

CSSI 10051 - Sydney Metro response to Independent Audit 05

SM-24-00091827

Applicable to:	Sydney Metro Western Sydney Airport
Status:	Final
Date of issue:	24 April 2024

SM – WSA CSSI 10051

Sydney Metro Response to Audit No.5 Findings

Item	Ref	Type	Requirement	Finding	Recommended or completed action ¹	By Whom	Status ²	Sydney Metro Response
WolfPeak 10051_IA5_1	A2	Non-compliance	<i>The CSSI must only be carried out in accordance with all procedures, commitments, preventative actions, performance criteria and mitigation measures set out in the documents listed in Condition A1 unless otherwise specified in, or required under, this approval.</i>	Non-compliance: SBT reported a non-compliance against A2 for truck queuing on Lansdowne Road on 26/10/23. Initially the ER and Sydney Metro considered there to not be a breach on the basis that E109 does not prohibit queuing but does require minimizing of queuing. However, a non-compliance was raised by Sydney Metro against A2 on 04/12/23 following discussion with the Department, based on a contravention of the applicable CTMP.	<p>The non-compliance was reported in accordance with A44/A45 following a discussion with the Department.</p> <p>The geofencing in the real-time truck tracking program (Virtual Superintendent) was updated to reflect the updated SBT access arrangement (now that SSTOM and SCAW have taken control of Lansdowne Road), and therefore enabling the better management of truck arrivals and movements.</p> <p>The Auditor is not aware of any further action from Department on the matter, nor any recurrence of the issue.</p>	SBT (CPBG)	CLOSED	N/A
WolfPeak 10051_IA5_2	A22	Observation	<p><i>Lunch sheds, office sheds, portable toilet facilities and the like, can be established and used where they have been assessed in the documents listed in Condition A1 or satisfy the following criteria:</i></p> <p><i>(a) are located within or adjacent to the Construction Boundary; and</i></p> <p><i>(b) have been assessed by the ER to have –</i></p> <p><i>(i) minimal amenity impacts to surrounding residences and businesses, after consideration of matters such as compliance with the ICNG, traffic and access impacts, dust and odour impacts, and visual (including light spill) impacts, and</i></p> <p><i>(ii) minimal environmental impact with respect to waste management and flooding, and</i></p> <p><i>(iii) no impacts on biodiversity, soil and water, and Heritage items beyond those already approved under other terms of this approval.</i></p>	<p>Observation: It is the Auditors view that FSM Minor Ancillary Facilities (MAF) 3 and 5 do not meet the definition of the MAF for two reasons.</p> <p>MAFs 3 and 5 are within the existing T1 rail corridor and within a lot that adjoins the Construction Boundary but are located 129m and 400m from the Construction Boundary respectively (not, in the Auditor's view to be 'adjacent' as required by A22(a)).</p> <p>The noise assessment associated with the MAFs predicted worst case noise impacts of up to 19dB(A) above the nighttime Rated Background Level (not, in the Auditor's view to be 'minimal amenity impact' after consideration of compliance with the ICNG as required by A22(b)(i)).</p> <p>However, the Auditor acknowledges the following:</p> <p>The MAF application identifies processes / mitigation measures that comply with the ICNG. Noise monitoring results provided by the auditee show worst case noise below the predicted worst-case impacts.</p> <p>The Department approved the heavy vehicle access to the two MAFs (during track possessions) in accordance with E105; Sydney Trains are conducting works along the rail corridor during possessions in addition to the FSM works (Sydney Trains are beyond the scope of this audit); and there have been no</p>	<p>The Department appears to be aware of the Project's intended use of MAFs 3 and 5 (via review and approval of the heavy vehicle access under E105) and has not raised any issues in relation to the matter.</p> <p>No complaints have been received.</p>	FSM (Laing O'Rourke / Transport for NSW)	CLOSED	N/A

¹ The recommended action does not preclude the need for all non-compliances to be reported by the proponent in accordance with A44/A45.

² Status of finding and action according to the Auditor at the time of finalizing the Report.

Item	Ref	Type	Requirement	Finding	Recommended or completed action ¹	By Whom	Status ²	Sydney Metro Response
				complaints regarding FSM works during the audit period.				
GHD OBS-A-1	A22	Observation	<p><i>Lunch sheds, office sheds, portable toilet facilities and the like, can be established and used where they have been assessed in the documents listed in Condition A1 or satisfy the following criteria:</i></p> <p><i>(a) are located within or adjacent to the Construction Boundary; and</i></p> <p><i>(b) have been assessed by the ER to have –</i></p> <p><i>(i) minimal amenity impacts to surrounding residences and businesses, after consideration of matters such as compliance with the ICNG, traffic and access impacts, dust and odour impacts, and visual (including light spill) impacts, and</i></p> <p><i>(ii) minimal environmental impact with respect to waste management and flooding, and</i></p> <p><i>(iii) no impacts on biodiversity, soil and water, and Heritage items beyond those already approved under other terms of this approval.</i></p>	Observation: Poor maintenance of ground causing collection of water near wheel wash system and buildup of sediment potentially causing dust hazard and sediment pollution at St Marys.	Improve maintenance of ground conditions at truck wash facility to avoid ponding of water and buildup of sediment potentially causing dust hazard and sediment pollution.	SSTOM (PLM)	OPEN	<p>ER inspections of SSTOM commenced in September when site establishment commenced. The October, November and December 2023 ER reports mention the effective installation of erosion controls, the operation of the wheel wash and installation of barriers to direct vehicles through the wheel wash and site compound at St Marys.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is noted that the majority of drainage within STM site is managed via the WTP and all offsite drains are adequately protected in accordance with the ESCP.</p> <p>Ongoing management of the site will continue to manage this risk.</p>
GHD OBS-A-2	A32	Observation	<p><i>For the duration of the work until the commencement of operation, or as agreed with the Planning Secretary, the approved ER must: (a) receive and respond to communication from the Planning Secretary in relation to the environmental performance of the CSSI;</i></p>	Observation: ER Reports do not specifically refer to receiving or not receiving communication from Planning Secretary. As such, it is not clear if this sub-condition has been triggered or not	ER monthly reports should clarify each sub condition in this condition A32 and conform to the ER Protocol.	Sydney Metro	OPEN	<p>The ER Protocol was developed with consideration of each sub condition of this condition and in consultation with the Department. If sub-condition (a) was triggered during a reporting period, it would be mentioned in the relevant report. Each ER report operates under the assumption that if no communication has been received from the Planning Secretary in relation to ER inspections, then it will not be specifically mentioned within the report.</p> <p>Furthermore, there has been no communication from the Planning Secretary in relation to the environmental performance of the CSSI with the ER.</p>
WolfPeak 10051_IA5_3	A46	Observation	<p><i>All Heavy Vehicles used for spoil haulage must be clearly marked on the sides and rear with the project name and application number to enable immediate identification by a person viewing the Heavy Vehicle standing 20 metres away</i></p>	<p>Observation: The ER noted in its Monthly Report for December 23 that some SBT spoil haulage trucks, reportedly from new haulage subcontractors, were observed to be missing Project markings consistent with A46. SBT was advised by the ER to review and refresh current Heavy Vehicle onboarding and management processes to ensure markings are fitted.</p> <p>This matter was not raised as a non-compliance by the ER or Project team at the time of the observation</p>	<p>Further ER Monthly Reports (January and February 2024) have not identified additional spoil haulage trucks without appropriate signage.</p> <p>CPBG have notified new haulage contractors of requirements to have Project Identification on spoil haulage trucks.</p>	SBT (CPBG)	CLOSED	N/A

Item	Ref	Type	Requirement	Finding	Recommended or completed action ¹	By Whom	Status ²	Sydney Metro Response
				<p>or in the ER Monthly Report. The Department was provided with the ER Monthly Report and have not, to the Auditor's knowledge, responded to the matter.</p> <p>The lack of Project markings on spoil haulage trucks was not raised again (or stated as being rectified) in the ER Monthly Report for January 24.</p>	Checks of Project Identification on spoil haulage trucks is ongoing during routine inspections.			
GHD OBS-B-1	B8	Observation	<p>The role of the Community Complaints Mediator is to provide independent mediation services for any reasonable and unresolved complaint referred by the ER where a member of the public is not satisfied by the Proponent's response. Where a Community Complaints Mediator is required, a mediator accredited under the National Mediator Accreditation System (NMAS), administered by the Mediator Standards Board must be appointed.</p>	<p>Observation: Accreditation details as per National Mediator Accreditation System accreditation details were not available to verify in this audit</p>	Provide accreditation details of community complaints mediator as onboarded.	Sydney Metro	OPEN	<p>Negocio Resolutions was appointed to the role of Community Complaints Mediator on 14/12/2021 across the WSA Project and has been utilised as Mediator within the SCAW Package. This mediator is confirmed to be accredited under the National Mediator Accreditation System (NMAS) (ref. 130-3710).</p> <p>The contract with Negocio Resolutions is still current as a Standing Offer Deed and will be utilised if required within the SSTOM package.</p>
WolfPeak 10051_IA5_4	C10	Observation	<p>Construction must not commence until the CEMP and all CEMP Sub-plans have been approved by the Planning Secretary or endorsed by the ER (whichever is applicable), unless otherwise agreed by the Planning Secretary. The CEMP and CEMP Sub-plans, as approved by the Planning Secretary or endorsed by the ER (whichever is applicable), including any minor amendments approved by the ER, must be implemented for the duration of construction.</p>	<p>One departure from the SCAW Soil and Water Management Plan (SWMP) was identified during the audit period. On 06/11/23 a member of the CPBUI construction team was witnessed pumping construction water into a basin without a Permit to Discharge. The activity was immediately stopped. The pumped water was observed to be contained within the erosion sediment controls installed and was not observed by the SCAW team to have impacted any nearby waters.</p>	<p>The Project team and ER deemed the event as non-reportable under the Sydney Metro Environmental Incident Classification and Reporting Procedure and A41-A45. The Auditor agrees with this assessment.</p> <p>SCAW has issued reminders on the need for permits and developed an EWMS for the activity. There have been no incidents of this nature since then.</p>	SCAW (CPBUI) / Sydney Metro	CLOSED	N/A
WolfPeak 10051_IA5_5	C14	Observation	<p>Each Construction Monitoring Program must provide:</p> <p>(a) details of baseline data available including the period of baseline monitoring;</p> <p>(b) details of baseline data to be obtained and when;</p> <p>(c) details of all monitoring of the project to be undertaken;</p> <p>(d) the parameters of the project to be monitored;</p> <p>(e) the frequency of monitoring to be undertaken;</p> <p>(f) the location of monitoring;</p> <p>(g) the reporting of monitoring results and analysis results against relevant criteria;</p>	<p>Observation: SBT (CPBG) advise that it is not intending on discharging treated water from the construction Water Treatment Plants (WTPs) to the environment due to treated water not meeting criteria (water is being discharged to trade waste). The Auditor observes that the downstream monitoring location at Orchard Hills (EPL sample point 6) as shown in the Surface Water Monitoring Program is not downstream of any current discharges.</p>	<p>SBT (CPBG) has reviewed the monitoring location and have concluded that anywhere upstream of the current monitoring location is within an ephemeral drainage channel and is not able to be sampled on a regular basis. The South Creek, however, is a perennial stream and as such is a more reliable indicator of creek health.</p>	SBT (CPBG)	CLOSED	N/A

Item	Ref	Type	Requirement	Finding	Recommended or completed action ¹	By Whom	Status ²	Sydney Metro Response
			<p>(h) details of the methods that will be used to analyse the monitoring data;</p> <p>(i) procedures to identify and implement additional mitigation measures where the results of the monitoring indicated unacceptable project impacts;</p> <p>(j) a consideration of SMART principles;</p> <p>(k) any consultation to be undertaken in relation to the monitoring programs; and</p> <p>(l) any specific requirements as required by Conditions C15 to C16.</p>					
WolfPeak 10051_IA5_6	E13	Observation	<p>Revegetation and the provision of replacement trees must be informed by a Tree Survey undertaken during detailed design. The Tree Survey must identify the number, type and location of any trees to be removed, except for trees that are offset under Condition E4. The Tree Survey must be submitted to the Planning Secretary for information with the Place, Urban Design and Corridor Landscape Plan required under Condition E79.</p> <p>Where trees are to be removed, the Proponent must provide a net increase in the number of replacement trees at a ratio of 2:1, except trees that are offset under Condition E4. Replacement trees must have a minimum pot size consistent with the relevant authority's plans / programs / strategies for vegetation management, street planting, or open space landscaping, or as agreed by the relevant authority(ies).</p>	<p>Observation: Tree Surveys have been completed by each contractor that has removed trees and each have been provided to Sydney Metro. The Auditor observes the following:</p> <p>To the Auditor's knowledge, tree survey data has not yet been compiled into a single Tree Survey for the purposes of revegetation and provision of replacement trees.</p> <p>According to the Staging Report, this condition is applicable to SBT and SCAW (although revegetation does not form part of the scope of these packages).</p> <p>According to the Staging Report, this condition is not applicable to FSM (although this package has removed 17 x planted/landscape trees during construction).</p> <p>According to the Staging Report, this condition is not applicable to SSTOM (although revegetation does form part of its scope, and the auditees advise that the Tree Survey will be provided by SSTOM to the Department with the PUDCLP (Stage 2) submission).</p>	<p>Compile tree survey data into a single Tree Survey to enable accurate replacement of trees.</p> <p>Update Staging Report to accurately reflect the applicability of this condition across each package.</p>	Sydney Metro	OPEN	<p>As advised during the audit, a single tree survey will be included within the SSTOM PUDCLP (Stage 2) and provided to the DPHI.</p> <p>Sydney Metro is currently in the process of updating the staging report to accurately reflect the applicability of this condition across each package.</p>
GHD OBS-E-1	E56	Observation	<p>All work undertaken for the delivery of the CSSI, including those undertaken by third parties (such as utility relocations), must be coordinated to ensure respite periods are provided.</p>	<p>Observation: The OOHW schedules are not detailed on the respite or mitigation details.</p> <p>There are activities with 20-30dB noise occurring at night, however, there are no respite or mitigation measures included</p>	<p>Provide details of how respite or mitigation of noise impacts from construction of the CSSI is being managed.</p>	SSTOM (PLM)	OPEN	<p>Respite is provided in accordance with consultation with the potentially impacted community, as per Condition E57. In addition, the project EPL (EPL21807) requires respite to occur for any works approved under EPL Condition L5.8, in accordance with EPL Condition L5.9.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are implemented in accordance with those identified in the DNVIS, and in accordance with the Additional Mitigation Measures (AMMs) detailed in Table 16 of the SM CNVS and Table 27 of the Project's NVMP. The OOHW Schedule includes a column ("AMMs") that identifies the applicable AMMs.</p>

Item	Ref	Type	Requirement	Finding	Recommended or completed action ¹	By Whom	Status ²	Sydney Metro Response
								Furthermore, weekly OOHW Meetings are held by PLM to plan any upcoming OOHW. The outcomes of the planning meetings are documented in the OOHW Schedule, which is used to ensure respite is achieved in accordance E57.
GHD OBS-E-2	E79 f, h, i	Observation	<i>The PUDCLP must include descriptions and visualisations (as appropriate) of: (f) details of strategies to rehabilitate, regenerate or revegetate disturbed areas, where relevant; (h) operational maintenance standards; and (i) the timing and responsibilities for implementation of elements included within the PUDCLP.</i>	Observation: The compliance table in Section 1.6 notes that this document is preliminary, with more details to be included in the Stage 2 document. This to be confirmed at next audit	Stage 2 final PUDCLP to include all details as noted in Stage 1 document. This to be confirmed at next audit	SSTOM (PLM) Sydney Metro	OPEN	Noted.
WolfPeak 10051_IA5_7	Not used							
WolfPeak 10051_IA5_8	E85	Non-compliance	<i>Condition surveys of all items for which condition surveys were undertaken in accordance with Condition E84 must be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced person after completion of the work identified in Condition E84. The results of the surveys must be documented in a Post-construction Condition Survey Report for each item surveyed. Copies of Post-construction Condition Survey Reports must be provided to the landowners of the items surveyed, and no later than three (3) months following the completion of the work that could impact on the subject surface / subsurface structure.</i>	Non-compliance: Note that the Auditor raised an observation in the fourth independent audit about the failure to complete and issue post-construction survey reports for TBI, St Mary's Lift and Stairs and Power. At the time of the fourth audit, only AEW Roads (Sydney Metro the owner of affected property) had a post construction survey report issued. Refer to finding 10051_IA4_18 for details. Sydney Metro subsequently reported this as a non-compliance. Preparation and submission of post-construction survey reports for St Mary's Lift and Stairs and Power packages was deemed not required by Sydney Metro as 'no buildings/ structures deemed to be at risk as a result of construction.' Post-construction survey reports for TBI were issued to all properties with the exception of 30-32 and 34 Queens Street (as records of post-construction surveys were not able to be retrieved). It is understood that 34 Queen Street verbally denied access when the TBI contractor requested to complete the post condition surveys.	Sydney Metro subsequently reported this as a non-compliance on 21/01/24. Post-construction survey reports that are missing for 30-32 Queens Street should be prepared and submitted to the landowners. 34 Queen Street should be contacted again to request access. If access is denied, this should be formally recorded. If access is granted, then the post-construction survey should be completed and issued to the landowner.	Sydney Metro	PARTIAL LY CLOSED	Sydney Metro reported this as a non-compliance during the fifth audit period. Sydney Metro has discovered an error in the tracking register. The post construction survey was completed for 16-18 Queen st and submitted to the property owner in November 2021. As noted, an NCR was raised against the TBI package for the delay in providing the post construction surveys to the property owners. Sydney Metro have not received the Post condition survey for 32 Queen Street. Action to close this is to request documentation from Ward civil. Although a pre-construction survey was completed for 34 Queen Street, access was verbally denied when Ward requested to complete the post condition surveys.
WolfPeak 10051_IA5_9	E94	Observation	<i>Before commencing remediation, a Section B Site Audit Statement(s) must be prepared by an NSW EPA-accredited Site Auditor that certifies that the Remedial Action Plan(s) is/are appropriate and that the site can be made suitable for the proposed use. The Remedial Action Plan(s) must be implemented and any changes to the Remedial Action Plan(s)</i>	Observation: SCAW prepared a RAP for an encapsulation cell for receipt of ACM from other sites (referred to as PS105). The location itself did not attract a RAP for any reason other than it was to receive ACM (i.e.: the land was suitable for its intended use). The PS105 RAP was issued to the Contaminated Sites Auditor and Interim Audit Advice was received that the RAP was acceptable and able to be implemented.	A Section B Site Audit Statement has since been obtained (08/03/24) and issued via Teambinder to Sydney Metro.	SCAW (CPBUI)	CLOSED	N/A

Item	Ref	Type	Requirement	Finding	Recommended or completed action ¹	By Whom	Status ²	Sydney Metro Response
			<i>must be approved in writing by the NSW EPA-accredited Site Auditor.</i>	<p>That being said works identified under the RAP, including placement of the marker layer and receipt of ACM material commenced prior to a Section B Site Audit Statement having been obtained.</p> <p>The Auditor acknowledges that Section B Site Audit Statements were in place for the contaminated sites subject to remediation via placement of ACM at PS105 (AEC 35, 36 and 43). The RAPs for AEC 35, 36 and 43 identified PS105 as the proposed encapsulation site for contaminated material, and therefore CPBUI considered the encapsulation activity at PS105 to have been considered and endorsed in the approved RAP's.</p>				
WolfPeak 10051_IA5_10	E96	Observation	<p>A Section A1 or Section A2 Site Audit Statement (accompanied by an Environmental Management Plan) and its accompanying Site Audit Report, which state that the contaminated land disturbed by the work has been made suitable for the intended land use, must be submitted to the Planning Secretary and the Relevant Council(s) after remediation and before the commencement of operation of the CSSI.</p>	<p>Observation: SBT's Aerotropolis and St Marys remediation works have been completed. A Validation Report, Site Audit Report and Section A1 Site Audit Statement was issued for Aerotropolis. According to SBT (CPBG), due to further management measures required associated with the groundwater contamination at St Marys, a Section A Site Audit Statement cannot be produced at this time, only a Section B.</p> <p>SBT have handed the St Marys site over to SSTOM for ongoing construction. Submission of documents relating to contamination are proposed to be submitted to the identified stakeholders prior to operations.</p>	<p>Obtain Section A1 or A2 (A2 being that the site is suitable for its intended use subject to implementation of an environmental management plan) Site Audit Statements for St Marys remediation works prior to operations.</p>	<p>SBT (CPBG) / Sydney Metro</p>	<p>OPEN</p>	<p>Section A1 SAS provided for Aerotropolis</p> <p>Due to further management measures required associated with the groundwater contamination at St Marys, a Section A SAS cannot be produced – only a Section B.</p> <p>In addition, the completion of the St Marys Metro Station is outside the scope of the SBT Works and will be completed by others under a SSTOM works package. Therefore, this matter is closed for SBT and should be followed up with PLM. As per the RAP, the follow-on contractor is required to prepare the EMP based on the final design on the station box.</p> <p>The Validation Report states: "As outlined in the RAP, an EMP shall be prepared to outline the requirements of a groundwater monitoring program to be implemented during the SSTOM Works to demonstrate the PRB remains effective until the station box and tunnel is tanked, and the groundwater flow direction returns to pre-construction direction."</p> <p>Therefore the scope for SBT was to provide a Section B which was completed (see St Marys Site Audit Report and Site Audit Statement for Validation Report.pdf) and included:</p>

Item	Ref	Type	Requirement	Finding	Recommended or completed action ¹	By Whom	Status ²	Sydney Metro Response
								<p>Purpose of site audit</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A1 To determine land use suitability Intended uses of the land: _____</p> <p>OR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A2 To determine land use suitability subject to compliance with either an active or passive environmental management plan Intended uses of the land: _____</p> <p>OR</p> <p>(Tick all that apply)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B1 To determine the nature and extent of contamination</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B2 To determine the appropriateness of:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> an investigation plan</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> a remediation plan</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a management plan</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> B3 To determine the appropriateness of a site testing plan to determine if groundwater is safe and suitable for its intended use as required by the Temporary Water Restrictions Order for the Botany Sands Groundwater Resource 2017</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> B4 To determine the compliance with an approved:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> voluntary management proposal or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> management order under the Contaminated Land Management Act 1997</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B5 To determine if the land can be made suitable for a particular use (or uses) if the site is remediated or managed in accordance with a specified plan. Intended uses of the land: Construction of a future underground train station</p>
WolfPeak 10051_IA5_11	E101	Observation	<i>The Sustainability Plan must be submitted to the Planning Secretary for information within six (6) months of the date of this approval and must be implemented throughout construction and operation.</i>	<p>Observation: There is disagreement between Sydney Metro and SBT (CPBG) as to whether SBT will achieve the non-potable water reuse target of 33% as set out in the Sydney Metro Sustainability Plan. This is primarily a result of the high salinity groundwater recovered during construction not being able to be treated by the treatment process adopted by SBT.</p> <p>Both Sydney Metro and SBT are currently awaiting the results of the Infrastructure Sustainability Design Rating third party verification to determine what % is agreed upon (to resolve this Technical Manual interpretation issue/disagreement).</p> <p>Sydney Metro are of the view that ‘the most significant portion of potable and non-potable water use for the WSA project as a whole is associated with the construction and operation of the SSTOM project. Hence Sydney Metro is of the view that the Project’s overall 33% water reuse target is not currently at risk.’</p> <p>The Auditor has not sighted the breakdown of non-potable water generation/reuse volumes across each package, but notes that the intrinsic salinity of the local groundwater means that suitable treatment must be adopted to ensure that the Sydney Metro WSA Project target reuse criteria of the of 33% can be met.</p>	Review the current and future non-potable water treatment processes and reuse opportunities adopted by SBT and proposed by SSTOM to ensure they enable Sydney Metro WSA Project target reuse criteria of the of 33% to be achieved.	Sydney Metro	OPEN	Actions noted. Infrastructure Sustainability Design Rating third party verification still pending.
GHD OBS-E-3	E102	Observation	<i>The Water Reuse Strategy must be prepared based on best practice and advice sought from relevant agencies, as required. The Strategy must be applied during construction.</i>	Observation: Water Reuse Strategy does not include details of consultation or advice from any agencies, or justification for not seeking that advice	Water Reuse Strategy should include details of consultation or advice from any agencies, of justification for not seeking such advice.	SSTOM (PLM)	OPEN	<p>The Water Reuse Strategy was developed based on best practice and at the time did not require any direct advice from relevant agencies.</p> <p>The information contained within the Water Reuse Strategy is based on advice received during detailed design and other stages of the project from relevant agencies such as Sydney Water to advise availability of recycled water and water connections as well as from WSA Co. to</p>

Item	Ref	Type	Requirement	Finding	Recommended or completed action ¹	By Whom	Status ²	Sydney Metro Response
								inform options for treatment of groundwater and restrictions on reuse.
WolfPeak 10051_IA5_12	E108	Observation	<p><i>If damage to roads occurs as a result of the construction of the CSSI, the Proponent must either (at the Relevant Road Authority's discretion):</i></p> <p><i>(a) compensate the Relevant Road Authority for the damage so caused; or</i></p> <p><i>(b) rectify the damage to restore the road to at least the condition it was in pre-work as identified in the Road Dilapidation Report.</i></p>	<p>Observation: According to the SCAW auditees, it was noted that Council had concerns over damage to Luddenham Road, and that after some time Council proceeded with rectification works.</p> <p>SCAW advised that it maintains a Luddenham Road Condition and Repair Register, detailing road degradation and works in the area / upcoming repair works. This information is communicated with Sydney Metro who manage the correspondence with Penrith City Council. Sydney Metro hold a fortnightly interface meeting between the Sydney Metro - Western Sydney Airport project management team and Penrith City Council. This forum allows for topic such as concerns over damage to Luddenham Road to be discussed.</p> <p>Sydney Metro advises that Penrith City Council have noted in their regular meetings that not all road damage is deemed attributable to Project works.</p> <p>Recently, the Sydney Metro Integration Team has commenced meetings (held 20/03/24) with the three main Project contractors to determine who should be responsible for various sections of the road they are using.</p> <p>Noting the above, it is not clear to the Auditor from the information sighted whether the damage to Luddenham Road has been caused (or exacerbated) by heavy vehicles from SCAW or other contractor, nor whether compensation from Sydney Metro WSA for damage to the road is warranted.</p>	<p>Further engage with Penrith City Council with the view to obtain written agreement on whether SCAW or any other Sydney Metro package is liable (in all or in part) for damage to Luddenham Road.</p> <p>Ensure rectification / compensation is completed in line with the aforementioned agreement.</p>	Sydney Metro	OPEN	<p>As detailed in the observation CPBUI Prepares a monthly condition report of Luddenham Road and provides correspondence to Sydney Metro for inclusion in the discussions with Penrith City Council.</p> <p>Ongoing consultation with PCC will continue to occur as construction progresses and any further findings or decisions on road repair will be made available to the auditor.</p> <p>To date, if PCC have specific road issues that they attribute to Sydney Metro, they liaise directly with Sydney Metro team members to pass on to respective contractors. Issues are also raised and discussed in the fortnightly PCC Delivery Update meetings. Significant or ongoing issues will also be raised in the monthly PCG meeting between Sydney Metro and PCC.</p> <p>In these discussions, PCC has noted that not all road damage is deemed attributable to SM-WSA works.</p> <p>Recently, the Sydney Metro Integration Team has commenced meetings (held 20/03/24) with the three main SM-WSA Contractors to determine who should be responsible for various sections of the road they are using.</p>
WolfPeak 10051_IA5_13	Not used							
WolfPeak 10051_IA5_14	E128	Observation	<p><i>Before undertaking any work and during maintenance or construction activities, erosion and sediment controls must be implemented and maintained to prevent water pollution consistent with Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils and Construction Vol 1 4th ed. by Landcom, 2004 (The Blue Book).</i></p>	<p>Observation: There were a number of complaints received during the audit period regarding SBT tracking mud out of the Orchard Hills site and on to Kent Road. According to the auditees this was caused by spoil haulage involving up to 200 vehicle movements per day.</p>	<p>SBT have installed concrete haul road internal to the site, an automated wheel wash (operated in concert with manual truck washing), continued with street sweepers internal to site and on Kent Road, and have paid for haulage trucks to be cleaned at the spoil disposal facilities before returning to site.</p> <p>Complaints about this issue have declined and the ER has noted in its February 2024 Monthly Report that conditions have improved, and focus continue to be applied to ensure controls are effective. Note that the ER will continue to provide surveillance on</p>	SBT (CPBG)	CLOSED	N/A

Item	Ref	Type	Requirement	Finding	Recommended or completed action ¹	By Whom	Status ²	Sydney Metro Response
					this issue outside of this audit process, and on this basis the Auditor considers the matter closed.			
WolfPeak 10051_IA5_15	E128	Observation	<i>Before undertaking any work and during maintenance or construction activities, erosion and sediment controls must be implemented and maintained to prevent water pollution consistent with Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils and Construction Vol 1 4th ed. by Landcom, 2004 (The Blue Book).</i>	Observation: Approximately 40mm of rain fell on the day of the audit site inspection. During the inspection construction water was observed to be flowing from the SSTOM Orchard Hills site north to the SBT portion of the site and south to the SCAW site. In both cases, SBT and SCAW were collecting and managing the water via the water treatment plant and erosion and sediment controls respectively, before leaving the Project boundary. No off-site impacts were observed.	SSTOM is outside the scope of this Independent Audit. However, it is recommended that improved surface water controls are applied on SSTOM portion of the Orchard Hills site to reduce the burden on the controls on SBT and SCAW. It is understood that SSTOM raised a non-compliance in relation to this matter (although this was not sighted by the Auditor). Coordination between SSTOM, SBT and SCAW to continue to ensure that controls across the catchments remain adequate in dealing with the cumulative surface water flows.	SBT (CPBG) and SCAW (CPBUI)	OPEN	It is noted a non-compliance has been raised by SSTOM on the area adjacent to the SBT site as noted by the auditor. This action will be further addressed through the NC process and is inspected during routine inspections. No further comment from CPBG. An interface meeting between SSTOM and SCAW occurred 26 February 2024 and further discussions have occurred between SSTOM and SCAW on this matter including agreement on suitable locations for SSTOM sediment/water retention basins and outlet interfaces with SCAW drainage. Project PESCPs have been updated to identify these locations and will be subject to ongoing review to assess performance of the proposed ERSED Controls and feedback provided to PLM and Sydney Metro as required.
WolfPeak 10051_IA5_16	E128	Observation	<i>Before undertaking any work and during maintenance or construction activities, erosion and sediment controls must be implemented and maintained to prevent water pollution consistent with Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils and Construction Vol 1 4th ed. by Landcom, 2004 (The Blue Book).</i>	Observation: Approximately 40mm of rain fell on the day of the audit site inspection. During the inspection a significant amount of construction water was observed to be flowing from the M12 site onto the SCAW site at Elizabeth Drive. SCAW's erosion and sediment controls at this location are substantial and appear to provide more than enough protection for the SCAW catchment. However, at the time of the audit site inspection, the M12 catchment size (and volumes of water to be managed) was not known by the SCAW team. Therefore, there is no guarantee that the SCAW controls are adequate in dealing with the cumulative surface water flows from both sites.	M12 is outside the scope of this Independent Audit. However, it is recommended that SCAW and M12 coordinate to verify whether SCAWs controls are adequate in dealing with the cumulative surface water flows and, if not, upgrade both M12 and SCAW controls to make them adequate. The auditees advise that as of 22/03/24, a resolution has been reached whereby M12 water will be facilitated through SCAW via a clean water diversion to allow works to be staged in the interface area whilst maintaining Blue Book and E128 compliance. The review and endorsement of an updated Erosion and Sediment Control Plan is underway and expected to be completed in April 2024.	SCAW (CPBUI)	OPEN	Multiple interface meetings have occurred between SCAW and M12 regarding water management in this area. As of 22 March 2024, a resolution has been reached where M12 water will be facilitated through SCAW in a design clean water diversion to allow works to be staged appropriate in the interface area while maintaining bluebook and CoA E128 compliance. PESCP review and endorsement by the SCAW CPESC was received 27th March 2024, and the diversion installed the week commencing of 1st April 2024.