



Contents

1.	Introduction	1-1
1.1	Purpose of the Supplementary Report	1-1
1.1.1	Submission Management Process	1-2
1.2	Assessment Process	1-3
1.2.1	Level of Detail	1-3
1.3	Consultation	1-3
1.3.1	Location of Public Displays	1-5
1.3.2	Bangalee and squatter Communities	1-5
1.3.3	Tannum Boyne Coastcare	1-5
1.3.4	Public Display Materials	1-6
1.3.5	Public Review Period	1-6



Tables

- Table 1-1 Submissions Received

1-2



1. Introduction

This Supplementary Report has been prepared in response to submissions received on the EIS during the notification period extending from 10 December 2007 to 4 February 2008 and is consistent with the approvals process outlined within Section 1.5 of the Hummock Hill Island Development (HHI Development) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The purpose of the Supplementary Report is not to duplicate the original EIS, having already prepared an EIS in accordance with Terms of Reference (ToR), but to provide further clarification of specific issues raised in submissions. Thirty-eight submissions were received by the Coordinator-General (CG) and are summarised in **Appendix A. Section 2 to Section 17** of the Supplementary Report respond to the issues raised in each submission.

This Supplementary Report, together with the EIS, will form part of the supporting documentation that will be reviewed and considered by the Coordinator-General under the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971* (SDPWO Act) and the Federal Minister for the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act) as part of the environmental assessment of the HHI Development.

Following the review and assessment of the Supplementary Report, the CG will prepare a report evaluating the supporting documentation. In that evaluation report, the CG may state one or more of the following:

- the conditions that must attach to the development approval;
- that the development approval must be for part only of the development; or
- that the approval must be preliminary approval only.

Alternatively, the CG's report may state:

- that there are no conditions or requirements for the HHI Development; or
- that the application for development approval must be refused.

In setting imposed conditions, the CG may:

- state when the imposed conditions take effect; and
- nominate an entity that is to have jurisdiction for the condition ("the nominated entity").

1.1 Purpose of the Supplementary Report

As highlighted above, it is not the purpose of this document to duplicate the original EIS but to provide further clarification of specific issues raised in submissions. The Supplementary Report aims to:

- provide comments and clarification of the HHI Development description in the EIS;



- summarise the submissions and providing technical responses to the issues raised in the submissions;
- provide conclusions with regards the key issues raised in the submissions; and
- provide recommendations to the CG in relation to the HHI Development.

1.1.1 Submission Management Process

Thirty-eight submissions were received by the CG. Of these submissions, nineteen were from government agencies or local Councils, fifteen were from individuals, three were petitions and one was from a non-government organisation. The list of submitters is provided in **Table 1-1**.

■ **Table 1-1 Submissions Received**

Submission Number	Submitter	Submission Number	Submitter
1	Civil Aviation Safety Authority	20	L. Woodsworth
2	Civil Aviation Safety Authority	21	Petition - multiple submitters
3	R. Woodburgess	22	Petition - multiple submitters
4	P. Higgins	23	Petition - multiple submitters
5	J. Munn	24	Burnett Mary Regional Group
6	T. and S. Andreatta	25	Environmental Protection Agency
7	K. Petrie	26	Department of Mines and Energy
8	I. Simmons	27	Department of Education Training and the Arts
9	Curtis Coast Environmental Protection Association	28	Department of Primary Industry and Fisheries
10	Department of Housing	29	Department of Main Roads
11	J. Arens	30	Queensland Transport
12	Department of Housing	31	Department of Natural Resources and Water
13	R. Robinson	32	Queensland Health
14	R. Woodburgess	33	Department of Communities
15	B. Atfield	34	Gladstone City Council
16	C. Atfield	35	Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts
17	G. Atfield	36	Calliope Shire Council
18	N. Atfield	37	Miriam Vale Shire Council
19	D. Atfield	38	Department of Emergency Services

A cross reference table identifying the issues in the submissions is provided in **Appendix A**.



1.1.1.1 Key Submission Issues

The key issues raised in the submissions received about the Hummock Hill Island EIS are summarised below:

- the sequence of development in the local region;
- impact of increased boating activities including boat strike to turtles and dugong;
- clearing of coastal dune;
- stormwater runoff and impacts on marine habitats;
- extent of clearing of native vegetation;
- habitat fragmentation;
- provision of essential services; and
- anthropocentric impacts on native fauna species.

1.2 Assessment Process

1.2.1 Level of Detail

One submission claimed that because the HHI Development is at an early stage of formulation and detailed design studies have not been undertaken to inform the EIS process and that this will limit opportunities for Council to provide definitive comments or recommend conditions.

As discussed in Section 1.5.1 of the EIS, the EIS has been prepared under the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act, 1971* (SDPWO Act) Significant Project Process to support an application for preliminary approval for a material change of use for the proposed land on Lot 3 on FD841442.

The Proponent's objective is to seek preliminary approval for the proposed HHI Development with all further approvals to be sought from State agencies and Gladstone Regional Council following the issue of the evaluation report from the CG. During this time, Gladstone Regional Council will be provided with the opportunity to review more detailed information as part of the Material Change of Use Application and if deemed necessary, provide further conditions to the development.

1.3 Consultation

As discussed in Section 1.6 of the EIS, the community consultation undertaken for the EIS and during the public consultation period aimed to:

- notify the community that the EIS had been lodged for assessment by the Coordinator-General and call for written submissions on the EIS by community members;
- satisfy the statutory requirements of the SDPWO Act in relation to the exhibition of the EIS and invitation for written submissions;
- provide information to stakeholders and community members to enable their review of the EIS and project reference design; and



- obtain input from local Councils, Queensland Government and Federal agencies on the EIS.

A range of communication and consultation activities were undertaken with community members and stakeholders to assist their review of the EIS. These included:

- hard copies of the EIS were distributed to Miriam Vale Shire Council offices and Miriam Vale Shire Library, Calliope Shire Council Administrative Centre and Calliope Shire Library, Boyne Island Library, Gladstone City Library and the Gladstone City Council Civic Centre. These reports were available from 10 December 2007 to 4 February 2008;
- publication of the EIS on the HHI Development website, CD copies (available free of charge) and hardcopies of the EIS (available for purchase);
- five advertisements were placed prior to the public displays, three appeared in the News Mail and two in the Gladstone Observer;
- 6000 letters inviting the community and stakeholders to the public displays were delivered to residents in the Miriam Vale and Calliope districts;
- access to information and feedback tools including the HHI Development website, freecall 1800 number, reply paid mail service and project email;
- three information sessions were held during the public consultation period; and
- briefings to Local Council, Queensland and Federal Government agencies.

Three public displays were during the period in which the Draft EIS was available for public comment. These displays were held in Turkey Beach, Miriam Vale and Benaraby and were preceded with advertisements and press releases to inform the community of the dates and location of the displays. The proponent and project staff attended the public displays and were available to discuss project details. A total of 19 members of the public visited the three displays over a three day period in January 2008.

Three submissions claimed that the community consultation undertaken during the development of the EIS and during the public consultation period was inadequate, specifically:

- the community forum should have been held in the Boyne Island/Tannum Sands area;
- the Bangalee and squatters community were not included on the list of stakeholders;
- the Tannum Boyne Coastcare group was not appropriately consulted;
- maps of seagrass, fish habitat areas and boat ramps were not shown during the public display; and
- the EIS fails the terms of reference where "The public consultation process must identify broad issues of concern to local community and interest groups" and "Details of the public consultation process and the major issues emerging from that process must be clearly addressed in the EIS."



Appendix B1 (Consultation Report) provides a detailed summary the consultation activities undertaken during the development of the EIS and during the public display period.

1.3.1 Location of Public Displays

The location of the Phase 1 (EIS development) public display was selected following discussion with Miriam Vale Shire Council on the most appropriate location to target 'affected' and 'interested' persons. The locations of Phase 2 public displays (EIS public display) were selected for their geographic location in relation the development and based on local knowledge gained from the phase 1 public display. It was appropriate at this stage of the EIS process to engage as many stakeholders as possible and thus three centrally-located venues were chosen.

1.3.2 Bangalee and squatter Communities

The Bangalee and squatter communities though not specifically listed in the stakeholder identification list were included as stakeholders in Section 16.1 of the EIS under 'residents surrounding Hummock Hill Island' for consultation purposes.

The EIS consultation team attempted to provide information to the Bangalee and squatters community through two specific avenues. Firstly, the team contacted Australia Post via several local post offices to find postal addresses to send information to these communities. Secondly, the team sent invitation letters to residents of the Miriam Vale, Calliope and Gladstone City Council areas via an all-resident letterbox drop (utilising Census collection data) which included Bangalee. The consultation team attempted to contact the squatter community however following further discussions with Australia Post Offices in the local area it was established that as a squatter community they did not have access to postal services, was not listed officially, nor were any of the squatter community members known to staff.

However the impact on these communities was extensively taken into consideration throughout the EIS, including but not limited to social, environmental and visual impacts.

1.3.3 Tannum Boyne Coastcare

The Tannum Boyne Coastcare (TBCC) group was specifically consulted by the EIS team. In April 2007, a meeting was arranged by two members of the EIS team at the Tannum Surf Club with the Treasurer of the TBCC, Theresa Wilkie. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the HHI Development and any concerns that TBCC may have. At this meeting, the EIS team provided the TBCC with an overview of the HHI Development and the EIS process. The TBCC representative discussed work that the TBCC were undertaking including water quality monitoring in Colosseum Inlet and the clean-up of the southern area of Wild Cattle Island. The TBCC representative identified a number of areas for concern for the group including:

- ownership of the land;
- loss of remnant vegetation;
- sedimentation of waterways associated with vegetation clearing; and
- loss of current uses of the island for local tourism (isolated location).



These issues were then included and considered as part of the EIS process.

Furthermore, the HHI Development team recorded that members of TBCC also attended the public displays held in January 2008.

Further information about the consultation process undertaken for the HHI Development is provided in **Appendix B1** (Consultation Report). This Consultation Report also outlines where in the EIS responses to issues raised during consultation were addressed.

1.3.4 Public Display Materials

The public displays were designed to allow the HHI Development consultation staff and the Proponent to discuss and present information on the HHI Development and to answer questions in an informal and relaxed environment. The materials used at the public display were designed to support the EIS by providing stakeholders with information about the HHI Development as well as encouraging their involvement in the EIS process. The public display materials included:

- an aerial photo of the site of the proposed HHI Development and concept plan overlay including lease and environmental boundaries (Phase 1 and 2);
- a map of Hummock Hill Island delineating land use and key areas of development (Phase 1 and 2); and
- seven posters providing details on the HHI Development, the EIS process, environmental management and approach to sustainability (Phase 1).
- a series of nine posters providing details on the HHI Development, the EIS process, environmental management and outcomes of the Draft EIS (Phase 2);
- a map of the proposed 'Town Centre Precinct' (Phase 2);
- a map of the proposed Golf Course or 'Open Space Precinct' (Phase 2);
- a map of the proposed 'Village Centre Precinct' (Phase 2); and
- copies of the Draft EIS (Phase 2).

Detailed information about the existing environment and potential impacts associated with the HHI Development were presented in the EIS in full. Not all information in the EIS was able to be presented in the public display, however was publically available through the EIS.

1.3.5 Public Review Period

A number of submissions raised the issue that the public review period was insufficient.

The public review period for the EIS was determined by the Coordinator-General in accordance with s33(1)(d) of the SDPWO Act. The duration of the public review period for the EIS was considered appropriate and provided sufficient time for community members to review and provide comments on the EIS.