

West Gate Tunnel Project

Conclave Report for Surface Noise and Vibration (related to Technical Report H of the EES).

Environmental Performance Requirements

CONFIDENTIAL & PRIVILEGED

Conclave held 7th August 2017. Document date 14th August 2017.

Chairperson: Matthew Stead (**MS**), on behalf of the Westgate Distributor Authority.

Experts:

- Shane Elkin (**SE**) for City of Hobsons Bay
- Darren Tardio (**DT**) for City of Melbourne
- Bert Zerbst (**BZ**) for Environment Protection Authority Victoria

Notes:

- This conclave report has been prepared in accordance with the WGTP IAC Protocol for Expert Conclaves.
- Given the expert's involvement (Shane Elkin and Darren Tardio) covers different areas with different issues the conclaves for these two areas were held separately.
- EES Chapter 8 - Environmental Management Framework has been used as the basis for discussion on EPRs.
- Bert Zerbst's involvement relates to all project regions however it only relates to construction noise. Where BZ's input was provided it is noted with his initials.
- Request for information is summarised after each conclave summary for SE and DT.

Signed:

Matthew Stead	Shane Elkin	Darren Tardio	Bert Zerbst
			

Region: City of Hobsons Bay

Conclave with Shane Elkin & Bert Zerbst

12 noon to 3 pm. 7th August 2017

Item No.	EPR NVP	Key issue	Proposed Changes	Agreed/ or Not Agreed (& Relevant Experts)	Discussion
1	1	SE suggest wording regarding “facing the traffic noise, being those adjacent to or with direct line of sight to the freeway” may be ambiguous.	SE proposed that EPR be clarified in regard to where noise limit be achieved or these words be deleted such that a more simple approach be adopted whereby all facades of noise affected properties are protected.	MS disagree. (SE & MS)	MS considers that this is addressed in the compliance testing methodology outlined in EPR NVP2 which refers to the testing requirements for acoustic consultants.

Item No.	EPR NVP	Key issue	Proposed Changes	Agreed/ or Not Agreed (& Relevant Experts)	Discussion
2	1	SE notes protection of acoustic amenity within public open spaces.	See SE evidence paragraphs 95 to 99. SE asks IAC to consider ERP for Parks and Open spaces with regard to traffic noise as was recommended by the IAC for East West Link Project.	MS disagree. (SE & MS)	<p>See MS witness statement. Noise mitigation is not required in accordance with VicRoads Noise Policy.</p> <p>Further to the list of parks identified in paragraphs 95 to 99, SE has subsequently learnt that a new recreational park is proposed to be built within Precinct 15 as part of this project. SE asks that this park also be considered for noise mitigation as the Year 2031 noise predictions show levels in excess of 63 dBA L10(18hr) in this location (see noise contour plots on pages 126 and 127 of the SNVIA)</p>

Item No.	EPR NVP	Key issue	Proposed Changes	Agreed/ or Not Agreed (& Relevant Experts)	Discussion
3	1	SE notes key issue is increase in operational noise levels along Millers Road.	<p>A) SE asks the IAC to consider the implementation of Project Note 1 such that only 1 truck toll point is implemented on the Westgate Freeway thereby reducing traffic noise on Millers Road to below 2 dB increase.</p> <p>B) Alternatively SE asks the IAC to consider implementation of noise mitigation as per SE paragraph 130 or 131.</p>	<p>A) MS agree</p> <p>B) MS disagree.</p> <p>(SE & MS)</p>	<p>A) MS notes that implementation of 1 truck toll point (see Project Note 1) would be beneficial for the impact on Millers Road.</p> <p>B) See MS witness statement regarding Millers Road. Noise mitigation is not required in accordance with VicRoads Noise Policy.</p>
4	1	See Item 13. DT/MS conclave.	See Item 13. DT/MS conclave.	<p>Agreed. MS/SE.</p> <p>(SE & MS)</p>	
5	2	SE suggests clarification of compliance monitoring requirements ie timing and number of locations / geographical coverage.	SE suggest compliance monitoring takes place within 6 months of operation (as per VicRoads RDN 06-01) and that the number of compliance monitoring location be consistent with the number of baseline ambient locations used in the EES Technical Report H.	<p>MS disagree.</p> <p>(SE & MS)</p>	<p>MS considers that this will be addressed in the OEMP and may not be required in the EPR NVP2.</p> <p>Refer also DT/MS conclave item 15.</p>

Item No.	EPR NVP	Key issue	Proposed Changes	Agreed/ or Not Agreed (& Relevant Experts)	Discussion
6	3	SE requirement for condition inspection within a fixed distance within 38 m of project.	Recommendation that Building condition inspection be carried out where predictions are made and there is a risk of exceedance of relevant EPR vibration.	Agreed. MS/SE. (SE & MS)	Based on experience we expect that this will be adopted by the contractor in any case.
7	3	SE and BZ recommend there be a requirement for real time monitoring in high risk areas.	Recommendations that CNVMP include a requirement for real time noise and vibration monitoring in high risk areas to enable prompt responses to adverse impacts.	Agreed. MS/SE/BZ. (SE, BZ & MS)	Requirement for real time noise and vibration monitoring is already included in the EES.
8	3	SE/MS suggests that MMRP EPR NV21 be adopted as relevant to further enhance requirements of NVP3.	Suggests adoption (as relevant) the requirements of MMRP EPR NV21 into EPR NVP3.	Agreed. MS/SE/BZ (SE, BZ & MS)	Elements of NV21 may assist the project CNVMP. SE suggests that MMRP EPR SC2 also be adopted as relevant to further enhance requirements of NVP3. This was not agreed by MS.
9	4	SE noted that there is no definition of background noise provided in the EPRs for CNVMP's "prediction of potential impact" purposes.	SE requests the IAC consider a definition of background noise to clarify EPR NVP4.	Agreed. SE/MS (SE & MS)	

Item No.	EPR NVP	Key issue	Proposed Changes	Agreed/ or Not Agreed (& Relevant Experts)	Discussion
10	11	SE suggests consideration of annual testing requirement for ventilation system compliance monitoring.	Suggest the word “annually” be inserted into NVP11.	SE/BZ Agree. MS disagree. (SE, BZ & MS)	MS does not consider necessary given role of Independent Auditor and OEMP.
11	New EPR	SE suggests that the Independent Auditor’s Reports be made public, within 7 days of finalisation, both during the construction and operational stages of the project.	SE recommends a new EPR to this effect be included in the Planning Approval.	MS disagree. (SE & MS)	This EPR would be applicable to all environmental areas, not just noise and vibration. MS believes this is beyond the scope of this conclave.

Additional information request from SE:

In my Expert Report dated 2 August 2017, I made a number of requests for additional information. Whilst responses to these requests would have provided me greater understanding of the EES findings, it is my opinion that the proposed EPR’s (including the proposed changes above and below) will provide the necessary protection for the constituents of Hobsons Bay City Council. Given that the WDA will be required to achieve compliance with the EPRs (and will be independently audited on a regular basis), it is not material that I receive the requested information for the purposes of this hearing.

Region: Melbourne City Council

Conclave with Darren Tardio regarding Melbourne City Council

3 pm to 6 pm, 7th August 2017

Item No.	EPR NVP	Key issue	Proposed Changes	Agreed/ or Not Agreed (& Relevant Experts)	Discussion
12	1	DT believes that internal noise objectives to be met at all levels of apartments as consistent with previous road projects.	DT suggests EPR to be updated accordingly so that consistency maintained for future projects.	MS disagree. (DT & MS)	Refer expert witness statements for discussion on EPR being met at all levels of an apartment.

Item No.	EPR NVP	Key issue	Proposed Changes	Agreed/ or Not Agreed (& Relevant Experts)	Discussion
13	1	SE/MS/DT suggest clarification of approach to off-reservation mitigation where noise levels can't practically be met with noise wall.	SE/DT/MS suggest adding reference to VicRoads RDN 06-01 Appendix E for reasonable and practicable requirements. The existing EPR noise objective of additional attenuation to remain where there is a shortfall from noise wall attenuation. Suggest removing "internal" in the sentence "...is provided <u>internal</u> to the building"	Agreed. SE/DT/MS. (SE, DT & MS) Note that SE was involved in discussion after initial conclave.	This is recommended to help clarify the process for assessing architectural treatment when noise walls do not achieve sufficient noise mitigation. By way of example, if the predicted external noise level at a home was 65 dBA L10(18hr) after all reasonable and practical measures (see VicRoads RDN 06-01 Appendix E) had been implemented, an additional 2 dB façade noise attenuation must be offered to the residents, being equivalent to achieving the criterion of 63 dBA L10(18hr).

Item No.	EPR NVP	Key issue	Proposed Changes	Agreed/ or Not Agreed (& Relevant Experts)	Discussion
14	1	<p>As noted in MS/DT statement the duration of compliance of NVP1 should be clarified. MS understands that this applied for the "Operational Phase" which also requires definition.</p> <p>Clarify date at which a property is eligible for assessment against the traffic noise levels criteria also suggested. EPR notes "existing and occupied" buildings at 2nd April 2017. Note that VicRoads RND 06-01 applies a different approach.</p>	Update EPR to consider key issue.	Agreed DT/MS. (DT & MS)	EPR NVP1 to be updated as suggested.
15	2	DT suggested Independent Auditor to ensure that EPR NVP2 is met with sufficient rigor in particular with regard to number of locations and corrections for traffic volumes and growth from the time of measurement.	Update EPR to consider key issue.	Agreed DT/MS. (DT & MS)	
16	3	Refer to SE/MS/BZ conclave re EPR NVP3. See item 8 regarding adopting parts of the MMRP EPR NV21.	Refer to SE/MS/BZ conclave re EPR NVP3.	Agreed DT/MS (DT & MS)	

Item No.	EPR NVP	Key issue	Proposed Changes	Agreed/ or Not Agreed (& Relevant Experts)	Discussion
17	3	DT requests clarification of inaudibility in NVP4 Part 2.	BZ and DT suggests inaudibility target is LA90 plus 0, where there are no annoying tones, impulsive sounds or intermittent noises are present, for purpose of CNVMP modelling only. 1254 does not require numerical definition for compliance assessment.	MS disagree. (DT, BZ & MS)	MS believes the EPR requires inaudibility and further clarification of EPA documents most likely not needed.
18	3	Refer Paragraph 47 and 52 regarding mandatory condition audits. See also item 6.	Recommendation that Building condition inspection be carried out where predictions are made and there is a risk of exceedance of relevant EPR vibration.	Agreed MS/ DT. (DT & MS)	Refer SE/MS conclave regarding NVP 3. Item 6. DT notes that this is satisfactory with regard to DT Evidence paragraph 47.
19	4	DT noted that NVP4 Part 1 is not clear due to wording around applying to other noise sensitive areas not listed in the table.	Replace "Community centres" with "Other noise sensitive areas".	Agreed DT/MS (DT & MS)	Existing EPR is not clear how it is applied to sensitive usage not listed in the table.

Additional information requests:

- Noise contours above elevated Road for Wurundjeri Way in the E Gate region.
- Heavy vehicles volumes or % for Wurundjeri Way extension.