

This is my response to both the Moorebank intermodal company's booklet "What the Environmental Impact Statement says about the terminal" and what I have read of the EIS on their website www.micl.com.au/community/eis.

Stated in the booklet was that there will be better environmental outcomes. For who? Not for the local flora and fauna. Not for the Georges river. And not for the residents living nearby. It is a known fact that people benefit from open green spaces and this is sorely lacking in suburban south-western Sydney. It is unhealthy to sit and commute long distances to work (as many living in this area have to do) and then to live in an environment that is not conducive to exercise and outdoor activity. We do not have a beach or a mountain in this area but we have the beautiful Georges River. We can turn this space into a very inviting green space that will benefit all the residents. An intermodal in this area will spoil the amenity and uniqueness of this place. The vegetation around the river should not be cleared for an intermodal. We should be revegetating the river-bank and surrounds to help increase and maintain our biodiversity. I feel it would be a crime to place a large pollutive enterprise next to the Georges River in a day and age when we should all know better. The residents and council are revegetating the parks and river-banks of the Liverpool municipality. We do not need SITA or SIMTA offering to carry out revegetation whilst destroying and polluting our suburbs. We have keen residents who are happy to grow native forests in Liverpool without having any ulterior motives other than seeing our flora and fauna thrive.

New jobs were listed as one of the benefits. I would agree with this statement but we can still have the same number of new jobs at a more suitable site. SIMTA and MIC also talk about contributing to local programs /community investment and they also realize that not all the intermodal benefits will be experienced locally. So are they finally admitting to a reduced quality of life for the residents that will live near the proposed intermodal? Do they believe that this can somehow be mitigated by "contributions" that they will make to this community?

Less congestion was listed as one of the benefits of an Intermodal in Moorebank. This again will certainly not be true for the residents of Moorebank, Liverpool, Casula, Wattle Grove, Holsworthy and the surrounding areas. Also, the containers will still need to be trucked out of the intermodal to the rest of Sydney. Would it not be better to have a few smaller intermodals dispersed strategically throughout Sydney or larger ones in more sparsely populated areas. It seems unfair that south-western Sydney residents have to bear more than their fair share of the burden for consumerism in greater Sydney. Another benefit, according to the booklet, will be an enhanced economy due to reduced business costs. Is the reduced business cost due to the already available M5, M7 roads and the railway lines. This is very short-sighted cost saving measure that will not bring long term benefits but ongoing problems. Most definitely road congestion in the Liverpool, Casula, Moorebank, Wattle Grove, Holsworthy and surrounding areas will be impacted very badly. I currently travel from Casula, eastwards along the M5 to work and I can say that during peak hour traffic moves very slowly despite the improvements recently made to the M5. With the predicted increase in population and the resulting increase in cars, the traffic problems will only worsen. This does not even take into account the number of trucks and semi-trailers that will be spilling into the M5, M7 and Hume highway when the intermodal is up and running. This will only make traffic so much worse. Many people will take alternate routes to cut down on delays and this will lead to congestion and impact surrounding roads and traffic negatively.

The EIS has stated that air quality will be affected negatively locally and less so at a regional level. Increased respiratory and cardiovascular issues can be expected. If so, surely the responsible thing would be to move the whole operation to a less densely populated area so that far less people will be impacted by the particulate matter and oxides of nitrogen. Of particular concern is that there are a lot of young families in the area and schools close to the proposed intermodal.

The Casula Powerhouse Art Centre and the surrounding parklands and river really showcase this area. This very unique and special area will be destroyed with the increased noise and visual pollution of a massive intermodal. I use the park next to the Casula Powerhouse on a regular basis. With the recent improvements made, more and more people are exercising in it, walking their dogs or bicycling with their families. Loss of recreational space was not seen as important or deemed likely to happen in the EIS. I do not believe that the increased noise, air and visual pollution that a large intermodal brings, will not change this recreational space. It would make it less likely for the residents to venture out. I feel sad that the negative impact will be continued into future generations, when we could have and should have planned a lot better, preserved and improved the biodiversity and increased the recreational facilities of this area. A better use of this prime land could be a business park, an educational or health facility or even land release for housing. This would create jobs and maintain the need for jobs whilst not negatively impacting the area as much as an intermodal would.

Productivity will be improved according to the booklet? How? And at what cost? I believe this cannot happen with the intermodal in Moorebank. Surely a well-planned and structured approach, (not an opportunistic least- cost, short- term measure), will deem that the intermodal needs to be away from a large town and well-populated suburbs.

I also feel that there was no real transparency or consultation, despite what SITA or SIMTA may say. They mentioned environmental groups and other stake holders in the EIS, but none of the local residents in my Weaving garden environmental group or ones that I know in the other local environmental groups were approached or asked about their opinion. Those I have spoken to have strong opinions against such an undertaking in this area. I feel that the residents have no control over this major decision and that the federal and state governments and SIMTA and MIC have forced this on us. They are trying to convince us that this bitter pill will help our economic woes. It won't. Keeping our environment clean and green, with reduced noise, particulate and chemical pollution and with less congested roads is a much more worthwhile aim. Encouraging Liverpool residents to exercise and relax in the green parks by the river will have more long term health, social and economic benefits.

As a veterinarian, I can tell you that this area is rich in wildlife, with a huge variety of birds. It also has threatened communities of plants and animals that need our protection. The Georges River also needs to be kept healthy and clean. For all the reasons I have listed above I have to say NO to the intermodal at Moorebank. Please place the intermodal in a more logical, sustainable site and NOT at Moorebank.

Yours sincerely , Dr. Rohini Fischer, a Casula resident.