

# Moorebank Precinct West Stage 2 Proposal Response to Submissions

## Appendix A: Community response table



**SIMTA**

SYDNEY INTERMODAL TERMINAL ALLIANCE

Part 4, Division 4.1, State Significant  
Development

Table 1 Community Response Table

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
Traffic	Congestion / Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that a holding yard for 60 heavy vehicles is not sufficient</li> <li>Concerns about traffic increases from the Proposal</li> <li>Concerns about the increase in heavy vehicles</li> <li>Trucks moved from Botany to Moorebank</li> <li>Concern that the Proposal would add to existing traffic congestion roads in the vicinity of the project. Specifically, M5, M7, Newbridge Rd, Heathcote Road and the Hume Highway</li> <li>Proposal would add to increasing road congestion created by upcoming apartment developments and from general population growth in the area</li> <li>Concerns that support vehicles and trucks from the Proposal would create congestion on the surrounding road network</li> <li>Concerns that vehicles travelling to and from nearby industrial areas would result in congestion on feeder roads</li> <li>Concerns that the Proposal would result in congestion in nearby suburbs including Moorebank, Chipping Norton, Casula, Liverpool and the Prestons</li> <li>Concern that surrounding intersections would not be able to accommodate traffic movements from trucks generated by the Proposal</li> <li>Impacts of additional traffic movements on the M5 and M7 increasing congestion</li> </ul>	<p>173124, 173958, 170625, 170685, 170604, 173727, 172981, 169388, 173725, 170071, 173976, 173978, 173966, 173974, 174039, 174416, 174060, 174384, 174318, 174426, 174804, 174727, 174861, 176048, 176051, 176055, 174763, 174702, 176069, 176065, 176034, 176042, 176040, 175981, 176038, 174754, 176467, 176453, 176352, 176336, 176437, 176316, 176301, 176309, 176311, 176320, 176328, 176271, 176299, 176102, 176252, 176244, 176263, 176095, 176246, 176099, 176111, 174725, 176307, 174825, 176075, 173970, 170021, 174873, 174871, 176459, 176449, 176046, 176332, 176273, 176292, 176324, 176318, 176092, 176256, 176429, 176425, 174306, 176024, 176391, 176360, 170125</p>	82

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<p>for vehicles travelling to and from the greater south west and western regions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns that construction of the Proposal is commencing prior to road upgrade projects on the surrounding roads. The Proposal relies of these to reduce congestion</li> <li>• Concern that the Proposal would shift larger container trucks into a higher volume of smaller trucks increasing congestion</li> <li>• The project only has one road frontage resulting in more congestion at the Northern and Southern intersections on Moorebank Avenue</li> <li>• Vehicle breakdowns on minor and major roads in the locality impacting traffic flow</li> <li>• Additional accidents from increased truck movements resulting in more congestion in locality</li> <li>• Congestion from the movement of fill to site</li> </ul>		
	Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How has the reduction in truck movements on the M5 been calculated? The same number of vehicles will still be required to deliver goods from the Proposal.</li> <li>• Traffic modelling has not been based on reliable data</li> <li>• Data used for the traffic modelling is outdated</li> <li>• The traffic accident study area has changed since the Concept Plan EIS and does not demonstrate how the</li> </ul>	173966, 174131, 173970, 176360, 174873	5

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<p>project may affect nearby accident blackspots e.g. the Hume Highway</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic model uses 2010 traffic counts for the M5 Bridge which is not representative of present conditions and does not account for the M5 widening</li> <li>• EIS does not discuss traffic movements from their origins / destinations to Moorebank Avenue</li> <li>• Congestion on the M5 bridge has not be addressed in the EIS</li> <li>• The assessment does not mention traffic delays and queueing from the Proposal as identified in previous EIS's.</li> </ul>		
	Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic, particularly heavy vehicles, potentially causing an increase in traffic accidents</li> <li>• Concerns that the project would increase congestion and hinder emergency response vehicle access</li> <li>• Concerns around the safety of trucks merging on to the M5 Motorway</li> <li>• Concerns around cyclist safety on Moorebank Avenue</li> <li>• Safety of heavy vehicles using local roads</li> </ul>	173124, 173966, 174702, 176024, 176342, 176320, 176263, 176429, 176292, 176324, 176318, 173970, 174306, 176044, 176385	15
	Road Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Damage to roads from increases in heavy vehicle numbers</li> <li>• Road infrastructure upgrades should be completed prior to the Proposal</li> <li>• Existing road infrastructure is not adequate to support the project</li> </ul>	173124, 176292, 174306, 176240, 176358	5

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cambridge Avenue would need to be upgraded and extended to Heathcote Road to accommodate heavy vehicle movements</li> <li>Additional roads and intersections to those identified in the EIS would require an upgrade to accommodate the proposal</li> </ul>		
	Use of local roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commuter vehicles utilising back roads to avoid congestion</li> <li>Heavy vehicles utilising local roads</li> <li>Increase in traffic on surrounding local roads</li> </ul>	176240, 173966, 176055, 175981, 174737	5
	Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient access for heavy vehicles with only one main entry point</li> </ul>	174306	1
Noise	Crushing plant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise impacts from the crushing plant on the suburbs of Casula, Glenfield and Wattle Grove</li> <li>Noise impacts to residents from extended hours of crushing plant</li> </ul>	174131, 173124	2
	Operational noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise from rail movements including wheel squeal and stationary idling vehicles</li> <li>Noise from operation of the proposal</li> <li>Noise from specific sources such as reversing alarms, horns, pneumatic braking, trains shunting, containers clanging together, starting engines</li> <li>It is illogical to suggest that because background noise levels are already above guidelines that slightly more noise would not be an issue</li> </ul>	173674, 174131, 174129, 175987, 175993, 176044, 176356, 168220, 173664, 173974, 176055, 173966, 176240, 173124, 170604	15

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extended operating hours of the warehouse terminal will negatively impact on residents</li> <li>Sleep disturbance from 24 hour operations</li> <li>Noise impacts to residents, schools and day-cares from 24 hour rail movements</li> <li>Noise from light and heavy vehicles traveling to and from the site 24 hours a day</li> <li>Wheel squeal impacts to residents on Tusculum Court (Wattle Grove)</li> <li>Impacts from idling trains on the rail line waiting to access the warehouse</li> </ul>		
	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise impacts from 24 hour operations</li> <li>The Proposal will result in noise impacts to residents in what are now considered quiet neighbourhoods</li> <li>The area is already affected by noise from the railway, motorway, Army and Defence, Kingsford Smith Airport Operations, Bankstown Airport Operations. The intermodal would result in cumulative impacts that would exceed reasonable noise levels.</li> <li>Noise impacts to Glen Regent Estate (Casula)</li> <li>The increase in site level from greater quantities of fill will result in greater impacts from operational noise</li> <li>Noise impacts to Glenfield Farm</li> </ul>	169388, 168220, 174060, 173168, 174131, 176042, 176048, 175987, 175993, 176030, 176034, 176040, 176038, 176055, 176453, 177851, 176342, 176273, 176324, 176299, 176271, 176097, 176240, 176320, 170685, 170851, 176046, 176248, 176391	29
	Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EIS does not provided a thorough noise assessment</li> </ul>	174129, 174131, 176356, 168220	4

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assessment of noise impacts to residences is inadequate</li> <li>• CadnaA noise model does not produce accurate and realistic noise level predictions</li> <li>• The noise model inputs are not based on reliable data</li> <li>• An increase in noise due to the increase in local traffic from the Intermodal terminal has not been fully examined</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to shift workers when setting acceptable daytime noise levels.</li> <li>• Monitoring locations L1, L2 and L3 were not appropriate and provided skewed results</li> </ul>		
	Mitigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No noise mitigation has been provided to mitigate impacts to adjacent residents from increase vehicle movements on Anzac Road</li> <li>• There is no plan to minimise noise impacts to receivers</li> <li>• Mitigation measures will be unable to prevent wheel squeal on the rail link due to the curve radii</li> <li>• What noise mitigation is proposed for residents in Casula and Wattle Grove</li> <li>• Noise mitigation is inadequate to prevent noise impacts to the residents of Casula</li> <li>• Insufficient noise mitigation has been provided to mitigation impacts under 'adverse conditions'.</li> </ul>	174508, 176048, 176030, 174131, 176358, 174865	6

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise walls should also be included along the eastern side of the rail entry line.</li> <li>Annual noise reporting would not be sufficient to capture single exceedances of noise limits</li> <li>Bushland buffer is inadequate to mitigate noise impacts to the southern area of Wattle Grove</li> </ul>		
Air	Air quality / pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that additional heavy vehicles and trains from the Proposal will result in increasing air pollution (in particular diesel emissions) impacting on nearby residents and the environment</li> <li>Impacts for dust generated by truck movements and particles from truck payloads dispersing into the air</li> <li>Decrease in air quality in the local and regional air quality from dust and pollution</li> <li>Increase in pollution generated by increased congestion and heavy vehicle movements</li> <li>The Proposal would exacerbate pollution in an area that is already considered to have high levels of pollution</li> <li>Removal of natural vegetation which 'filters' the air may increase air pollution</li> <li>Impacts to air quality from gas used for container cleaning / fumigating</li> <li>Air quality impacts from crushing plant operation to residents in Casula, Glenfield and Wattle Grove</li> </ul>	<p>173124, 170021, 170625, 170685, 173725, 173664, 173168, 173978, 173966, 173964, 174318, 174129, 174861, 176017, 174725, 175987, 175993, 176055, 176065, 176044, 176042, 176038, 177851, 176342, 176356, 176240, 176299, 176311, 176301, 176273, 176328, 176092, 176244, 176248, 176246, 176097, 172981, 176320, 176040, 174060, 173958, 173727, 173976, 174384, 176048, 176069, 176024, 176336, 176309, 176429, 176459, 176453, 176318, 174865, 176324, 176046</p>	56



Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dust pollution generated by the crushing plant</li> <li>• PM2.5 emissions are already in exceedance of NEPM standards without the project.</li> <li>• TSP generated by the Project would offset gains made by technologies to reduce PM10 emissions in the area</li> <li>• The project should not operate 24 hours per day due to the low level mixing depths of the area</li> <li>• Retrofitting should be considered to curb emissions and more effort should be made to prevent emissions through better use of technologies.</li> <li>• Emissions standards used in the EIS are old and have been superseded e.g. use of Euro III when Euro VI is available.</li> <li>• Pollution impacts from idling trains on the rail line waiting to access the warehouse</li> </ul>		
	Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality monitoring should be undertaken in areas closer to the most adversely affected receivers</li> <li>• Use of annualised monitoring data would cover up high emission events</li> <li>• Annualised monitoring is inadequate to report on key air quality indicators. Provision, monitoring, reporting and action resulting from rolling 24 hour monitoring for air quality indicators needs to be mandatory to reduce exposure.</li> </ul>	176356, 174426, 174865	3

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact of diesel emissions on nearby schools have not been considered</li> <li>The PM10, PM2.5 and TSP emissions generated by the proposal should not be viewed by comparison with the existing, but assessed as the collective impact of proposal emissions and the background</li> </ul>		
	Particulate matter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What increases in PM10 and PM2.5 will occur as a result of the project in the area surrounding the site? What increases will occur as a result of the combined projects?</li> <li>Will the increases in PM10 and PM2.5 arising from the intermodal developments push the levels of PM10 and PM2.5 (in any location) above the guidelines set by the World Health Organization?</li> </ul>	173966	1
Human health	Pollution / air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns around emissions from vehicles, trucks and trains that are potentially carcinogenic</li> <li>Increased dust and pollution will affect people's health particularly young children</li> <li>Impacts to air quality from the project would result in health impacts to nearby schools, childcare centres and homes</li> <li>Concerns around air pollution and particulates (including diesel particulate matter) from the project resulting in various impacts to health including: Shortened life expectancy, increases outbreaks of asthma, cancer in newborns, lung cancer in children, autoimmune diseases, bronchitis,</li> </ul>	170021, 170685, 168220, 170468, 173966, 173974, 174039, 173970, 174825, 174727, 174731, 174733, 174729, 174702, 176034, 176453, 176240, 176356, 176320, 176292, 176271, 174129	22

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<p>coronary disease, cardiovascular disease</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased impacts to those suffering asthma and other respiratory conditions</li> <li>Air quality in the Liverpool area basin will worsen with the introduction of an intermodal freight terminal and will create health problems for the community, particularly respiratory disease.</li> </ul>		
	Sleep disturbance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sleep disturbance from the Proposal resulting in impacts to human health</li> </ul>	174039, 174022, 176271, 176356	4
	Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acceptability of the health assessment relies on reduction in pollution levels from wood heater compliance programs and improvements in vehicle emission standards</li> </ul>	176356	1
	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient studies into the health effects of the project</li> <li>General impacts to health and wellbeing of nearby residents</li> <li>Impacts from stress</li> <li>Impacts to mental health of residents</li> <li>Impacts to health from the project is unacceptable</li> <li>Large increases in working population, straining health services in the area</li> </ul>	174022, 170071, 173974, 176260, 176467, 176254, 176273, 176111, 174883, 176097, 173958, 173976	12
	Effects of particulate matter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What health effects are likely to occur in the local population resulting from increases in PM10 and PM2.5 levels associated with the Intermodals?</li> </ul>	173966, 173970	2

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts to health from PM2.5 in diesel fumes generated by truck and train movements</li> </ul>		
Flora and Fauna	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns for flora and fauna removed from the site</li> <li>Project would impact on native flora and fauna and destroy habitat for local species</li> <li>The destruction of bushland and impacts to surrounding habitat would increase likelihood of animal illness</li> <li>Impacts to natural bushland</li> <li>Impacts to endangered species</li> <li>Project would impact on local fruit bat population</li> <li>Impacts from removal of riparian vegetation adjacent to the Georges River</li> <li>Increased wildlife strikes from more trains/trucks</li> <li>No insect control methods for use in detention basins have been proposed</li> </ul>	170021, 170685, 174060, 174384, 174508, 174737, 176034, 176459, 176467, 176427, 176309, 176273, 176322, 176271, 176318, 173978, 174754, 174861, 176256, 176336, 173725, 172981, 174865, 170625	24
	Vegetation management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project would require land clearing</li> <li>Further vegetation clearance required to manage bushfire</li> </ul>	174508, 178095	2
	Impacts to Native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts to Bellbirds on the Casula side of Georges River</li> <li>Impacts on native species from pollution</li> <li>Impacts on bird and possum species</li> <li>Impacts to the local Koala population.</li> </ul>	176459, 170625, 173727, 173725, 173978, 174508, 176044, 174804, 174039	9

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts from removal of 43 hollow bearing trees</li> </ul>		
Other issues	General Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project would contribute to the Urban heat island effect</li> </ul>	176273	1
	Hours of operation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>24/7 (including night and weekend) operations are unacceptable</li> <li>Object to the change to in working hours to allow pre-construction stockpiling. This task should be completed by bringing in more staff and equipment.</li> </ul>	173974, 176356, 176358	3
	Georges River/Waterways impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearing of land will increase the vulnerability of the area to flooding</li> <li>The project is in close proximity to the Georges River which may result in contamination from accidental spillage of chemicals and waste and runoff impacts from the Proposal</li> <li>Concerns that the project will impact on efforts to restore the Georges River</li> </ul>	170625, 173727, 170604, 172981, 173725, 173978, 173974, 174060, 174157, 176467, 176336, 176322, 176309, 176271, 176240, 170685, 173970	17
	Aboriginal Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to the involvement of the GLAC Gandangara (Local Aboriginal Council) and the Thurawal Local Aboriginal Land Council as they did not have indigenous heritage officers during their involvement.</li> </ul>	178095	1
	European Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project would impact on items of significant European heritage (to Moorebank and the national identity) including Kitchener's House, Casula Station and footbridge, Casula viaduct, The Strach and Cust buildings and the Dog Cemetery</li> </ul>	178095	1

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
	Bushfire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The southern areas of the site have the potential to increase the bushfire threat</li> <li>Risk of bushfire ignition from trains creating sparks</li> <li>The project would limit fast and safe access for emergency vehicles in bushfire situations</li> </ul>	178095	1
	Light pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lighting from 24/7 operations has the potential to impact on nearby residents</li> <li>Lighting may impact on flora and fauna including threatened species</li> <li>Floodlighting is scheduled until 11pm</li> <li>Lighting may impact the breeding patterns of native mammals</li> <li>Use of metal Halide lights will contribute to 'sky glow' and lighting impacts to residents and flora and fauna</li> </ul>	173976, 173966, 174825, 176030, 174022, 176342, 176260	7
	Visual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts to views from walking tracks of Leacocks Lane</li> </ul>	170851	1
	Contamination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contamination impacts from fumigation of containers with chemicals such as Methyl Bromide</li> <li>Disturbance of existing PFAS contamination from firefighting activities</li> <li>Appendix I - REMM 8R on page 25, should the survey of asbestos be clarified and widened to include "samples of all asbestos identified areas" and "selected soil samples?"</li> <li>Is site handover conditional of the findings from more extensive PFAS/PFOA testing? If not, what testing regime is intended to be conducted to</li> </ul>	174129, 174804, 174865, 174861	4

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		assess groundwater ingress of these pollutants? An independent survey should be undertaken to confirm presence and distribution, and permit to enacting of pollutant removal from the site.		
Planning process	Approvals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Proposal should not be approved due to the potential impacts to the surrounding environment</li> <li>The approvals process has not be undertaken correctly and is not transparent.</li> <li>A proper EIS has not been undertaken</li> <li>Release of EIS at Easter when residents were potentially away</li> <li>The approvals process and split development at the site leading to confusion</li> </ul>	174157, 174129, 176242, 173974, 173970, 176358, 176360	7
	Combined project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EIS should be completed for all projects at once</li> <li>The combined impact of both intermodals has not been sufficiently assessed</li> </ul>	173966, 175987, 175993, 176055, 177068	5
	Environmental Management Documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the CEMP be publicly available?</li> <li>How will the CEMP be regulated?</li> <li>Works period A is scheduled to occur prior to the construction phase of the Proposal, therefore prior to the development of the CEMP. How would the construction activities be regulated during this period?</li> </ul>	173124, 174865	2
	Tech studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns around the quality of the data in the specialist noise report.</li> </ul>	174131, 176055, 175987, 175993, 176240	5

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
Economics		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modelling data should be independently verified</li> </ul>		
	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor leadership for the Proposal</li> <li>Poor planning for the Proposal</li> <li>Mitigation for the Proposal is insufficient</li> </ul>	173168, 174131, 173974, 174804, 174306, 174721	6
	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responsibility to pay for Hume Highway upgrade</li> <li>The Proposal prioritises profit over community interest</li> <li>Economic benefits are derived from taking 3000 vehicles off the road but EIS demonstrates that the number would be significantly less than this</li> <li>Funding for the project</li> <li>Economic costs of adverse health impacts</li> </ul>	173124, 174416, 173962, 174873, 175987, 177851, 173966	7
	Reduction in property prices and compensation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decrease in property prices</li> <li>Request for reimbursement of property capital loss</li> <li>Impacts to nearby residents economic wellbeing</li> <li>Affected properties should be compensated to provide mitigation (e.g. double glazing)</li> <li>Directly affected residents should be compensated</li> </ul>	170685, 174384, 176342, 176427, 176442, 176273, 176271, 176108, 176111, 173966, 169388	11
Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employment numbers would be higher with a greater mix of industries</li> <li>Project should provide greater employment opportunities</li> </ul>	176090, 172999, 176240, 174873, 176360, 176030, 176055, 173976, 175993	9	



Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dispute employment numbers stated in the EIS. The use of automation would reduce these numbers significantly</li> <li>Decreases in employment in the region</li> <li>Employment should be preferentially provided for nearby residents</li> </ul>		
	Cost of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indirect cost of the project to the region not covered in the EIS</li> </ul>	170625	1
Community	Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How can residents ask questions and raise issues with the Proponent?</li> <li>How will residents be communicated with in the future?</li> <li>A community engagement plan including a community consultative committee, has not been implemented</li> <li>Consultation to date has been insufficient. Specific locations have been neglected</li> <li>Glenfield not included within consultation area</li> <li>Newspaper and newsletters are inadequate forms of consultation</li> <li>The process should halt until further consultation has been undertaken</li> <li>Advertisements were not placed in local newspapers</li> <li>Consultation does not align with legal obligations</li> <li>Consultation information has been difficult to understand and includes Jargon / industry terms</li> </ul>	173124, 173253, 173974, 173968, 174508, 176040, 176356, 176391	8

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation in languages other than English</li> </ul>		
	Impacts to community and lifestyle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Proposal would impact on community, families and lifestyle</li> <li>The Proposal would change the character of the area</li> </ul>	172999, 170071, 174721, 174129, 174508, 176248, 176075, 176342, 176437, 176305, 176322, 176330, 176104, 176115, 176061, 176244, 176111, 176254, 176332, 170021, 173976	21
	Cultural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project will have a negative impact on the Casula Powerhouse which is of cultural significance to the community and visitors</li> </ul>	176320	1
	Social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project will lead to vast dislocation of surrounding residents due to negative impacts</li> <li>Further information should be provided on social statistics in Wattle Grove and Casula</li> <li>Project will increase drug related crime</li> </ul>	169388, 173966, 176320	3
	Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal could become a target for terrorist attack</li> <li>Biosecurity risks (such as fire ants and the zika virus) from freight</li> <li>Explosion, leakage or emissions from containers and freight</li> <li>Proposal would compromise the safety of the region</li> </ul>	173966, 174129, 176038, 173970	4
	Rail network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts to commuter train availability</li> </ul>	174702	1

