by the Project.

During August and September 2013, MIC engaged with key commercial stakeholders that may have a role in developing the terminal, through a series of information sessions and discussions. Information has also been sought from organisations that operate in the freight logistics industry, operate or develop warehousing, or own intermodal terminals or similar infrastructure through a registration of interest (ROI) process. Further engagement with such stakeholders is ongoing, to enable MIC to finalise the procurement strategy for the terminal, and will continue during the formal procurement process. At the time of publication of this EIS, an evaluation of interest from potential operators and developers of the terminal has been completed. MIC has commenced direct negotiations with Sydney Intermodal Terminal Alliance (SIMTA) for a period of up to six months to determine whether suitable terms for the development and operations of the terminal can be agreed. If a detailed agreement with SIMTA cannot be reached within six months, MIC will consider other options.

5.2.3 Community consultation

Community consultation for the Project began in 2010 and has been ongoing since. The key consultation activities undertaken to date are described below.

- A Project website <<http://www.micl.com.au/>> is continually updated to provide information as the Project progresses, including details on the results of the water, air and noise monitoring. Outcomes of community consultation sessions (as discussed below) are also presented on the website.
- Communication with community members who have contacted MIC through the Project website has occurred through a series of personal briefings for residents in January 2011, August 2012 and January 2014. MIC has also responded to enquiries made through the website.
- Community update newsletters have been mailed (refer to copies included in Volume 2, Appendix D) to all households in communities surrounding the Project site (e.g. Casula, Wattle Grove, Holsworthy and Glenfield) to update the community on Project milestones. To date, five community updates have been mailed to 10,000 residents – in August 2011, October 2011, November 2011 and June 2012 – and to 12,000 residents in October 2013 and May 2014. The letters also invited the community to the information sessions (discussed below).

- Five community information sessions were held, on 28 October 2011, 29 October 2011, 30 October 2013, 2 November 2013 and 7 November 2013. These sessions provided the community with the opportunity to:
 - > view information boards about the various aspects of the Project (refer to Volume 2, Appendix D);
 - > hear presentations by MIC and the Project Team;
 - > ask questions about the Project during an open question and answer session;
 - > discuss the Project with members of the technical team and ask questions about any potential impacts; and
 - > take away fact sheets on some of the technical studies (refer Volume 2, Appendix D).

Further details on the community information sessions are provided below.

- Stakeholder meetings were held with local community members to address their particular concerns about the Project. This included meetings held on:
 - > 17 March 2014 at the Hunts Comfort Inn — seven community members were invited to attend, and two members attended; and
 - > 30 January 2014 at the Hunts Comfort Inn — three community members attended.

Community information sessions – October 2011

On 28 and 29 October 2011, two community information sessions were held, one at Casula and one at Wattle Grove, to brief the community about the Project and receive feedback from interested residents (refer to Table 5.4 for details). The information sessions were attended by 150 people in total (38 in Casula; 112 in Wattle Grove). One month's notification was provided for the sessions. Both sessions were advertised in one notification in the *Liverpool Leader*, *Liverpool City Champion* and *Daily Telegraph*. In addition, an electronic direct mail was sent to the Project's email subscription list, notification was added to the Project's website and a newsletter was distributed to the suburbs surrounding the Project site notifying the community of the information session details.

During the information sessions, residents were able to view maps, displays of the Project, a multimedia presentation, and a full colour Information Paper (refer to Volume 2, Appendix D), and talk with members of the Project team, comprising representatives from MPO and Parsons Brinckerhoff. Community members were also invited to fill out feedback forms with any issues or suggestions for consideration. The stakeholder and community issues raised at the information sessions are presented in section 5.3. A stakeholder database was set up to record enquiries about the Project as well as meetings, media coverage, correspondence and other engagement activities. Table 5.4 summarises key information regarding the sessions and their outcomes (refer to Volume 2, Appendix D for further details).

Table 5.4 Summary of community information sessions (October 2011)

Community information session details		Wattle Grove Community Centre – Friday, 28 October 2011, 3.30 pm–8.00 pm	Hunts Comfort Inn – Saturday, 29 October 2011, 10.00 am–2.00 pm	Total
Number of attendees		112	38	150
Number of attendees who registered details		72	28	100
Number of feedback forms received		28	8	36
Number of Information Papers issued		45	27	72
Number of known political representatives in attendance		2	–	2
Method of notification of information session	Community update newsletter	7	3	10
	Project website	1	2	3
	Local newspaper	10	6	16
	Word of mouth	6	4	10
	DoE website	1	-	1
Method of receiving information about the Project generally	Community update newsletter	10	5	15
	Project website	5	3	8
	Local newspaper	13	6	19
	Word of mouth	1	-	1
	DoE website	1	1	2
Intention to attend future information sessions		23	8	31

Community information sessions – October 2013 and November 2013

- Three community sessions were held on 30 October 2013, 2 November 2013 and 7 November 2013. Prior to these sessions, a Project brochure was distributed to 12,000 households in communities surrounding the Project site (e.g. Casula, Wattle Grove, Holsworthy and Glenfield), providing an update on the Project's progress and inviting the community to the information sessions. The Project brochure was distributed approximately two weeks before the first information session. A reminder brochure was provided one week before the sessions commenced and local newspaper advertisements were also run in the weeks leading up to the sessions.
- Approximately 85 people attended the three information sessions (25–40 people at each session; however, some people attended more than one session). Feedback forms were provided from 28 community members, either on the day or posted to MIC. Informal feedback was also documented during the sessions. Subsequently, a report (*Community Information Sessions October & November 2013 – Feedback Report* (Straight Talk 2013) (refer Appendix D, Volume 2) was produced and published on the MIC website. The stakeholder and community issues raised at the information sessions are summarised in section 5.3.
- A summary of the attendance at and feedback from the community information sessions held in 2013 is provided in Table 5.5.

Table 5.5 Summary of community information sessions (October and November 2013)

Attendee and feedback details	Summary of all three community information sessions (Wednesday 30 October 2013, Saturday 2 November 2013, Thursday 7 November 2013)
Number of attendees	85 ¹
Number of attendees who registered details	60
Number of attendees who live in the area surrounding the Project site (i.e. post code 2170)	31
Number of attendees who live further south/and or east of the Project site (i.e. post code 2173)	22
Number of feedback forms received	28
Feedback via other methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One community member provided feedback via the Project website • Feedback documented informally during the sessions

Note 1: Each community session was attended by between 25 and 40 people. As some people attended more than one session, it is estimated that approximately 85 people attended the information sessions in total.

Community groups and adjoining or potentially affected landholders

The following community groups have been identified within the local government area (however not all groups may have an interest in the Project):

- Weaving Garden Environment Group;
- Leacocks Lane Environment Group;
- Wattle Grove Environment Group; and
- Light Horse Park Environment Group.

These community groups form part of the broader community that was targeted by initial community information sessions held in October 2011 and in October and November 2013 (as described above).

Meetings were held with ABB (an adjacent landholder and occupier) in June 2013. Consultation with ABB will also occur during exhibition of the EIS and future Project development activities.

Consultation with residents and business owners in the vicinity of the Project site occurred as part of the broader community consultation as described above.

5.2.4 Indigenous stakeholder consultation

Consultation with Aboriginal representatives began in 2010 and has continued through the preparation of this EIS. This consultation has been undertaken through site visits and written and verbal discussions with the Registered Aboriginal Parties for the area.

The consultations were managed by Navin Officer Heritage Consultants and included the following Registered Aboriginal Parties:

- Tharawal Local Aboriginal Land Council (TLALC);

- Cubbitch Barta Native Title Claimants Aboriginal Corporation (CBNTCAC);
- Darug Land Observations (DLO);
- Darug Custodian Aboriginal Corporation (DCAC);
- Darug Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessments (DACHA);
- Darug Aboriginal Landcare Incorporated (DALI); and
- Banyadjaminga.

Consultation with the Registered Aboriginal Parties regarding cultural knowledge and values has been an ongoing process. It has included formal invitations to contribute in writing and verbally during the field survey (2010, 2013 and 2014), site visit (2012), excavation program (2012 and 2013), telephone conversations and the provision of drafts of the technical reports.

Further information on the investigations and Registered Aboriginal Parties consultations is outlined in Chapter 20 – *Aboriginal heritage*.

5.2.5 Biodiversity offsets strategy consultation

A biodiversity offsets strategy has been developed for the Project, which is designed to address impacts (such as vegetation clearing and habitat loss) that cannot be mitigated through the proposed onsite mitigation measures listed in section 13.4 of Chapter 13 – *Biodiversity*.

Meetings have been held with DoE, NSW DP&E and OEHL to discuss and develop the biodiversity offset assessments. This matter was also subject to ongoing discussion in general meetings held with DoE and NSW DP&E. A list of these meetings is included in Table D1 in Volume 2, Appendix D. Discussions on the biodiversity offsets strategy are ongoing with DoE and OEHL.

5.3 Summary of issues and concerns

5.3.1 Agency and business/infrastructure stakeholder issues and concerns

Volume 2, Appendix D, of this EIS provides a summary of issues raised by Government agencies during recent consultations or correspondence regarding the Project, including how these issues have been addressed in the Project development or EIS process, and/or how they will be addressed through mitigation or management measures.

Feedback received from Australian and NSW Government agencies established the need for the Project, shaped the Project approvals pathway and informed Project phasing. In particular, discussions with TfNSW have confirmed the level of import and export container demand at 1.05 million twenty-foot equivalent units (TEU) a year for the west and south-west Sydney region. The approach, with regards to the consideration of the cumulative impacts of the Project including the Sydney Intermodal Terminal Alliance (SIMTA), was discussed and agreed with NSW DP&E (refer to Chapter 27 – *Cumulative impacts*).

LCC has a particular direct interest in the Project, as the local council authority for the Project site and a directly affected landholder for land on which the proposed northern rail access option is located, as well as an additional area at the north of the Project site (refer to Chapter 23 – *Property and infrastructure*). In a letter from LCC to NSW DP&E (dated 2 February 2013), LCC expressed concerns in relation to issues such as:

- traffic and rail (routes, access, upgrades and/or control);
- amenity issues (noise, traffic, light spill);
- biodiversity impacts and compliance with relevant plans (e.g. Georges River Catchment REP and other relevant SEPPs);
- consideration of flooding impacts and guidelines (and need for rail bridges over the Georges River to maintain clearance for watercraft); and
- Aboriginal and European cultural heritage (e.g. potential losses, particularly that of the Australian Army Engineers Group (School of Military Engineering), and recommendations for development of management plans, appropriate reports for community consultation and interpretation strategies).

All these issues have been considered in the studies undertaken in preparation of this EIS (refer Chapter 11 – *Traffic, transport and access* for traffic and rail issues; Chapter 12 – *Noise and vibration*, Chapter 22 – *Visual and urban design* and Chapter 24 – *Social and economic issues* for amenity impacts; Chapter 16 – *Hydrology, groundwater and water quality* and Chapter 24 – *Social and economic issues* for flooding impacts and use of the Georges River; and Chapter 20 – *Aboriginal heritage* and Chapter 21 – *European heritage* for heritage issues). The issues raised by LCC have been generally consistent with issues raised by residents at the community information sessions (October 2011, and October and November 2013).

CCC has identified key issues such as the need for inclusion of the Council's local government area (LGA) in the traffic impact assessment, impacts on road infrastructure and the potential need for upgrades (particularly in relation to the Georges River crossing at Cambridge Avenue), and the potential for the Project to drive employment growth in the area. All these issues have been considered in the studies undertaken in preparation of this EIS (e.g. traffic, transport and access issues are addressed in Chapter 11 – *Traffic, transport and access*).

Issues raised by other agencies and business/infrastructure stakeholders that are potentially interested in being involved with Project operations are detailed in Volume 2, Appendix D. Consultation processes with other local businesses that are potentially affected by the Project are outlined within the general community consultation section below (refer to section 5.3.2).

5.3.2 Community issues/concerns

This section summarises the issues and concerns raised by the community, including potentially affected local businesses, in relation to the Project. Consultation with local businesses has occurred through the avenues employed to consult the community generally (e.g. distribution of newsletters, newspaper notices, information sessions, etc.), with information (such as newsletters and consultation events) also provided to key local bodies, such as the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce, for targeted distribution to the wider local business network.

Several key issues have been raised with the Project team during community consultations to date, including at the community information sessions held in October and November 2013, and in the earlier October 2011 sessions. Feedback has helped define the scope and outcomes of the specialist studies that support the EIS. It has also ensured that local community concerns regarding local impacts of the Project are addressed to the greatest extent possible within the constraints of the Project, considering the need to meet the identified Project objectives.

Table 5.6 summarises the key issues and concerns raised by the community and other stakeholders during the preparation of this EIS, including responses from the Project team and proponent and/or where the issues are further addressed in this EIS. Table 5.6 has been ordered according to the perceived level of concern by the community, with the issues of greatest concern listed at the top of the table.

Table 5.6 Summary of key issues and concerns raised by the community

Category	Issues/concerns raised	Response (or where addressed in EIS)
Traffic, transport and access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Congestion already experienced on the M5 Motorway and the local area and the impact on traffic as a result of the Project. Impact on the M5 Motorway and Moorebank Avenue intersection. Heavy trucks using local roads and potential damage to these roads. Trucks using local roads and back streets to do 'rat-runs' and parking on local streets. Scepticism about the estimated number of trucks the Project would attract (either directly or induced). Questions raised in regards to the traffic demand on the road corridors into Liverpool. Questions raised as to whether the traffic assessment takes into consideration new developments (e.g. the recycling plant with access from Newbridge Road). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project includes the upgrading of Moorebank Avenue to four lanes and upgrading of the on-ramps to the M5 Motorway to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of IMT traffic and existing users. Design of entry/exit points on Moorebank Avenue as north-only to prevent use of Cambridge Avenue. Refer to Chapter 11 – <i>Traffic, transport and access</i>. In regard to the fifth bullet point, estimates of truck volumes in this EIS were based on potential worst-case forecast volumes – and therefore represent a conservative estimate of potential impacts. Potential cumulative impacts with development on the SIMTA site have also been assessed in Chapter 27 – <i>Cumulative impacts</i>. Any wider induced traffic from other potential developments in the area is considered beyond the scope of this EIS.
Human health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health impacts on the local community as a result of the Project and exposure to diesel fumes. Concerns about toxicity, cancer, asthma and other diseases. Impact of emissions including dust and noise on people's health. Liverpool is already experiencing a high level of health issues from existing pollution including asthma and other respiratory illnesses. Concerns that this will be exacerbated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Onsite plant and equipment has been specified to operate on gas or electric power only – no diesel. Refer to Chapter 25 – <i>Human health risks and impacts</i>.
Air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived poor air quality (currently experienced) in the local area. Air quality would deteriorate as a result of the Project. Increase in pollution from increased traffic. Diesel emissions from trucks and locomotives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Onsite plant and equipment specified to operate on gas or electric power only – no diesel. The current air quality monitoring program would be continued through construction and operation to help minimise any air quality impacts. Refer to Chapter 17 – <i>Local air quality</i> and Chapter 18 – <i>Regional air quality</i>.

Category	Issues/concerns raised	Response (or where addressed in EIS)
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases in current noise levels as a result of the Project. Impact of noise on people's health. Associated noise impacts from the SSFL. Noise impacts from freight trains passing residential areas. Potential for 'wheel squeal' associated with trains on tight radius curves on the access bridges for the northern rail access. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conservation area proposed to increase buffer (separation distance) between the site and sensitive receivers at Casula. All layouts seek to maximise the distance between the working tracks and the sensitive receivers at Casula. <p>The current noise monitoring program would be continued through construction and operation to minimise any noise impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to Chapter 12 – <i>Noise and vibration</i>. (Note: Indirect impacts on human health are covered in Chapter 25 – <i>Human health risks and impacts</i>).
Biodiversity and the environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of threatened species and large areas of vegetation. Impacts on the Georges River in terms of water quality and flooding. Impacts on the activities on the river. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project preserves a significant area of riparian vegetation known as the conservation area on the western boundary of the main IMT site. Each layout provides opportunities to preserve areas of significant vegetation within the main IMT site that would be explored further during detailed design. The Project includes a commitment to establish the conservation area, as well as the Casula Offset Area (or 'hourglass land') and Wattle Grove Offset area, as a managed offset area. MIC would also continue to work with the NSW and Australian Governments to ensure that biodiversity offset sites are provided to satisfy government policy. Maintenance of conservation area for improved riparian and river water quality. Water treatment system would ensure all water discharged to the Georges River is of sufficient quality to maintain or improve Georges River water quality. The current water quality monitoring program would be continued through construction and operation to help ensure against any water quality impacts. Refer to Chapter 13 – <i>Biodiversity</i>. Refer to Chapter 16 – <i>Hydrology, groundwater and water quality</i>. Refer to Chapter 24 – <i>Social and economic impacts</i>.
Economic issues and benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in property values. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to Chapter 24 – <i>Social and economic impacts</i>.

Category	Issues/concerns raised	Response (or where addressed in EIS)
Community consultation process/ Accuracy of data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level and adequacy of community involvement in the EIS process. Data accuracy, transparency and adequacy (as guidelines may change). Involvement of non-English speaking members of the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Details provided in this chapter and Appendix D. The technical studies have been prepared by subject matter specialists using data collected through accredited methods. Technical studies will be released publicly as part of this EIS (refer Volumes 3 to 9). In the meantime, MIC will publish the results of air quality, water quality and noise level monitoring on the MIC website. A translation service is available on 1300 382 239 number and MIC has developed a communications strategy to ensure all interested community groups are involved.
SIMTA Project and cumulative impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confusion about the difference between the SIMTA Project and the Moorebank IMT Project. Cumulative impacts of the two projects (negative combined effect). The two projects are not in sustainable locations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The projects are entirely separate as explained in Chapter 3 – <i>Strategic context and need for the Project</i>. This EIS relates only to the Moorebank IMT Project, with the exception of the cumulative impacts assessment described in Chapter 27 – <i>Cumulative Impacts</i>. There is also insufficient freight catchment demand for both projects at Moorebank and insufficient capacity on the SSFL for both projects (i.e. it is very unlikely both projects would be developed as proposed). Cumulative impacts of the Project and an assumed modified SIMTA Project (SIMTA warehousing development only) have been considered in Chapter 27 – <i>Cumulative impacts</i>. Chapters 3 – <i>Strategic context and need for the Project</i> and 6 – <i>Project development and alternatives</i> detail reasons for selection of the Project site and why this location is preferred.
Proximity to residential areas and impact to quality of life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in the quality of life in suburbs of Wattle Grove, Moorebank and Casula. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to Chapter 24 – <i>Social and economic impacts</i>.
Alternative site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for EIS to look at alternative options (including alternative sites). Infrastructure does not support an IMT. Project should be relocated away from residential areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While other IMT sites are likely to be required in Western Sydney in future (such as Eastern Creek) the current site is the only site capable of servicing the south western Sydney freight catchment area for both IMEX and interstate freight, and with sufficient land and road/rail access. Refer to Chapters 6 – <i>Project development and alternatives</i> and Chapter 23 – <i>Property and infrastructure</i>.

Category	Issues/concerns raised	Response (or where addressed in EIS)
Planning approvals pathway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fearful that the Project has already been approved and is a 'done deal'. Unclear about the planning process and where the Project is up to in terms of the environmental assessment and approval steps. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project is not yet approved and is subject to both Commonwealth and NSW Government planning and environment approval processes (refer Chapter 1 – <i>Introduction</i> and Chapter 4 – <i>Planning and statutory requirements</i>).
Vibration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Associated noise and vibration impacts from the SSFL and the Project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to Chapter 12 – <i>Noise and vibration</i>.
Light pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Light spill to surrounding areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to Chapter 22 – <i>Visual and urban design</i>.
Casula Powerhouse Arts Centre and Parklands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise and visual impacts on the Casula Powerhouse Art Centre and surrounding parklands. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conservation area creates visual buffer between the Powerhouse and the main IMT site. Refer to Chapter 12 – <i>Noise and vibration</i> and Chapter 22 – <i>Visual and urban design</i>.
Design and site issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A business park should be put on the site to create more jobs. Warehousing should not be included in this Project. The Project is not designed to meet community requirements. Truck and train access should be underground. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project site has not been selected as a business park, as this would not meet the need for and objectives of the Project (refer Chapter 3 – <i>Strategic context and need for the Project</i>). Also, there is a substantial supply of other employment lands in the region, including in the future South West Growth Centre, at Erskine Park and Eastern Creek. The Project site was chosen for an IMT because of its specific characteristics including road and rail connections (refer Chapter 3 – <i>Strategic context and need for the Project</i> and Chapter 6 – <i>Project development and alternatives</i>). Warehousing was included in the Project as it would provide an essential supply chain function (i.e. warehousing is closely linked to container movements and storage). The Project would contribute to the community by generating employment during both the construction and operation of the facility (with 1,522 staff required on site during the construction phases and an estimated 2,174 staff on site during the ongoing operation of the IMEX, interstate terminal and warehousing). The Project has also been designed to minimise amenity impacts on the community. Underground truck and train access is not feasible as the Project has to be aligned to tie into the SSFL, which is at ground level.
Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts on heritage items on the Project site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to Chapter 20 – <i>Aboriginal heritage</i> and Chapter 21 – <i>European heritage</i>.

Category	Issues/concerns raised	Response (or where addressed in EIS)
Feasibility study and cost/benefit process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unsure about the feasibility study process. Uncertain that a significant rigorous process has been undertaken and the real costs of the Project, including the costs to the community, have been taken into account. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to Chapter 1 – <i>Introduction</i> and Chapter 6 – <i>Project development and alternatives</i>. The business case for the Project considered all of the key environmental impacts and economic impacts and benefits associated with the Project.
General objection to Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of residents who attended the information session and completed feedback forms objected to the Project. Requests for the EIS to look at alternative options. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to Chapter 3 – <i>Strategic context and need for the Project</i> and Chapter 6 – <i>Project development and alternatives</i>.

5.4 Consultation: the next steps

Community consultation will continue as part of the Project development process, to ensure the views of people living in the surrounding area are clearly understood and that MIC can respond to these views to the greatest extent possible. MIC will consider feedback from the local community during the EIS exhibition, and will continue to consider feedback during the ongoing design development, construction and operation phases of the Project (if approved) to ensure all relevant issues are considered.

5.4.1 Statutory exhibition of the EIS

Public exhibition of the EIS is required under Commonwealth and State legislation, as detailed in section 1.6 (Chapter 1 – *Introduction*) of this EIS. Section 103 of the EPBC Act requires the Project proponent to invite comment on the draft EIS, with the invitation to comment open for a minimum period of 20 business days. However, for this EIS, a 40 business day minimum exhibition period has been specified by DoE to reflect the scale and complexity of the Project. In NSW, Section 89F of the EP&A Act requires that the Secretary of the NSW DP&E makes this EIS publicly available for a minimum period of 30 calendar days. However, again to reflect the scale and complexity of the Project, this EIS will be on public display for at least 60 calendar days as specified by NSW DP&E.

During the exhibition period, any person (including a public authority) may make a written submission to the NSW Secretary of NSW DP&E. Given that the Project is subject to assessment and approval under both the EPBC Act and EP&A Act, there is a potential need for submissions to be made to each approval process. However, to simplify the submissions process for the community, the Secretary of NSW DP&E will act as a coordinating authority for community submissions in relation to both the EPBC Act and EP&A Act processes. All submissions received will be provided to the proponent (MIC) in order that they can be considered in the context of both the EPBC Act and EP&A Act approval processes. Under this arrangement, submitters need only make one submission to have it considered under both jurisdictions where relevant.

MIC's past consultation and engagement with the community has improved local awareness and understanding of the Project, and has provided MIC a sound understanding of the matters that are of most interest to the community.

5.4.2 Additional community and stakeholder engagement during the exhibition period

During the EIS exhibition period, MIC will undertake further consultation to inform the community and stakeholders of the exhibition of the EIS and provide information to allow them to make comments in their submissions on the EIS and/or the Project to NSW DP&E. Feedback during the exhibition period will also be obtained through face-to-face discussions, telephone calls to the Project Information Line (1300 382 239) and individual written submissions.

MIC has prepared an EIS Exhibition Plan which outlines how MIC will notify stakeholders about the EIS and explain the EIS to stakeholders during the public exhibition period. Consultation on the EIS will explain changes to the terminal concept since the last community information sessions, impacts of the terminal and potential mitigation identified in the EIS, and the opportunity to make a submission to DoE and DP&E. MIC will explain the changes to the EIS through the following:

- MIC will place explanatory material (e.g. fact sheets and a summary brochure) with the EIS document displayed by DP&E in public locations such as local libraries, council offices and DP&E offices.
- MIC will hold three open community information sessions on the EIS. The sessions will be held in Casula. The information sessions will include a presentation from MIC's technical adviser, Parsons Brinckerhoff, and MIC CEO, Ian Hunt, followed by a Q&A session. Community members will have an opportunity for one-on-one discussions with several representatives of MIC and Parsons Brinckerhoff.
- MIC will offer briefings on the EIS to key stakeholders, such as the members of parliament for the state and federal electorates near the terminal site, the local councils in the area (i.e. Liverpool, Campbelltown and Bankstown) and relevant state and federal Ministers and agencies.
- MIC is also willing to provide individual briefings to community members (or small groups) who have specific issues to discuss (such as traffic impacts).
- MIC's website will contain information on the EIS, including the display boards prepared for the information sessions; fact sheets; FAQs; a summary brochure; and information on how to make a submission.

The information sessions will provide members of the community with the opportunity to engage with members of the Project Team about the EIS and seek advice about completing a submission and/or requesting further information. The community will be advised of the dates, times and locations for the community information sessions through notices placed in the local Liverpool newspapers, a letterbox drop to local businesses and residents, an email to stakeholders who have previously registered for project updates, and information on the MIC and NSW DP&E websites.

There will be at least 10 working days between the start of the EIS exhibition period and the first community information session, to allow people time to review the EIS. Members of the community will also be reminded through newspaper advertisements of the end of the exhibition period one week before exhibition period ends to assist them to make a submission on the EIS and/or the Project within the specified timeframe.

As part of the exhibition notification, a newsletter will be distributed by MIC to local residents, government agencies and councils, and other relevant stakeholders. Letters will also be sent to potentially affected property owners advising them of the EIS exhibition. In addition, advertisements will be placed in local, state and national newspapers to announce the display of the EIS. Both the letters and the advertisement will provide details of the exhibition and community information sessions, including dates, locations and opening hours. Property owners and members of the community will also be invited to write a submission in response to the EIS and Project concept. The relevant contact details for lodging a submission will be included in both the letters and the advertisements.

5.4.3 Future community engagement activities

Following the public exhibition period, the EIS will be finalised (to satisfy the Commonwealth EPBC Act process) by documenting the submissions received, responding to those submissions, documenting and assessing any changes to the Project as a result of submissions, and incorporating these into the final EIS. A Submissions Report (or Preferred Project Report, in the event of significant design changes) will be prepared to satisfy the NSW EP&A Act processes for addressing submissions received, along with any Project modifications and/or additional environmental investigations. The relevant documentation will be lodged with DoE and NSW DP&E to assist with their determinations of the Project. The Final EIS and Submissions Report will respond to issues raised in submissions.

Consultation with key stakeholders and the community will continue during the next stages of Project development. Furthermore, with the exception of the Early Works (described in Chapter 8 – *Project development phasing and construction*), under the EP&A Act this EIS approval would not provide the opportunity to construct any part of the IMT until further detailed environmental assessments are undertaken and approved (referred to as Stage 2 State significant development (SSD) approvals). Further community consultation would be undertaken during preparation of these Stage 2 SSD approvals.

If the Project is approved, a Community Engagement Plan (CEP) will be prepared and implemented by the contractor selected for the construction and operation of the Project. This will outline the consultation and notification processes during the pre-construction, construction and operation phases. The CEP would be prepared to ensure that:

- the community and stakeholders have a high level of awareness of all processes and activities associated with the Project;
- accurate and accessible information is made available; and
- a timely response is given to issues and concerns raised by stakeholders and the community.

5.4.4 Citizens' Jury

A Citizens' Jury is developing a public benefits package to provide a direct benefit to people living near the IMT. The jury has around 20 members who were randomly selected from suburbs near the terminal by the independent newDemocracy Foundation. Community members were given an opportunity to make a written submission to the jury.

5.4.5 Future agency and businesses/infrastructure stakeholder consultations

During the next stages of the approval process, MIC will continue to consult with the relevant key agencies and businesses/infrastructure stakeholders. It is expected that the EIS (if approved) would be issued with conditions of consent, which would include a schedule of additional and more detailed assessments to be undertaken and provided as part of the Stage 2 SDD development approvals process. MIC will consult with relevant agencies and business/infrastructure stakeholders as required in relation to the individual approvals.

Following approval of the EIS, the CEP will detail further consultation and notifications to be undertaken during the pre-construction, construction and operation phases of the Project to ensure that agencies and business/infrastructure stakeholders are adequately informed.