From: David Morris david | morris13@gmail.com Subject: Berrima Rail Project Date: 27 June 2017 1:29 pm To:

## Attention: Executive Director, Resource Assessments Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, Sydney, NSW 2001

# THIS IS A SUBMISSION TO BERRIMA RAIL PROJECT EIS. SSD 7171

## I object to this project and recommend that it be rejected

I have been the owner, with my wife of a farm at Robertson, since 2001. Our property is bordered on one side by the MossVale - Unanderra railway line.

I object to the proposal "Berrima Rail Project" EIS SSD7171 by Hume Coal and ask that it be rejected.

My reasons are many and are primarily concerned with environmental issue of noise, diesel particulates pollution and coal dust particulates pollution.

There seems to be little specific considerations or mitigations of these issues mentioned by the proponent in the EIS.

For example, according to the proposal there will be 8 train movements a day.

But this figure according to <u>Ben Fitzsimmons, spokesperson for Hume Coal</u> who told me in a phone conversation on 17/5/17 that "this is an average figure". So in other words it could be <u>double</u> this number, or even more on some specific days. That could mean 16 or more train movements on some days.

Why is this of concern?

Enviroline, managed within the Australian Rail Track Corporation, the commercial operator of the MossVale to Unanderra railway line sent me an email dated 9/6/17. In it the officer named Angela writes about the normal number of train services currently using this rail line and I quote...

"On any day there may be more than 10-12 train services operating, with some days busier than others..."

So I draw your attention to the fact that on some days Hume Coal could be running 80% more train movements than all other ARTC train services combined.

This would severely impact on our enjoyment, amenity and possible health living adjacent to this rail line.

80% more trains means 80% greater propensity to noise, and to diesel and coal particulate pollutants.

Hume Coal has stated to me (again in a phone conversation with Ben Fitzsimmons 17/5/17) that the locomotives proposed to be used by Hume Coal are C44 aci models made by UGL. But are these new locomotives? <u>Or will they be second hand?</u> Either way how noisy are they? What is their diesel particulant "signature"

The C44 was first manufactured in 2008. I have asked the proponent, the EPA and the ARTC to give me noise levels for this locomotive. And I would like to know what their level of diesel air pollutants would be. I have not received a response from any of them.

It is of great concern that the proponent cannot assure me - nor the NSW Government - that their locomotives would be quieter than other locomotives used by other carriers on this rail line. I believe the proponent must provide <u>measurements</u> of noise levels of both the locomotive and the carriages, both loaded, and unloaded - as well as measured rates of diesel particulates before approval be considered further. I think the ARTC/enviroline agrees. In their response to me on 9/6/17 they state, "We understand the Hume Coal proposal is currently undergoing the planning process (EIS) and they are looking at measures to address

noise aspects related to locomotives/waggons."

What are these measurements? How can Planning approve this proposal without <u>measured</u> environmental impacts? I would suggest that Planning would be at risk of legal action if measured data was not to underpin the applicant's successful proposal.

Note also that if this proposal is approved it would mean up to 80% increase in coal trains passing within 50 metres of Robertson Public School.

Hume Coal needs to tell the residents of Robertson, and their children what "noise aspects" and "increase in particulates" would be suffered if approvals were granted.

Likewise diesel particulants from the proposed locomotives need to be measured and regulations complied with.

What test readings if any has the proponent included in their EIS for the health risks associated with coal dust from moving trains?

I do appreciate that Hume Coal has stated that their coal wagons will be " covered " What difference will this make to air pollution, and will it in fact stop the egress of particle matter proven to be a health hazard?

Will in fact the waggons be sealed to prevent any dangerous particulants escaping? Will the coal be sprayed before being loaded into wagons?

Will the wagons be covered, or sealed on the return journey from Pt Kembla when coal dust is arguably more likely to be blown out of uncovered and empty wagons?

I can find nothing specific, nothing certain in Hume Coal's EIS that would allay my very worrying concerns - for the safety of my family, and the residents and children of Robertson and the Robertson Public School community.

Until or unless Hume Coal can prove that their coal trains running on the MossVale - Unanderra line 24/7 will address my concerns -of noise pollution, diesel particulate health risks and coal dust particle health risks - they should not be given Planning approval.

The well-being of the Robertson community, including primary school children should not be put at risk by this proposal.

I request that the Hume Coal Berrima Rail project SSD 7171 be rejected.

David Morris "Burra Burra" 94 Old Kangaloon Road, Robertson

27/6/17

plus attachment letter from Enviroline IARTC

From: David Morris david ; morris (3.@gmail.com Subject: Fwd: Enquiry

Date: 27 June 2017 1:36 pm

ate: 27 June 2017 1:36 Το:

#### Begin forwarded message:

From: David Morris <<u>david concest3 Fromat com</u>> Subject: Re: Enquiry Date: 15 June 2017 7:19:21 am AEST To: Enviroline <<u>envirolines arts com au</u>>

Thank you Angela for your response I'm doing some further research and if I need any further information will be in touch Regards David

On 9 Jun 2017, at 8 49 am, Enviroline <en aroling @latte.com.au> wrote:

Hi again David,

Thank you for your interest in contributing an informed response to the Development Application process currently being undertaken by Hume Coal.

The Hume Coal website does include a lot of detail about the proposed operations, including details about the rail operations planned to support the project.

Equivalent bulk train and freight types use the Unanderra-Moss Vale line on a daily basis (including coal services, grain services, mineral cement and aggregates and other bulk freight types) and these have been carried on the line since the 1930s.

On any day there may be more than 10-12 train services operating, with some days busier than others, and there is a high number of ad hoc services that use the rail line (particularly during seasonal grain harvest periods).

There isn't necessarily a 'maximum number of trains per day' as this comes down to a number of factors such as the types of trains using the rail line, train length, speed, times and days that the network will be used.

With respect to capacity: Should future additional train paths be required by any operator along this rail line these are considered in line with availability, demand and pre-existing operations. As with all other transport networks, as population and freight demands increase, we also expect growth along major transport links such as the Moss Vale – Unanderra Line.

ARTC is constantly assessing the need for capacity enhancements (things like loop extensions) across our network based on demand from our customers and things like train volumes, operator train configuration and operator needs.

The Hume Coal project would form one part of the future considerations for investment in the Unanderra - Moss Vale rail line (alongside future grain demand and current Tahmoor coal train services). If there is an economic case based on demand, ARTC will consider what capacity enhancement projects might be appropriate.

We understand the Hume Coal proposal is currently undergoing the planning process (EIS) and they are looking at measures to address noise aspects related to

locomotives/wagons. Other matters of concern relating to environmental regulations associated with the Hume Coal proposal should be addressed to the relevant regulatory authority (NSW EPA) or addressed in the planning approvals process but we understand Hume Coal are proposing a number of mitigations in this regard.

Hume Coal are also the best party to direct your enquiries regarding the specific type of locomotives they propose to use

We operate on a commercial basis so any additional freight services on to the network

anow ion revenue to pay for the recurrent maintenance needs of the rail network. The train numbers proposed by Hume Coal are for example less than the peaks we would receive during a busy grain season. Particularly over the last six months or so which has been a particularly busy grain season.

As the Moss Vale – Unanderra line is a key branch line that connects into the national rail freight network and a nationally significant export port, operations are required on a 24/7basis. Any restrictions on this would reduce both the Port and rail transport's competitiveness.

Kind regards,

Angela

<image003.jpg>

P 1300 550 402

E enviroline@artc.com.au

Australian Rail Track Corporation 11 Sir Donald Bradman Drive Keswick Terminal SA 5035

#### artc.com.au

The information in this email and any attachments to it is confidential to the intended recipient and may be privileged. Receipt by a person other than the intended recipient does not waive confidentiality or privilege. Unless you are the intended recipient, you are not authorised to disseminate, copy, retain or rely on the whole or any part of this communication. If you have received this communication in error please notify ARTC on +61 8 8217 4366. While we have taken various steps to alert us to the presence of computer viruses we do not guarantee that this communication is virus free.

From: David Morris [mailto:david.morrisi.3@gmail.com] Sent: Monday, 5 June 2017 8:47 AM To: Enviroline Subject: Re: Enquiry

Hi Angela, Do you have any information as yet, please? regards, David Morris On 26 May 2017, at 12:45 pm. David Morris <<u>david.j.morris13@gmail.com</u>> wrote:

Thank you On 26 May 2017. at 12:20 pm. Enviroline <<u>enviroline@artc.com.au</u>> wrote:

Hi David,

Yes we received your enquiry and are looking into it.

Kind regards,

Angela

### <image001.jpg>

P 1300 550 402

E. enviroline@artc.com.au

## Australian Rail Track Corporation

11 Sir Donald Bradman Drive Keswick Terminal SA 5035

#### artc.com.au

The information in this email and any attachments to it is confidential to the intended recipient and may be privileged. Receipt by a person other than the intended recipient does not waive confidentiality or privilege. Unless you are the intended recipient, you are not authorised to disseminate, copy, retain or rely on the whole or any part of this communication. If you have received this communication in error please notify ARTC on +61 8 8217 4366. While we have taken various steps to alert us to the presence of computer viruses we do not guarantee that this communication is virus free.

From: David Morris [<u>mailto:david.j.morris13@gmail.com</u>] Sent: Friday, 26 May 2017 11:34 AM To: Enviroline Subject: Re: Enquiry

Hi Angela.

Just making sure you received this request, and whether you're able to help. Regards, David

David

On 19 May 2017, at 4:32 pm, David Morris <a>david.j.morris13@gmail.com</a> wrote:

Thanks Angela.

I have a farm at Robertson, on the MossVale-Ununderra line.

Hume Coal had a DA proposal in front of the NSW Dept of Planning seeking permission to a) mine for coal at Berrima, and

b) transport the coal from Berrima/Moss Vale by train to Pt Kembla on the Moss Vale-Ununderra line.

I am seeking information so as I can make an informed EIS comment to Planning about the impact on the

environment, particularly as Hume Coal is seeking approval to run 8 coal train movements on average per day 24/7.

Q1. What is the capacity of this line? (Maximum No. of trains per day.)

Q2 What is the current average number of trains per day on this line (% of capacity)

Q3 Are there any restrictions as to trains running 24/7?

Q4 Are there any plans by ARTC to increase capacity by -

a) adding a double track, or

b) adding sections of double track (for passing or waiting purposes)?