

North West Rail LinkEnvironmental Impact Statement - ~~Major Civil Construction Works~~**Submission Form**

This form can be used to make a submission about the proposed North West Rail Link - Environmental Impact Statement Major Civil Construction Work. The NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure (DPI) will take account of your views when considering the Environmental Impact Statement that is now on exhibition.

Once you have completed your submission return to DPI:

- By mail - Major Projects Assessment, Department of Planning & Infrastructure, GPO Box 39, SYDNEY NSW 2001.
- By fax - 02) 9228 6355
- Email - plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au

Transport for NSW cannot accept submissions on behalf of DPI. Submissions close Monday 21st May 2012.

Before posting your submission, please note the following:

- Fields marked with a * are compulsory. Anonymous comments are not able to be accepted as submissions, subject to the Act - please enter your name, email address and physical address accurately.
- You may request that your name be withheld from public display by ticking the box at the bottom of this form.
- If there is not enough room on this form for your comments, you can add extra pages.

Name*

Title

First Name

Last Name

Your Details

Email*

Organisation

Position in Organisation

Address*

Address 1

Address 2

Suburb

State

Postcode

COLIN

ROBERTS

colin.8601@gmail.com

5 BRAY AV

EARLWOOD

NSW

2206

Attached 1 2/2/2012

Comments on EIS2

2 November 2012

I did provide the attached comments to EIS1 and received an acknowledgement notation with identification number 45 from Transport for NSW.

I have investigated the EIS2 presentation document and I can only see abbreviated advice on page 61 in relation to my concerns.

Would you please provide me with the Planning Requirements particularly in relation to Fire life safety for the project.

In terms of fire life safety, this project should consider requirements from Cudgegong all the way to Chatswood as the project involves a new concept especially for the Rolling Stock and community safety expectations are revised over time.

Would you please advise which entity is the actual proponent for this infrastructure build.

In terms of my initial submission, the EIS2 response appears to either ignore the requests or treat them in a superficial and dismissive manner.

What did I request?

- a) The advice on the Tunnel Fire Life Safety specification to comply with the Specified Planning Requirements Conditions.

There is no specific advice - dot point 1 (Fire and life safety page 61 of EIS 2).

At minimum, a fire engineering design brief (including all infrastructure and rolling stock) should be available by now, if this project was being adequately defined and managed by Planning to achieve acceptability by the community. I understood that the nature of this consultation was set out to achieve full and frank advice to the public.

As an example I would invite Planning to consider the thesis "Fire Development in Passenger Trains" provided by Nathan White – Centre for Environment Safety and Risk Engineering, Victoria University, Australia, as a research beginning to provide some leads to the Planning Department in order to specify these requirements for this particularly unusual underground and elevated "metro railway design.

While this thesis may not apply directly it does provide some background for consideration and detailed requirements specification.

- b) My request for a simple curve and gradient diagram appears also to be ignored.

After the basic survey data, provided with the first EIS, comes the curve and gradient diagram. Obviously the tighter the curves the less efficient and more costly the

railway becomes to build and operate. Do the curves on this railway go below 800 metres?

Please provide the curve and gradient diagram from Cudgegong to Chatswood.

New Comments:

I note in EIS2 that there is mention of ventilation shafts but I cannot find their location on the diagrams provided.

Please provide the location and proposed design of these shafts as a matter of community advice.

I would expect to see a "sectional ventilation shaft" on either side of each respective tunnel station at the end of each ventilation section.

It is highly possible that the steeply graded tunnel will provide smoke control difficulties outside the expectation expressed in the EIS2 and that CFD modelling will be required. This may be particularly the case on the Epping to Chatswood leg of the project, particularly in relation to the full profile tunnel and the smaller single deck train?

I also note page 61 "Fire and Life Safety" dot point 3 that there will be only one train in a tunnel ventilation section and that is commendable. However this statement has the additional attachment "where possible".

These conditions should be unambiguous unless there is an assurance of additional safety controls. These "rules" are at times bent for operational expedient reasons to the detriment of passenger fire life safety with negative outcomes.

It is mentioned that there will be "no" dust effects in relation to the railway operation and tunnel ventilation.

Please provide the requirements conditions with respect to operational dust and advise the means of monitoring this at each location?

If the statement is correct and there is no dust then the recurrent cost of providing filtration is near zero and so filtration should be seriously considered. At least the quantity and detailed nature of the dust must be provided at each outlet vent and continually reported to the neighbours as this will at least impact on environmental amenity.

Fast Track Project Management

It is clear that this project is being fast tracked in project management terms and I understand that tunnelling contracts are in place before the agreed design for the complete infrastructure package is in place. Fire Safety, Ventilation, Smoke control, New Trains, Signalling, Rescue Resources, Operational control systems and documentation etc. Or are the details being kept secret?

Does the Planning Requirements Conditions allow for Fast Track Project Management? What are the Planning Requirements specified for the "project trains"?

It is clear that the train will be a high power consumer to cope with the present ECRL inefficient track profile and the new steep and deep tunnel profile

Colin Roberts





North West Rail Link

Environmental Impact Statement – Major Civil Works

Submission Form

From Mr Colin Roberts

Email colin.8601@gmail.com

Private Stakeholder

Address

5 Bray Av.

Earlwood 2206

NSW

Phone 0479 165 066

Dear Sir, Madam,

I have viewed the EIS documents and I have not been able to view the fire life safety provisions for the project.

I have recently made a direct request to the project team on their stakeholder contact form with respect to the project control specifications in relation to this issue. I have requested project fire safety specification comparisons particularly with the 2011 published AS 4825 Tunnel Fire Safety Specification.

This project involves steep (2.6% grade?), deep long tunnels, especially between Epping and Cherrybrook and heavy rail trains (typically 8 cars – 260 passengers per car crush laden).

Compliance with Tunnel Fire Safety requirements may impose extensive additional civil works especially with respect to the provision of internal safe places; operational control, emergency services access and ventilation openings.

I request that a curve and gradient diagram be provided with the EIS and that the full extent of the acceptable fire safety considerations especially with respect to civil works be provided at this project definition stage.

Colin Roberts