Hinze Dam Stage 3

Environmental Impact Statement

Supplementary Report Addendum

August 2007

Hinze Dam Alliance

Addendum

This addendum has been prepared to addresses changes to the Hinze Dam Stage 3 Environmental Impact Statement Supplementary Report. The addendum should be read in conjunction with the Supplementary Report. It addresses issues which were noted subsequent to production of the Supplementary EIS Report. Changes include general amendments to text. These changes are described in Table 1. Following Table 1, the replacement Appendix A of the Supplementary Report has been reissued with realigned cross-referencing.

- **Table 1 Addendums to Text**

Page No. in Supplementary Report	Section No. in Supplementary Report	Existing Text/Figure	Addendums
Page 3-18	Section 1.7.1	Section heading reads "1.7.1 ERA 7 – Chemical Storage"	The heading should read, "3.3.1 ERA 7 – Chemical Storage"
Page 3-78	Section 3.9.1	Text reads "The Hinze fishway, by comparison, will operate on a flow of only 0.08m3/s but has a bucket more than half as large as the Tracy facility, at 750L."	The text should read, "The Hinze fishway, by comparison, will operate on a flow of only 0.08m3/s but has a bucket almost half as large as the Tracy facility, at 750L."
Pages 4-139 to 4-160	Appendix A	Public Submission Summaries	Updated cross-referencing in tables to realign with sections in Supplementary Report.

Appendix A Public Submission Summaries

Submission Number and Name	**1. Celestine Taylor**
Date Received	21 June 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.8.2	Avifauna – birds and butterflies
3.8.8	Vegetation Protection Orders
3.2.2, 3.3.4, 3.7.2, 3.8.2, 3.8.4, 3.8.6,3.17.3	Rehabilitation works

Submission Number and Name	**2. Department of Employment and Industrial Relations**
Date Received	4 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
Noted	Employment Strategy

Submission Number and Name	**3. Marjory and Robert Smith**
Date Received	4 July
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.10.4, 3.11.4, 3.12.1, 3.12.2, 3.12.3, 3.12.4, 3.12.5	Capacity of Advancetown Road ■ Traffic ■ Driveways ■ Pedestrians ■ Lighting and safety ■ congestion from closure of Upper Gilston Road ■ provision of paths, walkways and cycleways
3.11.3, 3.12.6	Use of Old Advancetown Road

Submission Number and Name	**4. Numbinbah Valley Environmental Education Centre**
Date Received	4 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.7.2	Numinbah Valley Environmental Education Centre ■ Loss of rainforest area for teaching ■ Impact on Centre access road ■ Impact on cabins
3.8	Rehabilitation of upstream sites

Submission Number and Name	**5. Neil Blair**
Date Received	5 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.8.2	Traffic levels on Advancetown Road – impact on wildlife
3.10.4, 3.11.4, 3.12.1, 3.12.2, 3.12.3, 3.12.4, 3.12.5	Capacity of Advancetown Road ■ Traffic ■ Driveways ■ Pedestrians ■ Lighting and safety ■ congestion from closure of Upper Gilston Road ■ provision of paths, walkways and cycleways
3.11.3, 3.12.6	Use of Old Advancetown Road
3.10.2, 3.10.3, 3.10.4,	Dust and fumes from construction
3.10.3	Degradation of water quality in domestic water supply tanks from dust generated by construction and machinery
3.14.1	Affect of construction on property values

Submission Number and Name	**6. Bev Blair**
Date Received	5 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.8.2	Traffic levels on Advancetown Road – impact in wildlife
3.10.4, 3.11.4, 3.12.1, 3.12.2, 3.12.3, 3.12.4, 3.12.5	Capacity of Advancetown Road ■ Traffic ■ Driveways ■ Pedestrians ■ Lighting and safety ■ congestion from closure of Upper Gilston Road ■ provision of paths, walkways and cycleways
3.11.3, 3.12.6	Use of Old Advancetown Road
3.12.4, 3.12.5	Closure of Spillway Road
3.10.3	Degradation of water quality in domestic water supply tanks from dust generated by construction and machinery
3.7.1	Reliability of rainfall to fill the dam
3.9.5	Nerang River needs to be flushed out to improve it's condition
3.6.3	Plans to replace/upgrade the recreation facilities at the dam

Submission Number and Name	**7. Frank Weber**
Date Received	5 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.11.3, 3.12.6	Use of Old Advancetown Road
3.14.1	Affect of construction on property values
3.11.4	Road traffic noise from Advancetown Road

Submission Number and Name	**8. Roger Miles and Suzanne Stallard**
Date Received	5 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.10.2, 3.10.3, 3.10.4	Dust and fumes from construction
3.11.4	Construction noise at Red Oak Drive – duration and the continuous nature of the noise causing an impact on residents and businesses run from home
3.14.2	Relocation of residents to alternative locations during construction
3.11.6	Need to repair structural damage to buildings that may be caused by blasting
3.10.3	Need for water filtration systems if found that dust was degrading tank water quality
3.11.5, 3.11.6	Blasting impacts on buildings (continuous and long term)
3.11.6	Preconstruction building surveys
Noted	Securing Red Oak Drive for Local residents use
Noted	Deterring traffic from Panorama Western Access

Submission Number and Name	**9. Department of Environment and Water Resources**
Date Received	5 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.8.12	The EIS should include a discussion of alternatives to the inundation of 'priority' areas including options and a discussion of their feasibility and costs.

Submission Number and Name	**10. Environmental Protection Agency**
Date Received	10 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.8.4	Rehabilitation plans to be included in the compensatory habitat plan
3.8.4	Timing of the delivery of the compensatory habitat plan is needed
3.8.4	The Compensatory habitat plan needs to be finalised as part of the EIS
3.8.4	The EPA wants to be involved in the development of the compensatory habitat plan
3.8.4	EIS needs to contain the vegetation offset strategy which underpins the Vegetation Clearing Application
3.10.1	Basis for modelling results and consistency with EPA guideline for deposition of dust
3.5.1	Review of GCCC contaminated and records to supplement the EMR/CLR searches
3.5.1	Assessment of contamination in the dam buffer area
3.5.2	Past land use and activities at the potentially contaminated sites of houses, hotel and caravan park
3.5.2	Contamination in areas where herbicides have been used, and the level of herbicide use on these areas
3.5.3	Abandoned vehicles – describe quantity of vehicles and scrap metal, condition of soil to determine level of contamination
3.5.4	Notifiable activities – will be triggered where petroleum products are stored

3.5.1	EMR/CLR search criteria
3.8.5 and Appendix D	Update figures with labels on regional ecosystems – figures 9.3, 9.3a, 9.3b, 9.3c
3.8.5	Update species tables 9.6, and 9.22
3.8.5	Review the description of regional ecosystem 12.11.1
3.8.5	Update species description/habitat for *Sarcochilus hartmannii*
3.8	Threatened species management and protection ■ Mitigation measures for species ■ Survey to identify suitable relocation sites ■ Include threatened species in the compensatory habitat strategy
3.8.5, 3.8.7	Clearing of the inundation area ■ Protection of threatened species from mechanical clearing – clearly state that these areas will not be cleared ■ Describe the strategy/approach to clearing the inundation area
3.8.3, 3.8.2	Road upgrades ■ Details on the impact of the road and culvert upgrades on species and vegetation ■ Impacts of the upgrades on the habitat found along the creeks crossed by the road ■ Tusked Frog habitat – impact of road works ■ Glossy black cockatoo food trees – consider ways to avoid loss of trees
3.8.2	Rehabilitation plans ■ Include *Allocasuarina littoralis* in rehabilitation plans ■ Include the food plants of the Richmond birdwing butterfly in rehabilitation plans
3.8.3	Significant flora ■ More significant impacts on threatened flora species than that stated in the EIS
3.8.3	Resilience of vegetation communities to short term inundations – what is our evidence for the claims in the EIS
Noted	EMPS are to accompany ERA applications
3.2.1	Hours are reported inconsistently in the EIS, needs to be reviewed and corrected
3.3.1	Chemical storage ■ Description of the chemicals to be stored on site, the capacity of containers and location of storage areas
3.3.2	Crude oil or petroleum ■ Description of oil/petroleum to be stored, capacity of containers and locations
3.3.3	Dredging works ■ Description of dredging works, information consistent with the EPA guideline
3.3.8	Regulated waste Storage ■ Description of regulated wastes to be stored, locations and quantities
3.3.4	Further details on quarrying: ■ Plan of operations for staging ■ Process of extraction ■ Site description ■ See Environmental Operations Information Sheet – ERA 20
3.3, Appendix C	Water and Stormwater Management ■ Settlement ponds – number, location capacity, release points, quality of water, where release are made ■ Monitoring process – event based sampling from the settlement ponds, how much rainfall needs to fall before an event sample is taken, who is responsible within the Alliance
3.11.5	Blasting ■ Blasting on Sunday – will this occur?
3.3.7	Concrete batching ■ Information on how concrete batching will be undertaken ■ Details on electrostatic precipitation ■ Location of plant, number of silos, materials to be used, overfill protection measures ■ pH correction of batching plant waste water

3.3.5	Screening ■ Dust control measures for crushing, screening, conveyors and stockpiles ■ Treatment of wastewater for screening
3.3.6, Appendix C	Water ■ Oil separator – maintenance procedures, release point for treated waters, discharge location, water quality monitoring ■ Slimes dam – location, capacity, release points, waterbody to which releases are to be made, water quality of released water, monitoring program
3.4.6	Sewage ■ Location of septic system ■ Approval from GCCC for such a system needs to be shown to EPA
3.4.6	Domestic wastewater ■ Definition of domestic wastewater, location of sediment ponds, capacity of sediment ponds for treatment and the treatment process
3.10.5	Dust suppression ■ Definition of recycled water to be used for dust suppression ■ An approval from GCCC is needed if water is coming from an STP
3.8.6	Rehabilitation ■ Site rehabilitation and decommissioning plan is to be provided – see detailed format at end of EPA submission.
3.17.2	Groundwater ■ The EMP needs to cover the monitoring of groundwater levels as set out in the EIS

Submission Number and Name	**11. David Willoughby**
Date Received	10 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.11.3, 3.12.6	Use of Old Advancetown Road
3.10.3	Degradation of water quality in domestic water supply tanks from dust generated by construction and machinery
3.16.3	The increase of the dam wall by 15 m will create an environmental impedance
3.11.6	Preconstruction building surveys
3.2.1	Confirmation of hours of operation – wants only daylight hours
3.11.5, 3.11.6	Blasting impacts on properties within the Blast Exclusion Zone
3.1.2	Why were flood mitigation gates placed higher to the spillway when a gated system would reduce the height and in turn overall cost

Submission Number and Name	**12. Peter and Dorothy Grenning**
Date Received	10 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.12.3, 3.12.5	Pedestrian/Bikeway for Advancetown Road for safety purposes.
3.11.3, 3.12.6	Use Old Advancetown Road as alternate route to Advancetown Road
3.11.4	Road Noise Barrier – a noise barrier should be built on Advancetown Road.

`

Submission Number and Name	**13. Beris McKavanagh**
Date Received	10 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.16	Concern regarding amenity
3.11.3, 3.12.6	Use Old Advancetown Road as alternate route to Advancetown Road
3.2.1	Construction times – how many days a week/how many hours a day?
3.2.1	Concern over projected traffic volumes and times of movements – only have three hours sleep a day.
3.12.2	Use more shuttle buses to transport workers to reduce traffic movements.
3.12.3	Advancetown Road will be unsafe and not able to cope with the traffic load during construction.
3.12.4, 3.12.5	Advancetown Road will be a much busier road post construction with Gilston Road being closed.
3.11.4	Health impacts of traffic noise disrupting sleep.
3.11.4	Loud exhaust breaks from prime mover low-loaders.
3.12.3	Traffic Speed and Safety – Concern that cars will travel too fast regardless of speed signs. Need to enforce. Safety issue for residents on Advancetown Road.
3.12.3	Advancetown road has insufficient street lighting
3.10.4	Concern regarding impact of air pollution on water quality of tank water.
3.11.4	Permanent Road Noise Barrier should be constructed along Advancetown Road outside of home 21 and 23. Should be 4 metres high and natural colour with tree shrubs planted on both sides of the barrier.
3.14.1	Impact of project on property values not adequately assessed.
3.14.1, 3.14.2	Concern that property values will have diminished because of project. Compensation?
3.14.1	Real Estate business was not considered in EIS. This project will have impacts on the local economy.
Noted.	Disagree with 'Volume 1: Executive summary: Section 2: Project rationale 2.4.3 opening paragraph' regarding net community benefits.
3.12.4, 3.12.5	Close access to dam from Advancetown Road after construction phase

Submission Number and Name	**14. Tanya Pavey-Lloyd**
Date Received	10 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.2.1	Construction hours and uncertainty
3.12.2	Uncertainty regarding traffic volumes and movements
3.12.3	Danger for children and horse-riders on Advancetown Road due to traffic speed limit. Should have speed limit of 40-50km and put safety signs up.
3.11.3, 3.12.6	Use Old Advancetown Road as alternate route to Advancetown Road
3.12.3	If Advancetown Road must be used, need to have safe walk easy off the road for people, cyclist and animals.

Submission Number and Name	**15. Ken McKavanagh**
Date Received	10 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.16	Concern regarding amenity
3.11.3, 3.12.6	Use Old Advancetown Road as alternate route to Advancetown Road
3.2.1	Construction times – how many days a week/how many hours a day?
3.2.1	Concern over projected traffic volumes and times of movements – only have three hours sleep a day.
3.12.2	Use more shuttle buses to transport workers to reduce traffic movements.
3.12.3	Advancetown Road will be unsafe and not able to cope with the traffic load during construction.
3.12.4, 3.12.5	Advancetown Road will be a much busier road post construction with Gilston Road being closed.
3.11.4	Health impacts of traffic noise disrupting sleep.
3.11.4	Loud exhaust breaks from prime mover low-loaders.
3.12.3	Traffic Speed and Safety – Concern that cars will travel too fast regardless of speed signs. Need to enforce. Safety issue for residents on Advancetown Road.
3.12.3	Advancetown road has insufficient street lighting
3.10.4	Concern regarding impact of air pollution on water quality of tank water.
3.11.4	Permanent Road Noise Barrier should be constructed along Advancetown Road outside of home 21 and 23. Should be 4 metres high and natural colour with tree shrubs planted on both sides of the barrier.
3.14.1	Impact of project on property values not adequately assessed.
3.14.1, 3.14.2	Concern that property values will have diminished because of project. Compensation?
3.14.1	Real Estate business was not considered in EIS. This project will have impacts on the local economy.
Noted.	Disagree with 'Volume 1: Executive summary: Section 2: Project rationale 2.4.3 opening paragraph' regarding net community benefits.
3.12.4, 3.12.5	Close access to dam from Advancetown Road after construction phase

Submission Number and Name	**16. Richard Hill**
Date Received	10 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.10.3	Degradation of water quality in domestic water supply tanks from dust generated by construction and machinery
3.11.4	Disturbance to sleep of shift workers from construction
3.11.4	Compensation for sleep deprivation and associated stress
3.15.1	Objection of land resumption for the project at Gilston Road – property have a number of grave sites, old macadamia trees that are world renowned
3.7.4	Concerns that the project will lead to siltation of a stream used for water supply at 943 Gilston Road

Submission Number and Name	17. Sharon and Graeme Bakon
Date Received	10 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	Summary of Issues
3.10.4, 3.11.4, 3.12.1, 3.12.2, 3.12.3, 3.12.4, 3.12.5	Capacity of Advancetown Road ■ Traffic ■ Driveways ■ Pedestrians ■ Lighting and safety ■ congestion from closure of Upper Gilston Road ■ provision of paths, walkways and cycleways
3.10.2, 3.10.3, 3.10.4	Dust and fumes from construction
3.11.4	Road traffic noise from Advancetown Road from air brakes
3.2.1	Hours are reported inconsistently in the EIS, needs to be reviewed and corrected
3.12.4	closure of upper Gilston Road will be unsafe and need to have alternative access to this area
3.11.3, 3.12.6	Use of existing sealed bitumen road on council property (Old Advancetown Road)

Submission Number and Name	18. Colin Tough
Date Received	10 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	Summary of Issues
3.11.3, 3.12.6	Use of Old Advancetown Road
3.10.2, 3.10.3, 3.10.4,	Dust and fumes from construction
3.10	Adverse impacts of vehicles/pollution on health, particularly drinking water quality
3.2.1	Construction hours needs to be controlled to limit impact on nearby houses
3.11.5	Implications of living within the Blast Exclusion Zone

Submission Number and Name	19. Nicole Tough
Date Received	10 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	Summary of Issues
3.11.3, 3.12.6	Use of Old Advancetown Road
3.2.1	Construction hours needs to be controlled to limit impact on nearby houses
3.11.5	Implications of blast zone on horses
3.11.5	Loss of income due to interruption of horse training, riding lessons
3.11.5	Will Council accept liability for accidents involving horses on nearby properties from blasting

Submission Number and Name	**20. Maree Darmody**
Date Received	10 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.10.3	Propose that GCCC pay for, or refund the cost of cleaning houses, water tanks and roofs due to dust from construction
3.10.2	What management solutions are to be used to eliminate air quality impacts on local residents
3.10.2	Air quality monitoring to be set up on properties slightly away from the site to identify impacts on residents
3.10.2	Daily air quality monitoring results to be made available to the pubic on the internet
3.3.4, 3.11.4	What management solutions are to be used to eliminate noise impacts on local residents
3.11.4, 3.11.7	Noise monitoring to be set up on properties slightly away from the site to identify impacts on residents
3.11.7	Daily noise monitoring results to be made available to the pubic on the internet
3.14.2	Compensation for the increased cost of electricity for extended use of air conditioners, as residents will need to spend more time indoors during construction due to the doubling of noise levels
3.11.4, 3.14.1, 3.14.2	What compensation will be offered to landlords who are unable to rent their properties in the event that current tenants move out due to noise and dust from construction and new tenants cannot be found
3.11.6, 3.3.4	Preconstruction building surveys
3.3.4, 3.11.6	What management solutions are to be used to eliminate vibration impacts on local residents
3.11.6	Vibration monitoring to be set up on properties slightly away from the site to identify impacts on residents
3.11.6	Daily vibration monitoring results to be made available to the pubic on the internet
3.6.2	Future use of land resumed for the project, on Gilston Road

Submission Number and Name	**21. Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries**
Date Received	10 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
Appendix E	Legislative Requirement for fishway at dam
3.9.1	Current hydrological and biological data needed for the design of the trap and transfer fish passage is insufficient.
3.9	Further discussions need to occur with DPI&F regarding key criteria for fish transfer system.
3.9.1	Existing or proposed infrastructure downstream of the dam can not restrict fish passage
agreed	Any downstream crossing upgrade (or existing) associated with the dam should not compromise the operation of the fishway/transfer arrangement.
3.9.1	Unresolved issue regarding no downstream fish passage
3.9.1	More data on fish communities and movement in the Nerang river system is needed.

noted	Stocking rates at the dam
noted	Genetic mixing of stocked and wild fish will be assessed by DPI&F when considering the fish passage provision as part of the waterway barrier works component of the development approval.
noted	It is the responsibility of the owner/operator to undertake surveys of mercury levels in fish in the dam following stage 3 completion.
agreed	Consultation should occur with local fish stocking groups, angling groups and fishing charters to optimise location and trim height of tree stands.
3.9.2	EIS fails to clearly quantify the actual area of habitat that is lost through inundation of upstream waterways.
3.8.4, 3.8.5, 3.9.5	Support for recommendation in specialist study report to offset lost habitat and this should included in Compensatory Habitat Strategy proposed under section 20.1.4.
agreed	Increase lake habitat does not compensate for the loss of natural riverine habitats.
agreed	Mitigation actions should be developed with DPI&F and other relevant stakeholders.
noted	The ANCOLD guidelines do not address the issue of fish transfer after decommissioning. The ongoing provisions for fish movement will need to be devised and incorporated in a fishway management plan.
noted	A fish transfer management and operating plan should be included in the handover documentation.
3.9.1	No reference in Aquatic Ecology section about discussions between DPI&F and Alliance regarding need for downstream passage.
3.9.1	No real assessment of the up or downstream aquatic plant habitat beyond the list of plants or discussion of fish habitat requirements.
3.9.1	Section 10.3.5 misleading as it appears to say that only eels require upstream and downstream passage.
3.9.3	No data or information is provided on recreational or commercial fisheries in the system in Section 10.3.5.
3.9.1	Tables 10.2 and 10.4 should be modified to include a column on fish that have actually been confirmed in the Nerang system and those that may or may not occur.
3.9.1	Fish surveys should provide information for both upstream and downstream passage.
3.9.1	It is not clear whether the socioeconomic calculations regarding the long term provision of the fish passage is based on the provision of upstream and downstream or upstream only.
3.9.2	The length of riverine habitat that will be inundated should be supplied (as well as the percentage) (Aquatic Ecology Technical Report)
3.9.4	Omission of mention of potential for a water quality decline especially in the first few years after dam filling and the impacts on this on fish communities in the dam and downstream of the dam (Aquatic Ecology Technical Report).
3.9.1	'further restrictions to fish passage' should include reduced medium and high flows passing the dam and therefore providing cues or sufficient depth for migrating fish (Aquatic Ecology Technical Report).
3.9.1	Questions feasibility of targeting fish passage (downstream and upstream) according to fish species (Aquatic Ecology Technical Report)
noted	Support of several mitigation and management suggestions (Aquatic Ecology Technical Report).
noted	An additional map of the whole Nerang catchment indicating some (most upstream and downstream) sampling sites is required (Aquatic Ecology Technical Report)
3.9.1	Describing whole fish community below the dam was limited by the use of only one sampling method which has limitations in deeper sections (Aquatic Ecology Technical Report)

noted	Quantitative details such as size structure, relative abundance etc should be been tabulated to show fish community structure (Aquatic Ecology Technical Report)
noted	Questions sampling robustness. Recommends longer-term sampling and use of better and larger range of sampling tools. Should extend sampling sites to the mouth of the river (Aquatic Ecology Technical Report)
noted	Furthest downstream limit of observational sampling (Weedons Crossing) should be included in the sites map (Aquatic Ecology Technical Report)
noted	Support of several recommendations regarding the operation of the dam (Aquatic Ecology Technical Report).
noted	Support for upstream and downstream fish passages (Aquatic Ecology Technical Report)

Submission Number and Name	**22. Queensland Water Commission**
Date Received	11 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
Noted.	Recommend changes to way South East Queensland Regional Water Supply Strategy and Southern Regional Water Pipeline are referred to.
Noted.	General grammatical changes
Noted.	Changes to volumes of water involved in aspects of the Gold Coast Water Supply Strategy
Noted.	Changes to footnotes suggested
Noted.	Suggested additional text inclusions through EIS sections
Noted.	Contradiction in Aquatic Ecology section
Noted.	Contradiction in Socioeconomic section

Submission Number and Name	**23. Valerie Jones**
Date Received	11 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.13.1	Grave concerns that leaving felled trees will increase the fire load in an already fire sensitive environment
3.13.1	Concern that burning cleared vegetation will lead to bushfires
3.10.2, 3.10.3, 3.10.4,	Dust and fumes from construction
3.14.1	Affect of construction on property values
3.16.2, 3.16.3	Views from Red Oak Drive will be ruined by the construction of the raised Dam wall
3.11.4	EIS fails to address the acoustic implications on Red Oak Drive
3.11.4, 3.11.5	Construction noise at Red Oak Drive – duration and the continuous nature of the noise causing an impact on residents and businesses run from home
3.11.4, 3.11.5	Concern that a project of this size will cause horrendous disruption from noise, including blasting
3.14.2	Relocation of residents to alternative locations during construction
3.11.4, 3.14.1	What compensation will be offered to landlords who are unable to rent their properties in the event that current tenants move out due to noise and dust from construction and new tenants cannot be found
3.11.6	Vibration impacts on properties in Red Oak Drive

Noted	Giving every resident in SE Queensland a water tank would be cheaper than spending massive amounts on the Great Wall of Hinze
3.11, 3.12, 3.16, 3.18	Serious potential for severe psychological and physical illness to occur among the residents of Red Oak Drive
3.14.1	Compensation for reduced property values and disturbed visual outlook

Submission Number and Name	**24. Department of Main Roads**
Date Received	11 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.12.7	Need to be make clear how many locations along the Nerang-Murwillumbah Road and Gold Coast-Springwood Road where the stability and integrity of the road embankment are affected by partial embankment inundation
3.12.8	Detail where culverts are to be inundated by the raised dam
3.12.8	Detail the analysis for the assessment of the inundated culvert
Noted	Hydraulics analysis and workings need to be in accordance with Main Roads "Road Drainage Design Manual: Chapter 3 Hydrology and Design Criteria"
3.12.9	Provide final concept drawings for the re-alignment of the Gold Coast-Springbrook Road
3.12.9	Traffic assessment be prepared for the intersection of Pocket Road and the Gold Coast-Springbrook Road
3.12.7	Concept design drawings of the Pocket Road bridgeworks be provided
Noted	Detailed investigations need to be undertaken according to the methodology detailed in the GARID for the assessment of pavements
3.12.1	Assessment of access to the dam from the Nerang-Murwillumbah Road
3.4.2	Sufficient detail needs to be provided for a section 33 approval which relates to the regulation of parties other than Main Roads who wish to carry out roadworks, or otherwise interfere with a State-controlled road
3.12.12	Main Roads is aware of one of the boat ramps being relocated. The proposal is for its access to intersect with the Nerang-Murwillumbah Road. If this relocation and significant upgrade is considered part of the EIS project, Main Roads will make its assessment through the EIS process, however, the concept plan will need to be included in the EIS documentation for this to occur. If the relocation and significant upgrade of the boat ramp is intended to be a separate development, it will require a separate approval either through the IDAS process or under the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994 .

Submission Number and Name	**25. GCCC Natural Areas Management Unit**
Date Received	11 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.8.9	Legislative definition of the essential habitat should be included
3.8.9	Essential habitat should be described in terms of what species use the essential habitat
3.8.4	Compensatory habitat outside the GCCC area should be used as a last resort
3.9.6	Aquatic ecology operation EMP does not cover environmental flows released from the dam

3.9.6	Aquatic ecology operation EMP should be expanded to include riparian vegetation and habitats and draw on GCCC existing programs for restoration
Noted.	Points made above in Aquatic Ecology Operation EMP should be included in the aquatic commitments in the EIS
3.8.6	Terrestrial ecology operation EMP does not cover terrestrial ecology and should cover how inundated vegetation will be managed, relocation of EVRs and compensatory habitat

Submission Number and Name	**26. Mathew Jones**
Date Received	11 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.13.1	Do not want cleared vegetation to increase fuel loads for fires or unnecessary fires to be lit to dispose of the cleared vegetation
3.16.3	Saddle dam should blend in with the surrounding landscape, especially from Red Oak Drive. Clearing in front of the saddle dam will make it more obvious
3.14.2	Relocation of residents to alternative locations during construction
3.11.4, 3.14.1	What compensation will be offered to landlords who are unable to rent their properties in the event that current tenants move out due to noise and dust from construction and new tenants cannot be found
3.14.2	Compensation for pain and suffering or loss of amenity

Submission Number and Name	**27. Andrew Poole**
Date Received	11 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.10.2, 3.10.3, 3.10.4	Dust and fumes from construction
3.10.2	No testing of air quality has been carried out at Red Oak Drive
3.16.3	Views from Red Oak Drive will be ruined by the construction of the raised Dam wall
3.11.4	No testing of noise has been carried out at Red Oak Drive
3.11.4	Disturbance to sleep of shift workers from construction
3.10.3	Compensation for brown mud that clogs rainwater tanks and affects residents health
EIS Section 13.6.8	What measures are to be provided to protect the safety of Red Oak Drive residents from sightseers, politicians etc wanting to get views of construction
3.10.2, 3.10.3, 3.11.4, 3.16	the EIS does not cover or address the impact of the project on the resident of Red Oak Drive

Submission Number and Name	**28. Peter Johnson**
Date Received	12 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
Noted	Removal of access over dam wall will stop weekend tradition of

	motorcycle clubs meeting up at the Dam
Noted	Construction of road link should be the first activity on the construction program
Noted	Local community infrastructure needs to be maintained
Noted	Permanent closure of the dam link will result in more people will using Latimers Crossing Road (which is in poor condition)
Noted	The road over the dam should be replaced with a road downstream of the dam – requires the header tank to be relocated south of its current position. This option has not been explored
3.12.5	By disconnecting link from Gilston Road to Advancetown Road the residents of Duncan Road are affected in the following ways: ■ Flooding on Gilston Road in large events means that Advancetown Road is normally used to get out over the dam. Not possible under new plans; ■ Bush Fire Evacuation – Duncan Road Residents can have fires coming from the north and south and will not be able to use Advancetown Road as evacuation road if fires come from the north; ■ Emergency Services will only have one traffic route to attend to local residents
Noted	Duncan and Gilston Roads being dead ends will increase the possibility/potential of crime activities
Noted	Increased travel for Duncan Road residents to access recreational facilities around the dam
3.10.2, 3.10.3, 3.10.4	Dust and fumes from construction
3.10.3	Has consideration been given as to whether dust will affect water supply in tanks
3.10.4	Health impacts from increased dust in houses
3.3.4, 3.10, 3.10.3, 3.10.5, 3.10.6	EIS not addressed severity of dust management
3.10.5	Volume of water needed to manage dust over such a large areas will be substantial and more investigations are needed
3.7.3	Concentration of activities downstream of dam wall will increase the potential of downstream impacts of fuel/oil spills
3.16.3	Saddle dam could cause significant visual impact on the residents of Duncan Road
3.16.3	Retention of existing downstream vegetation will significantly reduce the visual impact of raising the dam wall
3.8.6, 3.16.2	Vegetation to be retained needs to be clearly identified and assessed in terms of significance and visual impacts prior to any works occurring
Noted	Blanket ban should be considered on winning any material and any downstream vegetation
3.11.7	Duncan Road noise monitoring results have not been communicated to public
3..11.4	Concentration of activities downstream of the dam wall will result in an increased construction noise that can be avoided if relocated
3.11.5	Mental effect of blasting on young children
3.11.6	Dilapidation reports should be arranged and commissioned by an independent authority so no claims of bias
3.12.4	Closure of upper Gilston Road will be unsafe and need to have alternative access to this area
3.16.2, 3.16.3	Alliance has failed to produce any information on impact of saddle dam on visual amenity for Duncan road residents
3.18	Response and rectification of sediment and erosion control issues has been non-professional
3.18	No effective communication from Alliance
Noted	Site does not lend itself to raising of the Dam to the full Stage 3 limits

Noted	Dam does not make economic sense to go ahead with dam
Noted	Question need for Q20,000,000 immunity
Noted	Project not a fair outcome for Duncan Road residents
3.2.2	The clay borrow area should be moved to upstream of the dam so as to: ■ Preserve the natural downstream topography including significant vegetation that currently exists in the clay borrow area . ■ Potentially less refilling required ■ Less vegetation removal required ■ Greater control of runoff by the use of sedimentation ponds on the edge of the dams waterway ■ Less depth required hence less chance of productivity being impacted by water logging of site
3.2.2	The only reason that clay borrow area is downstream of the wall is because of ease of construction and lowering of costs
3.2.2	Additional site investigations must be undertaken to see if upstream site is suitable
3.2.2	Potential clay source in the vicinity of the existing rowing hut
3.2.2	Size of the borrow area looks small compared with the amount of material needed
3.2.2	Concern regarding the depth of the pit needed and the lack of contingency plans if there is insufficient materials gained from this area
3.2.2	How/with what will the borrow pit be re-filled with after extracting the clay? Impacts associated with this?
3.2.2, 3.3	Buffer zone between waterway and borrow area does not consider the requirements for trapping, treating and verifying and releasing site runoff
3.3	No water quality monitoring discussed in the EMP for the southern arm of the Nerang River which the clay borrow area will discharge to
3.3	EMP does not demonstrate how the site waters will be trapped and treated nor any sizing requirements for sedimentation ponds
3.3	EMP too generic and not site specific – Alliance needs to prepare a site based EMP
3.3	All works should be contained within the site boundaries and managed efficiently
3.15.1	Concern regarding preservation of historical trees planted by the Duncan family which are located near clay borrow area
3.3.4, 3.16.2	Haul roads required to transport clay from area to fill location have significant environmental, social and visual effects to residents
3.2.2, 3.3	Whilst EIS states that buffer zone must be maintained between clay borrow area and Duncan Road, an image in the Executive Summary shows the extent of the clay borrow area extending into private property, with no buffer, no water quality devices and encroaching into natural waterways
3.2	Image of the clay borrow area in the Executive Summary does not show proposed haul roads
Noted	Sediment and erosion control have been non-existent
3.2.3	Project must be structured so that an independent body sits over the Alliance and monitors their work activities
Noted	Current construction management will not be sufficient for such a significant project

Submission Number and Name	**29. Department of Natural Resources and Water**
Date Received	13 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.4.1	Approval needed to clear four parcels of land outside the CID
3.4.1	Additional information is needed for the clearing of vegetation on state land
3.8.6	Weed Management EMP should include a statement that herbicide is not to be used to clear areas that will be inundated or affected by runoff
3.3, 3.8.2, 3.8.4	Rehabilitation EMP should be amended to ensure that Revegetation within the subject site occurs at densities and with species consistent with the existing vegetation; and Restorative planting of vegetation should occur progressively during construction to maintain and establish wildlife corridors
3.8.6	Terrestrial Fauna EMP for construction should be amended to ensure that within clearing sites identified on the subject site large trees should be retained where possible to provide nesting hollows and habitat for native fauna
3.9.6	GCCC IROL will need to be amended for the upgrade of the dam
3.3, 3.4	Approvals set out in Appendix B requires alteration to properly reflect administering Legislation
3.4.3	The EIS does not appear to state whether water is required for construction purposes. If water is required for construction, an estimate of the volume and where it is intended to be taken from should be available
3.4.4	Where the proposal is outside the Special Facilities Zone, specifically regarding State Land and boundary watercourses, Native Title Notifications under the Native Title Act (Cwth) 1993 must be in place and the notification period finalised, prior to the commencement of the Decision Making Period under the Integrated Planning Act 1997
3.4.5	NRW is currently undertaking discussions with the Alliance with regard to determining requirements for further documentation on the safety component of the dam structure in order to satisfy the failure impact assessment of the proposal

Submission Number and Name	**30. Queensland Police Service**
Date Received	16 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
Noted	No additional information requirements.

Submission Number and Name	**31. AE, SD, JN, LJ, RP Roberts**
Date Received	17 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.10.4, 3.11.4, 3.12.1, 3.12.2, 3.12.3, 3.12.5	Capacity of Advancetown Road ■ Traffic ■ Driveways ■ Pedestrians ■ Lighting and safety ■ congestion from closure of Upper Gilston Road

	▪ provision of paths, walkways and cycleways
3.11.3, 3.12.6	Use of Old Advancetown Road

Submission Number and Name	**32. Gold Coast and Hinterland Environment Council**
Date Received	17 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.7.2	Numinbah Education Centre should be provided with compensation for the restrictions of its operations
3.8.11	Limited time spent on on-the-ground flora and fauna surveys (less than a full seasonal cycle). This does not provide a full picture of impacts on all species, especially those in inundated areas
3.8.11	Coordinator General should impose condition with the recommendation of the project that further surveys for the remaining seasons of a full annual cycle are conducted and the EIS amended to cover findings and mitigation measures i.e. impacts on calculations of Vegetation Offsets
Noted	Objection to findings that downstream part of the Nerang River is of no ecological value and can not be cost effectively restored to good ecological condition
Noted.	Legally binding conditions should be imposed on the project reflecting the commitment by the Alliance and strengthening some of the definitions and undertakings
3.4.1, 3.8.4	Any exemptions granted under the VMA would provide opportunities for the proponents of the project to avoid fully or partially obligations for vegetation offsets. These obligations need to be clarified by legally binding conditions imposed by the Coordinator General
3.4.1, 3.8.4	Offsets for Of Concern REs. - Mandatory requirements for using an offset ratio of 1:1.5 should be explicitly stated and committed by the Alliance or imposed as a condition to the recommendation by the Coordinator General
3.4.1, 3.8.4	Offsets for Of Concern REs**. -** If 1:1.5 conditions can not be met, a different ration and a larger area should be used to compensate for this loss of vegetation
3.4.1, 3.8.4	Offsets for Threshold Res - Mandatory requirement for using an offset ratio of 1:2 should be explicitly stated and committed to by the Alliance or imposed as a condition to the recommendation by the Coordinator General
3.4.1, 3.8.4	Offsets for Threshold REs **-** If 1:2 conditions cannot be met within the subregion, 4.5 hectares and not 3 hectares would be required to comply with Offsets Policy
3.4.1, 3.8.4	Offsets for Essential Habitat **-** Mandatory Requirements for using and offset ration of 1:1.5 should be explicitly stated and committed by the Alliance or imposed as a condition to the recommendation by the Coordinator General
3.4.1, 3.8.4	Offsets for Essential Habitat **-** If 1:1.5 is cannot be met within the subregion, 720 hectares and not 360 hectares would be required to comply with Offsets Policy
3.8.4	Additional Offsets for newly discovered species - Has essential habitat area for *Randia moorei* been included in the calculation of the size for essential habitat to be inundated? Needs clarification and potential recalculation of the total offset areas for essential habitat needed
3.8.4	Offsets for Waterways **-** Mandatory requirements to use an offset ration of 1:2 should be explicitly stated and committed to by the Alliance or imposed as a condition to the recommendation for the Coordinator General
3.4.1, 3.8.4	Offsets for Waterways **-** If 1:2 cannot be met within the subregion, 129.78

	hectares and not 86.52 hectares would be needed to comply with the Offsets Policy
3.8.4	Offsets based on wildlife corridor disruption **-** More information is needed to determine whether additional offsets should be required because of disruption to wildlife corridors. Additional offsets may be required if performance requirements for connectivity are not met
3.8.4	Offsets based on wildlife corridor disruption **-** The permanent inundation of Little Nerang Creek and Nerang River will reduce movement of fauna across them at the upper reaches of the dam and will reduce dispersal capability of some species in the catchment
3.10.6	Greenhouse Gas Emissions **-** The Coordinator General should impose a condition to provide for adequate carbon sinks or carbon credits for the project

Submission Number and Name	**33. Jeffrey and Susan Wengrow**
Date Received	26 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.8.2	Noise and vibration impacts on wildlife
3.8.2	Domestic pets will also be affected by blasting – may bark and cause further noise
3.10.3	Red Oak Drive residents are subject to strong winds – has consideration been given as to whether dust will affect water supply in tanks
3.14.1	Affect of project on property values and ability to sell
3.14.1	Deterioration in landscape and visual amenity will negatively impact on property values during construction
3.14.1	Noise and vibration levels will have a negative impact on property values both during and after construction
3.14.1	Will the devaluation in the value of properties be reflected in rates and land tax assessments
3.16.3	Views from Red Oak Drive will be ruined by the construction of the raised Dam wall
3.16.1	The Red Oak drive photo in the EIS is unrepresentative of the views from Red Oak drive
3.11.4	Construction noise at Red Oak Drive – duration and the continuous nature of the noise causing an impact on residents and businesses run from home
3.11.4	No testing of noise has been carried out at Red Oak Drive (27,33)
3.11.4	An increase of 10dB(A) corresponds to a doubling of loudness. People in Red Oak Drive will be subject to more than a doubling of loudness
3.11.4	Noise levels at Red Oak drive unacceptable – health impacts of residents staying indoors for 12 hours a day
3.11.4, 3.11.5, 3.11.6	Unpleasant for Red Oak drive residents to work or utilise the garden or land
3.11.4, 3.11.7	The EIS contained no estimate of current of expected noise levels at The Panorama and Red Oak Drive. Can these be provided?
3.11.7	Has the impact of meteorological variations such as wind strength/directions and temperature inversions on noise levels at The Panorama and Red Oak Drive been considered?
3.14.1	Noise and vibration levels will have a negative impact on property values both during and after construction
3.11.4, 3.11.6	Physical and mental health effects of exposure to increased noise and vibration levels?

3.11.5	According to the QLD EPA, blasting should be avoided at times when strong winds are blowing from the blasting site towards noise sensitive places. Will this be adhered to?
3.11.7	The effects of temperature inversions have not been included in the assessment of noise impacts. They should be included
3.11.7	Will there be daily monitoring to see if blasting should proceed?
3.14.1	Potential loss of income as a result of noise levels from construction
3.11.4	Tone, pitch and type of noise are all concerns not just the level of noise
3.11.4	Unable to utilise parts of property due to noise levels from construction
3.11.6	Vibration impacts on properties in Red Oak Drive
3.14.1	Noise and vibration levels will have a negative impact on property values both during and after construction
3.11.6	Impact on vibration on dam wall
3.11.4, 3.11.6	Physical and mental health effects of exposure to increased noise and vibration levels
3.8.4	Scant regard has been given to the wildlife and environment
3.2.1	Hours are reported inconsistently in the EIS, needs to be reviewed and corrected
3.2.1	Does the 36 month estimate take into account possible periods of lost time due to heavy rain?
3.11.5	How many blasts per day?
3.1.3	Question whether the project is financially viable with recent cost estimates of $380-$500 million
3.8.4	The damage to the environment will be horrendous and irreversible with 360ha of vegetation to be removed
3.4.1, 3.8.4	Not justified in clearing areas of essential habitat, state wildlife corridors and threatened ecosystems
3.11.7	Simulation of dam water levels and projected noise levels and not 100% accurate of infallible and can produce varying results. Ramifications of errors are enormous
3.11.7	Do noise modelling scenarios take into account the structure, materials used and design of the individual houses?
3.18	Community information session of 20 June 2007 was poorly organised and uninformative
3.18	When accessing the EIS by internet, some estimated numbers on the noise modelling results for each scenario are indistinct or difficult to read
3.13.2	Has a threat assessment been made of the likelihood of sabotage or a terrorist attack on the dam? It will be particularly vulnerable during construction.
3.13.2	Are there to be government security checks and police checks on workers?
3.13.2	How extensive is the security during the course of the project and how much will this cost?
3.1.4	Project is major in terms of cost, time and impact and unsure if sufficient time for thorough investigation and consideration.
3.1.1	Previous investigations concluded there to be little gained in additional water supply – project is not economically viable.
3.1.1	People were assured when buying in the area that HDS3 would not occur until 2025 if ever (GCCC 2000)
3.1.1	HDS3 may not significantly increase water supply
3.1.1	Why risk jeopardising the Gold Coast's water supply?
3.1.3	All work on the dam should be halted until all emissions have been addressed, there has been a thorough re-examination of estimates from different modelling methods and the financial viability of the project is

	reassessed
3.12.1	Questions feasibility of train transport for workers when the first train doesn't arrive at Nerang until 6:39am.
3.12.2	How did you come to the figures regarding where the workforce will be travelling from when positions have not yet been advertised at the time the EIS was prepared?
3.12.2	Do traffic estimates assume workers stay on site all day and not leave at lunch time – this is unlikely?
3.12.2	The EIS claims no traffic impact along Worongary Road – highly unlikely.
3.16.2, 3.16.3	Concern about the effects of light pollution from the worksite at night on residents at Red Oak Drive.
Noted	Inaccuracies and omissions in EIS result in concern about the viability and safety of the project
Noted	Catastrophic implications if errors or miscalculations in the EIS i.e. wall cracks during/after construction

Submission Number and Name	**34. Gold Coast Catchment Association**
Date Received	26 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.9.5	The Hinze Dam EIS does not sufficiently address the negative outcomes for the Middle Nerang Catchment
3.9.5	Impacts if not addressed will have long term detrimental impacts on the Low Nerang River Catchment and its future sustainability as a community asset
Noted	The Executive Summary does not reflect the outcomes of the Research reports and Specialist studies contained within the body of the EIS
3.9.5	The EIS does not contemplate/recommend mitigation options to compensate for the downstream impacts of the HDS3
3.9.5	The Aquatic Ecology specialist report paints a much darker portrait than reality with regard to the Nerang River. Some areas are listed as being in good quality
3.9.5	Gold Coast City Council's Health of the Waterways Report 2002, Healthy Waterways Ecosystem Health Monitoring Program, Gold Coast Catchment Management Strategy (Aquatic and Riparian Ecological Assessment Study), Vegetation Remediation and Rehabilitation Plan Nerang River Weedons Crossing to Fyfes Road Nerang etc all comment of the health of the Nerang River – contradicts information in Aquatic Ecology Report
Noted	GCCC and community recognise that Nerang River needs investment and have begun to attempt reversal of present issues through many means. Many partnerships have been formed to progress these planning outcomes
Noted	Local communities have invested a great amount of time on the middle Nerang Catchment and many working groups formed
3.9.5	The suggestion in the EIS for HDS3 of an "offset strategy" is unlikely to have community support. It will cause disruption and possible cessation to the short and long term strategies and planning that have been achieved thus far for the river
3.9.5	This "offset strategy" has not been discussed with any of the interest groups involved and this concerns the community
3.9.5	Concern that the "offset strategy" has the ongoing potential to bleed funding from the Middle River by way of lowering its standing as a "project of worth". Community may witness shift of priority away from their own river to other riparian system and this may prove a

	discouragement to volunteers who take part in looking after the middle catchment
Noted	The operators of Hinze Dam should have an involvement in the downstream catchment as the impoundment has a direct negative affect on the middle reach riparian systems
3.4.3	Does the Hinze Dam and the HDS3 meet the community expectations as to their compliance to the Water Act 2000 Chapter 2 – Allocation and sustainable management – Part 1 – preliminary 10 [2] (c) (IV)
Noted	The proponents should adopt a more community friendly set of strategies towards the Middle Catchment of the Nerang River
3.9.5	The operators of the project should provide on-going compensatory funding towards downstream projects
3.9.5	The operators of the project should provide a funded commitment to weed management downstream of Hinze Dam
3.9.5	The operators of the project should provide an ongoing active participation in the collective management of future activities aimed at improving catchment management strategies in downstream riparian zones
3.9.5, 3.9.6	The operators of the project should ensure that environmental flow releases be revisited with the aim being that the DRN&W consider the options as to an increase in the spring/summer environmental flow releases and a reduction in the autumn/winter flow releases
3.9.5, 3.9.6	The operators of the project should give due consideration to the investigation of a future regime of "spiked flow events" to offset the impacts of the HDS3 and the altered flood flow that will be the outcome of the new dam configuration. The long term sustainability will be affected by the reduction of peak flow events
Noted	The Nerang River's future below the Hinze Dam and the impacts downstream should have been a priority point of the consultation process and now is an issue of concern
Noted	The EIS should reflect the need for the operations of Hinze Dam to enshrine and enhance the future of the river not abandon it
Noted	Money should be spent on the middle catchment so the river has a sustainable future
Noted	Unfortunate if the outcomes of HDS3 were a warning to communities that water and profit from water resources do not encompass true community benefit
3.9.5	Environmental integrity of rivers downstream of impoundments are not accounted for when infrastructure is built and sustainability of our river systems is not a priority when water is in high demand
3.9.5	The EIS is flawed in regards to the outcomes for the middle catchment of the Nerang River and proponent should seek to review the suggested outcomes by a series of workshops with a well balanced committee
Noted	The middle reaches if the Nerang River may never regain pristine qualities but its future sustainability is everyone's responsibility
3.9.6	The greatest impost to the health of the Nerang River is Hinze Dam and the proponents of HDS3 seek to negate their responsibilities as far as mitigation of environmental and social impacts

Submission Number and Name	**35. Department of Local Government, Planning, Sport and Recreation**
Date Received	27 July 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
Noted.	No additional information requirements.

Submission Number and Name	**36. Ken McKavanagh**
Date Received	03 August 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.11.3, 3.12.6	Use of Old Advancetown Road
3.18	Stalling campaign of releasing information is evident
3.12.6	Merit of a Permanent Alternative Access Road replacing the original proposal of reactivating Old Advancetown Road.

Submission Number and Name	**37. Councillor Ted Shephard**
Date Received	03 August 2007
Supplementary Report Section	**Summary of Issues**
3.10.4, 3.11.4, 3.12.1, 3.12.2, 3.12.3, 3.12.4, 3.12.5	Capacity of Advancetown Road ■ Traffic ■ Driveways ■ Pedestrians ■ Lighting and safety ■ congestion from closure of Upper Gilston Road ■ provision of paths, walkways and cycleways
3.11.3, 3.12.6	Use of Old Advancetown Road
3.16	Concern regarding amenity