

Appendix A

Submission Register

This page was intentionally left blank.

Table A-1: Summary of Submissions

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
1-1	Private submitter	Submitter lives very close to the proposed rail corridor and seeks relocation to another site (including all facilities) and negotiation about financial assistance in the relocation process.	Noted 2.3.3
1-2	Private submitter	Submitter is concerned that the viability of their farm will decrease as a result of the proposed rail corridor through various environmental impacts which may lead to a lack of beef weight gain in cattle.	2.3.3, 4.6 and 6.2.4
1-3	Private submitter	Submitter seeks approval to selectively clear an area of land that is presently restricted to compensate for the loss of production from pasture area within the proposed rail corridor.	Noted, 5.3
1-4	Private submitter	Submitter has concerns about property impacts including provision of access for walking cattle and wide farm machinery. Questions the security of tenure over private entry and the crossing of the rail corridor and seeks details about public liability. Mesh fencing of the corridor to be provided on their property prior to construction, and clarification about the specific access arrangements to their property.	2.3.3
1-5	Private submitter	Possible decrease in property value.	17.4
2-1	Wildlife Preservation Society of QLD	Clearing be kept to a minimum and this policy enforced on the ground. Minimal impacts upon creeks includes minimising impacts on riparian vegetation, wetlands and flood channels associated with the creeks - these are all important breeding locations. Erosion and run-off must be carefully managed during construction. John Stanisic should be enlisted to survey the riparian areas.	Noted
2-2	Wildlife Preservation Society of QLD	Avoid clearing at site 19 on the "The Brae" Cracow.	5.3.3.2
2-3	Wildlife Preservation Society of QLD	The EIS does not identify the location of the construction camps. Siting needs to be done carefully to minimise disturbance and fragmentation.	Noted, 2.4.10
2-4	Wildlife Preservation Society of QLD	Support for multi-use corridor where possible.	Noted
2-5	Wildlife Preservation Society of QLD	Provisions to maintain stock routes and road reserves are important as these areas are often the only remaining remnant vegetation communities.	5.3.3.5
2-6	Wildlife Preservation Society of QLD	Submitter recommends that fauna crossings under bridges and culverts should be adequate but concerned about the ability of native gliders to cross the rail corridor due to long gliding distance.	5.6 and 18.5.6
2-7	Wildlife Preservation Society of QLD	Sourcing surface water for construction purposes should be undertaken with minimum disturbance to water holes or streams. If water is obtained from the Dawson River at Delusion Crossing then extreme care must be exercised should as this area is one of the known sites of the Boggomoss Snail.	6.4 and 18.5.6
2-8	Wildlife Preservation Society of QLD	Submitter highlighted the importance of GQAL and recommends to try to avoid as much as possible.	Noted
2-9	Wildlife Preservation Society of QLD	Offsets need to be looked at carefully. It may be beneficial to put environmental offset resources to some biological areas in the upper Dawson Catchment. The submitter seeks collaboration from proponents to combine offsets and identify acceptable offsets in consultation with locals and the environmental groups (e.g. WPSQ).	5.4.1
2-10	Wildlife Preservation Society of QLD	Submitter highlighted the importance of the EMP, particularly its proper enforcement, public review and continued adaptability in the face of new circumstances.	Noted
2-11	Wildlife Preservation	Submitter is concerned about the cumulative impacts for the Upper Dawson River and implications of short-term exploitive decisions on the valley's future	Noted

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
	Society of QLD	ecosystem and food producing capacity.	
3-1	Private submitter	Submitter is concerned that their property is at risk of infestation by noxious weeds as a result of the project. Particular concern relates to the spread of Parthenium Weed due to soil disturbance and vehicles associated with the construction and maintenance of the railway line. Submitter requested a weeds survey to be carried out by a proponent representative and his son. Submitter promotes a washdown protocol for the project and identifies infrastructure requirements for washdown facilities.	4.6.4
3-2	Private submitter	Number not used – part of 3-1	na
3-3	Private submitter	Number not used – part of 3-1	na
3-4	Private submitter	Concerned about potential impact to current property water supply. Alternative reliable water source to be provided to severed paddocks prior to the commencement of construction.	4.6.3.2
3-5	Private submitter	Redundant fencing should be removed and new fences constructed to provide practical paddock layout.	2.3.3
3-6	Private submitter	Some existing roads through properties will be severed by the rail corridor. New roads will be required to provide access to various parts of the property. Some new roads may require all weather access to existing facilities.	2.3.3
3-7	Private submitter	Submitter states that the project will affect the movement of young cattle to another property at Theodore. This movement is possible by walking at present, however the young stock are not accustomed to noise and other distractions. As a result, the movement of young cattle between these two properties may require trucks, be more labour intensive and more expensive as a result of the rail corridor.	8.6.5
3-8	Private submitter	Submitter states that noise from the project will be a nuisance to grazing livestock in adjacent paddocks, including paddocks which are used to graze breeding cows. Concerned that the noise disturbance will increase the chance of the cows failing to calve. Also concerned that attempts to reorganise the grazing of the breeding herd may not be possible, as the affected paddocks are the best paddocks for depasturing the breeding herd.	8.6.5
3-9	Private submitter	Submitter concerned about possible loss of revenue through decreases in the sale of young bulls as a result of diminished ability to breed young bulls on the property.	2.3.3
3-10	Private submitter	Contamination of pasture by coal dust and the subsequent reduction in stocking rates in these paddocks, reducing the carrying capacity of the property as a whole. Wind generated by train movement, combined with cross winds will determine the distance that dust particles are blown from the train carriages. Distances will be greatest where the rail line is elevated above the adjoining land.	7.6.4
3-11	Private submitter	Heavy vehicle movement and other construction traffic along Cracow Road will damage the surface of the road, making it more dangerous for all road users. Bridge over Boam Creek and Otrack Creek should be upgraded.	10.4.1
3-12	Private submitter	Submitter concerned that the heavy vehicles associated with the construction of the rail line using Cracow Road will be dangerous for them and anyone else relying on Cracow Road for access to their property.	10.4.3 and 10.4.5
3-13	Private submitter	Submitter states that Cracow Road bridges over Boam Creek and Otrack Creek are very narrow and incapable of supporting B-double livestock vehicles. Concerned that most construction vehicles will be equivalent to the size of a B-double.	10.2
3-14	Private submitter	Submitter concerned about the effects of heavy vehicles and other traffic associated with the construction of the rail corridor on the surface of Carmody Road. It is a gravel road, designed as a reasonably low volume road and it is infrequently maintained. The road should be upgraded to a sufficient standard which reflects the increase in vehicular use. Submitter states that Carmody Road may become damaged from increased use, and may pose a danger to all users.	10.4.1

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
3-15	Private submitter	Number not used – part of 3-14	na
3-16	Private submitter	Number not used – part of 3-14	na
4-1	Private submitter	Submitter concerned about the heavy vehicle traffic on Carmody Road during construction and operation of the rail corridor poses a danger to their family while travelling this road to access their residence. The school bus (containing 21 students) will have to deal with the increases in heavy vehicle traffic and negotiating narrow bridges on the Theodore-Eidsvold Road will be problematic. Delays on the road may also affect emergency access to hospital, which has been a regular necessity for this family in the past.	10.4.1.1
5-1	Dept of Communities	Submitter considers the EIS to provide a comprehensive analysis of Department of Communities' issues and interests. Effective communication and mediation mechanisms addressing likely negative impacts must occur in a way that maximises coordination and engenders collaborative responses to identified social infrastructure needs. A holistic and inclusive approach should be taken with engagement of stakeholder agencies, so that no service needs "fall through the gaps".	13.3.1, 13.3.4
6-1	Private submitter	Submitter lives close to the proposed rail corridor, in proximity to Nathan Road. Major concern is level and frequency of noise from trains, and the potential impacts on health, work and general wellbeing.	8.6.2.3
6-2	Private submitter	Submitter concerned about the long term health impacts associated with the release of coal dust.	Noted, 7.6.4
6-3	Private submitter	Submitter concerned about the impacts of coal dust on the grazing quality of grasses, which is important for their income.	7.6.4
6-4	Private submitter	Concern raised about reduction in property value due to the proximity of the rail corridor. Seeks clarification about how individual landholders are assisted in dealing with noise, dust and property value issues.	2.3.3
7-1	Department of Education, Training and the Arts	The EIS, in general, satisfactorily meets the information requirements of the Department of Education, Training and the Arts (DETA). If the rail corridor traverses any departmental property, notifications and negotiations are requested.	Noted
8-1	Qld Transport	The EIS excludes the development of rail spurs to proposed coal mines, such as the spur for the Wandoan Coal Project. The Wandoan Mine EIS also did not include rail spur connections.	Rail spur part of Wandoan Coal Project EIS
8-2	Qld Transport	The EIS needs to clarify which rail gauge is proposed (narrow or dual).	2.4.2
8-3	Qld Transport	The economics section of the EIS understates the significance of the rail link to the region (positive implications for the transport network and regional development for the Surat Energy Province). There is no recognition of the global financial downturn on timeframes or demand for services.	14.2
8-4	Qld Transport	The transport section of the EIS does not address the issue of transportation of hazardous or dangerous goods. Clarification about the nature, quantities, routes and anticipated number of trips of any hazardous or dangerous goods, as well as specification of any strategies to mitigate risks, are required.	10.4.4
8-5	Qld Transport	Submitter highlighted that the transport study would benefit from the provision of further data on over dimension vehicles.	Noted
8-6	Qld Transport	Submitter seeks consideration of bus transportation of construction workers to and from their principle place of residence. EIS includes an assumption that these trips will be by private vehicle with occupancy rates of 1.5 people per vehicle, implying that there will be between 600 and 900 private vehicle trips at the start and end of each work period. Consideration needs to be given to more efficient and sustainable modes such as bus transport from key centres including Brisbane, Toowoomba and Gladstone.	10.4.5
8-7	Qld Transport	Submitter concerned about road safety implications of workers driving private vehicles to townships for entertainment, particularly given the high likelihood of	10.4.5

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
		alcohol consumption at these times. Submitter encourages the education and training of the workforce with respect to safe and responsible driving.	
8-8	Qld Transport	Submitter highlights the likely impact of the rail corridor upon the township of Wandoan, including loss of amenity and sleep disturbance for residents. Submitter states that the guidance from the Environmental Protection (Noise) Policy 1997 has been superseded by a new policy which commenced on 1 January 2009. New policy states that more optimal noise levels should be targeted for new rail corridor development, unless there are constraints on the location and design of the railway. Seeks clarification on consideration of alternate routes to minimise noise impacts at Wandoan.	Noted, 2.3, 8.2
9-1	DEIR	Compliance with the State Government Building and Construction Contracts Structured Training Policy (10% Policy) is applicable to the project. The submitter is pleased that there will be attempts to extend the 20% policy to this project, although not compulsory outside designated Indigenous communities. DEIR keen to assist the proponents to maximise employment opportunities for local people, including local Indigenous people. DEIR may assist proponent in complying with the 20% Policy.	14.5
10-1	Private submitter	Clarification on the meaning of "low intensity rural nature" and how the determination is made as to whether activity is "high" or "low" in nature.	4.3
10-2	Private submitter	Submitter states that many tributaries, streams and gullies will be intersected by the project, feeding into numerous water storages and many smaller (yet critical) storages on affected and adjoining land. Believe the EIS understates the importance of these watercourses and water storages.	Noted, 6.2
10-3	Private submitter	Submitter believes that landowners have not been given a choice of acceptance or non-acceptance for the project. Refutes the statement relating to a "strong feedback loop" between landowners and the project design team. Many questions raised at the beginning of the process have not been answered satisfactorily.	2.3.3
10-4	Private submitter	Submitter believes that all livestock and farming operations within the immediate vicinity of the rail corridor will be negatively impacted (rather than potential for this to occur).	Noted
10-5	Private submitter	The EIS does not include commitments for the collaboration or discussion with landholders about weed identification, location or control measures. Also seeks input from landholders into the Weed Management Plan.	4.6.4
10-6	Private submitter	Questions whether the rail corridor largely follows existing road reserves along the Cracow-Theodore Road, nor does it avoid mineral lease areas around Cracow.	2.3
10-7	Private submitter	Questions whether the alignment avoids major communities and agricultural activities in the study area, and seeks clarification about what a "major agricultural activity" is.	4.6
10-8	Private submitter	Submitter highlights the importance of ongoing erosion and sediment control, rather than just during construction of the rail line. Seeks clarification about why the Nathan Dam (unconstructed) is of more apparent concern than the weirs (Gryanda, Orange Creek, Theodore and Moura) and other smaller, yet critical, storages.	Noted, 18.5
10-9	Private submitter	Amalgamation details of the local councils in the study area should be updated.	4.3.2
10-10	Private submitter	Submitter concerned that landowners are required to make submissions in order for particular issues to be addressed, and believes that the proponent is already aware of all issues raised in these submissions.	2.3.3
11-1	Private submitter	Submitter is concerned that their property is at risk of infestation by noxious weeds as a result of the project. Particular concern relates to the spread of Parthenium Weed through soil disturbance and vehicles associated with the construction and maintenance of the railway line. Submitter requested a weed survey to be carried out by the submitter and a proponent representative. Promotes a wash-down protocol for the Project.	4.6.4
11-2	Private submitter	The proposed rail corridor will destroy an existing bore (equipped with windmill and tank), and this is not acknowledged in the EIS. Submitter seeks proponent to drill and equip a bore in the same paddock as a replacement water	2.3.3

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
		supply prior to construction of the rail corridor.	
11-3	Private submitter	The EIS does not satisfactorily identify the impact on the wetland near Castle Creek (Chainage 168).	5.5
11-4	Private submitter	Submitter concerned that the stock crossing between the eastern and western sides of the paddock will negatively impact grazing activities. Flooding poses a serious risk for any occupational crossing under the bridge at Castle Creek and the submitter believes there will be periods that livestock movement will not be possible and periods after when conditions will remain boggy. Seeks a new water point on one side of the line and pumped to a tank and trough on the other side of the line.	2.3.3
11-5	Private submitter	Access for stock during construction will be ineffective, as construction of the bridge will take many months, and livestock will not use the crossing under the bridge due to construction noise.	2.3.3
11-6	Private submitter	Submitter considers it unsafe to pass under a rail bridge during construction, and a breach of workplace health and safety obligations. Believes it will be necessary to destock the eastern severance of "Monacast" paddock during construction.	2.3.3
11-7	Private submitter	Clarify the construction camp locations and size, as the EIS proposes one on private property. Any construction camp will have substantial impact on depasturing of livestock. Submitter is concerned about the camp footprint, noise and other impacts on livestock grazing, and destocking of paddock. States that proper rehabilitation and waste disposal practices must be undertaken on construction camp sites.	2.4.10
11-8	Private submitter	The submitter noted that the Castle Creek wetlands is believed to be inhabited by koalas. The construction of the rail line will sever and destroy the koala habitat and reduce the size of the wetland.	5.5
11-9	Private submitter	Submitter concerned that the commitments made in the EIS will not be adhered to by the railway line manager during operation. Concerned about direct property and lifestyle impacts. Operation of the railway will influence the noise emissions, impacts of coal dust, and level of fire risk. Seek commitment that the operator of the railway will adhere to all requirements of the EIS.	2.2.1, 18.2
11-10	Private submitter	Submitter concerned that heavy vehicle movement and other construction traffic along the Defence Road will damage the road and make it unsafe for all road users, particularly after periods of wet weather as it is designed for reasonably low volumes of traffic. Seeks the opportunity to speak to a department representative.	10.4.1
12-1	Private submitter	The rail corridor will dramatically increase the risk of weeds spreading through a presently weed-free area. The EIS does not outline the consequences for the railway operator if the goal of preventing the introduction and spread of environmental weeds is not achieved. Where there are no consequences for failure, the measures outlined in the EIS are invariably ineffective. Submitter suggests a 3-step process. Step 1: landowners should be given the opportunity to highlight which weeds they are likely to have on their property, and about which weeds they have concern. Step 2: Proponent develops a "weed map" for the corridor to be signed by proponent and each landowner. Step 3: For 5 years after construction, the proponent is responsible for the eradication of any weeds (mapped as not previously being there) within 100m of the rail line. A bond or strong prosecution powers should support this arrangement, with monetary compensation payable to landholders for failure to meet the agreement on behalf of the proponent. Submitter believes this to be a real solution, not too financially onerous, achievable in the time span given, and fair for the landowners.	4.6.4
12-2	Private submitter	Number not used – part of 12-1	na
12-3	Private submitter	Number not used – part of 12-1	na
12-4	Private	Number not used – part of 12-1	na

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
	submitter		
12-5	Private submitter	Number not used – part of 12-1	na
13-1	Private submitter	Limited access points will prove a large encumbrance on cattle grazing activities. Ability to deal with fire outbreaks is reduced. Seeks a vehicular crossing at the southern end, and a set of yards to the west of the rail.	2.3.3
13-2	Private submitter	Altered overland flow will lead to erosion of a gully close to the bridge over Delusion Creek. Gully used to access the next paddock. Suggests a small change in alignment.	6.2
13-3	Private submitter	Possibility of weed introduction in a currently weed-free area. Requests management processes to include wash down requirements, weed survey on each property, and regular monitoring.	4.6.4
13-4	Private submitter	Upgrading Carmody Rd is essential to mitigate dust and potholes generated by increased traffic and heavy vehicle usage. Safety concerns for 'one lane' grids and blind spots and signage etc. may be needed. Spraying with water in peak periods may be necessary.	10.4.1
13-5	Private submitter	Potential for weed growth from soil disturbance in the development of fire breaks.	4.6.4
13-6	Private submitter	Submitter concerned about noise emissions in proximity to their residences. Concerned about effect of a cutting "tunnelling" noise towards houses. Elevated rail in some areas has the potential to affect lifestyle and operations (esp. weaning).	8.6
13-7	Private submitter	Submitter concerned about the impact of a 10m embankment on the visual amenity of the property.	4.3.5
13-8	Private submitter	Submitter concerned about the impact of a 10m embankment on the economic value of the property.	2.3.3
14-1	Private submitter	Submitter supportive of below-ground infrastructure development, but opposes above-ground infrastructure such as rail due to effects on operations, lifestyle and the landscape.	Noted
14-2	Private submitter	Project activities should not affect property telecommunications.	18.5.12
14-3	Private submitter	Consultation with affected landowners over changes in passing loop locations.	8.6
14-4	Private submitter	Submitter requests that landowners are authorised to fix fences, and if necessary, retrieve stray stock from the rail line.	2.4.7
14-5	Private submitter	The EIS identifies one of the construction camp locations as "Nathan Road at Bungaban, Twelve Mile Road". Concerns that the construction or operation of the camp will interfere with the school bus stop, timetabling or run at this intersection. Children being transported safely to and from school is a priority.	2.4.10
14-6	Private submitter	Submitter concerned that the criteria with which to assess the noise emissions of the rail line will be poorly suited to rural settings with very low existing background noise. Large issue because the quiet environment is a reason why people living in this area.	8.6
14-7	Private submitter	Landowner notification of blasting activities if required in their vicinity.	8.6.6.2
14-8	Private submitter	Confirmation that for 40km from the Leichhardt Highway, Nathan Road South is under control of Dalby Regional Council, rather than Banana Shire Council.	10.5
14-9	Private submitter	Maintenance of local roads used during construction is imperative. Nathan Road is not designed for large volumes of heavy traffic. Will affect residents who use this road regularly.	10.4.1
15-1	Private submitter	Risk that noxious weeds will be introduced to their property as a result of the rail corridor, particularly through soil disturbance and earthworks. Request a weeds survey to be carried out. Recommends an enforceable protocol requiring wash down of all vehicles during construction activities.	4.6.4
15-2	Private submitter	Submitter states that the rail line disrupts the ongoing use of their properties for grazing activities, including excluding access to water points in some areas. Issues include removal and reconstruction of fences, boundary reconfigurations,	2.3.3

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
		new water points, no guarantee that a practical source for underground water can be found.	
15-3	Private submitter	Submitter states that only 2 stock crossings on their property will negatively impact their ability to graze cattle in the 4 paddocks adjacent to the rail line. Flooding poses a problem for crossing under the rail line. Yards will need to be constructed west of the rail line for when access under the rail line is not available. Occupational crossing will need to accommodate large vehicles and farm machinery.	2.3.3
15-4	Private submitter	The submitter is concerned that the rail manager will not act in accordance with the commitments in the EIS. Rail operator can minimise impacts through appropriate measures such as reducing train speed. Seeks a commitment that guarantees the rail manager will adhere to all operational conditions outlined in the EIS.	2.2.1, 18.2
15-5	Private submitter	Submitter concerned that noise from the rail traffic will be a large nuisance to livestock (including reducing the growing capacity of the stock) and will take away the rural amenity of the homestead. The productivity of the property will be affected.	8.6 and 8.6.5
15-6	Private submitter	Submitter concerned that the pasture adjacent to the rail corridor will be contaminated by dust and diesel fumes, and will affect drinking water at the homestead. Not likely to be contained within the rail corridor, as there are reports of contamination from coal dust in areas adjacent to other rail lines in Central Queensland. Elevated areas of rail are a particular concern. Will result in less pasture for stock, reducing carrying capacity, and reducing productivity of the farm.	7.6.4
15-7	Private submitter	Construction of the rail line will alter water flows, causing extensive erosion on the property, especially due to elevated embankments. Has invested much time and money in reducing erosion of the land throughout the property.	4.2.3, 4.6 and 6.2.4
15-8	Private submitter	The rail corridor removes the potential to develop a homestay tourist enterprise on the property as it will affect the quiet rural amenity of the environment in this area.	Noted
15-9	Private submitter	The rail corridor will impact on the effectiveness of the grazing operations on the property, reducing carrying capacity and viable financial return.	2.3.3 and 17.4
15-10	Private submitter	Submitter states that close proximity to the rail corridor will remove the ability for the homestead to be used as the main homestead for the property. Seeks relocation or a new homestead to be constructed by the proponent.	8.6.2
15-11	Private submitter	Aboriginal art located close to the rail alignment will be put at risk.	11.1
15-12	Private submitter	Impact from increase of coal dust deposition from uncovered coal wagons parked for extended periods in the passing loops.	7.6.4
16-1	Qld Treasury	The desktop economic analysis is high level and may require updating (particularly with respect to coal). Suggests quantification of costs and benefits to provide an economic NPV and/or Benefit-Cost ratio for the project. Further study on the impact of likely increased local population during construction and operation.	14.4
16-2	Qld Treasury	Coal prices used in the EIS should be revised or justified based on recent market changes.	14.3
16-3	Qld Treasury	Seeks analysis of pricing mechanisms and access arrangements and their impact on the financial viability of the project.	14.4
16-4	Qld Treasury	Insufficient analysis of risks and opportunities associated with an increase in local population during construction and operation.	13.3.1
16-5	Qld Treasury	Concern that some risks remain classified as "high" even after assumed mitigation measures have been factored in.	15.4
17-1	Private submitter	Submitter concerned about the amount of water required during construction of the rail line. Concern that much of this will be from the Great Artesian Basin, and the downstream effects that this would have on existing businesses currently relying on GAB for water. Coupled with demand for construction of the Wandoan mine, this will have large impacts. The boggomoss mound	6.3 and 6.4

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
		springs will be affected by a reduced water table and pressure.	
17-2	Private submitter	The total use between Wandoan Mine and SBR will exceed State Government's reserved use rights of the GAB. Suggests that the proponent should construct gully dams along the corridor prior to construction in consultation with landholders. Glebe Weir pipeline should be fastracked and used to supply water for the construction of the southern end of the rail line.	6.3 and 6.4
17-3	Private submitter	Management practices for the construction and operation of the SBR should keep the area free of noxious weeds. Seeks monitoring stations for dust, noise and vibration during construction and operation of the rail corridor. Seeks clarification about safe distances for human health.	4.6.4
17-4	Private submitter	Submitter requests that the corridor should be dual gauge and part of the Great Inland Railway. Expresses concern that landowners still have many questions about the impacts to their properties. The EIS should be lodged after these matters (including acquisition) are resolved.	2.3.3, 2.4, 17.4
17-5	Private submitter	Submitter opposes the 11 minor public road and 62 private road level crossings due to safety issues. Requests grade separation, as education is not a solution.	10.3.1, 15.3
17-6	Private submitter	Submitter does not believe that every effort was made to limit the impact on existing properties by running close to property boundaries and away from homesteads. Access across the rail line for property management needs to be finalised, and requests them to be registered and attached to existing property titles. Seeks certainty of access now and for the future.	2.3, 2.4
17-7	Private submitter	Concern that the existing roads from Wandoan to Downfall Creek will be under the full impact of construction traffic because existing rail is not capable of transporting materials. Nathan Road is not of sufficient standard for this and must be upgraded by the proponent.	10.4.1
17-8	Private submitter	Confirm that the Eidsvold/Theodore Road is unsealed near the Cracow end and Nathan Road South is unsealed from Bowlings Road east.	10.5
17-9	Private submitter	It is unclear whether traffic modelling figures are correct for construction camps as they assume 6 persons per unit. Submitter raises they believe 2 persons per unit is considered usual.	10.4.3
17-10	Private submitter	Submitter concerned about impacts upon local roads during construction, and refutes that heavy haulage traffic will use the service road constructed in the rail corridor. Suggests consultation between councils and proponent to achieve a practical outcome.	10.4.1
18-1	Private submitter	Submitters claim that information provided to them has not been accurate, and consultation has been unfair and failed to meet requirements within the ToR.	2.2.1, 2.3.3
18-2	Private submitter	Affected landowners are disadvantaged by a lack of true and clear information about land acquisition.	Noted
18-3	Private submitter	Coverage of land acquisition in the EIS (s18.6.10) does not disclose the true state of Surat Basin Rail's attempted consultation and is inaccurate and misleading. Information on the land acquisition and compensation process has been untimely, inaccurate and unreliable.	2.3.3 and 17.4
18-4	Private submitter	Security for landowners to access properties on both sides of the railway line corridor. Submitter suggests to be in the form of granted easements.	2.3.3, 17.4
18-5	Private submitter	The EIS should provide specific details of proposed private crossings of the rail line to provide landowners with certainty of workable and efficient occupational crossings.	2.3.3, 2.4.3, 2.4.4
18-6	Private submitter	The EIS is incorrect in stating that coal dust is unlikely to cause adverse impacts on residential amenity or agricultural activities. Suggests that any approval of the project should be conditional upon all coal wagons being covered. The assessment of the risk of coal dust has been biased towards the proponent, as it is averaged over time and does not pick up short periods of high emissions.	Noted
18-7	Private submitter	Submitter requests the EIS to describe each stock route crossing and demonstrate that cattle can be transported across the line effectively.	2.4, 4.4
18-8	Private submitter	The Draft EIS fails to mention provision for service conduits to allow owners to pass water pipelines and electric or other cables across the rail line via conduits inserted through the embankment.	2.4.5

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
18-9	Private submitter	Submitter requests the proponent to disclose which residences it is prepared to move so that landowners can comment on this during the EIS process.	2.3.3
18-10	Private submitter	EIS does not state whether additional areas of land beside the rail corridor will be required for construction, materials storage, etc. Requests that the proponent commits to any additional areas required for construction purposes.	17.6
18-11	Private submitter	The proponent sought owners' consent for entry to their properties for investigation purposes without offering indemnity to the landowners.	2.3.3
18-12	Private submitter	Request that the proponent supply longitudinal section plans to any landowners who have not received them.	2.3.3
18-13	Private submitter	Landowners should be authorised to repair corridor fences themselves, and recover the cost of doing so from the railway manager. Poor track record with QR maintaining rail corridor fencing, increasing risk for landowners.	2.2.1, 2.4.7
18-14	Private submitter	Corridor should be fenced prior to any clearing and construction, temporary crossings of the corridor should be provided in consultation with landowners.	2.3.3
18-15	Private submitter	All public road crossings should be grade separated.	10.3.1
18-16	Private submitter	The proponent should cover the cost of a full-time supervisor with power to order trucks to remain on corridor access tracks and impose penalties for any breaches in order to protect local roads.	10.3.1
18-17	Private submitter	Water from the GAB must not be used for construction of the rail line. Alternative sources exist (such as coal seam gas water or purpose-built dams).	Noted
18-18	Private submitter	The proponent should provide further data on background air quality and noise prior to approval of the project. Concerned that the EIS contains inadequate background data.	7.5
18-19	Private submitter	Any access roads on public land linking up with occupational crossings should be of at least equivalent standard to existing access.	10.3.2
19-1	Banana Shire Council	Banana Shire Council recognises the relationship between the SBR and other mining and infrastructure projects. SBR should be examined in the context of water supply strategies and proposed projects. Recommends sharing and coordination between proponents of the major projects in the region.	Noted, 6.4 and Section 16
19-2	Banana Shire Council	Concern that study work has not been undertaken into a multi-user linear infrastructure and services corridor adjacent to the rail alignment. Submitter seeks early commencement of the study and requests involvement in the work. Suggests that workers' accommodation should also be a coordinated action.	2.3.2
19-3	Banana Shire Council	Construction camps in Rural Zone trigger Material Change of Use (impact assessable) applications under the Taroom and Banana Shire Planning Schemes. Also for extractive industries and some other activities associated with the construction of the rail. The EIS fails to confirm if a CID is being sought. Clarify the decision making process for necessary ERAs and update the project's approval matrix. More in-depth study of approvals for ancillary activities (esp. ERAs) is required and submitter requests involvement in this process.	2.4.10
19-4	Banana Shire Council	EIS approvals section must reflect amendments made to the Environmental Protection Regulation 1998. Early identification of ballast material and other rock and gravel products should be made available for further comment. SEIS should clarify intended sources, in conjunction with advice from Council.	17.2, 17.5 and 17.6
19-5	Banana Shire Council	The EIS does not identify from where construction raw water will be sourced. Council requires appropriate details and formal requests from the proponent to assess water supply proposals for potable water if it is to be sourced from the water reticulation network.	6.4
19-6	Banana Shire Council	Council seeks clarity about "unsuitable material" for use in the rail works encountered along the corridor, including where this material will be disposed. Council not aware of any commercial quarry called "Fairview Quarry". Kianga Quarry does not have a licence to extract 100 000+ tonnes per year. Recommend that the locations of all future quarries be finalised as soon as possible, and that all stakeholders are consulted.	4.2.4
19-7	Banana Shire Council	It is unclear what measures will be implemented to protect road assets from potential flooding or damage through erosion or sedimentation where a rail cross drain is adjacent to a local road.	15.4.6

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
19-8	Banana Shire Council	It is unclear what is the proposed fencing treatment at local road crossings, grids and gates. Grids and gates on road alignments will need to comply with DMR standards and will remain the responsibility of the rail manager.	2.4.7
19-10	Banana Shire Council	Council seeks appropriate details on the implications for the safety of road crossings, anticipated traffic delay times and conflicts with specific traffic movements.	10.3.1
19-11	Banana Shire Council	Clarify maintenance requirements for roads and bridges crossing the rail line and associated infrastructure.	10.4.1
19-12	Banana Shire Council	Council seeks the identification of definitive material extraction sites for intended use. Suggest that the rehabilitation and decommissioning needs of extractive industry sites operated by the proponent may vary. Consultation with stakeholders is key.	2.4.12
19-13	Banana Shire Council	Lack of analysis of approval processes, environmental impacts and servicing requirements for workers' camps. Requests a level of detail normally required for proper assessment of workers' accommodation, and to be open to public review and comment.	2.4.10
19-14	Banana Shire Council	Council requests that proponent must employ sufficient measures to ensure the rail line does not increase flooding or impacts on local roads. The development should provide adequate storage and bunding of hazardous substances away from potential natural disaster impact areas.	6.2, 15.4.6 and 18.5.13
19-15	Banana Shire Council	Final alignment should seek to avoid fragmentation of GQAL. EIS fails to address Desired Environmental Outcomes of the planning schemes and emphasis on settlement patterns and appropriate provision of housing and services to residents and workers. Insufficient information on workers' accommodation and their impact.	4.6, 2.4.10
19-16	Banana Shire Council	Flooding information in the EIS not consistent with an estimated Q100 event identified in a report for Dawson South Coal Project. EIS does not address potential flooding impact of the proposed Nathan Dam.	6.2
19-17	Banana Shire Council	An approval for development of rural land immediately to the south-east of Banana, off Barfield Road has been granted by Council. Eight of the eleven acreage lots are severed by the rail line, including a proposed sealed road.	Noted
19-18	Banana Shire Council	EIS does not provide information about the layout, access, services and other impacts of the accommodation camps. Accommodation camps are a significant concern for Council and the community. Seeks to discuss details about accommodation strategies and related impacts. Requires an open process with its communities with respect to details about accommodation camps - Material Change of Use (impact assessable) subject to referral to relevant State Government Agencies and public notification.	2.4.10
19-19	Banana Shire Council	Emergency response measures should reference Council's Disaster Management Plan.	15.4.5
19-20	Banana Shire Council	Council seeks more information about potential social and economic impacts of the project during construction. Addressing the minimisation of cumulative impacts (from this and other projects) is a key concern. Keen to assist in co-location efforts, and minimising cumulative impacts.	2.4.10, 13.3.4
19-21	Banana Shire Council	Construction camps in Rural Zone trigger Material Change of Use (impact assessable) applications under Taroom and Banana Shire Planning Schemes. Also for extractive industries and some other activities associated with the construction of the rail. EIS fails to clarify if a CID is being sought, and also the decision making process for necessary ERAs. Council suggests a more in-depth study of approvals for ancillary activities (esp. ERAs) and requests involvement in this process. Irresponsible to leave this to the Construction Methodology.	2.4.10
19-22	Banana Shire Council	The EIS does not identify provisions for landform alteration and rehabilitation. Council recommends rehabilitation for disturbed areas, particularly those used for material extraction, be conducted based on guidelines provided by DERM (formerly EPA).	18.5
19-23	Banana Shire Council	Council concerned that the responsibility for development of a Weed Management Plan is not with the proponent, but rather wholly with the contractor. Could be problematic with multiple contractors over the life of the	4.6.4

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
		project. EIS does not properly address the objectives of the <i>Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002</i> . A holistic weeds management plan, over the entire life of the project, should be prepared. The SEIS should contain a more detailed weed management plan.	
19-24	Banana Shire Council	Council considers parts of the EIS to be generic and broad. Does not contain sufficient detail to properly assess various elements of the proposal (access and roads, workers' accommodation, integration of development projects, cumulative impacts, water supply and management, amenity, weed and pest control, environmental protection and management). Council keen to participate in future stages of the study.	Noted
20-1	DNRW	GQAL should have been considered in a Multi-Criteria Analysis. Loss of GQAL has high impacts on local economy. Suggests inclusion of loss of GQAL in the "Basis of Assessment".	4.6
20-2	DNRW	The submitter is concerned about the amount of material that is cut to spoil and the amount of borrow required for fill. Seeks clarification about why more spoil could not be used in construction, reducing the amount of borrow material. Suggests moving alignment away from GQAL (esp. between chainage 180-215km).	4.2.3, 4.2.4
20-3	DNRW	Occupational crossings located in watercourses/drainage lines carry high risks of erosion for internal access tracks. Suggests the detailed design stage ensures that the location of occupational and stock crossings do not increase erosion risks, and considers relocating crossings away from watercourses and erodible areas.	4.2.3, 6.2
20-4	DNRW	Clarity sought about the source of raw water for the project. If coal seam gas water is used, detail should be provided on the water quality and element breakdown of the input water to be used on site.	6.4
20-5	DNRW	DNRW concerned that the rail corridor will require amendment of some runoff control systems, perhaps even new waterways within or adjacent to the railway boundary. EIS should note that the location and function of on-farm runoff control measures will be considered during detailed design. Landowners should be included in this process.	2.3.3, 4.6, 6.2.4
20-6	DNRW	Concern that the representative soils were not selected from within more detailed soil surveys. Suggests further detailed soil studies consistent with Perry (1968) and Forster (1983) and provide physical and chemical analyses.	4.2.2
20-7	DNRW	Potential impacts of railway embankments on salinity through alteration of surface and subsurface hydrology. Recommend studies to determine areas prone to salinity and water table rise during construction and provisions for appropriate design and management incorporated for high risk areas.	4.2.3
20-8	DNRW	Provision of adequate drainage in areas of high salinity risk.	4.2.3, 6.2.5
20-9	DNRW	Inadequate soils mapping has been undertaken as the representative soil sites has been based on the broad-scale assessment of the Atlas of Australia Soils rather than the more detailed mapping of the Perry 1968 reference. Recommends to conduct more detailed soil studies, and provide physical and chemical analyses from representative sites based on the referenced detailed soil surveys.	4.2.2
20-10	DNRW	Overland flows in agricultural lands may have been altered with the implementation of on-farm erosion control works. Additional works may be required to manage concentrated runoff from on-farm works and cuttings and embankments in the rail corridor.	4.2.3, 6.2.4
20-11	DNRW	DNRW recommend investigations into increased salinity due to creation of a hydraulic barrier, including a study of landscapes processes.	4.2.3
20-12	DNRW	DNRW state that EIS is concerned only with impact of drainage and overland flow on stability of rail embankments. Concerned that potential loss of GQAL not adequately addressed. Need to consider impact of rail embankment on drainage and overland flow so that risks to land and property are not increased. Adjust corridor to minimise loss of GQAL in small fragmented lands.	4.6
20-13	DNRW	The submitter states that the significant project status under the SDPWOA does not mean that the SBR meets the overriding need test of SPP 1/92.	.3.3

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
		Recommends amending the statement to reflect the significance of SPP 1/92.	
20-14	DNRW	The submitter seeks clarification as to whether alternatives exist that minimise impact on GQAL. Suggests considering GQAL in the MCA analysis.	4.6
20-15	DNRW	DNRW claims that there has been no analysis of flood risk. Request flood studies in vulnerable areas adjacent to the proposed corridor.	15.4.6
20-16	DNRW	Remove reference to Maranoa and District Region.	4.3.6
20-17	DNRW	More State Government land is affected than is indicated in the EIS. Confirm extent of all State land.	4.3.6
20-18	DNRW	Fragmentation of rural lots can impact economic viability of rural enterprises. Recommend process for resumption of land to reduce conflicts between farming activities and non-rural activities.	4.3.4
20-19	DNRW	Location of stock route crossing in watercourses may lead to exacerbated and water degradation.	6.2.4
20-20	DNRW	Concern about creation of small lots due to property severance. Where unavoidable amalgamation into adjoining parcels should be promoted to maintain their productivity.	4.6
20-21	DNRW	It is unclear how the loss of GQAL has been reduced through the route selection process. Recommend re-assessment of alignment with view to relocation away from GQAL.	4.6
20-22	DNRW	The rail corridor location and construction activities should also include consideration of adjacent on-farm infrastructure.	4.6
20-23	DNRW	The Proponent should ensure accurately reinstatement of soil profiles after disturbance to mitigate loss of high yield agriculture.	4.6
20-24	DNRW	Leases and permits are controlled by Department of Mines and Energy, rather than DNRW.	Noted
20-25	DNRW	Clarify the amount of assessable and non-assessable vegetation potentially impacted on non-remnant vegetation on State land.	5.3.2
20-26	DNRW	Number not used – part of 20-25	na
20-27	DNRW	Number not used – part of 20-25	na
20-28	DNRW	Clarification/correction of the RE status of Site 12: 11.12.1 and 11.10.9.	5.7
20-29	DNRW	Existence of commercial timber on State land not mapped as remnant.	5.3.3.6
20-30	DNRW	The amount of assessable non-remnant vegetation should be identified	5.3.2
20-31	DNRW	Clearing "not of concern" RE requires approval from DNRW for clearing for ongoing purposes. Amend EIS accordingly to reflect requirements of the VMA.	5.4.2
20-32	DNRW	Clarification is required on the vegetation approval process to be undertaken.	5.3.3.6
20-33	DNRW	Opportunities exist for NRW Forest Products to work with SBR proponents. Proponent to continue consultation and involvement with the group as the project progresses and details are finalised.	Noted
20-34	DNRW	The surface water section of the EIS is confusing and incorrect in some places. The submitter suggests rewriting to eliminate inaccuracies and confusing comments.	Noted
20-35	DNRW	The EIS is inaccurate in its discussion on the transfer of water licences. Clarification required to explain what entitlements are meant, and to distinguish between Water Licences and Water Allocations.	6.5
20-36	DNRW	Orange Creek Weir is located on the Dawson River.	Noted
20-37	DNRW	The EIS does not accurately reflect water licences and uses for surface water. Suggest re-writing this section to accurately reflect arrangement for water entitlements on the Dawson River.	6.2, 6.4, 6.5
20-38	DNRW	A qualified Department Officer (DERM) undertakes watercourse determination for any instances where there is doubt about whether a feature is a watercourse.	6.2
20-39	DNRW	Where a licence to interfere with the course of flow by diversion is required, applications will be assessed against the ACARP guidelines for stream diversion for the Bowen Basin.	Noted
20-40	DNRW	The project must be undertaken in accordance with the Guideline - Activities in a watercourse, lake or spring carried out by an entity.	Noted
20-41	DNRW	The EIS should detail requirements in relation to regulation of overland flow under the Water Resource (Fitzroy Basin) Plan 1999.	6.2
20-42	DNRW	The EIS does not provide discussion on whether there will be any impacts on	6.2.6

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
		existing surface users. If there are any impacts these should be addressed in the mitigation section.	
20-43	DNRW	Groundwater monitoring is proposed in areas of cuts and excavations to ensure surface water quality is not degraded by saline seepages from cuttings or embankments. The EIS should also recommend groundwater monitoring in areas identified as a high risk of salinity. This should be undertaken during the construction phase and as an on-going activity during the operational phase.	4.2.3, 6.3
20-44	DNRW	The groundwater section of the EIS is confusing and makes several incorrect statements about the legislation and nature of groundwater resources in the study area. A major deficiency relates to proposals to identify impacts of taking groundwater once the source has been identified. Detailed proposals and investigation will be necessary to identify potential impacts.	6.3, 6.4
20-45	DNRW	DNRW requires an explanation about why a desktop study was considered adequate for the groundwater environment, and why no field investigations were considered necessary. EIS should include potential impacts on all groundwater resources along the length of the corridor.	6.3, 6.4
20-46	DNRW	DNRW recommend re-writing the section of the EIS dealing with Schedule 11 of the Water Regulation 2002.	Noted
20-47	DNRW	EIS is confusing when stating legislation considered in assessing groundwater resources within the study area.	Noted, 6.3
20-48	DNRW	DNRW claim that the section dealing with groundwater resources does not contain sufficient information or clarity. Suggest re-writing the section to include a list of all groundwater resources in study area, details of these resources, and possible effects of the project on these resources.	6.3, 6.4
20-49	DNRW	EIS should outline the requirements to take sub-artesian water in the GAB declared sub-artesian area under the Water Act 2000. Should outline requirements for obtaining approvals to take water under the GAB water resources operation plan.	6.3, 6.4
20-50	DNRW	EPA does not "place" a responsibility onto NRW for managing groundwater resources through a water resource process.	Noted
20-51	DNRW	Cleared debris may concentrate overland flow. It is noted that if reusable timber is sourced from State land it is the property of State and NRW's Forest Products should be contacted.	18.5.3
20-52	DNRW	Spoil containing sodic soils could lead to land degradation as it will be difficult to re-establish vegetation on sodic soils.	4.2.4
20-53	DNRW	DNRW requests talks with the proponent about applications for road openings and closings when plans are finalised.	10.4.2
20-54	DNRW	Submitter is concerned at the significant area (1050 ha) of small sub-divided areas that will be created. It is proposed these areas will also be acquired. If these areas include GQAL, acquisition will result in the area being removed from agricultural production.	6.4
20-55	DNRW	No details are provided as to what the tenure is of the land on which proposed gravel pits are located. If these or additional proposed gravel pits are to be located within Leasehold land or other State land a permit under the Forestry Act 1959 would be required to access quarry material.	17.2.3
20-56	DNRW	The tripartite approach should include information about the upgrade of the sewerage treatment works and landfill for Wandoan (if construction camp located close to the township).	Noted, 2.4.10
20-57	DNRW	Infrastructure co-location is preferable in reducing cumulative impacts on environmental values such as vegetation and GQAL.	Noted, 2.3.2
20-58	DNRW	"The issuing of the CGs report has the effect of replacing the information and referral stage and notification stage of the assessment process under the IP Act". This only applies for applications for material change of use or requiring impact assessment. Clarify applications that are affected by this section of SDPWO Act.	17.3
20-59	DNRW	"In the case of a declared significant project under the SDPWO Act, the CGs report replaces the information and referral stage and notification stage for the application". The process outlined above applies for Material Change of Use application dealt with under the SDPWO Act. However, for operational works	17.3

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
		applications the full IDAS process is required. The submitter requests clarity around applications that are affected by this section of IP Act.	
20-60	DNRW	Uncertainty about the proposed approval process (CID or SDA).	17
20-61	DNRW	Relevance of Section 177 of the Land Act.	17.7
20-62	DNRW	DNRW suggests the EIS includes impacts on works that are subject to the <i>Soil Conservation Act 1986</i> and any measures to address such impacts. A study should be undertaken of aerial photographs to identify where the proposed corridor will impact soil conservation layouts.	4.2.3
20-63	DNRW	A licence to take water (water permit) and reference to artesian/sub-artesian bores are two different types of entitlements. This should be documented in the EIS.	Noted
20-64	DNRW	Analysis of soil should include references and manuals relevant to soil surveys and soil analysis. DNRW lists these.	4.2.3
20-65	DNRW	DNRW requests amendment to the EIS to reflect the approval process for cultural heritage management plans under the ACHA.	11.1
20-66	DNRW	DNRW suggests including a performance criteria relating to minimal interference with existing runoff control measures on adjacent properties.	18.5.3
20-67	DNRW	DNRW recommends avoiding vegetation windrows and spoil across slopes where overland flows may be diverted or concentrated.	18.5.2
20-68	DNRW	Potential for increased salinity risk through rising water tables from cuttings and compacted embankments must be considered. Submitter recommends the 3rd sentence under issues be expanded by adding the following: "...through changes in water tables resulting from construction works".	4.2.3
20-69	DNRW	It is unclear how measurements will be undertaken to monitor changes to hydrological and hydraulic regimes, and soil salinity. Suggests high risk areas have monitoring sites installed.	4.2.3
20-70	DNRW	DNRW states there is a need for the EIS to consider potential for ongoing impacts in addition to possible wet season impacts on hydraulic and hydrologic regimes.	6.2
20-71	DNRW	EIS does not consider impacts of alienating GQAL by the location of the corridor. Seeks definition about measures that address potential loss of GQAL resulting from construction and operation.	4.6
20-72	DNRW	NRW should be contacted with regards to road closures and detours.	10.4.2
20-73	DNRW	The project approvals process is unclear.	17
20-74	DNRW	Creation of physical land fragmentation. Submitter suggests amalgamation into larger lots.	4.6
20-75	DNRW	DNRW seeks information about commitments for the EMP (O). Ongoing monitoring for operational stage is important, particularly for issues such as salinity.	18
20-76	DNRW	DNRW seeks information about mitigation measures for changes in the salinity regime of surface and groundwaters in an EMP (O). Also define commitments for disposal of unsuitable spoil.	4.2.3, 4.2.4
21-1	Private submitter	Submitter does not believe that detailed, effective and legally binding procedures have been developed for implementation to adequately address environmental issues.	2.3.3
21-2	Private submitter	Rail alignment will affect submitter's most valuable and productive paddocks, turning them into unproductive sizes. Against station's grazing and land management best practice.	2.3.3
21-3	Private submitter	Rail alignment will affect the flow of animal movement to waters when mustering. Will jeopardise rotational grazing, and cause large additional costs in labour and unnecessary walking distance for animals. Will lead to a loss of kilograms of beef produced.	2.3.3
21-4	Private submitter	Submitter may be forced to improve large areas of less productive country to offset the effects of the rail line in most productive areas.	2.3.3
21-5	Private submitter	Paddocks and farm infrastructure will need to be reconfigured.	2.3.3
21-6	Private submitter	Rail line will affect the existing stock watering system on submitter's property. Will leave paddocks dry or with only one water point, and is not manageable.	2.3.3, 4.6.3.2

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
		New watering points will be required.	
21-7	Private submitter	Submitter concerned that rail line will traverse a critical dam on their property that has recently been constructed.	2.3.3, 4.6.3.2
21-8	Private submitter	Rail alignment poses a threat to palatability of pastures and water due to coal dust.	7.6.4
21-9	Private submitter	Concern the rail alignment will increase the risk of bushfires and weed introduction. Seeks a comprehensive action plan for prevention of fire hazards.	18.5.3, 18.5.7
21-10	Private submitter	Self-regulated wash down schemes are not effective in ensuring contractors and project representatives meet legal requirements about spread of weeds.	4.6.4
21-11	Private submitter	The submitter outlines various infrastructure improvements and property reconfiguration provisions necessary for operations if the rail line is constructed.	2.3.3
22-1	DM&E	Possible sterilisation of resources and deposits by the proposed rail line. Considers that the proponent has not addressed the matters relating to potential resource sterilisation.	4.5
22-2	DM&E	Rail alignment located close to mining leases of the Cracow underground gold mine. The Kilkenny shoot may extend under the rail corridor. The rail line should be located further west of the mine, or at the very least, in the far west of the rail corridor. The proponent should contact mine owners to discuss.	4.5
22-3	DM&E	The proponent should consult with Lodestone Exploration Limited about the rail corridor.	4.5
22-4	DM&E	The rail corridor overlies ironstone deposits between Dawsonvale and Cockatoo Creek. The proposed rail line effectively cuts the ironstone deposit into two parts and will result in the sterilisation of an undetermined amount of the deposit. The deposit is of importance to the State as it has some commercial potential. Proponent should look at potential ways to minimise sterilisation of the deposit. DME proposes to investigate available drill hole data to determine if a preferred route, that minimises or eliminates sterilisation of the deposit can be developed.	4.5
22-5	DM&E	Castle Creek quarry is within the proposed rail corridor. If the rail line is west of Defence Road, impacts on the quarry are not likely. Submitter suggests proponent to consult with quarry owner to determine if they identify any potential impacts.	4.5
22-6	DM&E	Proposed rail corridor traverses the northern part of the Northern Block of the Collingwood coal deposit. DME proposes that the rail corridor be located further north of this area, at least 1km north of Nathan Road.	4.5.5
22-7	DM&E	The westerly alignment options traverse parts of the Wandoan coal deposits. DME prefers the central of the three alignments around Wandoan as it offers proximity to the proposed Wandoan mine area and minimises potential impacts on identified resources of shallow coal.	4.5
22-8	DM&E	DME recommend the EIS addresses potential impacts on mining activities and identified mineral resources, rather than "potential impacts of the mining activity on the multi-user corridor".	4.5
22-9	DM&E	Several sections of the preferred centreline of the rail line impact identified coal resources within the Collingwood coal deposit and the Wandoan Group of deposits. DME expected the EIS to specifically address each of the resource impact matters that were raised in the DME's assessment in early 2008. The proponent has not specifically addressed the comments made in the DME's resource impact assessment in the EIS.	4.5
22-10	DM&E	The EIS does not identify potential impacts of the project on mining operations at the Cracow mine and what gold resources may be sterilised. Submitter recommends these potential impacts are identified and mitigation measures suggested. Should include vibration impacts on mine safety.	4.5
22-11	DM&E	The EIS to identify and discuss possible impacts of the rail line on the Dawsonvale Ironstone deposits.	4.5
22-12	DM&E	The EIS to identify the potential impacts on the Scotia Gas operation and coal seam gas resources and suggest mitigation measures.	4.5
22-13	DM&E	The EIS does not satisfactorily address the matter of potential resource sterilisation and impacts on mining and petroleum activities.	4.5

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
23-1	DTRDI	The EIS should demonstrate efforts to maximise employment opportunities for recently displaced workers from the QLD mining sector.	14.5
23-2	DTRDI	The EIS should discuss the pros and cons of potential workers' camp locations rather than leaving this to the contractor.	2.4.10
23-3	DTRDI	The Proponent should provide information relating to expected workforce and associated population growth. Recommends that the Proponent should bind contractors to workplace behaviour protocols and appropriate shift scheduling proposed in the EIS.	13.2
23-4	DTRDI	Relevant information should be made available to local leadership groups as outlined in the Sustainable Resource Communities policy. Recommends the EIS outlines the workforce accommodation strategy explaining the location of temporary and permanent workforces, as well as timing and sequencing details of construction and operation workforces.	Noted, 13.3.4
23-5	DTRDI	Proposed rail corridor will greatly impact on at least three centres of enterprise.	14.2
23-6	DTRDI	DTRDI encourages sourcing as much construction material as possible from within the region. Local Industry Policy requires proponents to develop Local Industry Participation Plans. DTRDI is supportive of such an approach and where appropriate, may be available to provide advice or assistance in preparing and linking local businesses to these opportunities.	14.5
23-7	DTRDI	DTRDI supports strategy to communicate the types of workforce positions available during the construction period to the broader community. Complements the Centres of Enterprise.	14.5, 14.2
23-8	DTRDI	The EIS requires discussion of sequencing of the temporary workforce and consideration of other temporary workforces in the region and their cumulative impacts.	2.4.10 and 16.3
24-1	DPI&F	Waterway crossings may require development approval from the Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries.	Noted
24-2	DPI&F	DPI&F prefers waterway crossings made of bank to bank bridges rather than culverts which may affect fish migration. Any impacts on fish habitats and fisheries should be identified and addressed in the EIS. Suggest contingency plan for removal of all barriers to supply water to construction site. Requires all disturbed fish habitat to be rehabilitated and restored after construction. Rail line should avoid critical fish habitats, and translocating weeds (aquatic and terrestrial) should be prevented.	6.2.3.1
24-3	DPI&F	Chemicals should be stored away from waterways and contained appropriately. Contingency plan should be developed for any accidents with the potential to impact waterways. Impact on water quality to be minimised.	18.5
24-4	DPI&F	The EIS contains a number of historical inaccuracies. Native Title holders (including common law holders) are entitled to participate in the development of indigenous cultural heritage management plans.	12.7
24-5	DPI&F	The EIS is slightly misleading in that the database of the Register of the National Estate does not have any legislative effect. The EPBC Act provides that the database will be retained for five years only and can be located on the website of the Department of Environment, Heritage and the Arts.	12.4
24-6	DPI&F	Number not used – part of 24-5	na
24-7	DPI&F	Suggest more emphasis on the likelihood of further sites being identified in the state-wide heritage survey. Include any updating/checking mechanisms for any more sites discovered.	12.5.1 Noted
24-8	DPI&F	The division of pastoral leases and resumption from them did not commence until 1869.	12.7
24-9	DPI&F	The main discovery of gold in Cracow which attracted miners was in 1931.	12.7
24-10	DPI&F	The summary of Juandah Homestead is useful in the EIS.	Noted
24-11	DPI&F	The words "Wandoan rail station accommodation" may not provide sufficient relevant information. They could refer to the railway station, the station master's house, trainmen's quarters or the goods shed. The Juandah historical society may have information on it from when they obtained the building from Queensland Railways. Alternatively the consultant should check in the John Douglas Kerr Railway Database at the John Douglas Kerr Heritage Centre at the	Noted

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
		Rail Workshops Museum at Ipswich.	
24-12	DPI&F	Number not used – part of 24-11	na
24-13	DPI&F	The passage of the Divisional Boards Act and the gazettal of Divisional Board areas occurred in November 1879 and the boards were formed and elected in 1880 (a minor point).	12.7
24-14	DPI&F	Macdonald's article on the Canoona Goldfield in Queensland Heritage is a better source than Queensland Coal and Coke Energy Pty Ltd's report (2006).	Noted
24-15	DPI&F	Uncertainty about who was the initial pastoralist to confirm Gwen Fox's book. The submitter identifies information may be sourced within the Commissioner for Crown Lands Registers of leases held at Queensland State Archives at Runcorn.	12.7
24-16	DPI&F	The Juandah railway station site was selected according to the best gradient rather than any town planning reasons.	12.7
24-17	DPI&F	Soldier Settlement - Murray Johnson's "'Honour Denied": A Study of Soldier Settlement in Queensland, 1916-1929' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Queensland 2002) is probably the best source on this topic. It is noted in the bibliography but not referred to.	12.7
24-18	DPI&F	Use the word "deposits" rather than "lodes" to describe coal mineralisation.	12.7
25-1	EPA	EPA relies heavily on previous studies and published information. Alignment is a reasonable compromise between parameters used in railway construction and environmental values. EPA has no issue with the alignment. However, there is very little certainty about various aspects of the proposal, and the EIS is insufficient to enable the EPA to meet statutory obligations in relation to assessment of the proposal. Commitments to undertake surveys during detailed design and "avoid impacts where possible" are very vague. The EIS provides insufficient information on the location and design of temporary and permanent activities involving ERAs. Proposed ERAs are based on superseded legislation. The proponent should prepare a comprehensive environmental management plan addressing all of the EPA's interests. If such a plan was prepared, then the majority of the EPA's concerns could be covered by a simple EPA recommended condition: that the proponent complies with the Environmental Management Plan.	2.3, 2.4, 17.5 and Section 18
25-2	EPA	EPA believes the EIS is inadequate as a statement of the actions to which the proponent will commit in response to identified impacts. Little or no consideration given to offsetting unavoidable project impacts. Direct, indirect and cumulative impacts also must be fully examined, quantified as far as possible and addressed as above, i.e. solutions proposed. The project as a whole, including its management throughout its pre-construction, construction and operation stages should be based on sound environmental protection and management criteria that are clearly identified, best practice and measurable. EIS must reflect Avoidance; Minimisation, including through design and management; and Offsetting.	Noted
25-3	EPA	EIS should incorporate measures for impact mitigation into the EM plan elements and address offset options and preferences for unavoidable and residual impacts.	18
25-4	EPA	EIS does not provide discussion about the SBR's use as a freight-only line after the assumed 50 year life span, and only brief information is provided about possible decommissioning. Options for continued use after 50 years should be discussed.	2.2.1
25-5	EPA	Alternatives and co-location opportunities for water supply options should be discussed in more detail, including how these options minimise water usage and transfer and energy losses. Project should optimise reuse and recycling opportunities.	6.4
25-6	EPA	Uncertainty over what other facilities will be co-located. Incomplete information to endorse them either individually or collectively.	2.3.2
25-7	EPA	Further information on the locations of the accommodation camps, camp arrangements and management regime for their decommissioning is required.	2.4.10
25-8	EPA	EPA suggests confirming the relationship of the proposal for the optimum development of the Surat coal basin, and implications for state infrastructure	2.3.2, 4.3.3

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
		programs (esp. co-locating facilities).	
25-9	EPA	EPA requests reference to all infrastructure required by the project on or off the rail reserve. Also requests reference to all infrastructure that is not intended to be decommissioned, as well as options for future use and proposed environmental management regimes.	2.2, 18
25-10	EPA	The EIS must demonstrate why certain impacts cannot be avoided or mitigated, but also how well the response is performing over time. The current, impacted and final conditions must be specified in a quantifiable way.	18
25-11	EPA	EPA requests a description of any indirect impacts of vegetation clearing, and a discussion of any disruption to fauna movement caused by the project, and the need for any fauna crossings at particular locations.	5.6
25-12	EPA	EPA suggests measures for the rehabilitation of disturbed areas in the EMP, including monitoring programs, the use of benchmarks to assess success of offset programs, and progressive stabilisation of work sites.	18.5
25-13	EPA	The Environmental Protection Act 1994 should be added to the list of legislation applicable to water. Update reference to the EP Regulations and EPP Water to 2008.	6.1, 6.5
25-14	EPA	EPA highlights the lack of background ambient water quality information in remote inland regions, the dated nature of NRW's data and the need for erosion mitigation for rail embankments. It is stated that incidental work (s.6.2) is unlikely to be classified as dredging under the 2008 EP Regulation. It is recommended that water quality is assessed in accordance with the EPP Water 2008.	6.1
25-15	EPA	The EIS needs to incorporate findings from the air chapter (Section 7) into the EM plans. Also needs to consider the recent EPP Air 2008.	7.2
25-16	EPA	EPA suggests quantifying all environmental harm of noise and vibration for sensitive receptors in accordance with the EPP (Noise) 2008, and specifies standards and indicators for low frequency noise and vibration. EPA also suggests guidelines: 'Planning for Noise Control' and 'Noise and Vibration for Blasting'.	8.2
25-17	EPA	Adequate discussion is provided in the EIS on likely solid waste products however the management regime needs to be documented in EM Plans.	18.5.9
25-18	EPA	S.5 findings should be used to determine need for and optimal location of fauna infrastructure for inclusion in design response and management plans.	18.5.6
25-19	EPA	The Non-Indigenous Cultural Heritage assessment (s.12.1) is not sufficient and that s3.10.1 of the ToR has not been satisfied. A thorough survey of potentially affected areas is recommended as well as management recommendations to be incorporated into design day to day management as appropriate.	12.5
25-20	EPA	In accordance with s.3.10.1 of the ToR that the EIS provides the findings of a visual assessment of preferred rail and associated infrastructure from different vantage points, identifying options for avoidance, management and offsetting.	4.3.5
25-21	EPA	The EIS does not provide a summary of the social impacts and mitigation measures.	13.3 and 13.6
25-22	EPA	EPA suggests that s14 should include consideration of environmental offsets in a manner similar to that applied to compensation for economic disruption.	Noted
25-23	EPA	EPA indicates that the EIS provides insufficient information on the location and design of temporary and permanent activities involving ERAs, e.g. concrete batching, fuel storage and sewage treatment and as a result is unable to provide conditions which would accompany any related development approval. Proposed ERAs and management responses are based on superseded regulations and policies which will require reference and review against the most recent regulations and Environmental Protection Policies . EPA also suggests further information on the location and design of temporary and permanent activities involving ERAs to enable the EPA to prepare conditions that would accompany any development approval; or the exclusion of ERAs from the ambit of the CG's report or limit the CG's report to preliminary approval for ERAs.	6.2.7, 17.2, 17.5 and 17.6
25-24	EPA	EPA states that EM plans need to include or provide for maintaining baseline	18

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
		water quality data for all project stages and commitments by the proponent to practical and achievable design standards (performance specifications) and measures for the project's management. An amended application should be submitted to the Coordinator-General as a change report if through future data collection and/or application of environmental management regime, it is necessary to amend the proposal presented in the EIS.	
25-25	EPA	EPA indicates that EM plans omit auditing and reporting. It is recommended that auditing and reporting is included in all aspects addressed by the EM plans and that audits should be undertaken by external auditors with reports provided to DIP.	18.6
26-1	Toowoomba Regional Council	Toowoomba Regional Council suggests that sourcing of construction materials from within the Council area would reduce traffic on the Toowoomba Range and Warrego Highway.	10.4.3
26-2	Toowoomba Regional Council	Toowoomba Regional Council highlights the opportunity to utilise local bus services to decrease traffic on the Toowoomba Range and Warrego Highway.	10.4.5
26-3	Toowoomba Regional Council	The project has potential for positive economic benefits for the Toowoomba Regional Council community.	Noted
26-4	Toowoomba Regional Council	It is suggested that future consideration should be given to flow on effects for regional communities if the Surat Basin exploration expands.	16
27-1	QPS	The expected increase in traffic volumes on major highways has the potential for increases in traffic crashes. It is suggested that a Traffic Management Plan be developed in consultation with QPS and that a 2 officer traffic section be established at Biloela dedicated to traffic safety and enforcement in the Gladstone District western divisions cluster. Funding would need to include a vehicle, equipment and salaries.	10.4.5
27-2	QPS	QPS outlines that increased movements of construction equipment on the rail and road network will require development of Traffic Management Plans for affected towns, Fatigue Management Plans and Disaster Management Plans.	10.4.5
27-3	QPS	QPS indicates increasing demand from a range of projects for wide load escort which impact on core policing activities. It is requested that the EIS should therefore determine the number and size of wide loads as part of a 'project schedule' (approximate) to enable the coordination of marked police vehicles allocated to wide load escorts to enable an understanding of the number of vehicles and equipment required.	10.4.3
27-4	QPS	QPS cites examples of vast property value increases as a result of similar projects and suggests that consultation is undertaken with mining companies, local and state government agencies to ensure the provision of affordable housing for police service employees who will need to live in the area to respond to increased service calls.	13.3.3.2
27-5	QPS	QPS identifies that there will be increased calls for service as a result of the construction workforce. Other concerns expressed include domestic violence associated with shift work and increased road crashes and offences from increased traffic. It is suggested that detailed numbers and locations of workers are provided to assist in planning for increased calls for service.	13.3.3.2, 13.3.1 and 13.3.4
27-6	QPS	QPS indicates that QPS has identified and outlined a number of Disaster Management and policing issues such as disaster plans, incident command management, radio coverage, traffic management and business continuity planning which will require further attention and mitigation measures.	18.5.14
27-7	QPS	It was identified that QPS has limited ability to respond to growth associated with the SBR Project and that additional mitigation measures and resourcing will be required.	13.3.3.2
27-8	QPS	Submitter outlines that an accurate picture of QPS resourcing requirements will require a expanded view of cumulative impacts which considers multiple projects being undertaken.	13.3.3.2
27-9	QPS	QPS indicates that policing issues are summarised in tables 2 and 3 of the submission. The movement of wide loads on major highways is a specific	10.4.3

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
		concern. Continued consultation with QPS is recommended in order to support the project development and service delivery to affected communities.	
28-1	Dept of Housing	Submission indicates that the Department of Housing is supportive of the social impact assessment and is pleased to participate as an advisory agent to provide advice on potential adverse impacts and mitigation strategies should they arise.	Noted
29-1	DMR	Submitter recommends consultation with Main Roads officers ensure the project does not compromise future road infrastructure improvements.	Noted
29-2	DMR	Table 10-10 of the EIS acknowledges that maintenance costs are yet to be determined. The proponent should provide contributions (in consultation with transport authorities) for impacts on road infrastructure.	10.4.1
29-3	DMR	A Traffic Management Plan should be developed in consultation with relevant transport authorities. (refer s.10.5)	10.4.5
29-4	DMR	The Traffic Management Plan should address impacts on road safety and provide mitigation strategies to manage increased traffic arising from shift changeover periods.	10.4.5
30-1	Powerlink	Consideration to be given for adequate clearances for Powerlinks 132kV transmission lines 4km south of Banana.	Noted
31-1	Dalby Regional Council	Submitter indicates that Dalby Regional Council supports the project provided a range of negative impacts upon residents and the community are minimised.	Noted
31-2	Dalby Regional Council	Submitter is supportive of maximising co-location opportunities with other infrastructure projects in the region.	2.3.2
31-3	Dalby Regional Council	Water supply to a construction camp at Wandoan needs to be considered in conjunction with the Xstrata Coal Development requirements. The submitter states that the Wandoan Water Treatment Plant will require an upgrade and the Wandoan Water Supply Scheme water supply is limited due to the Great Artesian Basin (GAB) allocations. The submitter suggests the SBRJV obtain increased GAB water allocation for the period during construction activities and contribute towards the review of Wandoan Water Supply in conjunction with the Wandoan Joint Venture and any upgrades should camps be assessing the Wandoan potable water supply. Access road to camps should be It is also indicated that the proponent would be required to maintain access roads in accordance with a Roads and Infrastructure Agreement with Dalby Regional Council.	2.4.10
31-4	Dalby Regional Council	Submitter indicates that the Sewage Waste Exclusion Zone should be monitored by proponents and EPA for legislated period after use of the site.	9.3.4
31-5	Dalby Regional Council	Submitter requests development of a Project Waste Management Plan (PWMP) including accumulated affects of the SBRJV waste requirements completed to the satisfaction of Dalby Regional Council prior to EPA approvals. (refer s.2.8.7)	9.3 and 16.5
31-6	Dalby Regional Council	Material imported to the site and left exposed must be treated to ensure noxious weeds are not introduced.	4.6.4
31-7	Dalby Regional Council	Submitter indicates opposition to utilising Wandoan water supply for construction purposes and expresses concern over exhaustion of GAB water.	6.3 and 6.4
31-8	Dalby Regional Council	Concern over insufficient water supply available in the Wandoan area to service both the SBR Project and Wandoan Mine Projects concurrently. Submitter indicates that they would prefer the project to utilise RO treated Coal Seam Gas water or other waste water sources rather than the Wandoan water supply.	6.3 and 6.4
31-9	Dalby Regional Council	The submitter would support a Coal Dust Management Plan to minimise coal dust from open wagons and stockpiles. It is indicated that Dalby Regional Council would not support a stockpile site near the Wandoan township.	7.6.4
31-10	Dalby Regional Council	The location of the proposed SBR rail line along the Leichhardt Highway to the west of Wandoan appears to be within 500m buffer zone for the WJV - Xstrata Coal Mine Frank Creek Pit and there will be accumulating affects on Wandoan residents.	Noted
31-11	Dalby Regional Council	The submitter indicates that the Wandoan community does not want the Frank Creek Pit mined due to the proximity of a number of sensitive receptors and the potential dust, noise, light and odour impacts. A range of examples are cited as to how these potential impacts may create negative health implications. The accumulated impact of the SBR Project, Frank Creek Pit and Leichhardt	Noted, 16.3

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
		Highway will affect the quality of life of Wandoan residents.	
31-12	Dalby Regional Council	Submitter requests further information regarding waste volumes and the development of a Project Waste Management Plan (PWMP) to the satisfaction of Dalby Regional Council and EPA. It is requested that the SBRJV contribute towards options developed between council and the WJV - Xstrata proponents. (refer s.9.1)	9.3.1
31-13	Dalby Regional Council	The proposal for on site sewerage treatment for the construction camp is satisfactory provided that all waste is treated to a standard that is suitable for reuse and complies with EPA requirements.	9.3.4
31-14	Dalby Regional Council	Submitter requires SBRJV to enter into an Infrastructure Agreement for maintenance and restoration of Council roads during and following construction. Works are to be at the cost of the SBRJV. (refer s.10.2)	10.4.1
31-15	Dalby Regional Council	The proponent should demonstrate that its sourcing of construction materials does not detrimentally affect Dalby Regional Council's road construction materials supply. (s.10.3.3)	2.4.12, 17.2.3
31-16	Dalby Regional Council	Submitter (Dalby Regional Council) requires a Traffic Management Plan prior to commencement of the construction phase. (refer s.10.3.6)	10.4.5
31-17	Dalby Regional Council	Train activated warning systems be provided at all at grade level crossings and crossings be capable of carrying heavy farm machinery. Assurance that provision for large machinery and livestock transporters be included in any future electrification plans.	10.3.1
31-18	Dalby Regional Council	Submitter requests the development of a comprehensive history of the Wandoan District, agreed to by proponents of all mining/transport and infrastructure projects to identify and preserve significant sites.	Noted
31-19	Dalby Regional Council	Submitter acknowledges the long term benefits which mining activities will bring to the area. A range of potential social impacts are identified, with a number of examples. It is suggested that there is a need for a Social Impact Monitoring Framework and Management Strategy for the Wandoan area.	13.3.4
31-20	Dalby Regional Council	Submitter requests local businesses are considered to service the project construction.	14.5
31-21	Dalby Regional Council	Submitter requests proponents address water supply, sewerage and waste management issues across all projects as a whole in the region (Dalby Region).	16.5
31-22	Dalby Regional Council	Dalby Regional Council requires that all vehicles entering the area and leaving the site to be adequately washed down to prevent the spread of weeds. Infrastructure requirements for community wash down facilities at Wandoan.	4.6.4
31-23	Dalby Regional Council	Concern about impact of railway adjacent to Wandoan Cemetery during funerals. Requests a management plan and protocols to be developed.	8.6.2.3
31-24	Dalby Regional Council	Submitter indicates support for development of natural resources provided maximum value adding community benefit and minimised impacts for residents.	Noted
32-1	Private submitter	The submitter suggests liaison with Local Government to acquire funding to upgrade sections of Nathan Rd to a sealed standard.	10.4.1
32-2	Private submitter	Security for landowners to access properties on both sides of the railway line corridor. Submitter suggests to attach to property titles.	2.4.3
32-3	Private submitter	Submitter suggests liaison with Sun Water to fast track the Glebe Weir of Dalby pipeline as alternatives to using artesian water. It is also suggested that new dams be constructed and left to landholders.	6.2.4.3
32-4	Private submitter	Co-locating water, gas, road and rail services into one corridor to avoid multiple corridors.	2.3.2
32-5	Private submitter	The submitter requests relocation of Nathan Road into the transport corridor thereby allowing landholders to resume existing road corridors.	Noted
33-1	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	Risk of damage to the Warrego and Leichardt Highways resulting from increased tonnage during construction. Strategies for maintenance and repair are requested.	10.4.1
33-2	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	Submitter requests that study of land sub layers identifying degradation risks, along with management strategies be included to the supplementary document.	4.2.3
33-3	Wandoan	Rail alignment located too close to the town of Wandoan and suggests	Noted

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
	District Liaison Committee	relocation at least to west of the communication tower.	
33-4	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	Submitter requests that coal freight wagons be covered to reduce release of contaminants which may compromise organic certification of livestock if ingested. Submitter cites the National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development and the obligations resulting from Livestock Production Assurance (LPA).	7.6.4
33-5	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	Inclusion of the Wandoan Cemetery as a noise sensitive area.	8.4
33-6	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	Submitter would like a service road along the easement and all road crossings to be grade separated for safety and movement of stock and machinery. (s.2.4, table 2-1)	10.3.1
33-7	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	The submitter suggests consultation with Dalby Regional Council to ensure that required potable water can be supplied from the Wandoan water supply.	2.4.11 and 6.4
33-8	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	It is unclear if the water allocation provisions identified in the EIS include dust suppression on private and Council roads. Mitigation measures to manage dust on private roads should also be included in the EMP.	2.4.11, 7.7, 18.5.4
33-9	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	The EIS does not specify the anticipated length of time which the exclusion zone will continue once the construction camp is no longer used.	9.3.4
33-10	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	Submitter requests suppression of dust during earthworks.	18.5.4
33-11	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	Any plant matter brought onto site should be sterilised to ensure no weeds are introduced to the area.	4.6.4
33-12	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	Submitter requests that construction water be drawn from surface supplies and from CSM water as the Hutton and Precipice Aquifers are already heavily utilised and under pressure. (refer s.6.2.2, Figure 6-2)	Noted and 6.3
33-13	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	Submitter suggests that neighbouring landholders should be notified well in advance of any blasting. (refer s.8.7)	8.6.6.2
33-14	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	Submitter suggests vehicle wash down facilities to prevent the spread of weeds. (refer s.5.2.1, table 5-4)	4.6.4
33-15	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	The submitter suggests liaison with Dalby Regional Council to ensure that local roads are left in similar or better condition following the project.	10.4.1
33-16	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	Submitter highlights that the submission identifies existing roads likely to be impacted by the project. (refer s.10.2)	Noted
33-17	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	Submitter highlights a social infrastructure shortfall in Wandoan which may result from projected population growth as termination point of the line. (refer s.13.4.7)	13.3.1 and 16.3
33-18	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	Submitter suggests consultation with local businesses to service the construction camps to increase community benefits. (refer s.13.5.2)	14.5
33-19	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	Submitter suggests liaison with Dalby Regional Council to ensure that the Wandoan town water supply is not adversely affected as a result of use by the SBR project. (refer s.16.5.2)	16.5
33-20	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	Submitter suggests locating maintenance and support facilities within Wandoan to increase benefits for the district. (refer s.2.5.2)	14.5
33-21	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	Submitter states the completed rail link will provide general freight opportunities and benefit for communities along the line.	Noted

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
33-16a	Wandoan District Liaison Committee	Submitter outlines projected number of additional vehicle trips generated by the construction workforce. Liaison with Dalby Regional Council is suggested to ensure that the local road network has adequate water used on the roads to ensure that the road is able to be maintained at an appropriate standard and that dust does not become a hazard for other road users or neighbouring landholders. (refer s.10.3.2)	10.4.1
34-1	Department of Premier and Cabinet	Submitter has no comment on the EIS.	Noted
35-1	Department of Local Government, Sport and Recreation	Submitter has no comment on the EIS. Would appreciate receiving more information on SIA and Local Government submissions to the EIS.	Noted
36-1	Qld Health	Submitter outlines that Queensland Health's assessment of public health impacts are provided in Attachment A and Appendix B of the submission.	Noted
36-2	Qld Health	The EIS does not adequately address potential implications for health services as well as health impacts of dust, noise and vibration.	13.3.3.1, Sections 7 and 8
36-3	Qld Health	Submitter highlights the changed landscape and community lifestyle which may result from the Surat Basin Rail and Wandoan coal projects, requires careful management to reduce environmental and public health impacts.	Noted
36-4	Qld Health	The EPP (Air) 1997 and EPP (Noise) 1997 used to assess noise and air quality have been superseded and require re-assessment against the current objectives of EPP (Air) 2008 and EPP (Noise) 2008.	8.2
36-5	Qld Health	Submitter highlights a lack of assessment of cumulative impacts (dust, noise and vibration) from the Wandoan coal project, requesting mitigation measures and assessment based on health based criteria.	16.3 and Sections 7 and 8
36-6	Qld Health	Submitter states that factors with potential to alter the health of workers, individuals and communities must be considered prior to construction and operational stages. Further assistance is offered by contacting Uma Rajappa (Director), Environmental Health Policy and Research Unit on 3328 9338 or Steven Begg (Senior Scientific Advisor), Environmental Health Policy and Research unit on 3328 9341.	13.3.3.1
36-7	Qld Health	Provision of food to the workforce must be compliant with the Food Act 2006.	2.4.10
36-8	Qld Health	Re-use of sewage treatment plant waste water for dust suppression (table 18.2, s.18.5) requires mitigation measures and assessment to ensure health risks are sufficiently managed.	9.3.4
36-9	Qld Health	Submitter states that the Australian and New Zealand Conservation Council Guidelines 2000 (ANZECC) proposed in s.6.1.5 are not sufficient to address health aspects of drinking water and that assessment against the Australian Drinking Water Guideline 2004 (ADWG) would be more appropriate and that the Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act 2008 may also apply to potable and recycled water. It is suggested that any assessment of potable water should include how it will be sourced, transported, reticulated and monitored for quality. Submitter also suggests that should recycled water be used as outlined s.2.8.2 that a management system for recycled water be described, specifically recommending use of the Australian Guidelines for Water Recycling - managing health and environmental risks (Phase 1) (2006).	2.4.11 and 6.4.2
36-10	Qld Health	Submitter states that the proponent needs to outline how cross contamination and cross connection of the individual supplies of medium and reduced quality water (s.6.2.5) will be eliminated.	6.4.2
36-11	Qld Health	Submitter highlights the intent to collect and re-use stormwater within construction camps (s.2.8.3), requesting further information and investigation into potential health impacts and mitigation measures.	2.4.10, 17.2.2
36-12	Qld Health	Submitter states that downstream surface water quality impacts require mitigation measures due to potential public health impacts. Submitter also highlights the importance of groundwater resources proposed for use by the project and consideration of groundwater quality and ground water levels for	6.2, 6.3 and 6.4

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
		appropriate use.	
36-13	Qld Health	Submitter states that predicted air emissions must be reassessed against the updated air quality objectives in schedule 1 of the Environmental Protection (Air) Policy 2008, which supersedes the policy against which air quality was assessed. The submitter refutes section 7.2.3 which states that the National Environmental Protection (Ambient Air Quality) Measures do not apply to isolated residences in close proximity to industrial areas. The submitter states the proponent must re-evaluate the proposed mitigation strategies to ensure the 24-hour PM10 air quality goal of 50 ug/m ³ and PM2.5 air quality goal of 25ug/m ³ (24-hour) and 8ug/m ² (1-year) is achieved at all sensitive receptors, the accommodation facilities, and the Wandoan and Banana townships. The submitter highlights the lack of dust emission assessment, stating that assessment of construction and operational dust emissions and development of mitigation measures will be required for Queensland Health to assess potential health risks associated with dust.	7.2
36-14	Qld Health	Submitter states that predicted noise emissions must be reassessed against the updated acoustic quality objectives in schedule 1 of the Environmental Protection (Noise) Policy 2008, which supersedes the policy against which noise levels were assessed. Submitter continues to state that the proponent has not addressed the potential noise impact on human health for the construction and operational phases and must therefore do so, including level of annoyance and effects on physical and psychological health. The publication - "The health effects of environmental noise - other than hearing loss" (http://enhealth.nphp.gov.au/council/pubs/ecpub.htm) is suggested as a useful reference document when undertaking an assessment.	8.2 and 8.3
36-15	Qld Health	Submitter indicates that the lack of construction noise emission assessment and operational noise levels does not allow Queensland Health to assess construction noise impacts on human health. Submitter also states that an assessment of low-frequency noise against health based criteria should be undertaken to develop mitigation strategies. It is stated that a noise mitigation information is not sufficient and that a noise management plan and monitoring program should be implemented for construction and operation.	8.3 and 8.6.3
36-16	Qld Health	Submitter states that Queensland Health cannot assess construction phase impacts due to a lack of vibration impact assessment. Also outlines the need for a vibration monitoring program and mitigation strategies should health based vibration criteria be exceeded.	7.3 and 8.3
36-17	Qld Health	Insufficient detail regarding sewage treatment plants to allow submitter to assess potential health risks. Also stated that if other waste streams are diverted as described in s.9.1.1, table 9-1 local landfills may be overwhelmed. Consultation with Local Governments to determine impacts and capacity issues is suggested.	9.3.4
36-18	Qld Health	Weekly collection of putrescible waste cited in s.9.2.2, table 9-5 as inadequate stating a range of potential impacts and suggests the use of waste receptacles compliant with the Environmental Protection (Waste Management) Regulation 2000. Submitter suggests the development of a waste diversion/re-use strategy in consultation with Local Government.	9.3.3
36-19	Qld Health	Potential increased pressure on health services as a result of the maximum workforce of 1350 people. It is suggested that the proponent should consult the relevant state and Local Government agencies and health service providers to address capacity issues.	13.3.3
36-20	Qld Health	Construction camps should be considered as sensitive receptors and therefore have mitigation strategies for air, acoustic and vibration objectives.	2.4.10, 17.2.2
36-21	Qld Health	The EIS excludes a sensitive receptor located within the construction footprint from further assessment. The submitter highlights the need for further information regarding the sensitive receptor and criteria for inclusion and exclusion of sensitive receptors.	7.6.1 and 8.4
36-22	Qld Health	The EIS (s.2.4) indicates the potential need for a concrete batching plant. It is suggested that the proponent undertake an assessment to determine impacts and mitigation measures to allow an assessment on potential health risks to be made.	17.5 and 17.6

ID	Submitter	Summary of Key Issues	Section
36-23	Qld Health	Submitter considers that management of air quality, noise and vibration issues will require an effective complaints monitoring system.	18.5.12
36-24	Qld Health	The EIS provides limited information regarding how the project will undertake the management of mosquitoes and midges (s.18.6.6). The submitter outlines a range of potential health impacts and suggests that a comprehensive mosquito management plan should be developed and implemented due to the close proximity of local townships, sensitive receptors, and the number of itinerant workers/visitors who will be on site for varying periods of time. Reference to Queensland Health's document "Guidelines to minimise mosquito and biting midge problems in new development areas". Periodic monitoring of ponded waters and rainwater tanks will determine if proposed control measures are effective in reducing mosquito-breeding numbers.	18.5.3
36-25	Qld Health	Submitter suggests that approval and licensing may be required for food business and certain types of accommodation facilities.	Noted
36-26	Qld Health	Submitter highlights the potential for social isolation amongst contractors as a result of the isolated location of construction camps. Submitter recommends a needs analysis be undertaken of typical camp residents to determine suitable social activities. Recommendations include; regular bus services to local towns, internet connections at camps and establishment of social group interaction areas not associated with alcohol or tobacco consumption.	2.4.10
36-27	Qld Health	Submitter highlights the potential health and safety impacts associated with alcohol consumption, and related project delivery implications. Submitter suggests that an Alcohol Management Plan be devised to ensure safe and responsible consumption of alcohol and assistance for employees with alcohol dependency.	13.3.3.1
36-28	Qld Health	Submitter suggests that further to the requirements of the Tobacco and Other Smoking Products Act 1998 that construction camps be designated either smoking free or have only one designated smoking area. Smoking areas should be situated to minimise impacts on other residents at the camp, with consideration of wind and screening etc. Quit programs for smokers in the camps should be offered.	13.3.3.1

This page was intentionally left blank.