Respondent: Transport for NSW

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
Justification	TfNSW is satisfied that the following requirement (included in the DGRs) has been adequately addressed at the concept plan level: *The need for and the objectives of the project, taking into consideration container trade numbers (import and export) at the international, national and state levels; future trends in container origin/destination in Sydney; intermodal capacity and demand; and identification of the terminal's freight catchment area and freight split.*	Noted.	
Rail provision	The proponent will be aware that the Long Term Transport Master Plan references the need for capacity augmentation, most likely to be quadruplication, of the East Hills Line Railway Corridor for passenger purposes. It is therefore vital that the proponent addresses further details of how their freight line might share the East Hills Line. The rail quadruplication sketch in Appendix H of the EIS report is acknowledged. It does not contain an adequate level of detail to ascertain the impact on the rail corridor. One of the issues it has not included is the location of the gas pipeline in the rail corridor on the southern side. The pipeline is protected by an easement (minimum 6 metres wide) and registered on title. It should therefore be easily identifiable on all drawings. The location of the 33KV power supply on the northern side of the corridor will need to be relocated. The only practicable option is on the southern side. It will then be difficult to accommodate quadruplicated passenger tracks, a service road, a fence for the service road, the freight line the 33KV supply line and the gas line which is a legal entitlement on corridor land.	The *Rail Access Report* acknowledges the proposed quadruplication of the East Hills passenger line and provides sketches to indicate how the passenger line and the SIMTA rail link may be accommodated within the rail corridor. The location of the 33kV lines and the gas main are shown on the sketches; however, as they are located in approximately the same location their labelling overlaps. The *Rail Access Report* acknowledges that there would be a need to relocate some of these services. Any relocation of services would be undertaken in consultation with RailCorp and the relevant utilities providers. The sketches accompanying the Rail Access Report have been prepared in accordance with Railcorp's Engineering Standards, including: ▪ ESC 210 Track Geometry and Stability ▪ ESC 215 Transit Space ▪ ESC 250 Turnouts and Special Trackwork SIMTA will continue to consult with landowners regarding land access and utilities, including DoD, DoFD, MICL, TfNSW (RailCorp), RMS and all necessary service providers, as part of subsequent planning approval stages and progression of detailed design, in accordance	Section 18 Appendix H *Rail Access Report* (Hyder Consulting, June 2013b)

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
		with the Statement of Commitments.	
Rail provision	The sketches should instead be scaled plans that show to RailCorp/TfNSW satisfaction how the East Hills Line Corridor will accommodate a freight rail alignment, a quadruplicated East Hills Line (solely for passenger purposes), a service road and a separating fence for RailCorp use that also takes into account infrastructure constrictions (gas line and 33KV electrical line) immediately adjacent to and on either side of the rail corridor.	The sketches accompanying the Rail Access Report have been prepared in accordance with Railcorp's Engineering Standards, including: ▪ ESC 210 Track Geometry and Stability ▪ ESC 250 Turnouts and Special Trackwork ▪ ESC 215 Transit Space. The sketches show the inclusion of a service road for the quadruplicated East Hills Line and the location of separating fences and identify the location of services within the corridor. Where the rail link intersects services, this is acknowledged on the sketches. The sketches have been prepared to demonstrate the feasibility of the SIMTA rail link alignment and are considered appropriate for a Concept Plan application. SIMTA is consulting with RailCorp about the progression of the detailed design.	Appendix H *Rail Access Report* (Hyder Consulting, June 2013b)
Rail provision	TfNSW maintains the corridor described above and it will be difficult to accommodate all of the above uses and it may be necessary to acquire land on the southern side of the corridor. If this is necessary it needs to be understood from the outset so the appropriate arrangements can be initiated and put in place with the proponent.	The sketches provided have been prepared in accordance with RailCorp's engineering standards for track geometry and transit space and demonstrate that there is sufficient room within the corridor to accommodate the SIMTA rail link and the quadruplication of the East Hills Line. Options for relocation and/or protection of services within the corridor would be developed during detailed design of the rail link.	
Rail provision	TfNSW continues to encourage the proponents of both the SIMTA development and the Moorebank Intermodal Terminal Project to consider common rail access. At present both SIMTA and the Commonwealth Moorebank Intermodal Terminal proposal are proposing	Section 2.2 of the *Rail Access Report* and Section 5.3.2.3 of the EA outline the suitability of the proposed rail alignment and connection to the SSFL. It concludes that the current rail alignment is considered to be a suitable alignment to support a future whole of precinct access	Section 18 Section 5.3.2.3 Appendix H

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
	to have their own lines and connection points requiring the provision of duplicate facilities.	arrangement, with access to the MICL site from the south also feasible through the same connection point. Recent discussion with ARTC indicated that they have a designated train path model showing that there are 24 train paths available each way. At its peak, the SIMTA proposal will require 21-22 paths. As the SIMTA rail link has the capacity to service the entire precinct, the impact on the SSFL would therefore be limited and not require the provision of duplicate connection points to the SSFL. SIMTA are open to the concept of precinct planning and development on a 'whole of precinct basis'. Notwithstanding this, these projects are currently in different stages of the planning approval process, with the SIMTA proposal much further advanced. The Statement of Commitments in the EA includes the following commitment: *The Proponent will continue to consult with relevant government authorities and bodies during the design development process for the detailed applications for the three major stages of the development. Depending on the development proposed, these may include:* *…* ▪ *Moorebank Intermodal Company Limited…* SIMTA understands the project efficiencies and joint commitments can be achieved through working with MICL, and are committed to discussions with them as a major stakeholder as part of subsequent stages of planning approval and progression of detailed design.	*Rail Access Report* (Hyder Consulting, June 2013b)
Rail provision	TfNSW first preference remains for the SIMTA freight line alignment to be integrated with the MIT proposal and located well to the north of the East Hills Line corridor such that TfNSW can preserve a viable and cost effective corridor option for quadruplication of the East Hills Line for passenger service purposes unencumbered in any way by construction	Section 2.2 of the *Rail Access Report* and Section 5.3.2.3 of the EA outline the suitability of the proposed rail alignment and connection to the SSFL. It concludes that the current rail alignment is suitable to support a future whole of precinct access arrangement, with capacity for access to the MICL site from the south, through the same	Sections 5.3.2.3 and 18 Appendix H *Rail Access Report* (Hyder

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
	or operation of the SIMTA freight line.	connection point. Recent discussion with ARTC indicated that they have a designated train path model showing that there are 24 train paths available each way. At its peak, the SIMTA proposal will require 21-22 paths. As the SIMTA rail link has the capacity and durability to service both the SIMTA site and the MICL site, without comprising operation of either site, a duplication of connection points to the SSFL would not be required. The *Rail Access Report* provides concept drawings which accommodate a land allowance for a possible quadruplication of the existing East Hills passenger line. Appendix B of the *Rail Access Report* shows concept plan sketches for this scenario. Further, the following Statement of Commitment is included in the EA (refer to Section 18): *The Proponent commits to the delivery of the rail link between the SIMTA site and the Southern Sydney Freight Line in the detailed planning application for the first stage of works. The application shall include the following information:* *...* ▪ *Clear demonstration that the proposed new siding will be compatible with the current and future track alignment, including the proposed quadruplication of the East Hills railway corridor.* *…*	Consulting, June 2013b)
Land ownership	RailCorp is the owner of the East Hills corridor land which the proponent proposes to use for freight rail access. The proposed freight line alignment also traverses the centre of the RailCorp owned Moorebank Station site. It is presumed the proponent wishes to lease or licence the subject RailCorp land, but this is not documented in the Environmental Assessment.	The sketches presented in the *Rail Access Report* demonstrate how the future Moorebank Station can be accommodated with the proposed SIMTA rail link. SIMTA is consulting with TfNSW, in particular RailCorp, regarding the proposal. The Concept Plan application is subject to a designation under Clause 8F(1)(e) of the EP&A Regulation as a proposal on land with multiple	Section 3.5

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
	In regards to the Moorebank Station site and the proponent's lack of ownership over this site, RailCorp has advanced a view that this may constitute an unsolicited proposal. TfNSW is giving this issue consideration as well as the potential commerciality implications of severing a site for a freight line on a site that previously had the potential to deliver a range of other land use outcomes.	land owners (MP 10_0193). A formal agreement would be reached between SIMTA and RailCorp as part of the first stage of the SIMTA proposal. As noted, SIMTA is consulting with TfNSW and will identify the appropriate arrangements for progression of the SIMTA proposal. Should it be determined that the proposal at the Moorebank Station site would constitute an unsolicited proposal, SIMTA would submit and Initial Submission and Strategic Assessment for the proposal. As discussed in the Section 3.5 of the EA, the SIMTA proposal is consistent with the NSW and Commonwealth strategic land use policies and will provide a benefit to the state. SIMTA is in a unique position to deliver one of NSW's strategic objectives, that of doubling the rail modal share of freight movements to 28%, and it consistent with the assessment criteria for unsolicited proposals.	
Engagement with MICL and TfNSW	It is suggested that this SlMTA proponent as well as the adjacent Moorebank lntermodal Terminal (MIT) proponent jointly engage with Transport for NSW to arrive at mutually agreeable statements of commitment on transport related issues.	SIMTA are open to the concept of precinct planning and development on a 'whole of precinct basis'. Notwithstanding this, these projects are currently in different stages of the planning approval process, with the SIMTA proposal much further advanced. The SIMTA proposal has to date prepared and exhibited their Concept Plan Environmental Assessment and exhibited the Environmental Impact Statement (draft and final) as required under the *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation ACT* 1999. The MICL proposal has to date, yet to exhibit an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). SIMTA acknowledges that there would be benefits to developing a 'whole of precinct' approach to support the proposed intermodal terminals however this is not currently feasible based on existing information and positioning in the approval process for each of these proposals. The Statement of Commitments in the EA includes the following commitment:	Submissions Report

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
		The Proponent will continue to consult with relevant government authorities and bodies during the design development process for the detailed applications for the three major stages of the development. Depending on the development proposed, these may include: *…* ▪ *Moorebank Intermodal Company Limited* *…* SIMTA understands that project efficiencies and joint commitments can be achieved through working with MICL, and are committed to discussions with them as a major stakeholder as part of subsequent stages of planning approval.	
Road upgrades	At full cost to SIMTA and MIT these commitments would at a minimum address: ▪ Commit to upgrade Moorebank Avenue from the most southerly point of access point onto Moorebank Avenue to four lane access up to the intersection of Moorebank Avenue and the M5. This should be inclusive of intersection treatments; including Anzac Road, signal plans, traffic analysis, staging and cost information to RMS's satisfaction. ▪ Commit to the upgrade of the Moorebank Avenue, Newbridge Road, and Heathcote Road intersection. This should be inclusive of signal plans, traffic analysis, and staging information to RMS's satisfaction. ▪ Commit to the upgrade of Moorebank Avenue and the M5 Interchange. This should expand the descriptions and diagram at Section 8.1 to provide detailed plans including signal plans, traffic analysis and staging options to RMS's satisfaction.	The indicative staging program and TEU thresholds proposed in the *Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment* report. Identification of the funding mechanisms to support the staged upgrade works is not considered appropriate at this stage of the planning approval process. The subsequent stages of development would be driven by market demand, and timing, other than for Stage 1 of the SIMTA proposal, cannot be confirmed at this stage. Further, the funding of each of these measures would be determined, taking into account a range of matters at the relevant time, including the contribution of the SIMTA proposal to the existing and proposed traffic conditions and the impacts of other proposed developments on the road network. The funding mechanism for upgrade works would be confirmed at subsequent planning approval stages, in consultation with all agencies involved. The Statement of Commitments has been updated to reflect the proposed road infrastructure upgrades in tables and sketch plans in the *Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment Report*. This includes the widening of Moorebank Avenue extends to the southern	Sections 5.3.4.2 and 18 Appendix F: *Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment* (Hyder Consulting, August 2013a) Submissions Report

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
		SIMTA site access and the indicative timing for the delivery of the infrastructure upgrades. The Statement of Commitments has been updated to reflect this. It is noted in Section 5.3 of the EA that these road network upgrades would be discussed and negotiated with RMS and potentially impacted stakeholders. Funding arrangements will be determined in the subsequent stages of planning approval. SIMTA will remain in consultation with all key stakeholders. Detailed design of the upgrade works would be undertaken in accordance with all applicable design guidelines and standards.	
Rail Access Report	Transport for NSW Freight and Regional Development Division has requested the following clarifications be provided in respect of Appendix H *Rail Access Report.*		
Rail Access Report	Page 1 -Third paragraph refers to "future Southern Sydney Freight Line". The SSFL has been operational since January.	Acknowledged.	Appendix H *Rail Access Report* (Hyder Consulting, June 2013b)
Rail Access Report	Page 5 - Dismisses the possibility of proposed MICL rail access servicing the whole precinct "given the complexities in crossing Moorebank Avenue." This assertion requires further justification. Superficially, it would appear that the capital cost difference of either option is not substantial. i.e. Moorebank Ave over rail is a shorter rail link (also there is no impact on East Hills Line as indicated elsewhere). Also the costs of the proposed bridge over Georges River and longer rail link need to be considered.	Section 2.2 of the *Rail Access Report* and Section 5.3.2.3 of the EA outline the suitability of the proposed rail alignment and connection to the SSFL. It concludes that the current rail alignment is considered to be a suitable alignment to support a future whole of precinct access arrangement, with the MICL site also being able gain to access through the same connection point. The proposed rail access shown in the current site layout for the proposed MICL site does not suit a whole of precinct approach. A rail link from the MICL site to the SIMTA site would necessarily cross Moorebank Avenue and bisect the MICL site. The grade of both sites would not allow for a rail bridge crossing of Moorebank Ave, therefore a level crossing would be required at Moorebank Avenue to allow	Appendix H *Rail Access Report* (Hyder Consulting, June 2013b)

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
		SIMTA trains to access the site. This would impose timing and access constraints to the operation of both proposals as traffic flow along Moorebank Avenue would be disrupted. The proposed SIMTA rail link would allow trains to access both sites from the south, without causing disruption to traffic flows on Moorebank Avenue, within the sites or disruption to rail movements on the SSFL.	
Rail Access Report	Page 5 -The train path analysis based on 365 days per year is not realistic. The figures in the unlabelled table are under the assumed 80% utilisation set out on page 6. This should be clarified.	Noted. Section 6.3.1 of the *Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment* outlines the breakdown of freight movements when the site is fully operational. It is noted that the one million TEU is evenly split between containers arriving by rail from Port Botany (500,000 TEUs) and containers returned to the port (500,000). At 80% utilisation of a 650 m train it is assumed that a train can carry up to 73 TEU. At 500,000 TEU in each direction, with each train carrying 73 TEU approximately 18.7 train movements per day would be required. The train paths outlined in Section 2.2 of the *Rail Access Report* have allowed for additional redundancy in order to estimate the maximum possible train movements per day.	Appendix F *Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment* (Hyder Consulting, August 2013a) Appendix H *Rail Access Report* (Hyder Consulting, June 2013b)
Rail Access Report	Page 6 - The sentence should be modified to read "With the SIMTA proposal requiring 21- 22 paths each way at its peak"	Section 2.2 of the *Rail Access Report* identifies the train paths required to service the SIMTA proposal per day. In the report, train paths refer to the round-trip required by a train from Port Botany to the SIMTA site, and then returning back to the port. Train movements refer to the individual train trips made from/to the port to/from the SIMTA site. At its peak, the SIMTA proposal will results in 21 - 22 train paths per day, resulting in 42 – 44 train movements.	Sections 5.3.2.3 and 5.3.3.1 Appendix H *Rail Access Report* (Hyder Consulting, June 2013b)

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
Rail Access Report	Page 6 -Train turnaround times. Are trains push-pull? If not, time is needed to run-around and do brake tests. Need to be able to hold trains on siding ready to enter the SSFL, while another leaves the SSFL. This issue requires clarification.	The SIMTA site will provide sufficient space to hold trains on site within SIMTA sidings, while allowing for run-around movements on site. Train turn-around times are outlined in Section 2.3 of the *Rail Access Report,* noting that: *[I]t is envisaged that 21-22 trains will use the SIMTA terminal each day, spread across the entire 24 hour period. This equates to roughly one train per hour. Analysis of the proposed intermodal infrastructure has determined that this turnaround is achievable based on the assumptions below:* ▪ *Each train would carry 73 TEU (based on 80% utilisation of 600 m train).* ▪ *Each Rail Mount Gantry Crane (RMG) (or similar) has capacity to undertake 30 moves per hour; equating to 49.5 TEU movements per hour (allowing for 20/40 ft split).* ▪ *With two RMGs operational and dedicated to clearing trains it is therefore possible to achieve the 1 hour turn around, leaving 26% redundancy in the system.*	Appendix H *Rail Access Report* (Hyder Consulting, June 2013b)
Rail Access Report	Page 8- Second last paragraph. Why will ARTC need to validate that 21 trains per day is sufficient to support 1 mil TEU p.a.? Is this not the role of SIMTA? This issues requires clarification.	Section 3.1 of the *Rail Access Report* states: *It should also be noted that SIMTA's rail operator will need to validate that the anticipated 21 services required will be sufficient to support a one million TEU terminal and the catchment demand for South Western Sydney.* The rail operator will be responsible for the operation of trains to and from the SIMTA site, and will be required to validate the excepted train paths will be adequate to support one million TEU movements. While ARTC have responsibility for the management of rail infrastructure used by rail operators, but are not themselves rail operators and their validation of the number of paths is not suggested as required within	Appendix H *Rail Access Report* (Hyder Consulting, June 2013b)

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
		the report.	
Rail Access Report	Page 8 - Last paragraph states: *ARTC also advised that there is a considerable amount of attention being directed at the future transport solutions for the cross-metropolitan container task and that they are working closely with the NSW Government over the next six months to assist in identifying a preferred strategy for this task and this is likely to lead to a firmer assessment of the scope and timing of capacity enhancements.* Can the proponent provide further details?	The initial operating stages of the SIMTA proposal are not expected to trigger requirements for rail upgrades to the SSFL. Section 2.2 of the *Rail Access Report* and Section 5.3.2.3 of the EA outlines the suitability of the proposed rail alignment and connection to the SSFL. It concludes that the current rail alignment is considered to be a suitable alignment to support a future whole of precinct access arrangement, with the MICL site also being able to access through the same connection point. Recent discussion with ARTC indicated that they have a designated train path model showing that there are 24 train paths available each way. At its peak, the SIMTA proposal will require 21-22 paths. As the SIMTA proposal has the durability to service the entire precinct, the impact on the SSFL would therefore be limited. SIMTA will continue consultation with ARTC in regards to any future expansionary infrastructure. The following statement of commitment is included in the EA: *The Proponent shall work with ARTC to identify the timing, scope and staging of any required capacity enhancement to the ARTC Network.*	Section 5.3.2.3 Appendix H *Rail Access Report* (Hyder Consulting, June 2013b)
Rail Access Report	Page 9- Can SIMTA cater for 1800m interstate trains on a joint siding if MICL shares access? Also, does sufficient capacity exist for MICL interstate trains (if introduced)? If not, what additional infrastructure may be required? This issue requires clarification.	Section 2.2 of the *Rail Access Report* and Section 5.3.2.3 of the EA outline the suitability of the proposed rail alignment and connection to the SSFL. It concludes that the current rail alignment is suitable to support a future whole of precinct access arrangement, with the MICL site also able to gain access through the same connection point. The *Freight Demand Modelling* report presents the results of modelling undertaken to derive an estimate of the catchment that would be serviced by the SIMTA proposal and reviews the capacities of the existing and proposed IMTs within the Sydney Metropolitan Region. As the SIMTA proposal is intended to facilitate port shuttle services,	Appendix G *Freight Demand Modelling* (Hyder Consulting, June 2013a) Appendix H *Rail Access Report* (Hyder Consulting,

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
		assessment of interstate movements and demand is not applicable to the SIMTA proposal. The MICL proposal has assessed the viability of interstate freight and determined that it would not be viable until 2030 at the earliest, as follows: *Development of an interstate terminal when justified by market conditions, but estimated for the purposes of this business case to commence operations in 2030 (MICL Business Case 2012).* It is our understanding that operation of the MICL site for the purpose of interstate freight movements would not commence until 2028 /2030 (MICL Information Boards, October 2013 & Detailed Business Case, (KPMG) February 2012) and would be subject to further assessment of market demand. The timeframe identified by MICL for development of interstate freight handling capacity is beyond the future case adopted for the SIMTA proposal. However, if interstate trains are introduced, the shared rail access would be sufficient to accommodate 1,800 m interstate trains. A turn-off point to the MICL site would be required on the rail link, to the west of the George's River bridge and to the east of the SIMTA site access. Given the length of the MICL site, it has been assumed that there would be capacity on the site to hold a 1,800 m train, without the need to break the train down on the rail link. There would be sufficient space from the turn off point to the MICL site for the SIMTA site to also accommodate a 1,800 m interstate train, should this be required in the future, with the initial breakdown of the train undertaken on the rail link, past the MICL site turn off. The SIMTA site arrangement has provided for four rail sidings on site. Three rail sidings would be able to accommodate up to 650 m sections of train each, with the final siding available to allow for manoeuvring of train carriages and performing run-around movements, ensuring that a	June 2013b)

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
		1,800 m train could be accommodated on site.	
Rail Access Report	Page 11 -The noise impacts of the tight radius curve needs to be assessed and mitigation identified. Also, what are the engineering issues of having loaded trains being held on the super/elevation? Will the points be remote/interlocked, so that trains don't need to stop? Will the turnout be installed with super elevation?	Section 2.2 of the *Rail Access Report* and Section 5.3.2.3 of the EA outline the suitability of the proposed rail alignment and connection to the SSFL. The alignment has been determined based on current design specifications and requirements prescribed by ARTC. The sketches accompanying the *Rail Access Report* have been prepared in accordance with Railcorp's Engineering Standards, including: ▪ ESC 210: Track Geometry and Stability ▪ ESC 215: Transit Space ▪ ESC 250: Turnouts and Special Trackwork Compliance with ARTC and RailCorp standards ensures that expected impacts of design aspects have been determined to be minimal and acceptable. Detailed detail will be undertaken during subsequent development stages. SIMTA is consulting with RailCorp regarding the progression of the detailed design of the rail link. In addition, maintenance of the rail tracks and sidings would be undertaken as required to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the intermodal terminal, providing on-going mitigation of noise impacts from train movement. Section 6.4 of the *Noise Impact Assessment* assesses the expected rail noise within the rail corridor associated with the SIMTA proposal. Predicted noise levels were at the most affected locations within each receiver catchment. Rail noise levels have been predicted using data from the RailCorp rail noise database. Section 6.4 concludes that the predicted rail noise levels are more than 10 dBA below the *IGANRIP* and RING trigger levels.	Appendix H *Rail Access Report* (Hyder Consulting, June 2013b) Appendix I *Noise Impact Assessment* (Wilkinson Murray, August 2013)
Rail Access	Page 16 - Operationally the proposal includes one set of points at the rear of the tip to split traffic to the north and south. Effectively this means	The SIMTA site will provide sufficient space to hold trains on site, within SIMTA sidings. The SIMTA site arrangement has provided for	Appendix H *Rail Access Report*

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
Report	that there are no crossing/holding facilities on the line which will affect capacity and reliability. A train cannot leave SIMTA once a Down train passes Leightonfield. This becomes particularly relevant if it is a joint access line. This issue requires clarification.	four rail sidings on site. Three rail sidings would be able to accommodate up to 650 m sections of train each, with the final siding available to allow for manoeuvring of train carriages and performing run-around movements. Should the MICL proposal gain planning approval and decide to access their site through the shared SIMTA rail link, it is expected that MICL would also be able to hold the full-length trains on sidings on the MICL site. This would mean that the trains could clear the rail link rapidly; ensuring minimal disruption to the shared access rail link. In addition, if both sites are developed it is anticipated that there would be opportunity to expand the northern access link to a double line, should joint access to service the MICL site and SIMTA sites were agreed. This would allow for a cross over loop between the north and south access, without causing further interference or requiring additional land within the East Hills Line.	(Hyder Consulting, June 2013b)
Rail Access Report	Page 17- Noise impacts from tight radii curves need to be assessed and mitigation measures identified.	Section 2.2 of the *Rail Access Report* and Section 5.3.2.3 of the EA outline the suitability of the proposed rail alignment and connection to the SSFL. The alignment has been determined based on current design specifications and requirements prescribed by ARTC. The sketches accompanying the *Rail Access Report* have been prepared in accordance with RailCorp's Engineering Standards, including: ▪ ESC 210: Track Geometry and Stability ▪ ESC 215: Transit Space ▪ ESC 250: Turnouts and Special Trackwork Compliance with ARTC and RailCorp standards ensures that expected impacts of design aspects have been determined to be minimal and acceptable. In addition, maintenance of the rail tracks and sidings would be undertaken as required to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the intermodal terminal, providing on-going mitigation of	Appendix H *Rail Access Report* (Hyder Consulting, June 2013b) Appendix I *Noise Impact Assessment* (Wilkinson Murray, August 2013)

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
		noise impacts from train movement. Section 6.4 of the *Noise Impact Assessment* assesses the expected rail noise within the rail corridor associated with the SIMTA proposal. Predicted noise levels were at the most affected locations within each receiver catchment. Rail noise levels have been predicted using data from the RailCorp rail noise database. Section 6.4 concludes that the predicted rail noise levels are more than 10 dBA below the *IGANRIP* and *RING* trigger levels.	
Rail Access Report	Page 21 -"Longer trains operating from the south will be broken up elsewhere prior to entering Glenfield" What if MICL comes on board (particularly 1800m trains). This issue requires clarification	The *Freight Demand Modelling* report presents the results of modelling undertaken to derive an estimate of the catchment that would be serviced by the SIMTA proposal and reviews the capacities of the existing and proposed IMTs within the Sydney Metropolitan Region. As the SIMTA proposal is intended to facilitate port shuttle services, assessment of interstate movements and demand is not applicable to the SIMTA proposal. The MICL proposal has assessed the viability of interstate freight and determined that it would not be viable until 2030 at the earliest, as follows: *Development of an interstate terminal when justified by market conditions, but estimated for the purposes of this business case to commence operations in 2030 (MICL Business Case 2012).* It is our understanding that operation of the MICL site for the purpose of interstate freight movements would not commence until 2028 /2030 (MICL Information Boards, October 2013 & Detailed Business Case, (KPMG) February 2012) and would be subject to further assessment of market demand. The timeframe identified by MICL for development of interstate freight handling capacity is beyond the future case adopted for the SIMTA proposal. However, if interstate trains are introduced, the shared rail access would be sufficient to accommodate 1,800 m interstate trains. A turn-	Appendix H *Rail Access Report* (Hyder Consulting, June 2013b) Appendix G *Freight Demand Modelling* (Hyder Consulting, June 2013a)

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
		off point to the MICL site would be required on the rail link, to the west of the George's River bridge and to the east of the SIMTA site access. Given the length of the MICL site, it has been assumed that there would be capacity on the site to hold a 1,800 m train, without the need to break the train down on the rail link. There would be sufficient space from the turn off point to the MICL site for the SIMTA site to also accommodate a 1,800 m interstate train should this be required in the future, with the initial breakdown of the train undertaken on the rail link, past the MICL site turn off. The SIMTA site arrangement has provided for four rail sidings on site. Three rail sidings would be able to accommodate up to 650 m sections of train each, with the final siding available to allow for manoeuvring of train carriages and performing run-around movements, ensuring that a 1,800 m train could be accommodated on site.	
Rail Access Report	Page 22- A correction is required. Air quality: The SIMTA proposal would accommodate up to 21 (should be 42) train movements per day.	Noted.	Appendix H *Rail Access Report* (Hyder Consulting, June 2013b)
Rail Access Report	Page 22 - Noise: Does not consider wheel/rail noise from tight curves.	Section 2.2 of the *Rail Access Report* and Section 5.3.2.3 of the EA outline the suitability of the proposed rail alignment and connection to the SSFL. The alignment has been determined based on current design specifications and requirements prescribed by ARTC. The proposed alignment has been designed in accordance with RailCorp standards, including: ▪ ESC 210: Track Geometry and Stability ▪ ESC 215: Transit Space ▪ ESC 250: Turnouts and Special Trackwork	Appendix H *Rail Access Report* (Hyder Consulting, June 2013b)

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
		Compliance with ARTC and RailCorp standards ensures that expected impacts of design aspects have been determined to be minimal and acceptable. In addition, maintenance of the rail tracks and sidings would be undertaken as required to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the intermodal terminal, providing on-going mitigation of noise impacts from train movement. Section 6.4 of the *Noise Impact Assessment* assesses the expected rail noise within the rail corridor associated with the SIMTA proposal. Predicted noise levels were at the most affected locations within each receiver catchment. Rail noise levels have been predicted using data from the RailCorp rail noise database. Section 6.4 concludes that the predicted rail noise levels are more than 10 dBA below the *IGANRIP* and *RING* trigger levels.	
Rail Access Report	Appendix A Page 6- Is the Moorebank Avenue bridge over the East Hill rail line a RailCorp or Army asset? Clarification should be provided.	The Moorebank Avenue bridge over the East Hill rail line is a road bridge and hence is not the property of RailCorp.	N/A
Public transport	It is acknowledged that the proponent has now included TfNSW's previously suggested bus servicing arrangement. This includes the provision of a Glenfield Station to Liverpool Station shuttle bus to serve the development and the rationalisation of bus routes 870, 871 and 872. These requirements have been included in a list of Suggested Public Transport Measures.	Acknowledged	N/A
Public transport	TfNSW seeks to incorporate the following matters into the proponents Statement of Commitments:	Appendix A of the *Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment* Report (Hyder Consulting, 2013) and Public Transport Assessment (Urbanhorizon Pty Ltd, 2011) sets out recommendations for a package of measures to deliver a target public transport mode share of 30% for employees accessing the SIMTA site and assigns responsibility for the delivery of each measure identified. This will reduce the potential for	Section 18 Appendix F, *Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment*

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
		traffic congestion in the surrounding network. Further, a Statement of Commitments has been included within the EA (Chapter 18) to facilitate upgrades to public transport infrastructure in proximity to the site: *The Proponent commits to negotiating with the relevant agencies/authorities as required to facilitate the staged delivery of the public transport infrastructure in accordance with the Transport Accessibility Impact Assessment:* ▪ *Designing and constructing the central spine road and other site roads to accommodate buses, bus infrastructure and cyclist use for employees.* ▪ *Construction of a covered bus drop off/pick up facility within the site to encourage the use of buses for employees.* ▪ *Review and rationalisation of the locations of Route 901 bus stops in the vicinity of the site to match the proposed northern terminal entry location and enhance accessibility.* ▪ *Providing peak period and SIMTA shift work responsive express buses to/from the site and Liverpool Station via Moorebank Avenue and Newbridge Roads with frequency dependant on the development of the site.* ▪ *Providing peak period express buses to/from the site and Holsworthy rail station via Anzac Road, Wattle Grove Drive and Heathcote Road with frequency dependant on the development of the site.* ▪ *Consulting with relevant bus provider(s) regarding the potential to extend the Route 901 bus through the site via the light vehicle road and increasing peak period bus service frequencies to better match the needs of existing and future employees of the locality with frequency dependant on the development of the site.* The statement of commitment is considered appropriate to address	(Hyder Consulting 2013)

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
		TfNSW's concerns.	
Public transport	1 The proponent notes that all proposed public transport measures suggested are subject to appropriate funding and consultation.	Noted. The existing Statement of Commitment is appropriate to address this recommendation.	Section 18
Public transport	2 Consideration must be given to any potential impacts to regular public bus services and school bus services operating in this area from the proposed traffic and truck movements. Should any impacts be identified, the measures proposed to mitigate these must be committed to being enforced.	The Traffic Impact Assessment Report assessed the impact of the SIMTA proposal on traffic on the surrounding road network (which includes bus services) and identified the mitigation measures necessary to maintain the current level of service at the impacted intersections during the AM and PM peak commuter periods. The mitigation measures identified would similarly mitigate impacts on bus services using the road network.	Appendix F, *Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment* (Hyder Consulting 2013)
Public transport	3 A Construction Management Plan should specify any potential impacts to regular bus services and school bus services operating on roads within the vicinity of the site from construction vehicles during construction of the proposed works. Potential impacts to pedestrian access to public transport infrastructure including bus stops must also be specified. Should any impacts be identified, the duration of the impacts and measures proposed to mitigate these must be clearly explained.	Noted the Statement of Commitment (Section 18) has been updated as follows: *The Proponent commits to developing a Construction Traffic Management Plan to minimise the potential impacts of the construction stage(s), including:* ▪ *Heavy vehicle access routes* ▪ *Location of construction worker parking* ▪ *Mitigation measures to avoid any unacceptable impacts on the surrounding land uses* ▪ *Mitigation measures to avoid any unacceptable impacts on regular bus services and school bus services operating on roads within the vicinity of the site and pedestrian and cyclist access.*	Section 18 Submissions Report
Public transport	4 The impact of the proposal and any changes to roadways on existing bus stop locations and the identification of any new bus stop locations to support the development must be assessed.	Noted. The existing Statement of Commitment has been updated as follows: ▪ *Consulting with relevant bus provider(s) regarding the potential to*	Section 18 Submissions

Aspect	Issue	Clarification / Response	EIS Section/ Specialist Study reference
		extend the Route 901 bus through the site via the light vehicle road and increasing peak period bus service frequencies to better match the needs of existing and future employees of the locality with frequency dependant on the development of the site. ▪ *Consulting with relevant bus providers regarding changes to existing bus stop locations and the identification of new bus stop locations if required.*	Report
Public transport	5 The proponent acknowledges that if the road closure of Cambridge Avenue occurs, it is highly unlikely that the shuttle bus will operate to the south of the site as Cambridge Avenue is the only suitable route for this service.	Noted. The existing Statement of Commitment discusses shuttle bus routes, none of which would use Cambridge Avenue to access the site (i.e. access to the SIMTA site would be from the north via the M5 Motorway). The following is provided as a Statement of Commitment in the EA: ▪ *Providing peak period and SIMTA shift work responsive express buses to/from the site and Liverpool Station via Moorebank Avenue and Newbridge Roads with frequency dependant on the development of the site.* ▪ *Providing peak period express buses to/from the site and Holsworthy rail station via Anzac Road, Wattle Grove Drive and Heathcote Road with frequency dependant on the development of the site.* Inclusion of the proposed Statement of Commitment is therefore not relevant, nor required.	Section 18