



# **APPENDIX A2-B EDITORIAL CORRECTIONS**

1.	No change required		1
	1.1.	No change required – Outside scope of Project / EIS	1
	1.2.	No change required – Information/comment acknowledged	1
	1.3.	No change required – Adequately outlined in EIS	1
	1.4.	Misinterpretation of EIS	1
	1.5.	No change required – Comment refers to outdated legislation	2
2.	Corrections		3
	2.1.	Correct Terminology	3
	2.2.	Updating organisation name	3
	2.3.	Typographic Errors	3





#### 1. NO CHANGE REQUIRED

### 1.1. No change required - Outside scope of Project / EIS

Thirty (30) issues were identified by the Office of the Coordinator General as not requiring any response as the issue raised was outside the intended scope of the EIS document.

Example: Issue number 35.5 was related to concerns around the correct disposal and management of coal seam gas wastewater. The Project does not include any creation, use, disposal or transfer of coal seam gas water. This issue is therefore not related to the Project and outside the intended scope of the EIS document.

Issue numbers: 8.35, 13.21, 17.21 17.4, 27.2.10, 31.9, 33.1, 33.4, 33.5, 33.6, 33.7, 33.8, 33.9, 33.10, 35.1, 35.2, 35.3, 35.4, 35.5, 35.6, 35.8, 37.6, 37.8, 37.10, 37.31, 40.16, 47.9, 47.10, 47.11, 48.34, 49.1, 58.3,

### 1.2. No change required – Information/comment acknowledged

Thirty-eight (38) issues were identified by the Office of the Coordinator General as not requiring any response as they were comprised of information, commentary and statements regarding the EIS document which, whilst relevant, did not require any extra actions to be carried out.

Example: Issue number 37.29 was a statement regarding the change in aquatic environmental habitat values from a natural flowing river to a large deep body of water that will occur with the construction of the dam. This is a valid statement but requires no response other than it is acknowledged.

Issue number: 27.2.10, 27.4.1, 27.7.1, 27.9.21, 28.3.2, 31.11, 31.12, 31.13, 31.14, 31.15, 31.2, 31.3, 31.4, 31.5, 31.7, 31.16, 37.29, 39.10, 47.14, 48.12, 54.1, 54.2, 54.3, 54.4, 55.1, 13.24, 14.7, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 9.1, 27.9.16, 27.9.29, 40.15, 41.136

### 1.3. No change required – Adequately outlined in EIS

Ten (10) issues were identified by the Office of the Coordinator General as not requiring any response as the queries raised had already been dealt with adequately in the EIS document and may have been missed by the reader.

Example: Issue number 37.7 requested additional assessment of the potential impact of the Nathan Dam proposal on the Great Barrier Reef. This has been covered within the EIS document and accepted by DoE as sufficient information for assessment.

Issue number: 35.9, 37.21, 37.39, 37.7, 43.4, 43.16, 44.3, 45.17, 41.37, 41.38

### 1.4. Misinterpretation of EIS

One issue was identified by the Office of the Coordinator General as not requiring any response as the reader misinterpreted information within the EIS document.

Example: Issue number 44.2 suggested that the water derived from Nathan Dam will be used to further activate or intensify the irrigated agriculture industry. The project is clearly targeting industrial clients rather than agricultural.





Issue number: 44.2

# 1.5. No change required – Comment refers to outdated legislation

One issue was identified by the Office of the Coordinator General as not requiring any response as the comment referred to outdated legislation.

Example: Issue number 41.82 noted an error in a table referring to a number in the *Water Resource (Fitzroy Basin) Plan 1999* which has been replaced by the *Water Resource (Fitzroy Basin) Plan 2011*.

Issue number: 41.82





### 2. CORRECTIONS

# 2.1. Correct Terminology

Two issues were identified requiring adjustments to the EIS text due to inaccurate terminology.

Example: Issue number 50.5 identified that the term Aboriginal was referred to as 'aboriginal' without capitalisation. This issue has been rectified throughout the AEIS.

Issue number: 41.14, 50.5

### 2.2. Updating organisation name

The following issue numbers have been identified as using out dated or incorrect names for groups or organisations.

Example: Issue number 27.4.2 – the document had incorrectly referred to the 'Department of Tourism , Regional Development and Industry'. This was replaced with the correct organisation name, 'Department of State Development'.

Issue number: 27.4.2, 27.7.3

# 2.3. Typographic Errors

One issue identified typographical errors in the EIS document.

Issue number 41.01 identified that the words "Connors River Dam & Pipelines EIS" appeared in the footer on several pages. This should have read "Nathan Dam & Pipelines EIS". This has been rectified throughout the AEIS.

Issue number: 41.01