

-----Original Message-----

From: Kate Juanda <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Tuesday, 3 September 2019 10:35 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: Opposed to the increase of emissions toxicity levels

Dear Glen,

I write to you gravely concerned by the precedent that you will set by allowing the “mistake” the RMS has “made” in their Environmental Impact Statement relating to air quality around NorthConnex.

Their request to increase the VOC ventilation outlet limit by 400% from 1mg/m (cubed) to 4mg/m (cubed), due to an apparent ‘transcription’ error would be detrimental to the health of the people living in the vicinity of the unfiltered stacks for this road. That aside, it sets a precedent for future air quality around other proposed tunnel roads.

Already the EIS statement for this project demonstrates very high levels of particulate matter along the length of the tunnels. There are grave concerns from health specialists about the health impacts stemming from this road and the mega WestConnex project, the later of which resulted in a Parliamentary Enquiry of which filtration was recommended. Yet the RMS is suggesting a 4-fold increase.

There has been an explosion in the media coverage and published scientific articles about the adverse impacts on health from air pollution and its devastating effects. Common and best practise in developed countries is to install filtration systems in urban tunnels or to place ventilation stacks away from sensitive receptors, such as children. These new Sydney tunnels are designed to carry a large numbers of trucks, the overall diesel particle emissions would be significantly greater than in any previous tunnel project in Australia and hence there is no true data to benchmark.

There is no safe level of exposure to air pollution and countries around the world are working hard to reduce toxins while we ignore the facts. Allowing a 400% increase in already risky levels would be damaging and result in a glut in cancer, heart attacks, strokes, asthma, impaired lung growth and other proven links.

Approving a 4-fold increased allowance limit must be accompanied by full supporting and referenced scientific data which I suggest will be almost impossible to find. Without it, an approval of this request would be professionally negligent and question the validity and integrity of the projects EIS process and risk the long term health and wellbeing of our people.

Yours sincerely

Kate