

10 September 2014

Director - Infrastructure Projects

Department of Planning and Environment

Number: SSI 13_6136

Major Projects Assessment

GPO Box 39

SYDNEY NSW 2001

NorthConnex Application Number: SSI 13_6136

Please find below my submission in response to the exhibition of the EIS for NorthConnex.

Firstly I would like to state I object to the project as described in the EIS.

I have a very high level of concern regarding the following issues and request that these be considered by NorthConnex and the Department of Planning. In regards to the NorthConnex tunnel, I am concerned about:

1. The lack of any measuring and modelling of Asbestos particulates that will be airborne in the tunnel from vehicles, and that will then be dispersed into the air at the proposed ventilation stacks.

These Asbestos particulates are from any cars and trucks built before 1993 and any other vehicles that have had the brakes and or clutches (fiction material) replaced prior to late 2003, which was only banned from replacement of Asbestos fiction material in late 2003. See link to a Government site.

http://www.commerce.wa.gov.au/sites/default/files/atoms/files/guide_asbestos.pdf

Also some currently imported vehicles (2 brands and several models) that also have been reported as being fitted with asbestos fiction material.

2. The lack of measuring and modelling on how much silica and other airborne particulates will be emitted to the local environment during construction, as I suspect this was the cause of the increase in respiratory complaints after the construction of the M5 and Lane Cove tunnels.

3. The base line or benchmark modelling used for all the particulate measuring as:

They were not taken from the areas where portal air intake would happen and the effect of the adjoining ventilation stack in certain weather conditions recycling the same air (although diluted) back in the intake portal.

4. Given Item 3 and that the modelling would be wrong and the particulate matter is higher than the EIS suggest. I believe a new EIS be independently completed taking into account the new baseline and a better solution be sort. See item 4 below.

To address my concerns I request that the following actions are undertaken:

1. To measure, model and continue to monitor for ever the tunnel and portal areas including the ventilation stacks with any emissions of Asbestos and to have appropriate filter systems installed to emit 0 Asbestos particulates.

2. To measure, model and monitor how much Silica and other dust particulates will be emitted and take appropriate action to reduce or eliminate any of these dust particulates during construction.

3. Remodel and use actual road level monitoring to get a correct base line of the actual air that will be used at the air intake of the portals, not some miles away in set some many metres above the ground.

And to take into consideration with this new modelling the actual weather conditions at the proposed stacks and what affect the outgoing air from the ventilation stack will have with the standard of air being taken into the intake portal, given the close proximity of the stack to the intake portal.

4. To not have a ventilation stack in a residential area, but have a relocated stack some kilometres, (say in the Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park) via a tunnel (as is proposed on the south bound tunnel although shorter). And would be cheaper than moving the whole tunnel and can be positioned on a hill top.

4B. To move the North bound portal and ventilation stack to a non-residential area.

Regards Jaime Garrick
116A Coonanbarra Rd, Wahroonga