

To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of the Casula Links Estate in Greater Liverpool NSW. I strongly object to the proposal and raise herewith a number of concerns and insist that a full inquiry is undertaken into the matter for the following reasons;

Consultation Process Has Lack Transparency

November 2010 - Department of Finance and Deregulation Appoints Parsons Brinkerhoff.

Parsons Brinkerhoff is also advisors assisting in the project feasibility study conducted by the Moorebank Project office.

According to their website, Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB) is one of the world's leading planning, environment and infrastructure firms. It has had involvement in many rail projects including the Southern Sydney Freight Line (SSFL) and the Glenfield Junction Alliance. PB is also a member of 10,000 Friends of Greater Sydney (FROGS). This not-for-profit organisation has welcomed the NSW Government's Moorebank announcement, as detailed in a recent Transport and Logistics News article. In it, the director of FROGS indicates his firm support for the realisation of the Moorebank Intermodal Project.

The Moorebank Project Office (MPO) employs PB as a consultant, for the planning phase of the Intermodal Project. PB has commissioned another firm to conduct an Aboriginal Heritage Assessment of the Intermodal site. This fact is not listed in the PB website, nor is the Moorebank Intermodal listed as a PB project.

It is imperative that any consultancy/advisory firm involved in the planning stages of a major project such as this be completely impartial. PB clearly is not, as they are a member of and aligned, pro-intermodal organisation, FROGS.

Local communities cannot have confidence that views and concerns expressed by them will be given due consideration without bias or prejudice. A firm that is part of a pro-intermodal group? PB now finds itself in the middle of two groups - FROGS and local community? Human nature indicates PB will side with their fellow bureaucrats. Why is PB involved in the planning stages? They do not seem to be living up to their values (see PB website) of ethical behaviour, integrity and respect? Engaging companies in the planning phase with vested interests in the project is apprehensible.

The proposed Moorebank intermodal freight terminal will be the largest in the nation, an infrastructure Senior Staffer has confirmed. 18 November 2009 in Liverpool Champion .Moorebank should not be the biggest facility in Australia! This is not Just!

It further goes on to say that the intermodal on the Commonwealth land will be sold to the Private sector. Quoted by Mr. Deegan. Again it all comes down to profits. The Impact to the surrounding environment is not a consideration. Nor will be a future consideration once it is privatised.

NSW MP Ms Lee Rhiannon told State Parliament that the “burden should be shared”. July 14th, 2010 in the Liverpool Champion MP Rhiannon called on the Federal Government to scrap its plan for an intermodal at Moorebank, “it’s the size of the operation at Moorebank which we have concerns about.” Ms Rhiannon also said “Pushing a major intermodal of such proportion onto one suburb is going to have an enormous impact on the number of trucks”.

The sheer volume of freight moved by road and rail will have enormous negative social, economic and environmental impacts on local communities.

It is prudent that full consideration be given to the total and combined impact of ALL development proposals, SIMTA and MPO rather than assessing each separately on a standalone basis. The combined effect will be massive and all this in the very heart of Western Sydney - Liverpool.

Despite a rapidly growing south western Sydney corridor, (it is estimated that the population of South West Sydney will increase by 450,000 in the next 30 years), lack of adequate roadways, shortage of infrastructure and ever decreasing land for housing, all this just 32 km from Sydney CBD - the Government kicks out the military to stick in a freight terminal. 50 years from now, the people of Sydney will say - what were they thinking!

The intermodal is not a NIMBY issue. In fact our Mayor Ned Mannoun has been quoted in saying. We do not want the intermodal in our front yard rather in our back. This is such a compromise, yet the government and environment protection agency want to inflict a dictatorial rule onto its people. No you are going to have it whether you like it or not! The Australian Government seems to be moving in the direction of China not the democracy it alludes itself to be.

Trucks Off the Road Argument

A case of ‘robbing Peter to pay Paul’. Moving trucks from one location, Botany to another, Liverpool/ Moorebank, 35 kms away will not get trucks off the roads in Sydney. What it will do is take some trucks away from Botany and dump a whole heap more in Liverpool & Moorebank. The Federal Government opposition Leader Mr. Tony Abbott stated in the Liverpool Champion June 9th, 2010 “If all that happens is the traffic jam is transferred to another part of Sydney. That’s not acceptable.” Mr. Abbott said.

We urge the EPA to be transparent, state the facts and prove that this is not going to be the case.

The very notion we need another intermodal in Sydney is testament to the fact that the city’s population is increasing and with it more business and trade - this will result in more trucks and more congestion on our roads.

NRMA was quoted in Open Road Magazine (Page 12) that new research showed the number of trucks on our roads was set to soar higher than previously thought, putting additional strain on underfunded highways.

The MIC panel at a meeting on October 28th 2014 at Hunts on the have said and it was heard and written by many residents that the government claim of taking trucks off the road between Botany to Moorebank is a false statement. Therefore in my view a con.

The Infrastructure Partnership Australia paper found that by 2020, “The number of freight trucks on Australia’s roads would be double what there were in 2006 and triple by 2050.”

It is grossly unfair to subject the Liverpool Area, the gateway to the South West to the ‘bulk’ of the goods movement.

The figures were released around the same time NRMA launched its ‘Share the Road’ campaign that highlighted the need for all drivers to be aware of the shape and size of vehicles driving around them. Mr. Blight said, again centralising the “largest intermodal facility”, in Moorebank will increase the number of fatalities in the area caused by trucks.

NRMA excerpts state to the 12 months ending September 2008, 266 people died from 234 crashes involving trucks on Australian Roads. Subjecting the bulk of the freight trucks to the Liverpool area will escalate this figure and cause detrimental incidences to local residents. In Preston’s there have been a number of incidents involving fatalities because trucks tend to get off major roadways to avoid tolls, exceeding speed limits and causing trucks to topple over.

If Government was serious about taking trucks off the road then a logical solution would be to locate a second intermodal on the outskirts, feeding it into the city. Badgeries Creek!

Industry is expanding where there is room to grow therefore; a majority of the industry is located or considering to locate outside the inner Sydney rink. A terminal at Badgeries Creek in the outer west of Sydney will mean shorter distances for truck drivers and fewer accidents on the road as general population does not have to contend with trucks. It is ludicrous to house people on the outskirts of Sydney with no infrastructure and yet place towers of containers on a beautiful river in the middle Metropolitan Sydney. Housing should be located near inner city river systems not containers or industry for that matter. Re-development of Homebush is a prime example of getting it right.

Vicinity of Moorebank to Port Botany.

Moorebank to Port Botany can be reached by the M5 and by rail. Moorebank Terminal will cater to the bulk of industry which is situated in the North West such as Plumpton, Eastern Creek. Thus the City of Liverpool will have the bulk of the congestion along the M5, M7, the Hume Highway and feeder roads. There will be abundantly more trucks in and around Liverpool as trucks will use arterial roads such Camden Valley Way , Cowpasture Rd, Elizabeth Dr, Hoxton Park Rd and General Macquarie Drive and Nuwarra Road not only to avoid ever increasing tolls but also to get to and from industry.

Why is a terminal in Moorebank of this magnitude proposed for the middle of Sydney Metropolitan on the banks a living, breathing river system? Why not locate such a beast on the vast outskirts of Sydney Metro, well away from people's homes, schools, shops and recreation. The terminal with its trucks, trains and containers should not be should not be using feeder roads out of the middle of the city but rather it should be the on the outskirts coming in. People should be living and thriving in the middle of Sydney Metropolitan with industry and intermodal facilities on the very outskirts. We demand better planning for Sydney and for Liverpool. Put the intermodal at Badgeries Creek next to the Airport. Commonsense! But that is nonexistent in NSW.

FAUNA AND FLORA

Effects on the Georges River.

Recently the GGPO gave a glowing report on the Georges River.

Spring 2010 monitoring by the Georges River Combined Council Committee showed that at Cambridge Avenue, Glenfield water quality improved from B- to A. The results show that the area where the intermodal will be placed. The Georges River is in excellent condition.

What is the Governments predicted outcome to the river once the intermodal goes in? There is no scientific evidence to uphold the EIS findings on Georges River? It is well known that an Intermodal placed on a river dispels emissions such as the chemical manganese that falls onto the river and gets into the ecosystem, in turn into our system via fish. Not to mention poor air quality due to diesel emissions coming from the quadrupling of trucks and freight trains from a 24 hour intermodal hub.

There are 454 species of fauna (both aquatic and terrestrial) recorded within the Georges River catchments, many of which have been listed under the NSW Threatened Species Act (1995). The number mentioned in the EIS is conservative. Will these be protected against the ultra fine particles? Will they be protected from the chemical manganese and other chemicals that fall onto the river and its adjoining parklands due to an intermodal on its banks and the quadrupling of trucks hence emissions from the Georges River Bridge

The Georges Rivers is home to the Chipping Norton Sailing and Liverpool Water Ski Clubs and an approved Marina. An intermodal on the banks will have devastating effects on these recreational sports. But the EIS hasn't taken any of that into account.

Holsworthy Army Reserve.

The Holsworthy army reserve extends from Holsworthy right down to the vicinity of Wollongong and is the most environmental sensitive untouched area of our state and its contribution as an environmental buffer cannot be underestimated.

The mere fact it is untouched environmental area, containing rare species 586 numerous wildlife animals and it is recognised as an area of great environmental significance, should sway the EPA to reconsider ever touching this nature strip. It is fact that there have been over 50 koalas's found in the last 6 years and may be one of

the largest koala habitats in Southern Eastern Australia. Ms Kate Ryan from Wires stated in the Liverpool Champion, “the regions koala population was active even though they are still one of the rarest animal species we have come into care.” She said the continuing threat of development was the biggest risk for the koalas as this destroyed their habitat. **“People need to get a grip.** Development destroys habitats for many animals like birds, wallabies, Kangaroos and wallaroos”, Ms Ryan said that the bushland around Holsworthy army barracks is ideal koala habitat.

I urge the Government to get a proper grip on what the intermodal will do to the fauna and flora of the Georges River and surrounding habitats. Another review needs to be done by another agency. It is not right that it is only done by Parsons Brinckerhoff who is working for the govt.

Heritage and Aboriginal Significance

The Steele Barracks in the school of military engineering dates back to the Second World War and has the Queens colors. Several other historic buildings were involved in the First World War leaving it steeped in Australian History and in particular war time of which Australians take particular pride.

To imagine Australia’s history will be demised by the introduction of an intermodal is unimaginable. The utter show of contempt, that progress has somehow been allowed to steam roll Australian war time history. What would those Australian troops say if they were living here today?

It brings up the question has the National trust of Australia any authority to question whether any of these historic buildings should be saved or is our history going to be trashed.

There are also shrines within the current defense boundaries - cross shrines for Vietnam and Korea and also a shrine for bomb detection dogs killed in action and also the ashes of some diggers have been scattered on the site. These must be considered as sacred sites if not heritage.

The bank of the Georges River where the intermodal is proposed is also a part of Aboriginal Heritage and needs to be thoroughly investigated. Both the Tharawal Local Aboriginal Council and the Dharawal people have always attested the need to protect the river at Liverpool due to their association with the River at that particular spot. The same reasons as to why Collingwood Precinct was preserved from development back in 2004, is the same reasons why Moorebank needs to be as well.

Impact to the Neighborhood

There are known impacts from freight transportation operations which include noise, round-the-clock bright lighting, and public health, and the potential for contamination from hazardous spills into the Georges River. How does the Government propose to protect residents of Casula Links who are directly in ear and eye shot of the intermodal? The EIS has not shown how it is to protect the residents from the spur lines going into the facility that will be run over the river via a bridge? The EIS does not address how to protect residents from the noise from accelerating freight trying to

get over the bridge? Is this even a consideration?

Casula Links residents have battled for over 6 years for noise barriers for the M5 roadway and since 2006 for noise barriers on the rail. The area has not received the same consideration as many other areas in Sydney, both affluent and not affluent. For instance, Macdonaldtown received noise walls for the trains yet they are not less than 25 metres away as residents in Casula/Liverpool Links. The Georges River Bridge over the Links Estate will be the only bridge left on the entire M5/ M7 network without barriers yet every house in the Casula Links Estate looks onto the bridge. If the government has not been socially and morally accountable for these two situations what hope is there for the Intermodal catastrophe. To add further salt to injury there are no noise walls on the Georges River Bridge with the current widening of the M5.

Environmental defenders state that EIS aren't that of yesteryear. "They are watered down". Other agencies such as DECC design procedures to "fit the situation". Yet the M5 Georges River Bridge (North) has been added onto many stages. It seems the Government is very lax when it concerns the people of Liverpool and the only option one will have to face is a class action or worse still someone dies from sleep deprivation related illnesses.

Noise mitigation is not factored into the EIS at present stage. There is a lot of buck passing. MIC has already alluded that they will not be responsible for upgrades to existing roads and mitigation. It will be the responsibility of Liverpool Council and Roads and Maritime Service. We in Liverpool have faced such buck passing a number of times with ARTC's Federal (Federal) and Rail Corp (state) in terms of noise walls. The commonality between the two is the rhetoric that it is not our problem it is the others problem. With no resolution to date. It is already known that buck passing will occur in the case with the intermodal.

The Liverpool community as previously stated will face traffic safety problems, due to increases in truck numbers. It is known that truck collisions with vehicles, is a major source of fatalities on our roads. Not to mention that the additional trucks will make it the surrounding streets unsafe streets for pedestrians. Also, we will see an increase to local rates for road maintenance due to the damage caused by big-rig trucks on local roads. I myself have had three near death experiences by trucks not seeing me today on Liverpool Roads. I cannot even fathom the fatalities as result of the intermodal introduction.

Pollution

The EIS states that its pollution monitoring station is located adjacent to the site. This is not the case. It is located at Reilly Street. For a more accurate measurement the monitoring station should be located on Lakewood Cres. I would like to know the pollution levels at this junction for it directly under the M5 bridge from which truck pollutants will fall onto residents and the river, next to the rail corridor and closer to the Proposed intermodal. But I can't see the EPA doing its job and actually testing the readings there. It is sheer logic that the readings will be much higher. But I guess EPA will just ignore that and opt for the more favorable readings from Reilly St.

I would further request that the EPA checks when the monitoring station was last

calibrated and move it to Lakewood Cres if it was serious about pollution monitoring.

It is also well documented that an intermodal facility will exhibit multiple sources of air pollution. An intermodal at Moorebank will add to “regional air pollution” as well as localised pollution for the terminal is extremely close to homes and schools.

Liverpool is known to be particularly affected by air pollution due to patterns of air circulation and certain landforms in the greater Sydney region.

The Liverpool area is known as a pollution basin, with low lying plains adjacent to the Georges River. Many residential homes nearby have existing Air-Clearance issues causing stagnation of the air-shed which exposes surrounding areas to excessive potential inundation with air pollution. The M5 roadway and adjacent railway already contribute too much of the pollution. The addition of more emissions will overload the local environment and create astronomically higher concentration of pollution we know from measurements taken by the NSW Department of Environment and Conservation, that air quality in Liverpool is not good to begin with.

Extract from the Atmospheric Pollution Research 2 (2011) (182-189)

IBA techniques have been applied to measure 21 different Chemical species present in fine particle (PM_{2.5}) pollution at Liverpool in the Sydney Basin between July 1998 and 31 December

2009. The average composition was found to be (23±13) % Ammonium sulphate, (22±16) % organics, (19±8) % black carbon, (11±12)% sea salt and (5.9±5) % wind-blown soils.

The dataset obtained was large enough and the mass closure sufficient (82±12)% to apply positive matrix factorisation (PMF)

Techniques to obtain seven source fingerprints related to motor Vehicles (23±11) %, secondary sulphates (24±21) %, biomass burning (27±25)%, sea salt (22±16) % and windblown soils (3.7±5.5) % and to estimate their contributions to the total fine mass (PM_{2.5}).

With existing high pollution figures in Liverpool most probably disproportionate to Greater Sydney. The EIS figures are conservative. Again I would request public inquiry into the matter to get an accurate pollution reading rather than which is underestimated and favored toward the proponent. The notion of placing more trucks in the area is sheer murder to the population which inevitably will lead to class actions in the future. The Liverpool area as a whole will be subjected to an increase in the regional air pollution and Casula/Wattle Grove residents, who live in close proximity to the intermodal/distribution centre with equipment and idling trucks waiting for containers, sitting on the Georges River Bridge and the Hume Highway lights will mean additional “local pollution”, not to forget idling rail. Wattle Grove/ Casula Residents will not only be exposed to existing regional pollution similar to all residents in the Sydney Metropolitan, but we will be also exposed to additional local pollution because of the quadrupling of diesel trucks and diesel trains in the area.

We insist that an impartial Environmental Report be done by yet another agency like Wilkonson and Murray or Arup. It is not enough to have just one agency that is favoring the corporation and the corporate dollar.

Intermodal facilities are also known to attract unsocial behavior. An intermodal of this magnitude will be greatly detrimental to nearby parklands, the Powerhouse and recreational clubs.

Incompatible Land Uses

It is abhorrent that despite the growing amount of scientific research that shows the direct correlation of health risk with proximity to intermodal, and diesel emission sources, health considerations typically are not integrated into land use decision-making.

The fact also that

We totally oppose the project because it is located in close proximity to schools and established residential communities as well as on the banks of a river and Parklands.

Furthermore, the Government has spent \$7.4m on the Casula Powerhouse Museum with the Council contributing to \$5.6 M totaling approx 13m not including recent additional funding. The intermodal is not in line with Liverpool City Council Growth Plan. The previous Frank Sartor Government first stated that Liverpool will be a Regional City, a River City, in line with Parramatta hence the location of the Powerhouse. Had council been told that the Banks of the Georges River across from the Powerhouse will be aligned with containers, I can put money on it that the proposal for the Art Centre would never have got off the ground. Adults and children often frequent the centre to participate in arts activities. The elderly often attend theatre and art displays at the Powerhouse as well.

Why are containers being placed on a River so close to residential areas? ***What other 1st world country places containers on a river?***

People should reside on the banks of a river not containers. The Georges River is not the Mekong. It is Prime Real estate that will bring a quadrupling of jobs as stated by the Liverpool Council than the measly amount advocated by the MIC. Also intermodals are automated today. There are not many jobs to be had as opposed to the suggestions of Liverpool Council. But again it would be interesting if logic prevails or the corporate dollar.

Residents and visitors should not have to contend with noise and different types of pollution from the neighboring container terminal.

I question if Australia is forward thinking modern nation or a reactive down trodden country that lacks thought and takes the easy way out and quick fix. Examples of this short vision mentality are all too common in Sydney, look at our roads; the initial two lane M5, non linking of the M4, cross city tunnel debacle to name a few.

The Australian Federal Government is being negligent by proposing the Australians biggest freight terminal in the vicinity of so many Schools, Approx 19 Childcare Centres and approximately 30,000 family homes within 2000m of the terminal site.

The MIC states

Sensitive receivers are defined as locations where people are likely to work or reside, and may include dwellings, schools, hospitals, offices or public recreational areas (NSW Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) 2005). Many such sensitive receivers accommodate groups who are most likely to be adversely affected by poor air quality: the very young, the aged and the infirm.

Yet Figure 17.2 has conveniently omitted a number of schools

St Francis X Primary
All Saints Primary (formerly Patrician Bros and St Marys Girls)
Al Amana College
Moorebank High School
ST Christophers Primary School
NewBridge Heights
Nuwarra Public School
St Josephs Moorebank
Hammondville Public School.

This is approximately 4000 students not accounted for in the EIS. Very few preschools were accounted for. I would like to know EXACTLY the number of schools preschools and childcare centres in the area before this goes ahead. And the number of students.

The EIS states

The LGA also has a higher youth population (persons aged 0 to 19 years as a percentage of the total population), Hence the threat of PM2.5 on growing lungs.

but a lower proportion of persons aged 65 years and over. These populations are particularly vulnerable to HHRI.

I do not believe this is true and would like to see the evidence to suggest otherwise by Liverpool Council census.

Please refer to the below article since there are no similar articles in Australia. I find it incomprehensible how we can possibly go forth without adequate studies in the matter.

<http://www.healthnews.uc.edu/news/?/7358/>

Study done by University of Cincinnati. Many US Public Schools in Air Pollution Danger Zone. This should read many Liverpool Schools in Danger Zone. You are putting a death certificate on many of our children. And one would be inhumane if one does not insist on further research into studies from abroad since no such studies exist in Australia before pushing such a proposal through.

Places of worship omitted include

St Lukes Anglican Church

St Marys Anglican Church.

St Christophers Church

St Thomas Indian Orthodox Cathedral

Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints

St Annes

St Thomas Anglican Church

Other places not included

Is Liverpool Regional Museum

And I find it mindboggling how one of the Largest Hospitals in the Southern Hemisphere Liverpool Hospital as well as Liverpool Private were not listed in the sensitive receiver.

What is the EIS purpose of only placing a handful of receivers and not ALL. Yet they all are in the area of the map shown. Is it to con the EPA into believing that there are not suggest not many sensitive receivers.

Again with such a huge number of sensitive receivers omitted particularly schools. The health effect and impacts on children is flawed. Because more than 4000 have been omitted from any study for the statistical analysis to be viable

The distance from the Intermodal Complex (SIMTA project plus Government) to the closest neighbouring houses in each suburb is as follow;

230m Wattle Grove (Delfin Dr)

280m Casula (Casula Rd, Canberra Way, Dunmore Cres)

530m Liverpool Links (Congressional Dr)

770m Glenfield (Goodenough St)

950m Moorebank (Moorebank Ave)

The EIS has also failed to include Lakewood Cres which is 22 meters away from the site.

Placing an intermodal mid suburbia of this magnitude so close to residents is blatant murder considering the known health effects pertaining to such facilities.

Need for a thorough investigation of the Potential Health of an Intermodal of such magnitude located in an Existing Pollution Basin

The EIS states

General health indicators for the region, sourced from the South West Sydney Local Health Network (SWSLHN), highlight that while data for life expectancy at birth and deaths from all causes are comparable to the state, local residents have poorer

outcomes for a range of other measures. These measures include behaviours linked to poorer health status and chronic disease, such as cardiovascular and respiratory diseases, cancer, and other conditions considered to contribute considerably to morbidity and mortality in later life (SWSLHN 2012). Behaviours include:

- current daily and occasional smoking – 17.0% (higher than NSW and all other examined regions;
dominated by the rate of smoking in males);
- adequate physical activity – 49.2% (11% worse than NSW and lower than all other regions, except for females in Greater Western and Southern and Sydney West);
- very high psychological distress – 11.4% (4% higher than NSW); and
- recommended vegetable consumption – 7.9% (17% worse than NSW and lower than all other regions except for males in Sydney West), with a similar trend observed for recommended fruit consumption (lower among females in SWSLHN than in all other suburbs except Greater Southern, and for males except in Greater Western and Southern)

Why have I and my neighbours in Casula Glen Regent etc been apart of this study.

I, my husband and my neighbours are non smoking,

If you visit the area one would see people walking ALL the time. As I do daily.

Close to ALL residents have a green vegetable garden. Considering they are migrants and this is the norm in their homeland.

Close to all houses have fruit trees.

This is disgusting how false these statements are. I would like the EPA to door knock on EVERY resident in the area. And SEE their Italian Croatian Chinese vegetable gardens. If I had time I would put pictures up for you myself. Such false claims.

**AND YES WE HAVE VERY HIGH PSYCHOLOGICAL DISTRESS
BECAUSE OF THE FALSE CLAIMS YOU ARE INFLICTING ON US
WITHOUT SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE TO PROVE OTHERWISE.
DISGUSTING!**

EIS states: Based on available data, children aged 2 to 8 years have also reported the highest rate of moderate to extreme interference with daily activities of all the health districts in NSW, while youths aged 9 to 15 years report the lowest (resulting in overall trends for activity interference amongst children aged 2 to 15 years in South West Sydney being comparable to that of the state).³

Again I don't know any resident that has been part of this sample study.

Every child in the area plays a sport. My children alone play a couple of sports. Why am I or my neighbours part of this study. The study is not comprehensive. Possibly outdated. And definitely false. Whoever did the EIS statistical analysis obviously failed statistics 101 and should be sacked. Or it has to be done properly by EPA. The data is incorrect and if it went to a court of law would fail dismally.

If EPA was serious Peer reviewed documentation needs to be thoroughly analysed

and a liaison needs to be made with the medical, scientific experts both here and abroad. The USA being a much older country than Australia has now discovered the effects of locating an intermodal mid suburbia (i.e. notably Los Angeles). The US holds conferences regarding the matter every three years inviting participants from all over the world. Liverpool Council was invited to attend the conference Oct 22-23, 2010 with the Deputy Major Ned Mannoun in attendance. Their reasoning for inviting Liverpool Council is they feel a social obligation as part of a global society to ensure that countries learn from their mistakes and place intermodal facilities on the outskirts, in industrial estates feeding into cities. Not in mid suburbia. One example is Carson, LA etc. In the past the state government has disregarded an article from the USA passing them as studies on rats. On further approach by residents (which is inappropriate for we have not the expertise on the area) Professors from the USA (USC and USCLA) sent additional peer reviewed documentation to support their arguments that an intermodal located in mid suburbia poses a great threat to the surrounding residents.

A solution to the problem is to hold an intermodal conference in Australia and invite the professors/ scientists from the United States since we haven't advanced in that area. Notably

Andrea Hricko University of Southern California Professor of Preventative Medicine member of the US EPA Work Group on Goods Movement of the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council. Co-ordinator of the Impact Project Conference

Ed Avol Professor of Clinical Medicine University of Southern California Expert on respiratory health, air pollution and the health impact of traffic. Rail, trucks and goods movement emissions

Professor John Froines University of Southern California Loss Angeles Chemical mechanisms and exposure assessment related to the health effects from exposure to airborne particulate matter; Diesel exposure and health effects

W. James (Jim) Guaderman University of Southern California Expert in environmental impacts on children's health. Near roadway health effects

Junfeng (Jim) Zhang University of Southern California Professor and Chairman of Department of Environmental and Occupational Health assessing human exposures to environmental contaminants and resulting health effects. Effects of diesel exposure on adults with asthma, black carbon, climate

Frank Gilliland University of Southern California Associate Professor of Preventive Medicine, Division of Occupational and Environmental Health, Keck School of Medicine. Epidemiology of acute and chronic pesticide exposure, epidemiology of respiratory illness, air pollution and asthma. Emerging issues diabetes, breast cancer, birth outcomes, cardiovascular disease and neurologic effects of air pollution exposure

It's disgusting how no liaisons has been had with these Professors/Doctors who are at the forefront of intermodal studies and all the EIS alludes to is a handful of studies.

I ask the EPA do the right thing and contact these professors and look into the research they have done before making any decision. Since throughout the EIS it states that there is no such research here in Australia.

We have looked beyond our shores in terms of the Carbon debate and have looked into/invited expertise from other countries regarding the issue. We need to show the same respect for the intermodal issue.

July 14th 2010 SMH. Michele Goldman, CEO of the Asthma Foundation.
"[We] would like to see an immediate upgrade in NSW's pollution monitoring equipment, which is already a decade behind the US and other advanced nations," she said.

With statements like this, stating that we are so behind, it is imperative that the EPA liaises with Professors and Scientists off shore with Greater knowledge of the issue concerning intermodal facilities in mid suburbia, particularly when the data is there and not yet available in Australia as stated by the EIS

Sample of Health effects.

Already the area is disadvantaged with respiratory problems as Stated by the EIS

respiratory disease is higher than the NSW average in South West Sydney, with higher rates reported in Liverpool East and in both north and south Campbelltown;

But of course the government and if the EPA allows this to go through basically wants to exasperate the problem and kill the south west off.

Health impacts as a result of exposure to ultra fine particles

Scientific evidence has shown that diesel exhaust consists of gases and particles of which some of these particles are in the PM_{2.5} range (that is they are smaller than 2.5 microns in diameter). Within that size range are extremely small particles called "ultra fine particles," tinier than 0.1 microns in diameter. Both cars and diesel trucks emit "black carbon" in their exhaust, although much higher levels of black carbon (or "elemental carbon") are found when sampling air pollution levels on truck-congested highways.

Diesel particulate forms a large part of the fine particulate matter (PM) in urban airⁱ because studies of PM seldom differentiate the source of the particulate matter.

Studies demonstrate that exposure to PM_{2.5} (particles) increases the risk of cardiovascular disease and reduces life expectancy. That is, those exposure to higher levels of particulate matter are more likely to develop cardiovascular disease or die earlier than expected from heart disease (such as heart attacks and coronary artery disease, according to a number of studies published during the past 20 years.^{ii,iii, iv} The American Heart Association recently published a statement on the role of air pollution in heart diseases, stating that:

“

Numerous epidemiological studies conducted worldwide have demonstrated consistent associations between short-term elevations in PM and increases in daily cardiovascular morbidity [illness] and mortality [death].... Several studies have also reported adverse cardiovascular outcomes in relation to long-term PM exposure.”

Elderly patients, those with underlying coronary or pulmonary disease, lower socioeconomic populations, and diabetics may be at particularly increased risk. Pope has estimated an average loss of life expectancy directly related to chronic air pollution exposure from between 1.8 and 3.1 years for those living in the most polluted cities in the United States. Cardiovascular causes account for the majority (69%) of the overall excess in morbidity and mortality.^v

Diesel emissions cause some of the most extensive impacts from freight transportation. The California Air Resources Board estimates, for example, that goods movement activities in that state each year cause 3,700 people to die prematurely – earlier than they would have if they had not been breathing high levels of particulate matter.^{vi}

Emissions inventories have also been conducted at 18 major intermodal facilities in California, as part of a series of Health Risk Assessments for those intermodal facilities prepared by staff of the California Air Resources Board. The inventories were used to estimate the tons of particulate matter in diesel exhaust emissions at each intermodal per year. For example, a large BNSF intermodal in Barstow, CA was estimated to emit 26 tons of diesel particulate matter per year.

Exposed community members are also considered at risk of lung cancer from diesel emissions in and near their communities. Some of the other known health impacts for residents exposed to diesel include:

- **Reduced lung function in children exposed to diesel while growing up.** According to investigators at the University of Southern California, children who grow up in more polluted communities with high levels of elemental carbon or EC (indicating diesel particle pollution) are more likely to have reduced lung function.^{vii}
- **Effects on lung function in adults with asthma, exposed for a brief period to diesel exhaust.** A study in London demonstrated that short-term acute exposure to diesel exhaust in adults who already had asthma could impact lung function; the study compared persons with asthma who walked in a park with no diesel traffic and then several weeks later walked on a London street with high volumes of diesel taxis and buses. Reduction in lung function and an increase in markers of inflammation were seen when the group was exposed to diesel exhaust – and the changes were associated with elevated levels of elemental carbon and UFPs.^{viii}
- **Reduced sperm production and endocrine disruption in laboratory animals.** In a series of Japanese studies of laboratory animals, prenatal (in *utero*) exposure to diesel exhaust particles were found to reduce sperm production in adulthood.^{ix} The Japanese team concluded that exposure to diesel exhaust particles disrupts endocrine (testicular) function in the male mouse reproductive system.^x In many of these studies, filtered air caused the adverse effects, suggesting that the gaseous phase of diesel exhaust appears to

be the cause.

New concerns have been raised in the past 10-12 years about the potential health effects of ultra fine particles (UFPs) from combustion processes. These UFPs have been studied less extensively than PM_{2.5} or larger PM₁₀ particles. UFPs do not weigh much because of their size, making up only 10% of the total mass of PM_{2.5}, and they have a large surface area, to which harmful chemical constituents from the exhaust can adhere.^{xi}

Recently, fourteen European scientific experts collaborated on reviewing the scientific literature on UFPs. Most of the experts concluded that:

The likelihood of an independent causal relationship between increased short-term UFP exposure and increased all-cause mortality, hospital admissions for cardiovascular and respiratory diseases, aggravation of asthma symptoms and lung function decrements was rated medium to high.^{xii}

The group stressed the importance of considering UFPs in future risk assessments and the need for further research on UFP exposure and health effects. Similar suggestions were made at a symposium in California sponsored by the South Coast Air Quality Management District, at which several scientists who spoke concluded that that if UFPs cause health effects, an air pollution standard for UFPs is needed.^{xiii}

- **More than 90% of particles in diesel exhaust are actually ultra fine particles (UFPs)** – smaller than 0.1 micron in diameter, and the **tiny particles can be easily inhaled into the lung.**^{xiv} Laboratory studies increasingly show that these UFPs are more toxic and have a greater ability to cause lung inflammation than larger sized particles.^{xv}
- **Ultra fine particles appear to possess the most toxic potential of various size particles,** according to Los Angeles researchers.^{xvi}
- **Ultra fine particles translocated (migrate) to the brain^{xvii} and to promote early atherosclerosis** (hardening of the arteries) in exposed laboratory animals.^{xviii}

Will the Federal Government of Australia follow suit and do a risk assessment into ultra fine particles and the effects on the surrounding community such as Wattle Grove Casula Moorebank considering that more trucks are coming into pre existing pollution Basin?

Health impacts discovered in Children as a result of increased Diesel Emissions PM_{2.5} Particulate matter

The EIS states No criteria for PM_{2.5} concentrations are provided in the Approved Methods for Modelling; nor are NEPM air quality standards specified for this pollutant. Instead, the NEPM (Ambient Air Quality) advisory reporting standard has been adopted for this pollutant. On some occasions, existing background PM_{2.5} concentrations exceed the NEPM

This is absurd that one would even contemplate on approving the EIS when it is based solely based on NEPM.

There are numerous findings, in many journals around the world now for instance *Journal of Allergy & Clinical Immunology*, showing evidence linking traffic pollution to children's asthma risk. Quadrupling the number of trucks in the Liverpool area in an existing pollution basin should be reported to the World Health Organisation for effectively one is killing the children of this area whose lungs are still developing. .

Studies involving children exposed to traffic-related pollution have shown the following effects:

Reduced lung function. Children who live near traffic-related air pollution are more likely to suffer reduced lung function as they grow up.^{xix}

Increased risk of asthma. Children living in homes within 225 feet of a highway have an increased risk of asthma.^{xx} Children are more likely to develop asthma when exposed to traffic pollution at school.^{xxi}

Australia and New Zealand have more asthma sufferers per capita than any other countries in the world. Asthma in Children is increasing at times doubling in Australia.

Increased wheezing, use of medication. Asthma exacerbation such as wheezing and use of more asthma medication occurs more often among children living closer to highways.^{xxii}

In addition, an analysis of cancer by census tracts in Los Angeles County found elevated rates of throat, mouth and tongue cancers and certain types of lung cancer in close proximity to a truck-congested I-710 freeway in Los Angeles County,^{xxiii} one of the most heavily used highways for movement of goods in the country.

The Hume Highway at Liverpool, Moorebank Avenue, Nuwarra Rd, Anzac Pde and people living in the vicinity of Camden Valley Way, Hoxton Park Rd, Governor Macquarie Drive, and Cowpasture Rd can expect a disproportionate increase in Health problems than to regional Sydney.

Wattle Grove and Casula will be inundated with emissions, noise and light spill. Traffic would radiate out and affect the whole region. Has this been thoroughly considered in light of the weight of evidence supporting know health risks? No!

Chris Hayes Mp for Liverpool states in Hansard 24th November 2010

We are in a situation where we are seeing an extraordinary number of people with disturbing health problems. In my electorate 22,000 people over the age of 15 have been diagnosed with obesity, 11,000 people have type 2 diabetes, 26,000 people suffer from high cholesterol, and 30,000 people suffer from asthma. It is absolutely overwhelming and we must take steps now to relieve that pressure on our health and hospital system.

In a seminar held on the 30th Nov.09 it was reported that;

- 1- Liverpool residents over the age of 16 years reported higher rates of asthma, diabetes and mental health than the NSW average.
- 2- The South West Health Centre reported the standardised mortality rate for cardiovascular death is 11% higher than the NSW average.
- 3- The standardised mortality rate is 6 % higher than the rest of NSW.
- 4- The admissions for maternity are 12% as against 8% for the rest of NSW.

Daily Telegraph August 21st 2011

The Asthma Foundation is concerned NSW has reduced monitoring of air quality, and fails to check for fine particles which are so damaging to young lungs and organs. Asthma rates in Western Sydney have soared but this health information is not correlated with pollution licensing. In NSW pollution licences are issued without consideration of what the environment can actually bear. The community is locked out of the licensing process, creating mistrust.

WHY DOES THE GOVERNMENT INSIST ON HURTING OUR CHILDREN BY BRINGING MORE TRUCKS TO OUR AREA!!

Bringing huge addition of trucks in the area will exasperate this problem. Making Liverpool the largest intermodal in Australia is absurd proposal considering the already existing health problems due to the environmental factors and demographics of the area. Not to mention the health costs society in the future.

The EIS statement that there are NO OEH or national air quality standards for PM2.5; reference is therefore made to the NEPM advisory reporting standard for this pollutant.

If the EPA pushes this through, without extensive research into its impacts and just referring to one NEPM. Each person in the EPA will be accountable for a death of a child and elderly in Liverpool. Blood on ones hands. And the biggest class action possibly in Australian History will prevail. And each person that has had a hand in this today will be brought before the courts.

Noise Impact

Community and occupational health studies show that noise can affect health and quality of life.

It is well known that intermodal/ rail operations are known to be noisy by virtue of the locomotives and yard equipment being used and the handling of heavy containers by cranes and other equipment. A negative impact to the Wattle Grove and Casula Communities will relate to the high volume of heavy-duty trucks – a major source of noise. As mentioned previously Casula residents cannot get noise barriers for the M5 Georges River Bridge, or for the Rail, despite other areas attaining them easily. What

hope have we, and assurance that the government will do the right thing in assessing and reducing noise to 55 decibels when it will not provide the due diligence with the M5 expansion and the introduction of the dedicated freight line. It is disgusting that a community such as Casula has to fight for the same rights as other areas. 6yrs later the matter has not been resolved. Yet we are expected to have faith that our Government will do the right thing in terms of the intermodal.

How on earth does the Government propose to protect the residents from the acceleration of freight trains to get over the proposed Georges River Bridge on both spur lines?

How absurd is it to suggest in the EIS that the trains will turn off their lights to when crossing the spur lines towards residential housing. We do have fogs. And the matter of safety has been neglected.

Architectural mitigation does not work for we have it in our own home. I have double glazed windows and sealing. Yet I am constantly awoken by trucks due to the lack of noise walls on the Georges River Bridge. We refuse to be prisoners in our own home. We would like to enjoy our backyard as other Australians do without now the addition of screeching locomotive wheels in eye sight to our homes due to the elevation of the proposed bridge over the Georges River.

Furthermore in the EIS there is no mention of any mitigation of noise walls on the Georges River Bridge despite the increase of trucks that will turn onto the bridge. Buck passing is already happening even though the intermodal has not been approved. Mr Ian Hunt at a meeting at Casula stated that it was not the MPOs responsibility to place noise mitigation on the bridge nor fix surrounding roads but rather the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS). I fail to comprehend how a proposal can even be considered without mitigating the roads and communities it will affect.

Ian Hunt has already alluded that MIC will not take responsibility for placing mitigation on the Georges River Bridge. Or fixing roads to accommodate the intermodal. That cost will be placed on Liverpool Council and Roads and Maritime Services.

The Georges River Bridge is the first point to where the trucks will be exiting and entering the Moorebank Intermodal. There will be a quadrupling of trucks on that bridge yet there are no noise walls to protect residents proposed. The Liverpool Casula Links estate will become the Ampitheatre of the South West. And a death will result due to sleep disturbance by trucks (compression breahing) due negligence of the government in not placing noise mitigation on the Bridge.

The Georges River Bridge cannot remain the only bridge left on the ENTIRE orbital network without barriers. That is discrimination. When mounds(hills) heading east towards the Toll Gates have noise walls to protect dirt! People live in Casula, Liverpool Links not livestock as people from an Office in CBD seem to think>

A MASSIVE PROPOSAL CANNOT BE INFLICTED ON A SOCIETY WITHOUT PROPER MITIGATION. AND THE BUCK PASSING NEEDS TO STOP!

The EIS is also inconsistent with the findings of ARTC findings at certain points in relation to noise. Please investigate!

Neighborhood Impacts – Lighting, Traffic Congestion, Truck and Rail Accidents
Please address!

Quality of life? It is known that intermodal facilities, distribution centers operate round-the-clock operations, often employing bright lights, referred to as “stadium lighting.”

Please review the research into the effects of bright night time light which has recently emerged, human studies looking at the effect of bright light and disturbances in sleep, hormones, immune function, and circadian rhythm.^{xxiv}

Previous laboratory studies on mice have shown that nighttime exposure to artificial light stimulated the growth of breast tumors by suppressing the levels of a key hormone called melatonin.^{xxv} In addition, night lighting (or “bright skies”) creates serious negative consequences for animal and bird life.^{xxvi}

Again how does the Government intend to protect a residential area such as Casula Links whose sight vision is in line with the intermodal lights? Casula Links is only 230m away from the facility.

The EIS does not address protecting Residents of
Segefield Place
Buckland St
St Andrews Boulevard

How does the Government intend to protect the fauna and flora of the banks of the Georges River and Parklands? The afternoon skies in Casula are frequented with many varieties of birds circling with the wind. This wonder will disappear with the introduction of the intermodal on the banks of the river.

It is also known that there are occasional train derailments and frequent truck accidents, a common occurrence in goods movement communities. Can the Government be certain that there will be no train derailments over the proposed bridge over the Georges River? What impact will a potential derailment have to the river not to mention residents living less than 25m away? Or is this not a concern?

Demographics

According to the U.S. EPA National Environmental Justice Advisory Council report on goods movement:

The environmental, public health and quality-of-life impacts of goods movement on communities are more pronounced in areas with major transportation hubs and high traffic roads. Minority and low-income communities near these hubs and throughways bear disproportionate impacts because of their close proximity to multiple pollution sources.^{xxvii}

It will be a social injustice by the Government if the intermodal of such magnitude is introduced into mid suburbia.

In the USA an EPA determined that at least 13 million people, including a disproportionate number of low-income, African-Americans and Latinos, live in close proximity to these facilities and are exposed to higher levels of diesel particulate matter than other residents in their region.^{xxviii}

Why is Australia following suit?

Majority of Liverpoolians are working class with a huge population of migrants.

The EIS states

The location of the Project within the Liverpool LGA and the greater Sydney region demonstrates a

demographic and socio-economic context that reflects both local and regional influences and trends.

In particular, the residents of the Liverpool LGA identify with a number of indicators that suggest greater

levels of socioeconomic disadvantage and, potentially, a higher vulnerability to impacts associated with

the Project. As compared to Sydney and the rest of the state, these indicators include:

- relatively high proportions of overseas born residents and people speaking a language other than English at home;
- higher levels of unemployment, mortgage stress, and single parent families; and
- lower median incomes.

It goes further to say

As described in Chapter 24 – Social and economic impacts, within the local study area, there is considerable variation in population and socioeconomic trends among suburbs in the vicinity of the Project site. For example, Wattle Grove has a comparatively lower level of socioeconomic disadvantage (lower unemployment levels, higher incomes and rates of home ownership, and fewer single parent families) than suburbs such as Liverpool and Lurnea, with the latter suburbs also having higher proportions of overseas born residents and people who speak a language other than English at home.

Why is not Casula and Glen Regent estate a part of this study since its directly across from the intermodal.

Why is not the intermodal placed in the far western Sydney such as Badgeries Creek where the people are seldom and new roads can accommodate? The Federal Government is discriminating against Liverpool due to the social-economical status of its residents. The government is aware that many non English speaking migrants will not be putting in a submission hence an easy path for its approval.

An intermodal would not even be considered in the Northern and Eastern Suburbs where it is needed and to which the bulk of the containers from the Moorebank site are heading. It's pure discrimination! An intermodal needs to be placed in the Far West, in Badgeries Creek now that the new airport is being approved.

Climate Change/Global Warming/Natural Resource Impacts

If the Australian Federal Government is serious about Global warming and Climate Change, it will place intermodal facilities on the outskirts in industrial areas, feeding into the city. Recent study by NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies identifies the transportation sector, including trucks, ships, and rail that rely on diesel fuel, as "the greatest contributor to atmospheric warming now and in the near term."^{xxxix} Trucking and rail freight in the U.S. alone accounts for 1.5% of global emissions,^{xxx}

In fact, a recent study by NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies identifies the transportation sector, including trucks, ships, and rail that rely on diesel fuel, as "the greatest contributor to atmospheric warming now and in the near term."^{xxxi} Trucking and rail freight in the U.S. alone accounts for 1.5% of global emissions,^{xxxii}

Alternatives

Why is the alternate Solutions not considered?

Just because it is Commonwealth Land does not mean that it's necessarily the best option of use for the land. If a thorough investigation is done in terms of Health impacts, Heritage, Environmental impacts and community impacts it is logically not the best solution, especially in terms of future visions for Sydney and Australia.

The Government is spending billions of dollars on the Southern Sydney Freight Line. Why is that line not extended towards Badgeries Creek on barren land with little to no effect to surrounding communities? The population is miniscule in comparison to the population and forecast population of Liverpool, Moorebank. Georges Fair being a new estate on the Fringe of the Moorebank Intermodal. Again people who bought in that area had no idea of a proposed intermodal on their fringe when government decided to vacate the Defence from the area. By putting the intermodal in Badgeries Creek near industrial zones the potential for industry locating out there means trucks will have shorter distances to travel. Since the majority of trucks are going North West.

Badgerys Creek now with the proposed airport is the ONLY logical solution. Personally I would prefer to see the intermodal in Newcastle or Goulburn but since the government prefers bandaide solutions Badgeries Creek should be the choice not Moorebank . Again the population is minuscule in comparison to Moorebank/ Liverpool. There is already existing industry out there with the potential of more industry. Badgerys Creek has the same advantages as Moorebank in that it uses the same feeder roads. M5, M7 Hume etc The South West Rail extension is now in place. Why isn't the ARTC, Southern Sydney Freight line going in at the same time along this planned line, hence making an orbital towards North West Sydney where the bulk of the freight is headed? Badgerys Creek is on the outskirts and would feeder into the

city. Hence, alleviating the traffic jams for ALL! Not just segments of the Sydney community. (which at the latest forum we found out from the environmental planner that the governments motherhood statement of taking trucks off the road is a farce and a con.

By placing the intermodal at Badgeries Creek. It is in line with the policy of different political persuasions by placing intermodal facilities on outskirts, especially when there is so much land available on the outskirts. Industry would be located on Sydney's fringes and people can live in the centre of Sydney. Moorebank can become like Homebush has been developed.

Conclusion

November 18th 2009 it was noted in Liverpool Champion from a resident that attended the forum quote.

Mr. Deegan from Infrastructure Australia kept saying that this has been identified as the site for a terminal no matter what, and even though adjustments may be made after community consultation it's still going to happen.

I am disgusted by this attitude even from the onset.

Daily Telegraph August 21 2011

Last year the Auditor General released a scathing assessment of what happens to pollution reports. The Government doesn't know how many separate pollution incidents have been reported, or the overall outcomes of its investigations.

The EPA can't say if it's achieving better outcomes for the environment.

The truth is we do not have an independent EPA in NSW. Bob Carr merged it into the Environment Department. It has lost its energy and expertise. It's so bad that it is left to a politician to sound the alarm when a pollution event occurs.

A credible EPA would have an independent commissioner who would take that decision and immediately alert the public himself.

This statement reconfirms that an only a full enquiry is appropriate for such a highly controversial development proposal. The level of hostility toward the proposals and failure to adequately address community concerns reinstates that only a full public inquiry will be sufficient to achieve this. The community of Liverpool is well aware through experience and sources advising that EIS of today are watered down and not as thorough as that of yesteryear. They are also designed to "Fit the purpose" and to favor big corporations and government. Not the greater good or the people of Sydney. We have seen this through the double standards in terms of mitigation for roads and rail. If a new lane goes in as what we have seen on the M5 duplication to date. Noise walls are automatically put into place despite the the lane moving further from the residents.

Yet with the rail ARTC do not need to place noise walls because the line is further away from housing. Double standard indeed. And a glitch in your ENTIRE system.

It is SHAMEFUL that the EPA ignored pleas by the Casula Residents to place noise walls on the Georges River Bridge. It is now the ONLY area on the ENTIRE network without noise walls protecting residents. We were even DISGUSTED to see a mound before the M5 toll way going east bound lined with noise walls!!

If EPA was NATA audited it would FAIL dismally due to the inconsistency. SHAMEFUL.

I personally would like to see a full Public Enquiry (under section 87.1e in accordance with s109 and s126 of the EPBC Act) on the intermodal proposals as there will be huge impact to all Liverpool residents.

We urge you to do the right thing and reinstall our confidence in the Government and the Environment Protection Agency for you have failed dismally in the past as shown by the residents of Port Botany and the Great Barrier Reef Debarcle. I request that another EIS from the likes of Arup and Wilkinson Murray not just one from Parsons Brinckerhoff to get a more informed view. Also research and liaison needs to be had with the USA who is progressive in this field. Partial Investigations as stated in the EIS is not acceptable! And will result in possibly the biggest class action Australia has seen in the near future.

I urge whoever is reading this to visit the Georges River and Liverpool and do the JUST thing by ones conscious and think beyond the square of the generation tomorrow not the band aide solution today.

In the words of Senator Abetz Liverpool Champion

"Nearly every community that lives near a river sees that river as an asset," he said.

"And the people of those rivers think, quite rightfully so, that they do need to be protected and looked after."

"So if an intermodal was to prejudice that, then clearly that is something that should be taken into account."

The proposed intermodal, which may have been a good idea all those years ago, is no longer a good idea," he said

"A good government, I believe, should always be open-minded and should always be flexible," he said. "I happen to agree, that with the current financial status we face as a nation, any decision we make should be looking at the best economic opportunity.

"From what I have heard there is apparently no doubt. That is the message I will be taking back to my ministerial colleagues, that putting an intermodal here, on the face of it, would be extremely inefficient."

I urge you to really consider your stance and do what's right by society. by placing the intermodal at the logical solution Badgeries Creek. Thereby protecting the River and its surrounding community and not be persuaded by the corporate dollar and a CEO's stance such as Ian Hunt who wants to protect one's job and pay packet which is not equivalent to your own. This is one's moral duty and obligation for the greater good. .

Yours Sincerely

Dara Bonic

Casula

Sample of a List of documents that should thoroughly be investigated and taken into consideration. I would like to see evidence one has read the below and more.

Australian Asthma Foundation

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Health effects assessment document for diesel engine exhaust. EPA/600/8-90/057F. National Center for Environmental Assessment, Office of Research and Development. Washington, DC: US EPA, 2002.

Pope CA, Burnett RT, Thurston GD, Thun MJ, Calle EE, Krewski D, Godleski JJ. Cardiovascular mortality and long-term exposure to particulate air pollution. *Circulation* 2004;109:71-77.

Kunzli N, Jerrett M, Garcia-Esteban R, et al. Ambient air pollution and the progression of atherosclerosis in adults. *PLoS One* 2010;5:e9096.

Brook RD, et al. AHA scientific statement, particulate matter air pollution and cardiovascular disease, an update to the scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2010;121:2331-2378.

Utell MJ, Frampton MW. Acute health effects of ambient air pollution: the ultra fine particle hypothesis. *J Aerosol Med* 2000; 13:355-359.

California Air Resources Board. Methodology for estimating premature deaths associated with long-term exposure to fine airborne particulate matter in California staff report. December 7, 2009. (Accessed February 23, 2011, at http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/health/pm-mort/pm-mort_final.pdf)

Gauderman WJ, Avol E, Gilliland F, et al. The effect of air pollution on lung development from 10 to 18 years of age. *N Engl J Med* 2004;351:1057-67.

McCreanor J, Cullinan P, Nieuwenhuijsen MJ et al. Respiratory effects of exposure to diesel traffic in persons with asthma. *N Engl J Med*. 2007 Dec 6;357(23):2348-58.

[Hemmingsen JG](#), [Hougaard KS](#), [Talsness C](#), [Wellejus A](#), [Loft S](#), [Wallin H](#), [Møller P](#). Prenatal

exposure to diesel exhaust particles and effect on the male reproductive system in mice. [Toxicology](#) 2009; Oct 1;264(1-2):61-8.

[Li C](#), [Taneda S](#), [Taya K](#), [Watanabe G](#), [Li X](#), [Fujitani Y](#), [Ito Y](#), [Nakajima T](#), [Suzuki AK](#). Effects of inhaled nanoparticle-rich diesel exhaust on regulation of testicular function in adult male rats. [Inhal Toxicol](#) 2009; Aug21(10):803-11.

Fanning E, Froines JR, Utell MJ et al. Particulate matter (PM) research centers (1999–2005) and the role of interdisciplinary center-based research. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2009 February; 117(2): 167–174

Knol AB, de Hartog JL et al. Expert elicitation on ultra fine particles: likelihood of health effects and causal pathways. [Part Fibre Toxicol.](#) 2009 Jul 24;6:19.

South Coast Air Quality Management District. Symposium - ultra fine particles: the science, technology, and policy issues. April 30, 2006. (Accessed March 6, 2011 at http://www.aqmd.gov/tao/ultrafine_presentations/ultrafineconferenceagenda-updated.htm)

Balmes JR. Editorial: How does diesel exhaust impact asthma? *Thorax* 2011;66:4-6.

Delfino RJ, Sioutas C, Malik S. Potential role of ultra fine particles in associations between airborne particle mass and cardiovascular health. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2005;113(8):934-46.

Li N, Sioutas C, Cho A, Schmitz D, Misra C, Sempf J, Wang M, Oberley T, Froines J, Nel A. Ultra fine particulate pollutants induce oxidative stress and mitochondrial damage. *Environ Health Perspect* 2003; 111:455-460.

Oberdörster G, Sharp Z, Atudorei V, Elder A, Gelein R, Kreyling W, Cox C. Translocation of inhaled ultra fine particles to the brain. *Inhal Toxicol.* 2004 Jun;16(6-7):437-45.

Araujo JA, Barajas B, Kellinman M, et al. Ambient particulate pollutants in the ultra fine range promote early atherosclerosis and systemic oxidative stress. *Circ Res* 2008 March 14; 589-596.

Gauderman WJ, Vora H, McConnell R, Berhane K, Gilliland F, Thomas D, Lurmann F, Avol E, Kunzli N, Jerrett M, Peters J. [Effect of exposure to traffic on lung development from 10 to 18 years of age: a cohort study.](#) *Lancet* 2007; Feb 17;369(9561):571-7.

McConnell R, Berhane K, Yao L, Jerrett M, Lurmann F, Gilliland F, Künzli N, Gauderman J, Avol E, Thomas D, Peters J. Traffic, susceptibility, and childhood asthma. *Environ Health Perspect* 2006; May;114(5):766-72.

McConnell R, Islam T, Shankardass K, Jerrett M, Lurmann F, Gilliland F, Gauderman J, Avol E, Künzli N, Yao L, Peters J, Berhane K. Childhood incident asthma and traffic-related air pollution at home and school. *Environ Health Perspect* 2010 Jul;118(7):1021-6.

Gauderman WJ, Avol E, Lurmann F, et al. Childhood asthma and exposure to traffic and nitrogen dioxide. *Epidemiology* 2005; 16:737-43.

Mack T. *Cancers in the urban environment*. 1st edition. Oxford, UK: Elsevier Academic Press; 2004.

Pauley SM. Lighting for the human circadian clock: recent research indicates that lighting has become a public health issue. *Med Hypotheses.* 2004;63(4):588-96.

[Wu J](#), [Dauchy RT](#), [Tirrell PC](#), [Wu SS](#), [Lynch DT](#), [Jitawatanarat P](#), [Burrington CM](#), [Dauchy EM](#), [Blask DE](#), [Greene MW](#). Light at night activates IGF-1R/PDK1 signalling and accelerates tumor growth in human breast cancer xenografts. [Cancer Res](#) 2011;Feb 10.

Chepesiuk R. Missing the dark: health effects of light pollution. *Environ Health Perspect*

2009;117:A20-A27.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Environmental Justice Advisory Council. Reducing air emissions associated with goods movement: working towards environmental justice." Nov. 2009. (Accessed February 25, 2011, at <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/publications/nejac/2009-goods-movement.pdf>)

Ibid.

NASA. Road transportation emerges as key driver of warming in new analysis from NASA. Feb 18, 2010. (Accessed March 1, 2011, at <http://www.nasa.gov/topics/earth/features/road-transportation.html>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Inventory of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions and sinks, 1990-2006. 2008.

NASA. Road transportation emerges as key driver of warming in new analysis from NASA. Feb 18, 2010. (Accessed March 1, 2011, at <http://www.nasa.gov/topics/earth/features/road-transportation.html>)

#U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Inventory of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions and sinks, 1990-2006. 2008.

ⁱ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Health effects assessment document for diesel engine exhaust. EPA/600/8-90/057F. National Center for Environmental Assessment, Office of Research and Development. Washington, DC: US EPA, 2002.

ⁱⁱ Pope CA, Burnett RT, Thurston GD, Thun MJ, Calle EE, Krewski D, Godleski JJ. Cardiovascular mortality and long-term exposure to particulate air pollution. *Circulation* 2004;109:71-77.

ⁱⁱⁱ Kunzli N, Jerrett M, Garcia-Esteban R, et al. Ambient air pollution and the progression of atherosclerosis in adults. *PLoS One* 2010;5:e9096.

^{iv}

Brook RD. et al. AHA scientific statement, particulate matter air pollution and cardiovascular disease, an update to the scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2010;121:2331-2378.

^v Utell MJ, Frampton MW. Acute health effects of ambient air pollution: the ultra fine particle hypothesis. *J Aerosol Med* 2000; 13:355-359.

^{vi} California Air Resources Board. Methodology for estimating premature deaths associated with long-term exposure to fine airborne particulate matter in California staff report. December 7, 2009. (Accessed February 23, 2011, at http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/health/pm-mort/pm-mort_final.pdf)

^{vii} Gauderman WJ, Avol E, Gilliland F, et al. The effect of air pollution on lung development from 10 to 18 years of age. *N Engl J Med* 2004;351:1057-67.

^{viii} McCreanor J, Cullinan P, Nieuwenhuijsen MJ et al. Respiratory effects of exposure to diesel traffic in persons with asthma. *N Engl J Med*. 2007 Dec 6;357(23):2348-58.

^{ix} Hemmingsen JG, Hougaard KS, Talsness C, Wellejus A, Loft S, Wallin H, Møller P. Prenatal exposure to diesel exhaust particles and effect on the male reproductive system in mice. *Toxicology* 2009; Oct 1;264(1-2):61-8.

-
- ^x [Li C](#), [Taneda S](#), [Taya K](#), [Watanabe G](#), [Li X](#), [Fujitani Y](#), [Ito Y](#), [Nakajima T](#), [Suzuki AK](#). Effects of inhaled nanoparticle-rich diesel exhaust on regulation of testicular function in adult male rats. [Inhal Toxicol](#) 2009; Aug21(10):803-11.
- ^{xi} Fanning E, Froines JR, Utell MJ et al. Particulate matter (PM) research centers (1999–2005) and the role of interdisciplinary center-based research. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2009 February; 117(2): 167–174
- ^{xii} Knol AB, de Hartog JL et al. Expert elicitation on ultra fine particles: likelihood of health effects and causal pathways. [Part Fibre Toxicol.](#) 2009 Jul 24;6:19.
- ^{xiii} South Coast Air Quality Management District. Symposium - ultra fine particles: the science, technology, and policy issues. April 30, 2006. (Accessed March 6, 2011 at http://www.aqmd.gov/tao/ultrafine_presentations/ultrafineconferenceagenda-updated.htm)
- ^{xiv} Balme JR. Editorial: How does diesel exhaust impact asthma? *Thorax* 2011;66:4-6.
- ^{xv} Delfino RJ, Sioutas C, Malik S. Potential role of ultra fine particles in associations between airborne particle mass and cardiovascular health. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2005;113(8):934-46.
- ^{xvi} Li N, Sioutas C, Cho A, Schmitz D, Misra C, Sempf J, Wang M, Oberley T, Froines J, Nel A. Ultra fine particulate pollutants induce oxidative stress and mitochondrial damage. *Environ Health Perspect* 2003; 111:455-460.
- ^{xvii} Oberdörster G, Sharp Z, Atudorei V, Elder A, Gelein R, Kreyling W, Cox C. Translocation of inhaled ultra fine particles to the brain. *Inhal Toxicol.* 2004 Jun;16(6-7):437-45.
- ^{xviii} Araujo JA, Barajas B, Kellinman M, et al. Ambient particulate pollutants in the ultra fine range promote early atherosclerosis and systemic oxidative stress. *Circ Res* 2008 March 14; 589-596.
- ^{xix} Gauderman WJ, Vora H, McConnell R, Berhane K, Gilliland F, Thomas D, Lurmann F, Avol E, Kunzli N, Jerrett M, Peters J. [Effect of exposure to traffic on lung development from 10 to 18 years of age: a cohort study.](#) *Lancet* 2007; Feb 17;369(9561):571-7.
- ^{xx} McConnell R, Berhane K, Yao L, Jerrett M, Lurmann F, Gilliland F, Kunzli N, Gauderman J, Avol E, Thomas D, Peters J. Traffic, susceptibility, and childhood asthma. *Environ Health Perspect* 2006; May;114(5):766-72.
- ^{xxi} McConnell R, Islam T, Shankardass K, Jerrett M, Lurmann F, Gilliland F, Gauderman J, Avol E, Kunzli N, Yao L, Peters J, Berhane K. Childhood incident asthma and traffic-related air pollution at home and school. *Environ Health Perspect* 2010 Jul;118(7):1021-6.
- ^{xxii} Gauderman WJ, Avol E, Lurmann F, et al. Childhood asthma and exposure to traffic and nitrogen dioxide. *Epidemiology* 2005; 16:737-43.
- ^{xxiii} Mack T. *Cancers in the urban environment.* 1st edition. Oxford, UK: Elsevier Academic Press; 2004.
- ^{xxiv} Pauley SM. Lighting for the human circadian clock: recent research indicates that lighting has become a public health issue. *Med Hypotheses.* 2004;63(4):588-96.
- ^{xxv} [Wu J](#), [Dauchy RT](#), [Tirrell PC](#), [Wu SS](#), [Lynch DT](#), [Jitawatnarat P](#), [Burrington CM](#), [Dauchy EM](#), [Blask DE](#), [Greene MW](#). Light at night activates IGF-1R/PDK1 signalling and accelerates tumor growth

in human breast cancer xenografts. Cancer Res 2011;Feb 10.

^{xxvi} Chepesiuk R. Missing the dark: health effects of light pollution. *Environ Health Perspect* 2009;117:A20-A27.

^{xxvii} U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Environmental Justice Advisory Council. Reducing air emissions associated with goods movement: working towards environmental justice." Nov. 2009. (Accessed February 25, 2011, at <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/publications/nejac/2009-goods-movement.pdf>)

^{xxviii} Ibid.

^{xxix} NASA. Road transportation emerges as key driver of warming in new analysis from NASA. Feb 18, 2010. (Accessed March 1, 2011, at <http://www.nasa.gov/topics/earth/features/road-transportation.html>)

^{xxx} U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Inventory of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions and sinks, 1990-2006. 2008.

^{xxxi} NASA. Road transportation emerges as key driver of warming in new analysis from NASA. Feb 18, 2010. (Accessed March 1, 2011, at <http://www.nasa.gov/topics/earth/features/road-transportation.html>)

^{xxxii} U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Inventory of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions and sinks, 1990-2006. 2008.