

## **Initial Comments and Questions on the OCU package.**

### **General**

The first two points relate to the visual impact both for the neighbouring house and for Regional Park users.

1. The OCU image show a unit that is much bigger, higher, and bulkier than the concept design led us to expect. Are the cross pipes being so high really essential to the function? They are also very large dimension pipes, much bigger in relation to the tanks than in the concept.

2. The two tanks are now shown much further apart than in concept and as a result the slab is much longer – do they really need to be so far apart?

Please provide photos of the three most recent of the 60 OCUs installed elsewhere in the Sydney Water system.

3. Do all three of the options meet statutory requirements in relation to noise impacts? Have noise studies been carried out for each as they were for the REF?

4. Will all three options equally solve the odour and corrosion problems?

5. Are all three feasible and constructible?

6. Sydney Water has provided some 'standard' criteria for projects. Please now provide us with those that are proposed for this OCU specifically. If we can be expected, as a group of people mostly not known to one another and with conflicting interests, to produce a set of agreed criteria in 3.5 hours, this is surely possible for Sydney Water before the second workshop.

7. While detailed costings are no doubt yet to be worked out, we should be provided with ballpark figures or, at least, a rank ordering of the options (this has in effect been done for eg vegetation impact in the package provided, where, similarly, detailed impact has yet to be worked out).

8. Similarly, could we be provided with rankings of the three options against each of the SW criteria, other than Environment and Community, which is what we are presumably working on in the workshops.

9. Please advise us of the weightings accorded to each of the five criteria SW standardly uses; better still, the weightings proposed for the site-specific set of criteria to be applied here.

10. The example Sydney Water criteria (2.1, 4.2, 5.2) include elements that are impacts on the community and should appear only under criterion 3 to avoid double counting.

11. Can we assume that the risk of operational failure is the same for all three options? Clear that the impacts of failure would differ.
12. What kind of operational failures are considered likely? At what frequency?
13. The Sydney Water criteria seem not to include the recurrent costs of maintenance and operation. Do these not differ across the three options?
14. Is the quantity of maintenance work SW (criterion 5.1) expected to differ across the three options?
15. How do the three options vary in relation to the quantity and complexity of construction (SW criterion 2.2)? How do these factors affect the cost of construction in each case?
16. The visual mock-ups in the package show the different prospects facing visitors to the Park. Could we see similar mock-ups of the view from No. 20?

### **More detailed**

1. The size of the OCU slab is very hard to read in each option. Can its dimensions be provided please.
2. How high is the stack proposed? Is it the same for each option? How high does the piping rise above the slab?
3. At least three things decrease the distance in Option W from the OCU to the adjacent house:
  - The width of the slab plus adjacent hardstand for trucks is about 10% wider in Option W than in Option A
  - In Option S the reinstated stairway is shown built over the older one, but in Option W shown as being some distance to the east of it.
  - There is less use made of intrusion into the road reservation than in the WCPS version of Option W, so that the S end of the slab is not as far removed as it might be.Could these be adjusted and the separation between the house and the OCU tanks at nearest approach be reported? It would be helpful to have a scale shown on the diagrams.
4. Option W as WCPS presented it originally (Let's call it W1) had a sound barrier built between the OCU and the residence at No.20. This is not shown in Option W2. Is there a reason for this?
5. What other measures can Sydney Water introduce to reduce impacts on No.20?
6. Is it possible to lower the OCU slab in Option W by cutting into the rock below?