From: Bruce Mitchell [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 5:21 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Bruce Mitchell

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Dean Longmore [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 2:25 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Dean Longmore

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Samuel Scander [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 2:16 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Samuel Scander

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: claire williams [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 12:54 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

claire williams

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Jacqueline Marks [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 12:41 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Jacqueline Marks

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Luke Barbuto [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 12:39 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Luke Barbuto

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Katherine Corcoran [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 12:36 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Katherine Corcoran

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Britt Erken [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 12:28 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

As a resident of the Inner West, I'm deeply concerned about the impact WestConnex is going to have on the air quality and the general quality of live in our area.

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by

taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Britt Erken

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Amir Demiri [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 11:54 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Amir Demiri

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Michelle Demiri [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 11:52 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Michelle Demiri

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: John Stephens [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 11:40 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

John Stephens

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: James Robinson [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 11:31 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

James Robinson

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Matt Beer [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 11:28 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Reject WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Matt Beer

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: marla minow [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 11:27 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

marla minow

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Alexandra Panos [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 11:26 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Alexandra Panos

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Matt Dunn [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 11:17 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from one area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Matt Dunn

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Keiko Takahashi [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 11:16 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is profoundly insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners will have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Keiko Takahashi

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Albert Iesho [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 11:14 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Albert Iesho

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Rebecca Garvie [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 10:58 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Rebecca Garvie

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Craig Major [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 10:57 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Craig Major

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: sarah Ferguson [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 9:06 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

sarah Ferguson

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Francine Hawker [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 9:04 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Francine Hawker

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 9:02 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

The school my little brothers attend is called St.Pius. You have left this school out of the EIS in the section that details educational facilities affected by Westconnex. This is a massive oversight in the EIS.

My family live in Brown Street an the noise decibels that will be emitted in the road corridor, far exceed the standards that are set. My family will be exposed to diesel particles that cause cancer.There are no safe levels of this particle.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people

use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around

Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: jube lang [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 9:01 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

jube lang

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Alexandra Russell [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:58 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Michael Wahhab [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:55 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Wahhab

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Mark Ely [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:54 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I strongly object to the project and the whole WestConnex for all the reasons listed below.

I demand that you publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below. Something which your department failed to do when I lodged similar objections to Stage 1b of the Westconnex project the M4east tunnel from Strathfield to Haberfield.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

Usage of the M5 is not growing, and has not grown for some years. This project only makes an existing road more expensive for commuters. It will save little time, if any, and at an exorbitant price. As the EIS acknowledges, the tolls are going to force drivers off the M5 and onto local roads, and no wonder. The Updated Strategic Business Case shows that for almost all of its users, the Value of Time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Local road upgrades just outside the project footprint included in this EIS are excluded totally as regards to costs, health, traffic modeling, and social and economic impacts. The 7 lane Euston Road between Sydney Park Road and Maddox Street narrowing to 4 lanes can mean only further forced property acquisitions along Euston / McEvoy to increase the road capacity and/or imposition of 24 hour clearways. The same situation arises for local roads coming off the St Peters Interchange such as Campbell Street 7 lanes into Unwins Bridge 4 lanes into Edgeware Road 2 lanes with current parking.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

This EIS refers continually to implementation of the entire Westconnex project, but contains no detailed information about Stage 3 and therefore the costs, health, traffic modeling, and social and economic impacts if (1) it is indeed financed and built and (2) if it is not built.

The Minister has continually indicated that the entire Westconnex project simply does not make sense unless Stage 3 is built. But this EIS operates on the assumption that this as yet unfinanced stage will be built. Why are these 'non-construction of Stage 3' impacts not explored in full in this decision making process for Stage 2 ?

The EIS refers to benefits 'of a future Sydney Gateway project'. No details have been provided in the EIS as to what this even is, let alone what the costs, health, traffic modeling, and social and economic impacts on local communities may be?

Westconnex has stated in community meetings that detailed traffic modeling has been done for various intersections (Sydney Park Road / Euston ; Sydney Park Road / Huntley; Euston / Maddox; Sydney Park Road / Mitchell Road) but these have not been published in the EIS. This means the impacts on Erskineville, Alexandria and Newtown cannot be analysed in this EIS.

The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work; there should be modelling of impact of traffic management along with increased pubic transport

I object to the use of an air quality model that hasn't been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in some areas close to the tollway portals, including near schools. It 's not acceptable for a government to deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Mark Ely

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Mary-Anne Cornford [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:51 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

More roads just mean more cars. I don't believe any other city in the world would corrupt such a beautiful and significant part of their culture just to move a few more vehicles around. WestConnex will only cost and destroy Sydney.

Yours sincerely,

Mary-Anne Cornford

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Jo Lukis [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:51 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I write to you as a long-time resident of the Inner West, who strongly believes that Westconnex will utterly destroy the neighbourhood that I love for the below reasons. I am also a daily public transport user who does not own a car and I would like to see recently cancelled bus services transporting local residents to and from the city during peak hour reinstated, rather than these billions of tax-payer dollars wasted on this terrible concept.

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Jo Lukis

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Simon Roman [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:48 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Simon Roman

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] 12730

From: Caroline Shepherd [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:47 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

As an Australian resident, taxpayer and lifelong resident and ratepayer of the Inner West, I vehemently oppose this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would

see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this

pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed

– not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Caroline Shepherd

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:46 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunnèling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

[redacted]

From: Siaan Mackie [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:46 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Siaan Mackie

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Beth Pierce [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:43 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.
It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful

paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Beth Pierce

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Justin Clark [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:42 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Justin Clark

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Geoffrey Stewart [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:39 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

I also have concerns that the exit point at blackwattle Bay Area will become a pinch point for all cars and will create a traffic nightmare at Victoria road and city west link area

Yours sincerely,

Geoff Stewart

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Basem Badaui [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:36 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Basem Badaui

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:34 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I am writing on behalf of the residents from 2 - 34 Campbell Rd Alexandria, NSW, 2015.

We strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

We also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections outlined below.

We object to the release of the EIS in the weeks prior to Christmas and the provision of 60 days (and not extend to the possible 90 days) to review and provide a response. We believe the non-extension of the review period and the release date was specifically designed to minimise responses to the EIS.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

We therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:33 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

_____

[redacted]

From: Bree van Reyk [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:32 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this propojsal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Bree van Reyk

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Ellen Ramos [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:31 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Ellen Ramos

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Tristan Ellis-Windsor [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:30 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_67

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Tristan Ellis-Windsor

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Mary Binder [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:30 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Mary Binder

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Shyama Ryland [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:16 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Shyama Ryland

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Bernadette Gethings [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:10 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Bernadette Gethings

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Drew Johnson [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:04 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Drew Johnson

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Alyssa Bird [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:02 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Alyssa Bird

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Ketan Patel [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 28 January 2016 8:01 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Project SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5 EIS submission

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The stated objectives for WestConnex, including the New M5, were contrived to fit the project after it had already been announced. Even so, WestConnex fails to meet them. For example, it will cause irreversible biodiversity loss, rather than minimising impacts to biodiversity. It will reduce social and visual amenity across the route. It will worsen regional air quality. Perhaps most critically for WestConnex, it will actively worsen congestion in many parts of Sydney, and make little impact on congestion across the rest of the city.

I strongly object to the fact that AECOM, which has a record of failed traffic modeling and other WestConnex contracts that depend on this project going ahead, has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS. What's more, this EIS is of extremely poor quality, and filled with errors, basic omissions, superficial analyses, and opaque modeling.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane).

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

In fact the whole WestConnex has been characterised by corrupted processes, and a lack of transparency and accountability. This is unacceptable for any project funded by taxpayer money, let alone a massive one that would see communities and endangered species destroyed, thousands of people evicted from their family homes and businesses, and billions of dollars of public money diverted from projects that would benefit NSW more.

The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at about 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travellers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling. Why would this project be the exception to this norm?

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. It is unacceptable that no traffic modeling was only done past two intersections after the end of the project. Even so, this EIS still makes it clear that this project will provide no solution to traffic congestion, as it shows several intersections across the project route will remain at Level of Service F (i.e. the worst possible level, and the one that is indicative of system failure) after the project. It also shows that many already congested roads along the route will get worse, including those around the St Peters Interchange, Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Independent transport modelling experts have found scores of problems with the application of the WestConnex Road and Traffic Model, which has not been released for scrutiny. It would be negligent for any government to go ahead with a project based on uncertain predictions. What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make this model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS fails to assess this.

Thousands of residents and workers will be exposed to health impacts in all areas where demolition, earthworks, construction and removal activities will take place for up to 24 hours per day, seven days a week. This includes communities in Arncliffe, Kingsgrove, Beverly Hills, St Peters and Alexandria. These health risks are rated as HIGH for all areas. Mitigation is recommended, but no firm information is available about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible and communities cannot be forced to accept this.

Tunnelling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a "short period", but does not say what this short period is. In some cases, tunnels and tunneling would take place around 20m below people's homes. This is not acceptable, particularly given the collapse of buildings that took place during the Lane Cove Tunnel's construction, and the legal action residents above Brisbane's Airport Link are now being forced to take after experiencing property damage.

In cities like Sydney, traffic-based air pollution is a major contributor to total air pollution. The international experience with road projects like this is that they encourage more traffic. There are more cars, and more people use them, and indeed this is what the EIS predicts with its large forecasted rise in vehicle kilometers travelled (VKT). This is bad for population health in Sydney, not just the areas immediately surrounding this project.

There is overwhelming international evidence now from organisations like the World Health Organisation (WHO) that shows that traffic-based air pollution increases the number of heart attacks and strokes people have. It increases deaths from heart disease, and respiratory disease. There is some new evidence from WHO that links this pollution to impaired lung growth in children and diabetes. These health effects occur both with long-term exposure and repeated short-term exposure, and there is no safe level of exposure to this pollution.

The air quality study in this EIS shows that some communities will be exposed to increased doses of dangerous pollution, especially those living close to the project's surface roads and unfiltered stacks. Drivers in the long tunnels are also likely to experience high levels of exposure, particularly those on motorbikes. It is unacceptable for the NSW Government to deliberately place the health of citizens at risk in this way.

As well, the assessment of air quality and noise impacts in this EIS are completely dependent on the traffic modelling. But the traffic modeling used in this study cannot be independently verified, is extremely limited in scope, is dependent on other unfunded and unplanned toll road projects going ahead (e.g. Sydney Gateway and southern extension), and appears to be based on overly optimistic usage predictions. For this reason, the air, noise, social impacts and health risk assessments in this EIS cannot be regarded as reliable.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. I strongly object to this superficial 'analysis', which consists of little more than bald claims rather than a serious investigation of how alternatives such as improved public transport, better traffic management and freight on rail could reduce congestion more effectively than the WestConnex New M5.

This EIS shows hundreds of homes along the project route will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. In fact the real impact is likely to be far worse than the results provided in this EIS, because noise monitoring was only done at Beverly Hills and St Peters. Such limited evidence provides the community with no confidence in the conclusions reached in this EIS. Independent experts have also reported that some of the tables are inaccurate in the noise report and are therefore unreliable.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $16.8 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

It is alarming that costs for this taxpayer-funded project are blowing out at the rate of more than $2 billion a year. When WestConnex was announced in 2012, it was one toll road with a price tag of $10 billion; it is now a series of toll road projects that encompasses WestConnex and additional projects such as the Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway that will now cost $16.8 billion. At this rate the final price tag will be well in excess of $20 billion even before the cost of financing large loans, addressing its social, health and environmental impacts, and covering the (inevitable) shortfall in toll revenues is taken into account.

This EIS also completely fails to consider negative impacts of the whole project – for example, total loss of vegetation – while relying on unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole project to justify its existence.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the local council

that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable, as is the destruction of other vital community parks along the route.

Community parks, an endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony, critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and trees along the project route would be destroyed for these projects. Some of these, such as the endangered flora and fauna, were species that the RMS was legally obliged to maintain and protect as part of construction for the M5 East. Others, such as the M5 Linear Park and trees lining the noise walls, are spaces the local community has built up over many years after their community was carved up the M5 East. For all of this to be swept aside for this toll road is not only unacceptable – it is undemocratic and a grave violation of the government's environmental and legal responsibilities.

I am aware that independent traffic experts have not access to full information about the assumptions on which traffic modelling. The proponents must be instructed to fully respond to independent experts who have been commissioned by Councils or are academic researchers and to make their models available. AECOM and RMS openly admit that they have collaborated on the modelling. Their claims must be fully and independently scrutinised. When the living conditions of thousands of residents and billions of dollars of public money are at stake, it is not acceptable for a government department or private company to keep such a model secret.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The arrogant social impact study in this EIS dismisses the impact of forcing hundreds of people from their homes and businesses on communities in a few lines – particularly when residents are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and suffering high levels of distress and trauma as a result. It is also unacceptable that these acquisitions have been forced through before any planning approvals were granted.

The social impact study also fails to assess the impact of this project on other communities that will be deeply affected. For example, the proponents and AECOM have not consulted properly with the community on and around Stoney Creek Road, nor informed residents that WestConnex has a plan that will make congestion and air quality worse in their neighbourhood.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Ketan Patel

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Laila Stewart [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 8:45 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Laila Stewart

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Rachel Coleman [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 8:45 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Rachel Coleman

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Marianne Hender [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 8:38 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Marianne Hender

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 8:37 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I object to the New M5 because the EIS provided on USB sticks at local libraries was incomplete.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

[redacted]

From: Kieran Ella [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 8:30 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Kieran Ella

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Julie-Anne Richards [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 8:30 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Julie-Anne Richards

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: kath reynolds [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 8:27 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

It is appalling that you will impact the Wolli Creek bushland which is essential for the mental well being of people forced to live in highrise with no open space. The pollution from extra vehicles you will inflict on small children living and attending schools in the vicinity of exhaust stacks is outrageous.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

kath reynolds

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: tom bannerman [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 8:27 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

tom bannerman

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Amanda Everett [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 8:26 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Amanda Everett

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: John Guthrie [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 8:26 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

John Guthrie

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Seb Alvarez [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 8:25 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised. Lastly, stop being a bunch of fuckwits.

Yours sincerely,

Seb Alvarez

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 8:24 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

[redacted]

From: Megan Currie [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 8:24 AM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I strongly object to the manner in which this project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route. There have been no published information on pollution mitigation, simply oh when it happens we'll think about it.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities.

I strongly object to the destruction of endangered flora and fauna for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I strongly object to the permanent destruction of public parks for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have

been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

I strongly object to the complete failure to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

I strongly object to WestConnex's failure to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Megan Currie

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Sharon Tandy [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 10:33 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Sharon Tandy

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Marlene Sarroff [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 10:33 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Marlene Sarroff

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 10:32 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Deborah Smith [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 10:30 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Deborah Smith

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Gregory Staniforth Ricketson [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 10:30 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I am a Business Owner (Austasian Films Pty Ltd) based in Newtown, and also a long standing resident of Newtown since 1998.

I have carefully reviewed and totally endorse the points of objection (in the submission dated 28 January 2016 (as follows) lodged by the "Newtown Precinct Business Association - New M5 EIS Submission"

28 January 2016 The Secretary

Department of Planning and Environment

Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

NEWTOWN PRECINCT BUSINESS ASSOCIATION – NEW M5 EIS SUBMISSION 1

Dear Ms Secretary,

We make this submission in response to the Westconnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as per above reference.

The Newtown Precinct Business Association (NPBA) is the representative body of the business community in the precincts of Newtown, Enmore, Erskinville, St Peters and parts of Marrickville.

Over the last 13 months, we have actively managed a consultative advocacy campaign to monitor the potential impacts that Westconnex Stage 2 (New M5) may have on our precinct and the businesses within it.

To date we have had many major concerns with the project and we are outlining these concerns in this submission and in line with the EIS mentioned above.

Central to our campaign has been the protection of King St, the hub of activity for our precinct and Australia's premier high St model. The visitor economy is the life blood of our precincts and Westconnex has the potential, both in the long and short term, to significantly impact our vibrant and diverse business community.

Subsequent to this is the flow on effect that this project will have on our surrounding precincts. While King St is the central hub, it would not exist without the villages that surround it in Enmore, Erskinville, St Peters and Marrickville. In effect, anything that effects King St, effects the whole precinct we represent.

While King St has been central to our campaign, of equal importance is Edgeware road, Enmore road, Mitchell road, Sydney road and Euston road, on which there are also significant impacts on local businesses.

Further to this, the majority of businesses in the precinct are owned by locals. This makes any impact on the business community very personal to those business owners and therefore very passionate about our campaign and the whole project.

Our major concern has always been that any increase in traffic movements on King St as a result of Westconnex will mean 24 hour clearways. This leads to a decrease in available parking spaces, decreased safety for pedestrians and health issues due to pollution at a bare minimum.

We understand that in the EIS, and Minister Gay himself in our face to face meeting in December 2015, states the commitment to 'No changes to clearways or parking on King St'. This specific statement is quoted in Appendix 1A section 15_48 as well as many similar comments in other locations of the EIS;

'King Street and Enmore Road business precinct contains numerous businesses, including retail, services, restaurants and cafes. The project does not propose to modify King Street, including speed limits or on-street parking arrangements along King Street.

In future years, traffic modelling indicates that King Street is expected in most cases to experience reduced peak hour volumes under the 2021 'with project' scenario and 2031 cumulative scenario when compared to the without project scenario (refer to Technical Working Paper: Traffic and transport (Appendix G).

The exception to this would occur in the 2031 cumulative case, where AM peak hour volumes southbound would increase by around 35 per cent when compared to the 'without project' scenario. However, this is in the opposing direction to the dominant AM peak hour and is within the design carrying capacity of the road. As there would not be any significant changes to traffic volumes or no modifications to King Street are proposed as part of this project, the project would not have a significant impact on businesses or amenity along King Street.'

The highlighted statement above, and the guarantees contained in multiple sections of the EIS, provide a condition that there will be no changes to clearway or parking restrictions on King St based on the traffic modeling contained in the EIS. This modelling indicates that there will be no significant changes to traffic volumes.

Further to this, while changes may not be proposed as part of the Westconnex project, King St is managed by RMS, who have the ability to change traffic conditions independent to other projects. Oxford St and Parramatta road are recent examples of this.

Our major point of concern with this project is here. This EIS states that there will be no changes to King St clearways because the traffic modelling indicates there will be no reason to change them. It is our belief, supported by further documentation, that the traffic modelling is incorrect and incomplete, which will force RMS to change the clearway restrictions on King St and kill our business community.

We have four major points to outline in this submission in response to the EIS. The traffic modelling within this EIS;

1. Is not complete as there is a five-year gap for the construction period of 2016 – 2021 where there is no traffic modelling performed for all of the impacted areas, yet major road infrastructure will be built requiring road closures, traffic diversion, heavy vehicle traffic movements, limitations of local amenity, demolitions, excavations and other heavy construction works

 This detailed information is not contained in the EIS and it is abhorrent that a five-year construction zone that has immense impact on the social and economic environment is not included in the EIS

 This point alone should be grounds for a delay in the planning process until such time that this information is available for public scrutiny

2. Shows vast inconsistency with other independent traffic modelling reports

 We shall make comparisons to the AECOM traffic modelling to independent reports later in this document

3. Has been managed by AECOM who have recently been forced to pay $280million compensation for misleading traffic modelling for Queensland toll roads.

 AECOM by their own admission and I quote "no longer provide traffic and revenue forecasting for toll road operators or owners in Australia" extracted from the Wall St Journal September 15 2015 – See Appendix 1 for the full article or 31TUclick here for the website linkU31T

4. Has inconsistencies and inaccuracies that will lead to severe impact to the Visitor Economy of Newtown

 The points we will be making below will indicate that this project will have a severe impact on the visitor economy of Newtown and the surrounding suburbs. This in turn will cripple business and have a flow on effect to residents who own a majority of businesses in the area and the workforce they employ.

1 – The Construction Period for Stage 2

After consultation with both Roads and Maritime Sydney (RMS) and Sydney Motorway Authority (SMA), we have identified that there is no construction schedule or traffic modelling to identify the impact this construction will have on all the local areas within our remit.

Section 7 of appendix G outlines construction compounds and anecdotal information relating to some of the impact, but this information is just a description of the works that need to be carried out.

In this section there is modelling for 6 intersections in the 'affected area'. In truth there are over 30+ intersections that will be affected as a result of the forecast high level of delay and poor level of service as stated on page 181, Section 7.5.8.2 of said appendix G. The analysis that is missing from this EIS is the impact on surrounding roads and intersections as a result of these anticipated high levels of delay and poor levels of service.

In other words, these six intersections quoted in the EIS, will experience high levels of delay particularly in AM and PM peak hour traffic which will force vehicles on these roads to find alternate routes. These alternate routes being the 30+ intersections in and around our precinct. The major roads this will impact are King St, Edgeware Road and Enmore Road.

This point specifically relates to our major concern that there will be increased traffic movements on King St and subsequent clearway restrictions being lifted to potentially 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Further to this is the subsequent increase in vehicle movements in other major precinct roads such as Edgeware, Enmore, Sydney, Mitchell and Euston Roads.

Considering the length of construction (five years) and the serious amount of construction and impact on local roads, we cannot understand how an EIS does not have this information so that the developers can properly assess the impact on the social and economic environment as a result of the construction of this stage of the project.

The NPBA have expressed these concerns to both RMS and SMA who have committed to providing further information regarding the construction period on the condition that planning is approved for the project. This is a contradictory statement as we believe we can not properly assess the impact of the project until such information is made public.

This point alone should be enough to halt any approval of this project until this information is made public to assess its impact. It is our belief that without this information, the EIS that has been submitted is incomplete and any approvals be held until such information is made public.

2 – Inconsistencies and shortfalls in EIS traffic modelling

With the assistance of the City of Sydney, we have access to screenline reports to assist in showcasing inconsistencies in the EIS traffic modelling. These screenlines use data supplied by RMS/SMC and has then been interpreted and represented in a clear format by TTM on behalf of the City of Sydney. TTM was asked to review the traffic modelling and in doing so they requested additional data as the EIS had so little information.

King St traffic modelling has not been included in the EIS as this section of road is not deemed part of the project. As you can see in the screen line reports in Appendix 2, the following increases/decreases in traffic on local roads has been forecast

Year 2021 Forecast Average Weekday Traffic (2-Way) comparison of with new M5 and without new M5

- King St +3%
- Edgeware Road +4%
- Mitchell Road -43%
- Euston Rd +74%

Year 2031 Forecast Average Weekday Traffic (2-way) with new M5

- King St +1%
- Edgeware Rd +4%
- Mitchell Rd -37%
- Euston Rd +69%

There are contrasting forecasts contained in the EIS. The EIS forecast a decline in King St traffic movements, where these screenlines clearly state that there will be an increase in weekday traffic movements in all major roads in our precinct with the exception of Mitchell Road.

The actualization of these reports would suggest that traffic restrictions on King St, Edgeware Road, Enmore Road (which connects them) and Euston road will require significant amendment to handle the increased traffic movements.

In our consultation with RMS and SMA, we understand that there is a proposed 'King St Gateway' currently being scoped. Its intention is to encourage northbound princess highway traffic down Sydney road and southbound Sydney rd traffic down the princess highway.

This gateway is not part of the Westconnex project nor this EIS, therefore our consideration of this proposal is negligible until such time that an EIS has been submitted for public viewing and planning approval.

The traffic demands forecast for Euston Road will disperse to other streets. Whilst Euston Road is proposed to be upgraded this upgrade is only to just north of Sydney Park Road. Traffic would have to disperse prior to and shortly after this point. The main alternative routes are Mitchell Road and King Street. It is our opinion that the modelled route choices have not accurately split the traffic between Euston Road, Mitchell Road, and King Street.

The select link plots for Euston Road (Appendix 2 Figure 4-6 and Figure 4-7) indicate that the main demand for Euston Road is traffic to and from Campbell Road east of the Princes Highway (76 % AM, 62% PM) with most of the remainder being to and from the New M5 (20 % AM, 25% PM). Some of this traffic may already be accessing Euston Road via Canal Road and Burrows Road or Sydney Park Road. It appears that the upgrade of Campbell Road and Euston Road are effectively providing a new route into the CBD. Traffic on King Street reduces as a result.

However, as seen in Figure 4-6 and Figure 4-7, local streets carry significant increase in traffic. Maddox, Fountain, and Bowden Streets are particular examples (shown in blue). This distribution of additional traffic is of concern. Maddox Street feeds to Mitchell Street and Bourke Road. Fountain Street feeds to Swanson Street and Erskineville Road onto King Street and Enmore Rd. Bowden Street is a feeder to Bourke Road and also to Mandible Street.

As a result of these significant changes, we believe RMS will be forced to change clearway restrictions on major roads in our precinct to allow a greater flow of traffic. Should this occur, the impact on our business community, both on and adjacent to King St would be catastrophic. As would the flow on effect to the owners of these businesses who are predominantly local residents, let alone the tens of thousands of people they employ.

3 – Flawed Traffic Modelling by AECOM

As identified above, AECOM have a history of incorrect, flawed and misleading traffic modelling. The effects of which are not fully comprehensible until many years later. Considering that AECOM are providing the traffic modelling for this EIS, we do not accept the modelling found in this EIS to be accurate or an accurate representation of the traffic movements in and around our precincts in the next 30 years of this project.

Another astounding quote from this article and further evidence to AECOM's inability to forecast traffic modelling – 'AECOM's settlement is one of the largest related to misleading and deceptive conduct in Australian corporate history, ...'

This supports our belief that traffic modelling in the EIS is incorrect and with subsequent independent traffic modelling reports showing increases in traffic movements (as stated in point 2), where AECOM show decreases, we do not accept that AECOM can provide accurate information from which the state government can make an accurate judgement. Nor can NSW Planning and Development make an accurate, informed and objective assessment of this EIS.

This also further supports our belief that traffic in and around our precinct will increase, providing the necessity to change current clearway restrictions and instigate new clearways on roads such as Edgeware and Enmore Roads and King St.

Given the far reaching impact of this project, the immense expense for the Westconnex Project and the subsequent RMS road projects such as the King St Gateway, we cannot in our right minds allow the plan for the new M5 to be approved based on an EIS and traffic modelling performed by a company that by its own admission will not develop any further traffic modelling studies because of its own incompetence, a $280million compensation payout and providing the information by which a state government toll road went broke.

4 – Severe impact on the Visitor Economy of Newtown

In 2014, the NPBA commissioned our 'Visitor Economy Research' which provided us with detailed information regarding the people who visit Newtown for the purposes of leisure. This research has provided us with qualitative data we have used to measure the downturn in economic impact decreased parking and pedestrians can have on our business community. You can see the relevant information relating to this research in Appendix 3.

The majority of visitors, 56%, use cars to and from Newtown. Further to this, a total of 14% of these visitors parked on King St in either free or paid parking.

One in five Sydney-siders will visit Newtown in the next twelve months, making it the most popular destination outside the CBD. This equates to 1,353,702 visitors coming to Newtown in 2016. 14% of these visitors parked on King St with 88% of these visitors having at least one other person with them on their visit. This equates to 356,294 visitors who access the Newtown precinct via parking on King St.

According to our research, the average visitor to Newtown spends $46. When extrapolated, this means that the approximate cost to the visitor economy of no parking on King St alone is $16,389,540 in a full calendar year.

Additional impacts will occur when constraints are placed on parking off King St, further reducing the number of visitors to the precinct.

More impact will be felt by businesses on King St and surrounding precincts, when pedestrians walking next to a clearway do not feel safe and don't return to the precinct.

Further impact will be felt when our thousands of local businesses close or reduce staffing levels in line with reducing visitation and subsequent spending.

This economic impact analysis is for the removal of car parking on King St only as this is the only quantifiable data available to our organisation. We have not had the time or resource to extrapolate this data to Enmore, Edgeware, Sydney, Mitchell or Euston Roads.

Needless to say that when all potential impacts are assessed, the baseline figure of $16,389,540 would increase alarmingly.

Over the course of the last 13 months, we have sought to engage with originally the Westconnex Delivery Authority (WDA). Initial consultation was ineffective to the point where the WDA refused to reply to emails and phone calls requesting consultation.

In the last six weeks, and as a result of our campaigning, our federal member Mr Anthony Albanese, was able to facilitate a meeting with Minister Duncan Gay and his Roads and Maritime Sydney (RMS) team. This led to a further meeting on 27 January with the interface team from RMS and the Sydney Motorway Authority.

We believe that if these meetings were held in early 2015, the issues we are outlining in this submission may have been averted. We note in the EIS (Section 1A – 7_11) that the WDA mention that the NPBA were involved in a consultative process. This is an inaccurate statement. Our connections with WDA were as follows

1. An introductory meeting held in December 2014 were the following was discussed

a. General introductions and an overview of the project

b. An offer from the NPBA to commence a regular consultative process

c. Potential to scope a member forum to discuss issues pertinent to our stakeholders and devise possible solutions

d. An indication from the NPBA that the gap between the construction of stage 2 and the completion of stage 3 has significant negative impact on the precinct which the NPBA is willing to assist WDA to overcome in a consultative process

e. Please see appendix 4 which contains the outline of our advocacy plan as detailed to WDA in this meeting and approved by the NPBA board in December 2014

2. Follow up communication

a. WDA contacted NPBA seeking advice of a public forum, not the consultative process we originally discussed

b. Advice was given and the public forum was held

3. Public Forum

a. This forum only provoked further criticism of the project as the information presented was rejected by the members of the public in attendance

4. Post public forum

a. 5 phone calls were made to WDA seeking confirmation of our next meeting

b. 5 emails were sent to WDA requesting as above

c. No communications were received by the NPBA after the Enmore Theatre forum

Further detail as to the content of meetings, emails and phone calls can be provided. Suffice to say that statements relating to the NPBA being involved in a consultation with WDA are false.

In addition to our four key points above we include the following issues with this EIS in support of our constituents who have presented the following information.

- The project as proposed in this EIS does not deliver the broader objectives of Westconnex as stated in the updated strategic business case (November 2015)

o Primarily - 'Relieve road congestion to improve the speed, reliability and safety of travel on the M4, M5 and CBD/airport/port corridors, including parallel arterial roads' & 'Support Sydney's long-term economic growth through improved motorway access and connections linking Sydney's international gateways, western Sydney and key places of business across the city' – page 114, Updated Strategic Business Case

o This project fails to connect western Sydney, the CBD, the airports or the ports

- This EIS refers continually to implementation of the entire Westconnex project, but contains no detailed information about Stage 3 and therefore the costs, health, traffic modeling, and social and economic impacts if (1) it is indeed financed and built and (2) if it is not built.

- The Minister has continually indicated that the entire Westconnex project simply does not make sense unless Stage 3 is built. But this EIS operates on the assumption this as yet unfinanced stage will be built.

- The EIS refers to benefits 'if a future Sydney Gateway project proceeds'.

No details have been provided in the EIS as to what this is, let alone what the costs, health, traffic modeling, and social and economic impacts on local communities may be

- Westconnex has acknowledged in community meetings there will be two 'on demand' pedestrian crossings on Euston Road between Campbell Street and Sydney Park Road intersection. This will result in a backup of traffic on what is meant to be an 80 kph roadway. This makes no engineering nor traffic management sense.

- Westconnex has acknowledged in community meetings there will be a centre lane on Euston Road between Campbell Street and Sydney Park Road intersection to allow trucks to turn into both eastern and western industrial properties. It is inevitable that the many trucks doing so will require management by traffic lights, further slowing down the projected 50,000 per day traffic flow along this section of Euston Road.

- Alexandria, Enmore, Newtown and other suburbs will suffer deteriorating air quality due to traffic congestion exposing residents to lung cancer and children to impaired lung development

- The EIS ignores the social impact of devastating the suburb of St Peters

- Westconnex M4 and M5 will remove 40 hectares of vegetation which cools suburbs and reduces our carbon footprint

- Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are and have been offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and the distress and trauma this has caused.

- The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including the five-year construction period.

- The inadequate analysis of the threat posed to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, which even Westconnex admits may not survive the M5's construction and operation.

- The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work; there should be modelling of impact of traffic management along with increased public transport

- No noise modelling has been done for how residents living above two stories will be affected

 Cost analysis provided by Sydney Motorway Authority does not include the subsequent cost of RMS road projects such as the King St Gateway which will add further cost to project and significantly influence the financial viability of the entire project

 Construction/developer contracts have been entered into before this EIS was lodged. The use of an air quality model that hasn't been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in some areas close to the tollway portals, including near schools.

 Westconnex will unfairly load Western suburbs residents up with tolls without enhancing public transport possibilities which are the primary mode of transport for these residents currently travelling to the CBD (as opposed to vehicles).

 The suggestion that tunneling activities would need to be conducted 24 hours per day, seven days a week, including associated activities such as spoil handling and haulage. This will place great pressure on significant numbers of nearby residents throughout day and night-time periods.

 Tunneling would cause vibration and damage to homes. The EIS says it will only be for a short period but does not say what a short period is.

 The EIS repeatedly says that threats to the livable environment of residents during construction and operation would be subject to plans developed later. These plans should be available in this EIS before approval can be considered.

 AECOM's analysis of 'alternatives' provides no solid evidence. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for the western Sydney should have been explored in line with state government policy, specifically the NSW Long Term Transport Master Plan.

 Unfiltered ventilation stacks should not be used when safer filtered stacks are an option.

 The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g., Clem7).

 The average daily travel time in Sydney has been stable at approximately 80 minutes per person for decades, while the average trip distance has increased substantially. In this time, billions have been spent on tollways. Travelers are spending more than ever on tolls, yet are not spending any less time travelling.

There is not enough information on the traffic volumes that will occur in Alexandria, and there is also conflicting information on possible mitigation strategies. Although the diagrams in the EIS show right-hand turn lanes in all four directions at the Sydney Park Road/Euston Road intersection, the text of "New M5 EIS Vol 2B App G Traffic and Transport" instead indicates that there will be a "banned right turn from Mitchell Road into Sydney Park Road [because of] the banned right turn southbound at the Sydney Park Road / Euston Road intersection". The text also indicates that there will be a "north-bound lane [which] will go as far as Maddox Street, where it becomes a new left-hand turn lane", but the diagrams do not show this. Not having clarity on which of these two scenarios is planned makes informed consultation impossible. If these right-hand turns into Sydney Park Road are not permitted, there will be enormous volumes of traffic on local roads as drivers try to rat

run. Likewise, the extra left-hand turn lane, if it is actually planned, seems destined to drive traffic onto local roads.

It is not clear whether proposed increases in population in the Inner Sydney have been taken into account in traffic congestion predictions eg; Green Square

Westconnex is now a private company that is not obligated to publish its contracts. This makes transparency for a state and federal government funded infrastructure project impossible.

According to the EIS there is a risk of unacceptable levels of fine particle pollution on the Southern end of Sydney Park. There is no safe level of fine particle exposure; Westconnex is consciously building a project that it knows will worsen already high levels of pollution on St Peters, Enmore and Alexandria

Westconnex admit that dangerous dust pollution will be created during construction at St Peters. It proposes to water the site to avoid this. The community cannot accept this when Westconnex itself has failed to water the site during current asbestos removal.

Construction traffic will continue throughout the night which will disturb the sleep of residents located along local road networks.

Thousands of trees along the route in Beverly Grove Park, Sydney Park and other parks are being destroyed to make way for a tollway that even the EIS shows won't solve traffic congestion. This drastically reduces public amenity

Valuable heritage buildings will be destroyed or left marooned and surrounded by tollway in St Peters.

There is already flooding at St Peters when there are rain storms. Councils have already found that the flood modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the M5.

 Experts have not been available at very limited EIS sessions. None were held in Newtown, Alexandria or Erskineville.

 Residents are being forced out of homes at below market prices before approval has been given for the project.

The noise assessment shows that hundreds of homes will experience noise above acceptable levels. In fact, the results revealed in Appendix J could be far worse because monitoring was only done for one location at Beverly Hills and one in St Peters where only 30% of results could be included.

 Westconnex failure to assess correctly and handle responsibly asbestos that is already impacting on communities in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park. Given its failure to identify much asbestos along the M4 during an EIS, its contamination analysis for the New M5 must not be accepted at face value. The EIS ignores the work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that Westconnex won't meet its time-saving or congestion goals

The Newtown Precinct Business Association, its committee, our members and constituents ask that you reject this EIS due to the lack of detailed information and potentially incorrect and misleading information. It is impossible to make an informed decision for planning approval based on the issues identified in this submission.

We ask that you publish our name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections we have raised.

On Behalf of the Newtown Precinct Business Association

Signed:

Name: Simon Shaw

Street: 5 Eliza Street

Suburb Newtown

Postcode 2042

Email 31Tcoordinator@newtownprecinct.com.au31T

Phone 0450 900 381

I insist that you reject this proposal, publish my name (including my business name) and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Gregory Staniforth Ricketson

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Pippa Brown [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 10:28 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Pippa Brown

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Jess Roberts [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 10:25 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Jess Roberts

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Estee Laird-Wah [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 10:25 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Estee Laird-Wah

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 10:24 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 10:23 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

_____

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 10:23 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 10:22 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 10:17 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

WestCONnex is bad for humanity as a whole.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

_____

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 10:16 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 10:13 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Esmeraldo Rodrigues [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 10:13 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Esmeraldo Rodrigues

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Mark Troy [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 10:13 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

Mark Teoy

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 29 January 2016 10:03 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Categories: Follow-up, Assessment Panel

Attn: Secretary, re: WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

Submission to WestConnex New M5 EIS, project number SSI 14_6788

I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and provide only short-term relief from traffic congestion. I have yet to hear of an independent transport expert who backs the project. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The strategic justification for the New M5 is weak and inconsistent with the NSW Government's strategic planning and policy framework, despite its inclusion in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy and the Long Term Transport Master Plan. The project as proposed in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not deliver the broader objectives of WestConnex as stated in the Updated Strategic Business Case (November 2015).

There has been no compelling case made for why WestConnex should be built, and the project should not receive approval and not proceed. This EIS and the Updated Strategic Business Case for WestConnex are clear that the benefits accruing from Stage 2 do not outweigh the costs. Benefits are shown to come once the whole WestConnex project is built according to the Updated Strategic Business Case, and that no benefits exist until all three Stages are delivered (WestConnex Full Scheme: Economic Appraisal, KPMG, 19 November 2015). I am aware that even this has now expanded to include other tollways such as the Sydney Gateway, making it even more likely that this project will provide disbenefits to society if it proceeds as proposed in this EIS, i.e. as a standalone project. This is particularly concerning given there is a significant risk that Stage 3 will not be built.

Fundamentally flawed projects like WestConnex do not account for changing work practices supported by technologies such as teleworking, or flexible office spaces, or that car journeys are dropping as workers elect to work closer to home or use public transport, bicycles or car sharing. It also does not account for trends that will substantially change how people choose to travel in future and reduce the number of cars on the road, such as peak car or driverless cars.

WestConnex comes at not only a huge cost that is blowing out at the rate of over $2 billion a year. It also comes with a massive opportunity cost. The $16.8 billion and rising that would be spent on WestConnex is money that would be taken away from hospitals, schools, regional roads, and the public transport improvements that are urgently needed – not just in western Sydney, but many parts of regional NSW. If this $16.8 billion was spent on public transport and effective road management, a project like WestConnex would not be necessary.

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

The EIS lacks rigour and sound analysis, despite the huge volume of documentation. This lack of rigour and analysis is consistent across all chapters and appendices. The project objectives are biased towards a motorway solution, so that any proposed alternative falls short of the proposed solution. Similarly, the work undertaken in the EIS is highly compliance driven, and fails to take into account opportunities or strategic impacts, and the assessment of cumulative impacts is almost negligent.

WestConnex is presented as a 'transformational' infrastructure project, however, the EIS is not clear on what transformation it will achieve. There is no demonstration that WestConnex delivers transformation in terms of social or economic improvement, or better land use outcomes. To the contrary, WestConnex will deliver a piece of infrastructure that increases traffic on local roads, does not enable value capture or urban renewal, and is not consistent with the government's land use priorities or the proposal in the 2012 State Infrastructure Strategy.

Traffic on the existing M5 East exceeded capacity "within months" of opening (New M5 Project Overview, November 2015), including recent road widening. This lack of capacity is, in part, the rationale for the construction of the New M5. Managing demand on the M5 East and providing high quality public transport alternatives for those who can change mode would be a more effective long term solution that simply a 'predict and provide' approach, yet this alternative - along with many others - has not been assessed.

A larger question raised by the proposed New M5 project is what happens if capacity on this motorway is reached? The existing M5 East has proven that a new motorway can easily reach or exceed capacity within a 15 year timeframe. If that outcome is realised for the New M5, Sydney will be left with a transport legacy that cannot support the jobs growth in the west consistent with Government policy. Sydney needs to manage demand for existing road assets to maximise economically productive use and deliver sustainable transport as a real alternative to car travel. International cities such as Los Angeles are moving away from their dominant car-based culture to invest in public transport in order to build the sustainability and attractiveness of their city for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The New M5 project has only been assessed to 2031, which does not take into account the 45 year concession period for the asset as stated in the WestConnex Updated Strategic Business Case. The assessment does not account for future events that may radically change travel demands or behaviours.

Heritage buildings would be destroyed for this project, while others would be isolated in a flood of traffic. e.g. terraces next to construction compounds and motorway in Campbell Street.

Residents in south west Sydney will suffer a huge loss of amenity as a result of the existing M5 being stripped of its green space and vegetation, particularly when residents fought so hard to get these green spaces established and thriving. I also strongly object to their concrete noise walls being replaced with transparent barriers. These will be right next to hundreds of homes, who will now be forced to look at (as well as listen to and breathe the fumes of) lanes of motorway traffic just over their fences. It is utterly unacceptable to prioritise the views of passing motorists over the privacy and amenity of people who live in an area.

This EIS fails to model traffic beyond two intersections after this project. This deliberately obscures the threat to King Street and roads in Alexandria. I object to exposing King Street and Edgeware Rd to the threat of becoming clearways.

Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, which has caused additional and completely unnecessary distress and trauma for the owners. I find it disturbing that the NSW Government was warned three years ago that the compulsory acquisition process was unfair to those whose properties were being forcibly taken, yet has both failed to make the changes recommended and actively suppressed the report that handed down these findings.

I strongly object to the unacceptable impact the project's construction will have on local residents, businesses and schools. Across the route of this project, people face years of having their streets turned into car parks for construction workers; 24/7 construction noise, vibration, and heavy truck movements; exposure to asbestos, construction dust, and toxic materials; and more. Mitigation is recommended in this EIS, but no information is provided about who might receive this and what it might be. Instead, decisions are put off until after approval – and in some cases the beginning of construction. This is completely indefensible.

Billions of dollars of construction contracts have been let for this project before this EIS was lodged. This casts huge doubts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process, and places unreasonable pressure on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

This project deliberately exposes communities in certain areas to increased pollution. Such an approach values the health and safety of people in certain areas of Sydney over others, and is both unjust and unacceptable. In addition, despite there being no safe level of exposure to fine particulate matter, the proponents want to build this project knowing it will increase these pollutants around much of the project route.

Scientific experts agree there is no safe level of fine particle pollution. Rather than aiming to shift dangerous pollution from area to another, the government should be finding cleaner transport solutions that do not leave residents living beside polluted roads or unfiltered pollution stacks – no matter where they live.

The air quality study shows that dangerous fine particle pollution already exceeds acceptable levels in some areas in the project areas, and will worsen if this project is built. I also object to the way this and other information about air quality and pollution impacts has been provided in this EIS; it is far too dense and opaque for ordinary residents to

understand. It should go without saying that where public health is concerned, information about negative impacts should be provided in a way that affected residents can understand.

The EIS demonstrates that air quality, even at existing levels, is close to the allowable limits, and will only get worse with a major interchange, road upgrades and ventilation stacks implemented at the St Peters Interchange and surrounds. If new air quality standards as proposed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2012 are implemented, the New M5 would well exceed allowable air pollution levels.

The flaws and optimistic assumptions in the traffic modelling mean that toll revenue is likely to be significantly lower than forecast. AECOM has a history of providing over-optimistic traffic forecasts for toll roads, resulting in previous financial failures (e.g. Clem7 in Brisbane). I find it completely unacceptable that AECOM has been paid $13 million of taxpayer money to complete this EIS despite this, and despite it being awarded other WestConnex contracts that depend on the project going ahead. This is an utterly unacceptable conflict of interest. The public cannot trust that this EIS properly and fully investigates the true economic, environmental and social impacts of this project, and indeed the poor quality of this document reflects this. I also object to AECOM doing the EIS when it has contracts in the rest of the project including Stage 2. This conflict of interest needs to be explained and addressed.

Even with these flaws, tolls on these roads are to be in effect for decades. Many Sydneysiders will not see these roads untolled in their lifetimes. Nor will western Sydney or rural and regional NSW see any investment in their communities to create employment opportunities that would circumvent the need to commute long distances by car to jobs in Sydney's CBD, eastern suburbs and inner city.

The New M5 would cause costly traffic chaos throughout the inner west and south-west Sydney. The roads around the St Peters interchange are already at an unacceptable Level of Service and are getting worse because of in-fill developments not allowed for by the EIS. This EIS also clearly demonstrates that the traffic on roads around the St Peters Interchange will deteriorate as a result of WestConnex, as well as already heavily congested roads in Bexley, Rockdale, Kingsgrove and Brighton-Le-Sands. I object to building a road that the proponent admits will produce such volumes of traffic that such roads will be beyond capacity. Where traffic is already bad, plans should be to reduce it, not make it worse.

Meanwhile, even this EIS projects that the existing M5 and New M5 combined will end up taking less traffic now than the Cross City Tunnel, which was a financial disaster. This is because even the proponents know that commuters will be unwilling to pay $6 each way to use either of these toll roads, which is in line with figures in WestConnex's Updated Strategic Business Case that show for almost all of potential users, the value of time saved is less than the cost of using WestConnex.

What is even more worrying is that the proponent now concedes that it cannot make its traffic model work without other, unfunded toll road projects. What happens if or when these projects do not proceed? This EIS does not say, so the public does not have a chance to form a view or comment.

The delivery of the New M5 and in particular the St Peters Interchange, will have a significant impact on residents and businesses. The increased traffic resulting from this project will impact on urban amenity and will limit the ability for public transport services to operate efficiently due to increased local road congestion.

The EIS assumes that by 2031 the full WestConnex project will be complete. This includes the M4-M5 Link (Stage 3), which will have additional significant impacts on residents and businesses. Nowhere in the EIS are these impacts considered, nor information given to the public to fully consider or understand the implications of the whole WestConnex program.

The analysis of alternatives provided by AECOM in this EIS provides no solid evidence for the conclusions drawn. A combination of demand management of traffic and new public transport projects, especially for western Sydney, should have been explored. This is just one of many potential alternatives that could have provided more effective, sustainable and cost-effective ways of easing congestion that AECOM has failed to analyse.

The evidence provided by the EIS in support of the project is incomplete and unbalanced, selectively including and excluding impacts from subsequent planned stages of the WestConnex project. The analysis of strategic alternatives in the EIS is cursory and fails to demonstrate the New M5 extension is the best option to meet the needs of a growing Sydney population. The EIS also does not take into consideration the travel patterns of residents and businesses in western or south-western Sydney that the New M5 is intended to serve, nor the wider impacts on inner-Sydney communities affected by the WestConnex program.

In addition, the noise monitoring performed in this EIS has been too limited to properly assess the massive noise that will be generated by construction and operation of this project, and the impact it will have on the hundreds of thousands of Sydney residents who would be exposed to and affected by it.

The project will cause immense social harm. It will destroy long-established communities. It will cause an increase in air pollution-related deaths and illnesses. The increase in air pollution will inhibit lung and nervous system development in children. There are numerous ways of spending $17 billion that would deliver a much greater social and economic benefit, and would not cause so much destruction. Such alternatives are barely mentioned in this EIS and have certainly not been analysed as required by the project SEARs.

The social impact study is little more than a 'cut and paste' job and is insulting to communities where hundreds of tenants and owners have lost homes and others will live in decimated communities. The report exaggerates the potential positive aspects of the project, while the negative aspects are either downplayed, insufficiently detailed or omitted altogether. Where negative economic or social impacts are identified in the report, they are inadequately addressed in terms of management or mitigation actions to be taken.

The statement that the New M5 project is an integrated transport project is false and misleading. It is a motorway that does not provide for improved public transport connections and has not fully considered the active transport component in line with government policy. The City's view is that the government could have delivered a better outcome by focusing on ways to "improve access" that is modally agnostic and more consistent with government's land use policies.

Endangered flora and fauna would be destroyed for this project, including the Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Arncliffe and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills. Saving these species in particular was a condition of the previous M5 motorway; destroying them now makes a mockery of these legal protections. I also object to the unprofessional analysis of the threat posed by the New M5 to these species and to biodiversity in general, as this section of the EIS attempts to downplay the significance of the flora and fauna threatened by this project and the impact of this project on biodiversity overall.

I am also concerned that the EIS suggests that the breeding ponds of the Green and Golden Bell Frog have not been kept healthy in recent years, especially since the RMS was responsible for building these ponds as a condition of the old M5.

Many public parks would be temporarily or permanently destroyed for this project, including parts of Sydney Park and the M5 Linear Park, along with thousands of mature trees along the route. Even if these trees would be reinstated, it will take decades to achieve the level of canopy that exists.

The project's proponents have misled the public about its plan to take 14,000 square metres of Sydney Park. For months it said it would only take 8,000 square metres, leaving it until the EIS was lodged to inform the Council that it planned to forcibly acquire the rest. This will diminish the enjoyment of the park in many ways. Peaceful paths, exercise equipment, children's play areas and sporting grounds, and more will all be adjacent to a major highway. This is completely unacceptable.

The increase in road capacity on Euston Road from four lanes to between six and eight, and Campbell Road from two lanes to six will have noise impacts on people living in the area and using Sydney Park.

There is already flooding at St Peters during heavy rainfalls. Councils have already found that the flooding modelling is not acceptable for the M4 East and the same approach has been used for the New M5.

The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. The entire WestConnex, including this project, has been characterised by poor governance, and a complete lack of transparency and accountability. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

The proponents have failed to consult with local businesses across the route, many of which would be destroyed by the traffic and/or construction impacts of this project.

The proponent has failed to adequately assess and responsibly handle asbestos, including the huge amounts it has removed ahead of this EIS from the Alexandria Landfill and transported through inner Sydney out to the western suburbs. More toxic asbestos is expected to be dug up and transported from various sites along the New M5 for this project, and the numerous breaches of basic health and safety procedures observed by residents in St Peters, Granville and Erskine Park in this regard have not been properly assessed in this EIS.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal, publish my name and submission in accordance with the undertaking on your website, and provide a written response to each of the objections I have raised.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 18 January 2016 5:10 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 SSI 14_6788

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

I make this submission in response to the WestConnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

- The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

- The cost of WestConnex has rapidly escalated by 70% to $17 billion. All indications are that this will become $20 billion minimum when local road remediations are added on.

- Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are routinely being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, causing unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already traumatic process.

- There is no independent assessment of traffic modelling. The Sydney Motorway Corporation claims its model has been peer reviewed but refuses to publish the review or the assumptions on which it is based; independent traffic planners cannot test its results.

- WestConnex has failed to consult with businesses in King St Newtown, St Peters, Kingsgrove, and other parts of the inner and south-west Sydney that will be negatively impacted by this project. Such businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by road closures during construction, increased traffic, and/or the imposition of future clearways in retail or industrial precincts that will inevitably result when local roads are unable to cope with the extra traffic generated by induced demand and 'rat runs'.

- Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that they won't create clearways in the future are worthless. The EIS acknowledges that a full review of local traffic conditions will be conducted after construction of the M5 New is completed, and action taken to rectify any local road traffic problems only after the project is operational.

This is disguised code for imposition of the inevitable clearways on King Street and Edgeware Roads in Newtown/Enmore, in the Alexandria and Erskineville, and other areas across the project route.

- There has been no genuine consultation with the community.

- A failure to do traffic modelling outside the immediate project footprint, leaving the community to deal with environmental and financial costs of congestion in the future. It is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the construction end points of the project.

- The project includes unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness. The health of some residents is being played off against uncertain benefits to others.

- The St Peters Interchange will dump over 100,000 cars and trucks onto already congested local streets, many of which will end up on local streets into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore. This is not by accident – it is intentional.

- The EIS claims unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole WestConnex while dealing with negative impacts only for each project stage. This is development approval by stealth.

- The EIS claims that traffic congestion caused by the New M5 would be improved by WestConnex Stage 3, the Southern Extension and the Sydney Gateway, but no plans have been released for any of these plans. These projects are also unfunded, and in the case of the M4-M5 link, dependent on the M4 East and New M5 sections of WestConnex being profitable. Every expert outside of the NSW Government and the proponent has raised serious doubts as to whether these projects will recoup their enormous costs, especially given the recent failure of toll road tunnels such as the Cross City Tunnel and Lane Cove Tunnel. What happens if (when?) these future projects aren't built? This EIS makes no attempt to assess this.

- The EIS ignores the work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence-based arguments that WestConnex won't meet its projected time savings or congestion relief targets.

- The project would see the destruction of flora and fauna that the NSW Government is legally obliged to protect, including the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Kogarah Golf Club and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills.

- Residents along the route would be subjected to 24/7 construction noise, dust and heavy truck movements at the proponent's discretion.

- The unsafe and possibly illegal removal of asbestos that has already taken place from the Alexandria Landfill that has been described by Roads Minister Duncan Gay as "remediation", despite the assessment of such remediation being explicitly part of the Director-General's requirements for this EIS. What is the point of having such requirements if the work is going to proceed ahead of the EIS being written, let alone approved?

- Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

- The NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition, which undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal. I expect that my submission will be published in accordance with the undertaking on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 18 January 2016 5:10 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 SSI 14_6788

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

I make this submission in response to the WestConnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

- The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

- The cost of WestConnex has rapidly escalated by 70% to $17 billion. All indications are that this will become $20 billion minimum when local road remediations are added on.

- Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are routinely being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, causing unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already traumatic process.

- There is no independent assessment of traffic modelling. The Sydney Motorway Corporation claims its model has been peer reviewed but refuses to publish the review or the assumptions on which it is based; independent traffic planners cannot test its results.

- WestConnex has failed to consult with businesses in King St Newtown, St Peters, Kingsgrove, and other parts of the inner and south-west Sydney that will be negatively impacted by this project. Such businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by road closures during construction, increased traffic, and/or the imposition of future clearways in retail or industrial precincts that will inevitably result when local roads are unable to cope with the extra traffic generated by induced demand and 'rat runs'.

- Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that they won't create clearways in the future are worthless. The EIS acknowledges that a full review of local traffic conditions will be conducted after construction of the M5 New is completed, and action taken to rectify any local road traffic problems only after the project is operational.

This is disguised code for imposition of the inevitable clearways on King Street and Edgeware Roads in Newtown/Enmore, in the Alexandria and Erskineville, and other areas across the project route.

- There has been no genuine consultation with the community.

- A failure to do traffic modelling outside the immediate project footprint, leaving the community to deal with environmental and financial costs of congestion in the future. It is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the construction end points of the project.

- The project includes unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness. The health of some residents is being played off against uncertain benefits to others.

- The St Peters Interchange will dump over 100,000 cars and trucks onto already congested local streets, many of which will end up on local streets into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore. This is not by accident – it is intentional.

- The EIS claims unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole WestConnex while dealing with negative impacts only for each project stage. This is development approval by stealth.

- The EIS claims that traffic congestion caused by the New M5 would be improved by WestConnex Stage 3, the Southern Extension and the Sydney Gateway, but no plans have been released for any of these plans. These projects are also unfunded, and in the case of the M4-M5 link, dependent on the M4 East and New M5 sections of WestConnex being profitable. Every expert outside of the NSW Government and the proponent has raised serious doubts as to whether these projects will recoup their enormous costs, especially given the recent failure of toll road tunnels such as the Cross City Tunnel and Lane Cove Tunnel. What happens if (when?) these future projects aren't built? This EIS makes no attempt to assess this.

- The EIS ignores the work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence-based arguments that WestConnex won't meet its projected time savings or congestion relief targets.

- The project would see the destruction of flora and fauna that the NSW Government is legally obliged to protect, including the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Kogarah Golf Club and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills.

- Residents along the route would be subjected to 24/7 construction noise, dust and heavy truck movements at the proponent's discretion.

- The unsafe and possibly illegal removal of asbestos that has already taken place from the Alexandria Landfill that has been described by Roads Minister Duncan Gay as "remediation", despite the assessment of such remediation being explicitly part of the Director-General's requirements for this EIS. What is the point of having such requirements if the work is going to proceed ahead of the EIS being written, let alone approved?

- Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

- The NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition, which undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal. I expect that my submission will be published in accordance with the undertaking on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 18 January 2016 5:10 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 SSI 14_6788

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

I make this submission in response to the WestConnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

- The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

- The cost of WestConnex has rapidly escalated by 70% to $17 billion. All indications are that this will become $20 billion minimum when local road remediations are added on.

- Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are routinely being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, causing unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already traumatic process.

- There is no independent assessment of traffic modelling. The Sydney Motorway Corporation claims its model has been peer reviewed but refuses to publish the review or the assumptions on which it is based; independent traffic planners cannot test its results.

- WestConnex has failed to consult with businesses in King St Newtown, St Peters, Kingsgrove, and other parts of the inner and south-west Sydney that will be negatively impacted by this project. Such businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by road closures during construction, increased traffic, and/or the imposition of future clearways in retail or industrial precincts that will inevitably result when local roads are unable to cope with the extra traffic generated by induced demand and 'rat runs'.

- Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that they won't create clearways in the future are worthless. The EIS acknowledges that a full review of local traffic conditions will be conducted after construction of the M5 New is completed, and action taken to rectify any local road traffic problems only after the project is operational.

This is disguised code for imposition of the inevitable clearways on King Street and Edgeware Roads in Newtown/Enmore, in the Alexandria and Erskineville, and other areas across the project route.

- There has been no genuine consultation with the community.

- A failure to do traffic modelling outside the immediate project footprint, leaving the community to deal with environmental and financial costs of congestion in the future. It is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the construction end points of the project.

- The project includes unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness. The health of some residents is being played off against uncertain benefits to others.

- The St Peters Interchange will dump over 100,000 cars and trucks onto already congested local streets, many of which will end up on local streets into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore. This is not by accident – it is intentional.

- The EIS claims unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole WestConnex while dealing with negative impacts only for each project stage. This is development approval by stealth.

- The EIS claims that traffic congestion caused by the New M5 would be improved by WestConnex Stage 3, the Southern Extension and the Sydney Gateway, but no plans have been released for any of these plans. These projects are also unfunded, and in the case of the M4-M5 link, dependent on the M4 East and New M5 sections of WestConnex being profitable. Every expert outside of the NSW Government and the proponent has raised serious doubts as to whether these projects will recoup their enormous costs, especially given the recent failure of toll road tunnels such as the Cross City Tunnel and Lane Cove Tunnel. What happens if (when?) these future projects aren't built? This EIS makes no attempt to assess this.

- The EIS ignores the work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence-based arguments that WestConnex won't meet its projected time savings or congestion relief targets.

- The project would see the destruction of flora and fauna that the NSW Government is legally obliged to protect, including the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Kogarah Golf Club and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills.

- Residents along the route would be subjected to 24/7 construction noise, dust and heavy truck movements at the proponent's discretion.

- The unsafe and possibly illegal removal of asbestos that has already taken place from the Alexandria Landfill that has been described by Roads Minister Duncan Gay as "remediation", despite the assessment of such remediation being explicitly part of the Director-General's requirements for this EIS. What is the point of having such requirements if the work is going to proceed ahead of the EIS being written, let alone approved?

- Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

- The NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition, which undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal. I expect that my submission will be published in accordance with the undertaking on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 18 January 2016 5:09 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 SSI 14_6788

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

I make this submission in response to the WestConnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

- The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

- The cost of WestConnex has rapidly escalated by 70% to $17 billion. All indications are that this will become $20 billion minimum when local road remediations are added on.

- Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are routinely being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, causing unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already traumatic process.

- There is no independent assessment of traffic modelling. The Sydney Motorway Corporation claims its model has been peer reviewed but refuses to publish the review or the assumptions on which it is based; independent traffic planners cannot test its results.

- WestConnex has failed to consult with businesses in King St Newtown, St Peters, Kingsgrove, and other parts of the inner and south-west Sydney that will be negatively impacted by this project. Such businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by road closures during construction, increased traffic, and/or the imposition of future clearways in retail or industrial precincts that will inevitably result when local roads are unable to cope with the extra traffic generated by induced demand and 'rat runs'.

- Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that they won't create clearways in the future are worthless. The EIS acknowledges that a full review of local traffic conditions will be conducted after construction of the M5 New is completed, and action taken to rectify any local road traffic problems only after the project is operational.

This is disguised code for imposition of the inevitable clearways on King Street and Edgeware Roads in Newtown/Enmore, in the Alexandria and Erskineville, and other areas across the project route.

- There has been no genuine consultation with the community.

- A failure to do traffic modelling outside the immediate project footprint, leaving the community to deal with environmental and financial costs of congestion in the future. It is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the construction end points of the project.

- The project includes unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness. The health of some residents is being played off against uncertain benefits to others.

- The St Peters Interchange will dump over 100,000 cars and trucks onto already congested local streets, many of which will end up on local streets into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore. This is not by accident – it is intentional.

- The EIS claims unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole WestConnex while dealing with negative impacts only for each project stage. This is development approval by stealth.

- The EIS claims that traffic congestion caused by the New M5 would be improved by WestConnex Stage 3, the Southern Extension and the Sydney Gateway, but no plans have been released for any of these plans. These projects are also unfunded, and in the case of the M4-M5 link, dependent on the M4 East and New M5 sections of WestConnex being profitable. Every expert outside of the NSW Government and the proponent has raised serious doubts as to whether these projects will recoup their enormous costs, especially given the recent failure of toll road tunnels such as the Cross City Tunnel and Lane Cove Tunnel. What happens if (when?) these future projects aren't built? This EIS makes no attempt to assess this.

- The EIS ignores the work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence-based arguments that WestConnex won't meet its projected time savings or congestion relief targets.

- The project would see the destruction of flora and fauna that the NSW Government is legally obliged to protect, including the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Kogarah Golf Club and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills.

- Residents along the route would be subjected to 24/7 construction noise, dust and heavy truck movements at the proponent's discretion.

- The unsafe and possibly illegal removal of asbestos that has already taken place from the Alexandria Landfill that has been described by Roads Minister Duncan Gay as "remediation", despite the assessment of such remediation being explicitly part of the Director-General's requirements for this EIS. What is the point of having such requirements if the work is going to proceed ahead of the EIS being written, let alone approved?

- Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

- The NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition, which undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal. I expect that my submission will be published in accordance with the undertaking on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Michael Roberts [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 18 January 2016 5:09 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 SSI 14_6788

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

I make this submission in response to the WestConnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

- The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

- The cost of WestConnex has rapidly escalated by 70% to $17 billion. All indications are that this will become $20 billion minimum when local road remediations are added on.

- Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are routinely being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, causing unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already traumatic process.

- There is no independent assessment of traffic modelling. The Sydney Motorway Corporation claims its model has been peer reviewed but refuses to publish the review or the assumptions on which it is based; independent traffic planners cannot test its results.

- WestConnex has failed to consult with businesses in King St Newtown, St Peters, Kingsgrove, and other parts of the inner and south-west Sydney that will be negatively impacted by this project. Such businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by road closures during construction, increased traffic, and/or the imposition of future clearways in retail or industrial precincts that will inevitably result when local roads are unable to cope with the extra traffic generated by induced demand and 'rat runs'.

- Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that they won't create clearways in the future are worthless. The EIS acknowledges that a full review of local traffic conditions will be conducted after construction of the M5 New is completed, and action taken to rectify any local road traffic problems only after the project is operational.

This is disguised code for imposition of the inevitable clearways on King Street and Edgeware Roads in Newtown/Enmore, in the Alexandria and Erskineville, and other areas across the project route.

- There has been no genuine consultation with the community.

- A failure to do traffic modelling outside the immediate project footprint, leaving the community to deal with environmental and financial costs of congestion in the future. It is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the construction end points of the project.

- The project includes unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness. The health of some residents is being played off against uncertain benefits to others.

- The St Peters Interchange will dump over 100,000 cars and trucks onto already congested local streets, many of which will end up on local streets into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore. This is not by accident – it is intentional.

- The EIS claims unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole WestConnex while dealing with negative impacts only for each project stage. This is development approval by stealth.

- The EIS claims that traffic congestion caused by the New M5 would be improved by WestConnex Stage 3, the Southern Extension and the Sydney Gateway, but no plans have been released for any of these plans. These projects are also unfunded, and in the case of the M4-M5 link, dependent on the M4 East and New M5 sections of WestConnex being profitable. Every expert outside of the NSW Government and the proponent has raised serious doubts as to whether these projects will recoup their enormous costs, especially given the recent failure of toll road tunnels such as the Cross City Tunnel and Lane Cove Tunnel. What happens if (when?) these future projects aren't built? This EIS makes no attempt to assess this.

- The EIS ignores the work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence-based arguments that WestConnex won't meet its projected time savings or congestion relief targets.

- The project would see the destruction of flora and fauna that the NSW Government is legally obliged to protect, including the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Kogarah Golf Club and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills.

- Residents along the route would be subjected to 24/7 construction noise, dust and heavy truck movements at the proponent's discretion.

- The unsafe and possibly illegal removal of asbestos that has already taken place from the Alexandria Landfill that has been described by Roads Minister Duncan Gay as "remediation", despite the assessment of such remediation being explicitly part of the Director-General's requirements for this EIS. What is the point of having such requirements if the work is going to proceed ahead of the EIS being written, let alone approved?

- Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

- The NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition, which undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal. I expect that my submission will be published in accordance with the undertaking on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Roberts

Sydney NSW 2046, Australia

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 18 January 2016 5:08 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to WestConnex New M5 SSI 14_6788

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

I make this submission in response to the WestConnex M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). I strongly object to this project and the entire WestConnex of which this is part, and ask that you reject this proposal on the basis of this environmental impact statement (EIS).

I also strongly object to a number of specific aspects of this EIS, and I expect you to publish this submission and send me a written response to each of the objections I have outlined below.

- The planning processes surrounding this project and WestConnex as a whole have been utterly corrupted. For example, key parts of the business case remain hidden from public scrutiny, even though it is being funded by taxpayer money. Homes and businesses are being forcibly acquired, multi-million and/or billion-dollar contracts have been let, and construction works have occurred place before any planning approvals are granted for this project. Community consultation has also taken place only after detailed plans have been drawn up, so the general public has little to no input on a project that will affect hundreds of thousands of people's lives for many years to come.

- The cost of WestConnex has rapidly escalated by 70% to $17 billion. All indications are that this will become $20 billion minimum when local road remediations are added on.

- Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions are routinely being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, causing unnecessary added distress and trauma during an already traumatic process.

- There is no independent assessment of traffic modelling. The Sydney Motorway Corporation claims its model has been peer reviewed but refuses to publish the review or the assumptions on which it is based; independent traffic planners cannot test its results.

- WestConnex has failed to consult with businesses in King St Newtown, St Peters, Kingsgrove, and other parts of the inner and south-west Sydney that will be negatively impacted by this project. Such businesses are part of a thriving economy and street life that would be destroyed by road closures during construction, increased traffic, and/or the imposition of future clearways in retail or industrial precincts that will inevitably result when local roads are unable to cope with the extra traffic generated by induced demand and 'rat runs'.

- Assurances from politicians and bureaucrats that they won't create clearways in the future are worthless. The EIS acknowledges that a full review of local traffic conditions will be conducted after construction of the M5 New is completed, and action taken to rectify any local road traffic problems only after the project is operational.

This is disguised code for imposition of the inevitable clearways on King Street and Edgeware Roads in Newtown/Enmore, in the Alexandria and Erskineville, and other areas across the project route.

- There has been no genuine consultation with the community.

- A failure to do traffic modelling outside the immediate project footprint, leaving the community to deal with environmental and financial costs of congestion in the future. It is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the construction end points of the project.

- The project includes unfiltered ventilation stacks when alternatives are available. There is no safe level of fine particle pollution, which is linked to cancer and respiratory illness. The health of some residents is being played off against uncertain benefits to others.

- The St Peters Interchange will dump over 100,000 cars and trucks onto already congested local streets, many of which will end up on local streets into Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria and Enmore. This is not by accident – it is intentional.

- The EIS claims unproven, unplanned positive benefits for the whole WestConnex while dealing with negative impacts only for each project stage. This is development approval by stealth.

- The EIS claims that traffic congestion caused by the New M5 would be improved by WestConnex Stage 3, the Southern Extension and the Sydney Gateway, but no plans have been released for any of these plans. These projects are also unfunded, and in the case of the M4-M5 link, dependent on the M4 East and New M5 sections of WestConnex being profitable. Every expert outside of the NSW Government and the proponent has raised serious doubts as to whether these projects will recoup their enormous costs, especially given the recent failure of toll road tunnels such as the Cross City Tunnel and Lane Cove Tunnel. What happens if (when?) these future projects aren't built? This EIS makes no attempt to assess this.

- The EIS ignores the work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence-based arguments that WestConnex won't meet its projected time savings or congestion relief targets.

- The project would see the destruction of flora and fauna that the NSW Government is legally obliged to protect, including the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frog colony at Kogarah Golf Club and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Ironbark Forest at Kingsgrove/Beverly Hills.

- Residents along the route would be subjected to 24/7 construction noise, dust and heavy truck movements at the proponent's discretion.

- The unsafe and possibly illegal removal of asbestos that has already taken place from the Alexandria Landfill that has been described by Roads Minister Duncan Gay as "remediation", despite the assessment of such remediation being explicitly part of the Director-General's requirements for this EIS. What is the point of having such requirements if the work is going to proceed ahead of the EIS being written, let alone approved?

- Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive. WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

- The NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition, which undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal. I expect that my submission will be published in accordance with the undertaking on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

_____

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Russell Workman [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 18 January 2016 4:20 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Attn: Secretary, Re: submission to WestConnex New M5 SSI 14_6788

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

I wish to register my very strong objection to the WestConnex New M5 proposal.

This project shows how little the NSW Govt cares for the people of Sydney's inner-west and that the NSW Premier does not want a long career in politics.
I feel that the WestConnex project is a project conned onto Sydney by a NSW Govt that is virtually run and funded in a large way by wealthy property developers.
Their mouth-piece is the NSW UrbanTaskforce.

It is vital to property-developer interests that Connex goes ahead as with the massive scale of re-zoning of areas alongside it from single storey dwellings to multi-story, they will make huge amounts of money - of course a lot will go overseas to foreign Government entities - but much will stay here in the developer's pockets and tax minimisation manipulated overseas accounts.

My own suburb is swiftly being ruined, with the Town Centre being expanded to accomodate the growing number of multi-story compartments which will add thousands of residents to our overcrowded roads and footpaths.
But who cares, we don't live in rich beachside municipalities, just the heritage threatened inner-west where many of the newest residents are used to living in crowded vertical architecture.

Maybe WestConnex will make it easier, but not faster, to get out of the rat-hole this suburb and other inner-west ones will become, and of course with all that concrete and metal replacing trees and greenery, the whole area becoming a heat-sink, the climate will become nice and tropical.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal but of course you won't. Too many millions to be made by those politically-donating developers.
I expect that my submission will be published with my name and suburb on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,
Russell Workman
Sydney NSW 2134, Australia

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Voren O'Brien [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 18 January 2016 4:19 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Attn: Secretary, Re: submission to WestConnex New M5 SSI 14_6788

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

I wish to register my strong objection to the WestConnex New M5 proposal.

Global experience and research has shown conclusively that these kinds of toll road mega-projects are hugely expensive and counterproductive.

In particular, the 1980-81 Parliament of New South Wales Report by Mr D. S. Kirby, B.A., LL.B. of The Commission of Inquiry Into The Kyeemagh-Chullora Road (The Kirby Report) investigated numerous studies from around the world that ALL concluded that new roads lead to new congestion.

WestConnex will absolutely fail to solve the problem its purports to solve. Road congestion will continue, or increase, and billions of dollars will be wasted. And this is in the face of widespread community OPPOSITION to the road proposal.

The Kirby Report also stresses the amenity of existing green space in Sydney. The Wolli Creek Valley was saved from an 8 lane highway because of its recognised environmental value.

WestConnex will increase air pollution and traffic, and expose NSW taxpayers to unacceptably high levels of financial risk. Even the EISs produced for the various stages of WestConnex show it is not a long-term solution to Sydney's congestion problem.

The fact that the NSW Government has already signed multi-billion dollar contracts for WestConnex before this EIS was even placed on public exhibition undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

The Kirby Report also explains the fatal flaw in building roads that compete with pubic transport. This undermines the viability of public transport and encourages extra road use at a time when the planet should be phasing out car use to dramatically reduce carbon output and prevent the catastrophe of irreversible climate change.

I canot accept that ANY politician can in good conscience support the WestConnex New M5 proposal. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

In regards to the WestConnex New M5 and this EIS, I also object to the following:

- The EIS relying on endlessly building new tollways such as the M4/M5 link, Southern Extension and Sydney Gateway to make the New M5 work, despite these additional projects are being not only unfunded but unplanned (or at least no plans have been released to the public for scrutiny).

- The arrogant and substandard assessment of the social and psychological impact of this project on affected areas. For example, the impact of forced acquisition of scores of homes in St Peters on the families affected and the close-knit community that will be fractured as a result is merely briefly described and not assessed. I am not aware of any affected homeowner that was surveyed or even contacted by the authors for this study, which is a gross failing on the part of AECOM.

- WestConnex M4 and M5 will remove 40 hectares of vegetation which cools suburbs and reduce our carbon footprint

- Residents affected by compulsory acquisitions being offered below-market prices for their homes and businesses, and the distress and trauma this has caused.

- The impact of hundreds of diesel trucks, dust and noise on communities including during years of construction. The cumulative impact of these should be added to the same problem with the M4 East.

- The manner in which this project will pour traffic onto the local road network in the inner west and south-west Sydney, adding to already costly and unhealthy traffic congestion.

- The inadequate analysis of the threat posed to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, which even WestConnex admits may not survive the M5's construction and operation. In addition, the EIS ignores publicly available scientific evidence of breeding events of Green and Golden Bell Frogs on Kogarah Golf Course in order justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney.

- The EIS provides no hard evidence about why alternatives won't work. No scenarios have been modeled in which alternative solutions such as traffic management, increased public transport, or a combination of such solutions could reduce traffic congestion more effectively than WestConnex.

- No noise modelling has been done for how residents living above two stories will be affected, despite the number of people who already live in mid- to high-rise developments near the tunnel's exits and pollution stacks, and plans to add many more such developments along the project route in future.

- The cost of WestConnex escalating at a rate of $2 billion a year before the majority of the project has even begun construction.

- I object to the use of an air quality model that hasn't been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. There will be an increase in dangerous pollution in areas close to the tollway portals and

pollution stacks, including near schools. It's not acceptable for a government to deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy. I note that fine particle pollution can cause deadly diseases such as cancer, respiratory illnesses and cardiovascular diseases, and can impair lung development in children.

- The residents of western and south-west Sydney being forced to pay large tolls to use this road, rather than being provided with the additional public transport capacity and connections.

- Billions of dollars of construction contracts being let before this EIS was lodged; the doubt this casts on the legitimacy of the community consultation process; and the unreasonable pressure this places on the Dept of Planning and Environment to approve this project regardless of its flaws.

I therefore ask that you reject this proposal. I expect that my submission will be published with my name and suburb on your website and that you will provide a written response to my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Voren O'Brien

Sydney NSW 2206, Australia

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 18 January 2016 3:46 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Attn: Secretary, Re: submission to WestConnex New M5 SSI 14_6788

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

Submission to DP & E Project Number: SSI 14 6788 WestConnex M5

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex New M5 motorway proposal.

Lack of Transparency and Accountability

1. The taxpayer-funded cost of construction has escalated from $10bn to $16.8bn, and the project's viability is highly questionable.

2. A taxpayer-funded project costing $16.8bn should be transparent. Redactions were so prevalent in the business case that was finally released by the government, that independent analysts could not effectively interpret it.

3. WestConnex is now a private company that is not required to publish contracts that rely on taxpayer funding – this is unaccountable government at its worst. The fact that the NSW Minister for Roads, Maritime and Freight and the NSW Treasurer hold shares in this corporation is a conflict of interest, given that their role as public officers should be to ensure that public funds and public/private projects are placed under the highest scrutiny.

4. Billions of dollars in construction contracts have been entered into before the lodgment of the EIS and the previous M4 East EIS were placed on public exhibition, or Development Consent was given. This undermines community confidence that this is a genuine consultation process.

5. AECOM was paid $13m for its work on the EIS, and also to prepare the original New M5 proposal – this is a clear conflict of interest and demonstrates an unacceptable lack of independence.

6. WestConnex will not release the full assumptions on which it is based to Councils or independent experts so that these predictions can be verified.

Flawed Business Case

7. The EIS relies for its justification on a connection to the Airport – for which there is no detail or design available.

8. Tolls of at least $6 each way on the new WestConnex M5 motorway will discourage drivers from using it and lead to local roads becoming more congested.

9. WestConnex will not solve Sydney's traffic issues; the Environmental Impact Statement itself demonstrates, that even with construction of the full project, travel times in our community will only improve by as little as 30 seconds whilst, in other areas, traffic on suburban streets will increase by almost as much as 50%.

10. The EIS shows that this project will severely hamper bus services, increasing travel time by over 20% in some instances. For those people who lessen the overall traffic burden by utilising public transport, this project is a major concern.

No Real Evaluation of Alternatives

11. I support a major injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unsustainable roads and unaffordable tolls. If $16.8bn were to be spent on public transport and effective road management, then WestConnex would not be necessary.

12. There is no apparent assessment of the environmental costs and benefits of the New M5 proposal relative to the alternatives, no adequate appraisal of whether the proposal is in the public interest, and the EIS provides no evidence about why alternatives will not work. Unsubstantiated claims such as the below are made without adequate reference, and fail to articulate what analysis frameworks were used (such as what improvements to existing public transport infrastructure were factored in):

"Public transport is best suited to serving concentrated, high volume flows of people to and from established centres. It is less suited to serving disposed cross-city or local trips. Even with significant investment and high levels of patronage growth forecasts for Sydney's public transport network, 72 per cent of journeys in 2031 will be made on the road network each weekday by vehicle, equal to an additional 4.3 million new trips compared to current traffic movements (Infrastructure NSW, 2014)."

13. This section of the EIS does not, in-fact, show that public transport and freight rail options are not feasible alternatives to the new M5 toll project, and the summary statement admits: "Public and active transport options would be feasible alternatives to the project should the objectives of the WestConnex program of works be largely concerned with transporting people to and from centres." The argument for WestConnex hinges on the key customer markets identified for the project including: "highly dispersed and long distance passenger movements, as well as heavy and light freight and commercial services and businesses whose travel patterns are also highly dispersed and diverse in nature." This argument is highly flawed in that it does not posit a significant reduction of commuter traffic on existing roads given improved public transport and active transport options and therefore the increased capacity on the existing road infrastructure would support the transpor

t of goods and services that are not accommodated by increased rail freight services. The claim that movements on this corridor are 'long distance' are also questionable given that the complete WestConnex project is 33 kms and many motorists will not use the entire toll road. Claiming that travel requirements are dispersed and diverse does not necessarily preclude the development of public transport and freight systems that can accommodate such requirements.

14. Before billions of taxpayer dollars are spent on the WestConnex project, and Sydney is left with a grim future of car-dependency, modeling must be done to compare the positive impact that could be achieved through increased public transport together with traffic management. This contemporary approach has been found to be a more successful alternative in other modern cities, than the continued and unsustainable injection of cars into urban areas with motorways.

The New M5 Will Contribute to Greenhouse Gas Emissions

15. I challenge the claim in the EIS, appendix U, that WestConnex will reduce greenhouse gas emissions because free-flowing traffic produces lower emissions than congested traffic. This claim has been discredited by reputable transport experts worldwide. It has been demonstrated that the construction of new roads creates what is known as an induced traffic effect, encouraging the use of cars and leading new carbon emissions. Furthermore, motor vehicles on a road will always produce greater emissions than the public transport alternatives in which the government should be investing.

16. I challenge the EIS claim that WestConnex will reduce greenhouse gas emissions in 2031 by 12% despite an increase in light traffic of 41% and truck traffic by 106%.

Devastating Impacts on Local Communities, Amenities and Traffic Congestion

17. The EIS does not take into account the impact of flow on traffic to areas in our community which fall outside the report's very limited area of study and does not consider the flow on impact of traffic emerging from the St Peters interchange into the suburbs of Mascot, Eastlakes, Kensington, Kingsford, Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria, or the inner city. Table 8.2 'WRTM Screenline Analysis – AWT (2031)' in Appendix G shows traffic in the Inner West increasing by 36%, 43%, 103% and 62%.

18. The WestConnex M5 will pour up to 100,000 vehicles into the Inner West road network, adding to already costly and unhealthy road congestion. South King St in Newtown will be particularly affected with particularly onto South King Street in Newtown and will be unable to accommodate such a massive increase in traffic.

19. Drivers wishing to avoid excessive toll fees will use local streets as rat-runs, worsening local congestion problems.

20. It is not clear whether the EIS modeling for traffic congestion has accounted for massive proposed increases in the population of Inner Sydney.

21. WestConnex is refusing to release information about any InnerWest construction compounds that would be necessary were the M4/M5 ever to be built.

22. The EIS ignores the psychological impact of devastating St Peters.

23. The impact of the New M5 on the largest green space in the inner west, Sydney Park is critical - as well as losing a significant portion of this park, there will be tunnels, ramps, ventilation stacks and multi lane roads with fast moving traffic, right alongside the park. Many residents and visitors to this iconic area of Sydney will cut off from the park by the St Peters interchange and the widening of Euston Road to seven lanes between Sydney Park Road and Campbell Road. All park users and local residents will be subject to high levels of pollution and noise.

24. The WestConnex will result in the clearing of countless homes, and will severely affect parts of the community, destroying the amenity of residents in places like Euston Road.

25. Despite a parliamentary committee chaired by Liberal MP Matt Kean having found the compulsory acquisition system to be "unfair and inadequate", the Government has forged ahead, acquiring a number of homes along the WestConnex route, with many more targeted for acquisition in the coming month. This blatant disregard for the equitable compensation of those affected is reprehensible and must be addressed before further acquisitions are made.

26. Tunnel construction has the potential to put at risk the structural integrity of hundreds of old, sandstock brick buildings within Inner West heritage conservation areas.

Noise Pollution

27. The EIS provides no noise assessment for any buildings above 2-storeys despite the fact that thousands of St Peters and Alexandria residents already live in apartment blocks and will be affected.

28. Health effects of the high levels of construction noise over a three year period have not been sufficiently assessed.

Air Pollution from the M5 Will Be Hazardous to our Health

29. Alexandria, Enmore and Newtown will suffer deteriorating air quality due to traffic congestion, exposing residents to PM2.5 fine particulate matter that is known to cause respiratory disease and lung cancer.

30. The placement of unfiltered smoke stacks in our community will pour dangerous pollutants into residential areas and near to schools like Alexandria Park Community School.

31. I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used before in Australia and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. Under the new 'Clean Air Agreement' NSW has opted for air pollution standards below World Health Organisation guidelines. It is not acceptable for the NSW government to deliberately place the health of its citizens at risk. It is a known medical fact that fine particle pollution of the type that will be emitted by the tollway portals is a cause of lung cancer.

32. The results of air quality modelling for annual average PM2.5 in the WestConnex New M5 EIS, indicate that there will be an increase in the levels of this particle pollution at 63% of receptors along the proposed route.

33. Unfiltered ventilation exhaust stacks will be located less than 500 metres from homes, public schools, childcare centres, aged care facilities and hospitals in the west, south west and inner west suburbs on the Westconnex route. Vehicles that use diesel fuel are responsible for around 80 per cent of fine particle pollution from vehicles. According to a recent ABC health report, the high hazard zone for health is considered to be 150 metres either side of busy roads – particularly within 50 metres. And, depending on the number of vehicles on the road, the levels can be up to 10 times higher than the usual city background – which is already at levels which are considered unhealthy. So the increases we can expect in dangerous air pollution by encouraging more vehicle trips and locating dangerous ventilation stacks next to homes, schools and hospitals, are completely unacceptable.

34. WestConnex admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during the construction of the St Peters interchange and proposes to water the site to reduce risk; however, this can only be assumed to be unreliable and dangerous given that WestConnex has already failed to water the site during asbestos removal.

35. During construction, WestConnex admits that 1,000 diesel truck movements a day using Euston Rd in Alexandria will end up in traffic jams on local roads.

36. Construction traffic will continue throughout the night, which will disturb the sleep of local residents, already stressed by WestConnex construction.

Destruction of Important Habitat and Greenspace

37. The WestConnex project will also lead to the destruction of more than 75 hectares of vegetation, including endangered Turpentine Iron Bark Forest and the critically endangered Cooks River Castlereagh Iron Bark Forest.

38. The EIS does not provide an adequate analysis of the threat posed to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, and ignores scientific evidence of their breeding events on Kogarah Golf Course in order to justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney. Even WestConnex admits the frogs at Arncliffe may not survive construction.

39. The loss of around 350 trees to construct a spaghetti style interchange next to Sydney Park is a shocking development. The construction of the interchange and the consequent pollution that will result from it, will compromise the health of those, including children, who use the park amenity for sport and recreation.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, 17 January 2016 5:24 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

I write to express my strong objection to the WestConnex New M5 motorway proposal.

1. I support a major injection of funds into public transport for the Western suburbs rather than a legacy of unsustainable roads and unaffordable tolls. If $16.8bn were to spent on public transport and effective road management, then WestConnex would not be necessary.

2. The taxpayer-funded cost of construction has escalated from $10bn to $16.8bn, and the project's viability is highly questionable.

3. A taxpayer-funded project costing $16.8bn should be transparent. Redactions were so prevalent in the business case that was finally released by the government, that it could not be effectively interpreted by independent analysts.

4. WestConnex is now a private company that is not required to publish contracts that rely on taxpayer funding – this is unaccountable government at its worst.

5. Billions of dollars in construction contracts have been entered into before the lodgment of the EIS.

6. AECOM was paid $13m for its work on the EIS, and also to prepare the original New M5 proposal – this is a clear conflict of interest and demonstrates an unacceptable lack of independence.

7. WestConnex will not release the full assumptions on which it is based to Councils or independent experts so that these predictions can be verified.

8. The EIS relies for its justification on a connection to the Airport – for which there is no detail or design available.

9. Tolls of at least $6 each way on the new WestConnex M5 motorway will discourage drivers from using it and lead to local roads becoming more congested.

10. WestConnex will not solve Sydney's traffic issues; the Environmental Impact Statement itself demonstrates, that even with construction of the full project, travel times in our community will only improve by as little as 30 seconds whilst, in other areas, traffic on suburban streets will increase by almost as much as 50%.

11. The EIS shows that this project will severely hamper bus services, increasing travel time by over 20% in some instances. For those people who lessen the overall traffic burden by utilising public transport, this project is a major concern.

12. The EIS provides no evidence about why alternatives will not work. Before billions of taxpayer dollars are spent on the WestConnex project, and Sydney is left with a grim future of car-dependency, modeling must be done to compare the positive impact that could be achieved through increased public transport together with traffic

management. This contemporary approach has been found to be a more successful alternative in other modern cities, than the continued and unsustainable injection of cars into urban areas with motorways.

13. I challenge the claim in the EIS, appendix U, that WestConnex will reduce greenhouse gas emissions because free-flowing traffic produces lower emissions than congested traffic. This claim has been discredited by reputable transport experts worldwide. It has been demonstrated that the construction of new roads creates what is known as an induced traffic effect, leading to more cars and new carbon emissions. Furthermore, motor vehicles on a road will always produce greater emissions than the public transport alternatives in which the government should be investing.

14. I challenge the EIS claim that WestConnex will reduce greenhouse gas emissions in 2031 by 12% despite an increase in light traffic of 41% and truck traffic by 106%.

15. The EIS does not take into account the impact of flow on traffic to areas in our community which fall outside the report's very limited area of study and does not consider the flow on impact of traffic emerging from the St Peters interchange into the suburbs of Mascot, Eastlakes, Kensington, Kingsford, Newtown, Erskineville, Alexandria, or the inner city. Table 8.2 'WRTM Screenline Analysis – AWT (2031)' in Appendix G shows traffic in the Inner West increasing by 36%, 43%, 103% and 62%.

16. The WestConnex M5 will pour traffic into the Inner West road network, adding to already costly and unhealthy road congestion.

17. It is not clear whether the EIS modeling for traffic congestion has accounted for massive proposed increases in the population of Inner Sydney.

18. The EIS provides no noise assessment for any buildings above 2-storeys despite the fact that thousands of St Peters and Alexandria residents already live in apartment blocks and will be affected.

19. Alexandria, Enmore and Newtown will suffer deteriorating air quality dues to traffic congestion, exposing residents to lung cancer.

20. The placement of unfiltered smoke stacks in our community will pour dangerous pollutants into residential areas and near to schools like Alexandria Park Community School.

21. I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used before in Australia and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. Under the new 'Clean Air Agreement' NSW has opted for air pollution standards below World Health Organisation guidelines. It is not acceptable for the NSW government to deliberately place the health of its citizens at risk. It is a known medical fact that fine particle pollution of the type that will be emitted by the tollway portals is a cause of lung cancer.

22. WestConnex admits that dangerous dust pollution will be created during the construction of the St Peters interchange and proposes to water the site to reduce risk; however, this can only be assumed to be unreliable and dangerous given that WestConnex has already failed to water the site during asbestos removal.

23. During construction, WestConnex admits that 71,000 diesel truck movements a day using Euston Rd in Alexandria will end up in traffic jams on local roads.

24. Construction traffic will continue throughout the night, which will disturb the sleep of local residents, already stressed by WestConnex construction.

25. Health effects of the high levels of construction noise over a three year period have not been sufficiently assessed.

26. WestConnex is refusing to release information about any InnerWest construction compounds that would be necessary were the M4/M5 ever to be built.

27. The EIS ignores the psychological impact of devastating St Peters.

28. The WestConnex will result in the clearing of countless homes, and will severely affect parts of the community, destroying the amenity of residents in places like Euston Road.

29. Despite a parliamentary committee chaired by Liberal MP Matt Kean having found the compulsory acquisition system to be "unfair and inadequate", the Government has forged ahead, acquiring a number of homes along the WestConnex route, with many more targeted for acquisition in the coming month. This blatant disregard for the equitable compensation of those affected is reprehensible and must be addressed before further acquisitions are made.

30. Tunnel construction has the potential to put at risk the structural integrity of hundreds of buildings within Inner West heritage conservation areas.

31. WestConnex M4 and M5 will remove 40ha of vegetation which cools our suburbs and reduces our carbon footprint.

32. The EIS does not provide an adequate analysis of the threat posed to the endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs at Arncliffe, and ignores scientific evidence of their breeding events on Kogarah Golf Course in order to justify risking one of two surviving colonies of these frogs in Sydney. Even WestConnex admits the frogs at Arncliffe may not survive construction.

33. The loss of around 350 trees to construct a spaghetti style interchange next to Sydney Park is a shocking development. The construction of the interchange will compromise the health of those who use the part amenity which is used for children's and sporting recreation.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, 17 January 2016 5:23 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

I make this submission in response to the WestConnex New M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), project number SSI 14_6788. I object to the project and the whole WestConnex for a range of reasons, which I have listed below.

I expect to receive a response to all of my concerns.

TRAFFIC IMPACTS

I object to the impact on traffic the New M5 will bring to my local suburbs. When complete, the New M5 will cause an extra 50,000 cars per day into our suburbs. The proponent estimates our key local roads, such as King Georges, Stoney Creek, Canterbury, Forest, and Moorefields will need to absorb this additional traffic due to motorists avoiding the tolls.

I object to the public announcements that King Georges Road will have a 49% improvement in travel time, yet the EIS acknowledges that the current LoS-F (Level of Service) will be the same with our without WestConnex.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the Westconnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from WestConnex.

I object to the failure of the Sydney Motorway Corporation to publicly reveal the peer review of the traffic model and their failure to reveal the assumptions on which it is based so independent traffic planners can test its results.

POOR ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

TRUCK MOVEMENTS DURING CONSTRUCTION

I object to hundreds of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste (asbestos) through Kingsgrove and Moorefields Road to the Western suburbs where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

DESTRUCTION OF BIODIVERSITY

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Iron Bark forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

I object to the removal of 7 hectares of habitat of one of only two surviving colonies in NSW of endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs for a massive tunnelling site.

TUNNELLING IMPACTS

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

AIR QUALITY

I object to a transport 'solution' that results in a further nine unfiltered exhaust stacks throughout highly populated suburbs.

It is unacceptable that a 35 metre exhaust stack is located in the valley of Kingsgrove, with schools, homes and sporting fields on higher ground.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. I note that there will be an increase in dangerous pollution in some areas close to the tollway portals and near roads with increased traffic. It is not acceptable to me that a government should deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of Janaury 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

URBAN LANDSCAPE DESIGN

I object to further deterioration to our amenity that this project will cause. Statements such as "the narrowed pedestrian access around the edge of the widened portion of the M5 East Motorway would not be out of character" completely dismisses the significant change to our urban environment with the legacy M5.

I particularly object to the transparent noise walls, as an "opportunity to enhance the driver experience with views across Canterbury Golf Course, Beverly Grove Park and Tallawalla St park". This demonstrates that urban repair for residents' is not a priority.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

In addition, no credible authority in the world today would suggest that building huge urban motorways is the solution to cutting national greenhouse emissions, or that increases in vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) would somehow result in a net reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Yet this is exactly what the proponent is claiming in this EIS. I object to this flawed analysis.

PROCESS

I object to a planning system that awards billion-dollar contracts to tollway construction company when local government staff and many experts are convinced the WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

I object to a consultation period being held during January when schools are closed, residents are away and many local government staff are on holidays. The consultation period should be extended until March 2016.

SOCIAL IMPACT STUDY

Whole communities will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study - which is even less detailed than the inadequate one done for the WestConnex M4 East EIS - should be rejected, as it ignores well established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut and paste and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

NOISE

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Liz Roberts [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, 17 January 2016 4:54 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

I make this submission in response to the WestConnex New M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), project number SSI 14_6788. I object to the project and the whole WestConnex for a range of reasons, which I have listed below.

I expect to receive a response to all of my concerns.

The interchange should be moved further away from areas in Sydney that are growing in size to account for population growth and that combat urban sprawl in the outer suburbs of Sydney. Eg - further down in Tempe in the Industrial areas. Tempe is majority single dwelling, factories, and run down retail. the impact on residents and commerce would be far less that with the current proposal.

Newtown, Alexandria and Erskineville's population has and will continue to increase due to the large number of unit's being built. The potential for more to be built, to tackle Sydney house prices should be a tactic. With increased population more effective and efficient modes of transport should be considered a car congestion should be minimised to increased.

The quality of life of residents living in inner city areas, which benefits cities overall, is dependent on parklands and recreational areas. Although it appears that the amount of parkland destroyed in is aiming to be kept to a minimum, it doesn't take into account the loss in quality and usability of a park that is situated next to a major freeway interchange.

A number of additional reasons are outlined below

TRAFFIC IMPACTS

I object to the impact on traffic the New M5 will bring to my local suburbs. When complete, the New M5 will cause an extra 50,000 cars per day into our suburbs. The proponent estimates our key local roads, such as King Georges, Stoney Creek, Canterbury, Forest, and Moorefields will need to absorb this additional traffic due to motorists avoiding the tolls.

I object to the public announcements that King Georges Road will have a 49% improvement in travel time, yet the EIS acknowledges that the current LoS-F (Level of Service) will be the same with our without WestConnex.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the Westconnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from WestConnex.

I object to the failure of the Sydney Motorway Corporation to publicly reveal the peer review of the traffic model and their failure to reveal the assumptions on which it is based so independent traffic planners can test its results.

POOR ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

TRUCK MOVEMENTS DURING CONSTRUCTION

I object to hundreds of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste (asbestos) through Kingsgrove and Moorefields Road to the Western suburbs where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

DESTRUCTION OF BIODIVERSITY

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Iron Bark forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

I object to the removal of 7 hectares of habitat of one of only two surviving colonies in NSW of endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs for a massive tunnelling site.

TUNNELLING IMPACTS

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

AIR QUALITY

I object to a transport 'solution' that results in a further nine unfiltered exhaust stacks throughout highly populated suburbs.

It is unacceptable that a 35 metre exhaust stack is located in the valley of Kingsgrove, with schools, homes and sporting fields on higher ground.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. I note that there will be an increase in dangerous pollution in some areas close to the tollway portals and near roads with increased traffic. It is not acceptable to me that a government should deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of Janaury 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

URBAN LANDSCAPE DESIGN

I object to further deterioration to our amenity that this project will cause. Statements such as "the narrowed pedestrian access around the edge of the widened portion of the M5 East Motorway would not be out of character" completely dismisses the significant change to our urban environment with the legacy M5.

I particularly object to the transparent noise walls, as an "opportunity to enhance the driver experience with views across Canterbury Golf Course, Beverly Grove Park and Tallawalla St park". This demonstrates that urban repair for residents' is not a priority.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

In addition, no credible authority in the world today would suggest that building huge urban motorways is the solution to cutting national greenhouse emissions, or that increases in vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) would somehow result in a net reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Yet this is exactly what the proponent is claiming in this EIS. I object to this flawed analysis.

PROCESS

I object to a planning system that awards billion-dollar contracts to tollway construction company when local government staff and many experts are convinced the WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

I object to a consultation period being held during January when schools are closed, residents are away and many local government staff are on holidays. The consultation period should be extended until March 2016.

SOCIAL IMPACT STUDY

Whole communities will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study - which is even less detailed than the inadequate one done for the WestConnex M4 East EIS - should be rejected, as it ignores well

established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut and paste and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

NOISE

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

Yours sincerely,

Liz Roberts

Sydney NSW 2043, Australia

[redacted]

From: Joanne Deaves [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, 16 January 2016 2:40 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

I make this submission in response to the WestConnex New M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), project number SSI 14_6788. I object to the project and the whole WestConnex for a range of reasons, which I have listed below.

I expect to receive a response to all of my concerns.

TRAFFIC IMPACTS

I object to the impact on traffic the New M5 will bring to my local suburbs. When complete, the New M5 will cause an extra 50,000 cars per day into our suburbs. The proponent estimates our key local roads, such as King Georges, Stoney Creek, Canterbury, Forest, and Moorefields will need to absorb this additional traffic due to motorists avoiding the tolls.

I object to the public announcements that King Georges Road will have a 49% improvement in travel time, yet the EIS acknowledges that the current LoS-F (Level of Service) will be the same with our without WestConnex.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the Westconnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from WestConnex.

I object to the failure of the Sydney Motorway Corporation to publicly reveal the peer review of the traffic model and their failure to reveal the assumptions on which it is based so independent traffic planners can test its results.

POOR ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

TRUCK MOVEMENTS DURING CONSTRUCTION

I object to hundreds of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste (asbestos) through Kingsgrove and Moorefields Road to the Western suburbs where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

DESTRUCTION OF BIODIVERSITY

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Iron Bark forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

I object to the removal of 7 hectares of habitat of one of only two surviving colonies in NSW of endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs for a massive tunnelling site.

TUNNELLING IMPACTS

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

AIR QUALITY

I object to a transport 'solution' that results in a further nine unfiltered exhaust stacks throughout highly populated suburbs.

It is unacceptable that a 35 metre exhaust stack is located in the valley of Kingsgrove, with schools, homes and sporting fields on higher ground.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. I note that there will be an increase in dangerous pollution in some areas close to the tollway portals and near roads with increased traffic. It is not acceptable to me that a government should deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of Janaury 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

URBAN LANDSCAPE DESIGN

I object to further deterioration to our amenity that this project will cause. Statements such as "the narrowed pedestrian access around the edge of the widened portion of the M5 East Motorway would not be out of character" completely dismisses the significant change to our urban environment with the legacy M5.

I particularly object to the transparent noise walls, as an "opportunity to enhance the driver experience with views across Canterbury Golf Course, Beverly Grove Park and Tallawalla St park". This demonstrates that urban repair for residents' is not a priority.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

In addition, no credible authority in the world today would suggest that building huge urban motorways is the solution to cutting national greenhouse emissions, or that increases in vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) would somehow result in a net reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Yet this is exactly what the proponent is claiming in this EIS. I object to this flawed analysis.

PROCESS

I object to a planning system that awards billion-dollar contracts to tollway construction company when local government staff and many experts are convinced the WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

I object to a consultation period being held during January when schools are closed, residents are away and many local government staff are on holidays. The consultation period should be extended until March 2016.

SOCIAL IMPACT STUDY

Whole communities will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study - which is even less detailed than the inadequate one done for the WestConnex M4 East EIS - should be rejected, as it ignores well established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut and paste and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

NOISE

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

Yours sincerely,

Joanne Deaves

[redacted]

From: Robert IRVINE [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 15 January 2016 5:07 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

I make this submission in response to the WestConnex New M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), project number SSI 14_6788.

I object to this project and to the whole WestConnex scheme for a range of reasons, including all those listed below.

I expect that all of these objections will receive due consideration and will be responded to in writing.

TRAFFIC IMPACTS

I object to the impact on traffic the New M5 will bring to my local suburbs. When complete, the New M5 will cause an extra 50,000 cars per day into our suburbs. The proponent estimates our key local roads, such as King Georges, Stoney Creek, Canterbury, Forest, and Moorefields will need to absorb this additional traffic due to motorists avoiding the tolls.

I object to the public announcements that King Georges Road will have a 49% improvement in travel time, yet the EIS acknowledges that the current LoS-F (Level of Service) will be the same with our without WestConnex.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the Westconnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from WestConnex.

I object to the failure of the Sydney Motorway Corporation to publicly reveal the peer review of the traffic model and their failure to reveal the assumptions on which it is based so independent traffic planners can test its results.

POOR ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

TRUCK MOVEMENTS DURING CONSTRUCTION

I object to hundreds of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste (asbestos) through Kingsgrove and Moorefields Road to the Western suburbs where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

DESTRUCTION OF BIODIVERSITY

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Iron Bark forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

I object to the removal of 7 hectares of habitat of one of only two surviving colonies in NSW of endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs for a massive tunnelling site.

TUNNELLING IMPACTS

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

AIR QUALITY

I object to a transport 'solution' that results in a further nine unfiltered exhaust stacks throughout highly populated suburbs.

It is unacceptable that a 35 metre exhaust stack is located in the valley of Kingsgrove, with schools, homes and sporting fields on higher ground.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. I note that there will be an increase in dangerous pollution in some areas close to the tollway portals and near roads with increased traffic. It is not acceptable to me that a government should deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of Janaury 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

URBAN LANDSCAPE DESIGN

I object to further deterioration to our amenity that this project will cause. Statements such as "the narrowed pedestrian access around the edge of the widened portion of the M5 East Motorway would not be out of character" completely dismisses the significant change to our urban environment with the legacy M5.

I particularly object to the transparent noise walls, as an "opportunity to enhance the driver experience with views across Canterbury Golf Course, Beverly Grove Park and Tallawalla St park". This demonstrates that urban repair for residents' is not a priority.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

In addition, no credible authority in the world today would suggest that building huge urban motorways is the solution to cutting national greenhouse emissions, or that increases in vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) would somehow result in a net reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Yet this is exactly what the proponent is claiming in this EIS. I object to this flawed analysis.

PROCESS

I object to a planning system that awards billion-dollar contracts to tollway construction company when local government staff and many experts are convinced the WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

I object to a consultation period being held during January when schools are closed, residents are away and many local government staff are on holidays. The consultation period should be extended until March 2016.

SOCIAL IMPACT STUDY

Whole communities will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study - which is even less detailed than the inadequate one done for the WestConnex M4 East EIS - should be rejected, as it ignores well established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut and paste and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

NOISE

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

Yours sincerely,

Robert IRVINE

Sydney NSW 2042, Australia

[redacted]

From: Anne Quested [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 15 January 2016 4:53 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

I make this submission in response to the WestConnex New M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), project number SSI 14_6788. I object to the project and the whole WestConnex for a range of reasons, which I have listed below.

I expect to receive a response to all of my concerns.

TRAFFIC IMPACTS

I object to the impact on traffic the New M5 will bring to my local suburbs. When complete, the New M5 will cause an extra 50,000 cars per day into our suburbs. The proponent estimates our key local roads, such as King Georges, Stoney Creek, Canterbury, Forest, and Moorefields will need to absorb this additional traffic due to motorists avoiding the tolls.

I object to the public announcements that King Georges Road will have a 49% improvement in travel time, yet the EIS acknowledges that the current LoS-F (Level of Service) will be the same with our without WestConnex.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the Westconnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from WestConnex.

I object to the failure of the Sydney Motorway Corporation to publicly reveal the peer review of the traffic model and their failure to reveal the assumptions on which it is based so independent traffic planners can test its results.

POOR ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

TRUCK MOVEMENTS DURING CONSTRUCTION

I object to hundreds of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste (asbestos) through Kingsgrove and Moorefields Road to the Western suburbs where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

DESTRUCTION OF BIODIVERSITY

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Iron Bark forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

I object to the removal of 7 hectares of habitat of one of only two surviving colonies in NSW of endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs for a massive tunnelling site.

TUNNELLING IMPACTS

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

AIR QUALITY

I object to a transport 'solution' that results in a further nine unfiltered exhaust stacks throughout highly populated suburbs.

It is unacceptable that a 35 metre exhaust stack is located in the valley of Kingsgrove, with schools, homes and sporting fields on higher ground.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. I note that there will be an increase in dangerous pollution in some areas close to the tollway portals and near roads with increased traffic. It is not acceptable to me that a government should deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of Janaury 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

URBAN LANDSCAPE DESIGN

I object to further deterioration to our amenity that this project will cause. Statements such as "the narrowed pedestrian access around the edge of the widened portion of the M5 East Motorway would not be out of character" completely dismisses the significant change to our urban environment with the legacy M5.

I particularly object to the transparent noise walls, as an "opportunity to enhance the driver experience with views across Canterbury Golf Course, Beverly Grove Park and Tallawalla St park". This demonstrates that urban repair for residents' is not a priority.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

In addition, no credible authority in the world today would suggest that building huge urban motorways is the solution to cutting national greenhouse emissions, or that increases in vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) would somehow result in a net reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Yet this is exactly what the proponent is claiming in this EIS. I object to this flawed analysis.

PROCESS

I object to a planning system that awards billion-dollar contracts to tollway construction company when local government staff and many experts are convinced the WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

I object to a consultation period being held during January when schools are closed, residents are away and many local government staff are on holidays. The consultation period should be extended until March 2016.

SOCIAL IMPACT STUDY

Whole communities will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study - which is even less detailed than the inadequate one done for the WestConnex M4 East EIS - should be rejected, as it ignores well established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut and paste and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

NOISE

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

Yours sincerely,

Anne Quested

Sydney NSW 2015, Australia

[redacted]

From: Emily English [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 14 January 2016 10:56 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

I make this submission in response to the WestConnex New M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), project number SSI 14_6788. I object to the project and the whole WestConnex for a range of reasons, which I have listed below.

I expect to receive a response to all of my concerns.

TRAFFIC IMPACTS

I object to the impact on traffic the New M5 will bring to my local suburbs. When complete, the New M5 will cause an extra 50,000 cars per day into our suburbs. The proponent estimates our key local roads, such as King Georges, Stoney Creek, Canterbury, Forest, and Moorefields will need to absorb this additional traffic due to motorists avoiding the tolls.

With taking traffic off our local roads, this is therefore a failed objective.

I object to the public announcements that King Georges Road will have a 49% improvement in travel time, yet the EIS acknowledges that the current LoS-F (Level of Service) will be the same with our without WestConnex.

I object to the deceptive and misleading information distributed to the public.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the Westconnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from WestConnex.

I object to the failure of the Sydney Motorway Corporation to publicly reveal the peer review of the traffic model and their failure to reveal the assumptions on which it is based so independent traffic planners can test its results.

POOR ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

TRUCK MOVEMENTS DURING CONSTRUCTION

I object to hundreds of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste (asbestos) through Kingsgrove and Moorefields Road to the Western suburbs where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

DESTRUCTION OF BIODIVERSITY

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Iron Bark forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

I object to the removal of 7 hectares of habitat of one of only two surviving colonies in NSW of endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs for a massive tunnelling site.

TUNNELLING IMPACTS

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

AIR QUALITY

I object to a transport 'solution' that results in a further nine unfiltered exhaust stacks throughout highly populated suburbs.

It is unacceptable that a 35 metre exhaust stack is located in the valley of Kingsgrove, with schools, homes and sporting fields on higher ground.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. I note that there will be an increase in dangerous pollution in some areas close to the tollway portals and near roads with increased traffic. It is not acceptable to me that a government should deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of Janaury 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

URBAN LANDSCAPE DESIGN

I object to further deterioration to our amenity that this project will cause. Statements such as "the narrowed pedestrian access around the edge of the widened portion of the M5 East Motorway would not be out of character" completely dismisses the significant change to our urban environment with the legacy M5.

I particularly object to the transparent noise walls, as an "opportunity to enhance the driver experience with views across Canterbury Golf Course, Beverly Grove Park and Tallawalla St park". This demonstrates that urban repair for residents' is not a priority. I find this attitude particularly objectionable.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

In addition, no credible authority in the world today would suggest that building huge urban motorways is the solution to cutting national greenhouse emissions, or that increases in vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) would

somehow result in a net reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Yet this is exactly what the proponent is claiming in this EIS. I object to this flawed analysis.

PROCESS

I object to a planning system that awards billion-dollar contracts to tollway construction company when local government staff and many experts are convinced the WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

I object to a consultation period being held during January when schools are closed, residents are away and many local government staff are on holidays. The consultation period should be extended until March 2016.

SOCIAL IMPACT STUDY

Whole communities will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study - which is even less detailed than the inadequate one done for the WestConnex M4 East EIS - should be rejected, as it ignores well established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut and paste and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

NOISE

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

Yours sincerely,

Emily English

Sydney NSW 2209, Australia

[redacted]

From: Amelia Pyke [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 14 January 2016 8:01 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

I make this submission in response to the WestConnex New M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), project number SSI 14_6788. I object to the project and the whole WestConnex for a range of reasons, which I have listed below.

I expect to receive a response to all of my concerns.

TRAFFIC IMPACTS

I object to the impact on traffic the New M5 will bring to my local suburbs. When complete, the New M5 will cause an extra 50,000 cars per day into our suburbs. The proponent estimates our key local roads, such as King Georges, Stoney Creek, Canterbury, Forest, and Moorefields will need to absorb this additional traffic due to motorists avoiding the tolls.

I object to the public announcements that King Georges Road will have a 49% improvement in travel time, yet the EIS acknowledges that the current LoS-F (Level of Service) will be the same with our without WestConnex.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the Westconnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from WestConnex.

I object to the failure of the Sydney Motorway Corporation to publicly reveal the peer review of the traffic model and their failure to reveal the assumptions on which it is based so independent traffic planners can test its results.

POOR ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

TRUCK MOVEMENTS DURING CONSTRUCTION

I object to hundreds of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste (asbestos) through Kingsgrove and Moorefields Road to the Western suburbs where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

DESTRUCTION OF BIODIVERSITY

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Iron Bark forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

I object to the removal of 7 hectares of habitat of one of only two surviving colonies in NSW of endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs for a massive tunnelling site.

TUNNELLING IMPACTS

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

AIR QUALITY

I object to a transport 'solution' that results in a further nine unfiltered exhaust stacks throughout highly populated suburbs.

It is unacceptable that a 35 metre exhaust stack is located in the valley of Kingsgrove, with schools, homes and sporting fields on higher ground.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. I note that there will be an increase in dangerous pollution in some areas close to the tollway portals and near roads with increased traffic. It is not acceptable to me that a government should deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of Janaury 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

URBAN LANDSCAPE DESIGN

I object to further deterioration to our amenity that this project will cause. Statements such as "the narrowed pedestrian access around the edge of the widened portion of the M5 East Motorway would not be out of character" completely dismisses the significant change to our urban environment with the legacy M5.

I particularly object to the transparent noise walls, as an "opportunity to enhance the driver experience with views across Canterbury Golf Course, Beverly Grove Park and Tallawalla St park". This demonstrates that urban repair for residents' is not a priority.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

In addition, no credible authority in the world today would suggest that building huge urban motorways is the solution to cutting national greenhouse emissions, or that increases in vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) would somehow result in a net reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Yet this is exactly what the proponent is claiming in this EIS. I object to this flawed analysis.

PROCESS

I object to a planning system that awards billion-dollar contracts to tollway construction company when local government staff and many experts are convinced the WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

I object to a consultation period being held during January when schools are closed, residents are away and many local government staff are on holidays. The consultation period should be extended until March 2016.

SOCIAL IMPACT STUDY

Whole communities will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study - which is even less detailed than the inadequate one done for the WestConnex M4 East EIS - should be rejected, as it ignores well established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut and paste and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

NOISE

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

Yours sincerely,

Amelia Pyke

Sydney NSW 2015, Australia

[redacted]

From: James Breuer [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 13 January 2016 8:42 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

I make this submission in response to the WestConnex New M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), project number SSI 14_6788. I object to the project and the whole WestConnex for a range of reasons, which I have listed below.

I expect to receive a response to all of my concerns.

TRAFFIC IMPACTS

I object to the impact on traffic the New M5 will bring to my local suburbs. When complete, the New M5 will cause an extra 50,000 cars per day into our suburbs. The proponent estimates our key local roads, such as King Georges, Stoney Creek, Canterbury, Forest, and Moorefields will need to absorb this additional traffic due to motorists avoiding the tolls.

I object to the public announcements that King Georges Road will have a 49% improvement in travel time, yet the EIS acknowledges that the current LoS-F (Level of Service) will be the same with our without WestConnex.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the Westconnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from WestConnex.

I object to the failure of the Sydney Motorway Corporation to publicly reveal the peer review of the traffic model and their failure to reveal the assumptions on which it is based so independent traffic planners can test its results.

POOR ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

TRUCK MOVEMENTS DURING CONSTRUCTION

I object to hundreds of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste (asbestos) through Kingsgrove and Moorefields Road to the Western suburbs where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

DESTRUCTION OF BIODIVERSITY

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Iron Bark forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

I object to the removal of 7 hectares of habitat of one of only two surviving colonies in NSW of endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs for a massive tunnelling site.

TUNNELLING IMPACTS

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

AIR QUALITY

I object to a transport 'solution' that results in a further nine unfiltered exhaust stacks throughout highly populated suburbs.

It is unacceptable that a 35 metre exhaust stack is located in the valley of Kingsgrove, with schools, homes and sporting fields on higher ground.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. I note that there will be an increase in dangerous pollution in some areas close to the tollway portals and near roads with increased traffic. It is not acceptable to me that a government should deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of Janaury 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

URBAN LANDSCAPE DESIGN

I object to further deterioration to our amenity that this project will cause. Statements such as "the narrowed pedestrian access around the edge of the widened portion of the M5 East Motorway would not be out of character" completely dismisses the significant change to our urban environment with the legacy M5.

I particularly object to the transparent noise walls, as an "opportunity to enhance the driver experience with views across Canterbury Golf Course, Beverly Grove Park and Tallawalla St park". This demonstrates that urban repair for residents' is not a priority.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

In addition, no credible authority in the world today would suggest that building huge urban motorways is the solution to cutting national greenhouse emissions, or that increases in vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) would somehow result in a net reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Yet this is exactly what the proponent is claiming in this EIS. I object to this flawed analysis.

PROCESS

I object to a planning system that awards billion-dollar contracts to tollway construction company when local government staff and many experts are convinced the WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

I object to a consultation period being held during January when schools are closed, residents are away and many local government staff are on holidays. The consultation period should be extended until March 2016.

SOCIAL IMPACT STUDY

Whole communities will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study - which is even less detailed than the inadequate one done for the WestConnex M4 East EIS - should be rejected, as it ignores well established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut and paste and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

NOISE

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

Yours sincerely,

James Breuer

Sydney NSW 2205, Australia

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 13 January 2016 7:36 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

I make this submission in response to the WestConnex New M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), project number SSI 14_6788. I object to the project and the whole WestConnex for a range of reasons, which I have listed below.

I expect to receive a response to all of my concerns.

TRAFFIC IMPACTS

I object to the impact on traffic the New M5 will bring to my local suburbs. When complete, the New M5 will cause an extra 50,000 cars per day into our suburbs. The proponent estimates our key local roads, such as King Georges, Stoney Creek, Canterbury, Forest, and Moorefields will need to absorb this additional traffic due to motorists avoiding the tolls.

I object to the public announcements that King Georges Road will have a 49% improvement in travel time, yet the EIS acknowledges that the current LoS-F (Level of Service) will be the same with our without WestConnex.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the Westconnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from WestConnex.

I object to the failure of the Sydney Motorway Corporation to publicly reveal the peer review of the traffic model and their failure to reveal the assumptions on which it is based so independent traffic planners can test its results.

POOR ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

TRUCK MOVEMENTS DURING CONSTRUCTION

I object to hundreds of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste (asbestos) through Kingsgrove and Moorefields Road to the Western suburbs where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

DESTRUCTION OF BIODIVERSITY

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Iron Bark forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

I object to the removal of 7 hectares of habitat of one of only two surviving colonies in NSW of endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs for a massive tunnelling site.

TUNNELLING IMPACTS

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

AIR QUALITY

I object to a transport 'solution' that results in a further nine unfiltered exhaust stacks throughout highly populated suburbs.

It is unacceptable that a 35 metre exhaust stack is located in the valley of Kingsgrove, with schools, homes and sporting fields on higher ground.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. I note that there will be an increase in dangerous pollution in some areas close to the tollway portals and near roads with increased traffic. It is not acceptable to me that a government should deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of Janaury 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

URBAN LANDSCAPE DESIGN

I object to further deterioration to our amenity that this project will cause. Statements such as "the narrowed pedestrian access around the edge of the widened portion of the M5 East Motorway would not be out of character" completely dismisses the significant change to our urban environment with the legacy M5.

I particularly object to the transparent noise walls, as an "opportunity to enhance the driver experience with views across Canterbury Golf Course, Beverly Grove Park and Tallawalla St park". This demonstrates that urban repair for residents' is not a priority.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

In addition, no credible authority in the world today would suggest that building huge urban motorways is the solution to cutting national greenhouse emissions, or that increases in vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) would somehow result in a net reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Yet this is exactly what the proponent is claiming in this EIS. I object to this flawed analysis.

PROCESS

I object to a planning system that awards billion-dollar contracts to tollway construction company when local government staff and many experts are convinced the WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

I object to a consultation period being held during January when schools are closed, residents are away and many local government staff are on holidays. The consultation period should be extended until March 2016.

SOCIAL IMPACT STUDY

Whole communities will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study - which is even less detailed than the inadequate one done for the WestConnex M4 East EIS - should be rejected, as it ignores well established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut and paste and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

NOISE

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

[redacted]

From: Germana Eckert [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 12 January 2016 5:43 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

I make this submission in response to the WestConnex New M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), project number SSI 14_6788. I object to the project and the whole WestConnex for a range of reasons, which I have listed below.

I expect to receive a response to all of my concerns.

TRAFFIC IMPACTS

I object to the impact on traffic the New M5 will bring to my local suburbs. When complete, the New M5 will cause an extra 50,000 cars per day into our suburbs. The proponent estimates our key local roads, such as King Georges, Stoney Creek, Canterbury, Forest, and Moorefields will need to absorb this additional traffic due to motorists avoiding the tolls.

I object to the public announcements that King Georges Road will have a 49% improvement in travel time, yet the EIS acknowledges that the current LoS-F (Level of Service) will be the same with our without WestConnex.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the Westconnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from WestConnex.

I object to the failure of the Sydney Motorway Corporation to publicly reveal the peer review of the traffic model and their failure to reveal the assumptions on which it is based so independent traffic planners can test its results.

POOR ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

TRUCK MOVEMENTS DURING CONSTRUCTION

I object to hundreds of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste (asbestos) through Kingsgrove and Moorefields Road to the Western suburbs where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

DESTRUCTION OF BIODIVERSITY

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Iron Bark forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

I object to the removal of 7 hectares of habitat of one of only two surviving colonies in NSW of endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs for a massive tunnelling site.

TUNNELLING IMPACTS

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

AIR QUALITY

I object to a transport 'solution' that results in a further nine unfiltered exhaust stacks throughout highly populated suburbs.

It is unacceptable that a 35 metre exhaust stack is located in the valley of Kingsgrove, with schools, homes and sporting fields on higher ground.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. I note that there will be an increase in dangerous pollution in some areas close to the tollway portals and near roads with increased traffic. It is not acceptable to me that a government should deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of Janaury 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

URBAN LANDSCAPE DESIGN

I object to further deterioration to our amenity that this project will cause. Statements such as "the narrowed pedestrian access around the edge of the widened portion of the M5 East Motorway would not be out of character" completely dismisses the significant change to our urban environment with the legacy M5.

I particularly object to the transparent noise walls, as an "opportunity to enhance the driver experience with views across Canterbury Golf Course, Beverly Grove Park and Tallawalla St park". This demonstrates that urban repair for residents' is not a priority.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

In addition, no credible authority in the world today would suggest that building huge urban motorways is the solution to cutting national greenhouse emissions, or that increases in vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) would somehow result in a net reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Yet this is exactly what the proponent is claiming in this EIS. I object to this flawed analysis.

PROCESS

I object to a planning system that awards billion-dollar contracts to tollway construction company when local government staff and many experts are convinced the WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

I object to a consultation period being held during January when schools are closed, residents are away and many local government staff are on holidays. The consultation period should be extended until March 2016.

SOCIAL IMPACT STUDY

Whole communities will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study - which is even less detailed than the inadequate one done for the WestConnex M4 East EIS - should be rejected, as it ignores well established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut and paste and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

NOISE

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

Yours sincerely,

Germana Eckert

Sydney NSW 2205, Australia

[redacted]

From: Kathryn Calman [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 11 January 2016 8:53 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox
Subject: Submission to SSI 14_6788 WestConnex New M5

Attn: Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment

I make this submission in response to the WestConnex New M5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), project number SSI 14_6788. I object to the project and the whole WestConnex for a range of reasons, which I have listed below.

I expect to receive a response to all of my concerns.

TRAFFIC IMPACTS

I object to the impact on traffic the New M5 will bring to my local suburbs. When complete, the New M5 will cause an extra 50,000 cars per day into our suburbs. The proponent estimates our key local roads, such as King Georges, Stoney Creek, Canterbury, Forest, and Moorefields will need to absorb this additional traffic due to motorists avoiding the tolls.

I object to the public announcements that King Georges Road will have a 49% improvement in travel time, yet the EIS acknowledges that the current LoS-F (Level of Service) will be the same with our without WestConnex.

The EIS ignores the published work of independent traffic and planning experts who have presented evidence based arguments that the Westconnex will not meet its goals. It should be rejected on that basis alone.

I object to the decision by AECOM to do no serious traffic modelling outside the project area; it is absurd to suggest that the impacts will stop at the end of the project. Instead communities will be left to deal with traffic and unhealthy pollution and the additional financial and social costs that will result from WestConnex.

I object to the failure of the Sydney Motorway Corporation to publicly reveal the peer review of the traffic model and their failure to reveal the assumptions on which it is based so independent traffic planners can test its results.

POOR ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

I object to the superficial consideration of alternatives which consists of little more than bald claims rather than presenting analysis of alternatives including public transport and traffic management that could reduce road freight and car use.

TRUCK MOVEMENTS DURING CONSTRUCTION

I object to hundreds of trucks a day for years transporting millions of cubic metres of soil including contaminated waste (asbestos) through Kingsgrove and Moorefields Road to the Western suburbs where it will be dumped without any clear plans or information for communities affected.

DESTRUCTION OF BIODIVERSITY

The RMS was given approval to build the old M5 on condition that it protected endangered flora and fauna. Now it wants approval to destroy those communities for a new tollway because its old project has failed to solve congestion. This makes the system of conditions meaningless. This proposal should be rejected.

I object to removal of most of critically endangered Cooks River Iron Bark forest at Kingsgrove. I note that scientists have observed that its value has been deliberately minimised in the EIS.

I object to the removal of 7 hectares of habitat of one of only two surviving colonies in NSW of endangered Green and Golden Bell Frogs for a massive tunnelling site.

TUNNELLING IMPACTS

I object to the selection of tunnelling methods that may damage houses at the surface.

AIR QUALITY

I object to a transport 'solution' that results in a further nine unfiltered exhaust stacks throughout highly populated suburbs.

It is unacceptable that a 35 metre exhaust stack is located in the valley of Kingsgrove, with schools, homes and sporting fields on higher ground.

I object to the use of an air quality model that has not been used in Australia before and which cannot be verified by the NSW EPA. I note that there will be an increase in dangerous pollution in some areas close to the tollway portals and near roads with increased traffic. It is not acceptable to me that a government should deliberately place the health of citizens in jeopardy.

I particularly object to tollway portals and increased traffic being so close to local schools. I note that fine particle pollution can cause lung cancer and is particularly dangerous for the lungs of growing children. I support the parents of local schools who have requested an extended period of time after school returns at the end of Janaury 2016 in which to seek independent advice.

URBAN LANDSCAPE DESIGN

I object to further deterioration to our amenity that this project will cause. Statements such as "the narrowed pedestrian access around the edge of the widened portion of the M5 East Motorway would not be out of character" completely dismisses the significant change to our urban environment with the legacy M5.

I particularly object to the transparent noise walls, as an "opportunity to enhance the driver experience with views across Canterbury Golf Course, Beverly Grove Park and Tallawalla St park". This demonstrates that urban repair for residents' is not a priority.

Almost 2 km of transparent noise walls in our area is not reasonable for any community to accept. Urban design that benefits the motorists at a significant impact to residents is simply immoral.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The whole WestConnex system will increase greenhouse gas emissions in Sydney at a time when we should be doing all we can to reduce them. I am not convinced by a method of analysis which does not look at alternatives but instead compares the New M5 project against a 'do nothing' scenario to claim a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

In addition, no credible authority in the world today would suggest that building huge urban motorways is the solution to cutting national greenhouse emissions, or that increases in vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) would somehow result in a net reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Yet this is exactly what the proponent is claiming in this EIS. I object to this flawed analysis.

PROCESS

I object to a planning system that awards billion-dollar contracts to tollway construction company when local government staff and many experts are convinced the WestConnex will not deliver on its objectives. This places unreasonable pressure on planners to approve the project.

I object to the fact that AECOM who have a record of failed traffic modelling has been paid $13 million to complete this EIS while it has other contracts which depend on the project going ahead.

There was no serious community consultation for the New M5. Public meetings where senior executives lecture hundreds of residents or stalls in shopping centres staffed by poorly informed casuals may tick a box but it does not amount to community consultation. The Community Feedback report is misleading.

I object to a consultation period being held during January when schools are closed, residents are away and many local government staff are on holidays. The consultation period should be extended until March 2016.

SOCIAL IMPACT STUDY

Whole communities will be disastrously impacted by this project. The social impact study - which is even less detailed than the inadequate one done for the WestConnex M4 East EIS - should be rejected, as it ignores well established evidence of the significant negative impacts on people of loss of community identity and social connections. The study is little more than a cut and paste and is insulting to residents, both those who are being forced to sell and those who will stay.

NOISE

Many residents will experience noise during construction and operation at unsafe levels that can damage health. I object to the lack of information about mitigation and the suggestion that those above a second story may not be mitigated at all.

The Beverly Hills area is already a high traffic noise area due to the existing M5. The lack of mitigation, and any suggestions by residents is termed not feasible, then not reasonable is unacceptable.

I recognise there is pressure on several NSW Departments, including Planning and the Environment, to approve this project. I remind public servants of their obligation to the public and to the potential social, health and economic costs of spending $16.8 billion on WestConnex when it provides no solution to Sydney's transport needs.

Yours sincerely,

Kathryn Calman

Sydney NSW 2209, Australia