

Appendix A

Summary of submissions received

SUBMISSIONS SUMMARY – Pacific Highway- Kempsey to Eungai (Kempsey and Nambucca LGA's)

No.	Position	Reason
1	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No interchange with Crescent Head Road. Hardly receives mention unlike Stuarts Point and South West Rocks. Crescent Head relies on tourism with many visitors following Tourist Route 12 and stay awhile. Concerned that that without direct access economic disaster will occur causing unemployment, especially in a high unemployment area like this. Identifies that villages around Taree suffered downturn after bypass to Taree and does not want to see it happening to Crescent Head.
2	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Mid coast strategy has been cited in the EA but not appear to be specifically addressed. Will not impact on both Kempsey and Frederickton Growth areas.
3	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Levee proposed as a flood mitigation measure will have detrimental impacts on property referred to as 'Cheese Factory' Concerned about height and impacts on the environment.
4	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access and egress. Safety of east-west alignment at property. Alignment of driveway to Bruce's lane Drainage and flooding impacts which will impact on property Impacts for duration and post construction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise- sound barriers Dust Pollution Vibration Visual impact of upgrade on property Property acquisition- what impact will It have on property values Request a 12 month trial period after completion and operation of the upgrade for compensation and acquisition of property if there are any complications to safety, health and well being;
5	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dual carriageway no longer required due to peak oil occurring – road infrastructure should be replaced by rail spending,
5.1	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above.
6	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 100m from highway corridor and property currently rented. Noise impacts- will increase over construction and again after completion of works. Identifies that low-level noise pavement and walls is used and seeks commitment this will be the case.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual house treatments unacceptable for country living where outdoor lifestyle emphasised • Air quality- wind direction (Westerly) will result increased exposure to pollutants that currently does not happen. Unlike visual, noise etc, there is no proposed mitigation. What is the RTA proposing? • Visual impact- will be intrusive as opposed to now leafy outlook. Seeks commitment to landscaping and tree replacement as per the EA and perspective drawings (or better). • Construction dust- what will be dust control and measures on place.
7	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise impacts on animals and residents during construction and operation; • Dust during construction; • Visual impact of road; • Impact on local wildlife that visit property;
8	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bypass will destroy tranquil setting and safety/lifestyles of those in the Inches road vicinity; • President of local riding group who use forests for horse ridding and the freeway will destroy them; • Agists horses on property which is quiet, new road will increase noise; • Inches Road overpass will be difficult to navigate horses across; • Water movement- reduction in runoff which will in turn restrict water availability to people;
9	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road will be an eyesore; • Will create a dustbowl which has major impacts on health- chronic asthmatic and construction impacts may increase this- must go to hospital and if road closed at different periods cannot access services; • Wildlife impacts- both on habitat and that of animals visiting property.
10	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roadwork will impact on business and heavy vehicle movements; • Noise and height of roadway will impact on horse training activities; • Road will be closed at specific periods and will not be able to attend to work;
11	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests that a 25m x 6m navigable lock be provided in the flood levee at Frederickton to provide refuge for boats in times of flood.
12	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owns land that will be acquired by the RTA (including demolition of structures on-site); • Intends to remain on land left (for retirement) and build new house • Requests that the RTA working corridor and highway kept as far east as possible to allow Shannon Close as access to property.
13	Did not Specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has strong concerns that the project will impact on acoustic amenity during construction and operation; • Construction noise will be greater than ambient noise thus impacting on amenity; • Less than 600m from sight line of proposed road and currently low ambient noise levels at night which will be introduced by freeway; • Residence outside the area of study but will be impacted by operational noise. • Request additional noise monitoring outside their property so can assess changes in construction/operational noise and if

		exceedances, noise mitigation measures as specified in chapter 16 employed to landholders satisfaction.
14	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage and local flooding issues on property; • Noise levels and sound proofing barriers; • Dust; • Pollution; • Vibration during and after construction; • Visual impacts; • Property acquisition- how will this affect the property valuation; • Timeframe for works and advice of commencement.
15	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Error in Chapter 6 and Chapter 15 of the Environmental Assessment- sewerage easement was considered to be property boundary rather than existing Highway; • Correct property size 9.6ha and 10.6 with accretion. This could have additional impacts on a total of 11 farms (including theirs) • Considers operational capacity of land will be impacted as a 2m high levee across property will have an impact on existing drainage and gate/pipe. • Northern section of hectare lot adjacent to part of western boundary will be affected by highway works but unlikely to be directly involved/acquired. Clarification if other works will impact the lot in future; • Currently no dwelling entitlement for property but notes neighbouring property with entitlement and that part will need to be acquired- interested in mediating a solution for an entitlement and appropriate lot size;-
16	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to access road being constructed to Mountain Nursery via Bingis Lane (currently only residents); • Noise impacts – specifically underpass works; • Unnecessary clearing of vegetation/habitat and noise during operation; • Family ashes scattered on property; • Water quality impacts- existing watercourse has minimal protection; • Bingis Lane will need to be sealed due to traffic increase (semis, pantechs etc) with 40km limit and calming devices. • Additional heavy vehicle restriction required (8-5) and children being injured; • Proximity of church hill quarry to highway- will blasting still occur and will it be dangerous; • Additional option suggested- why cant road come from mill to nursery- greater cost benefit; • Crown road- maintained by residents not council, clarification of maintenance responsibilities and need fencing for their property. • Animal strikes from road operation.
17	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Made previous submissions in August 2005 (Moorland to Herons Creek) and January 2004 (Kempsey to Eungai) that can be considered as formal submission to EA; • Seeks assessment of integrating a rail easement with the road alignment which will have significant benefits;

18	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant increase in heavy vehicles travelling the highway and legislative Council to investigate improving existing rail corridor. • Specifically, new sections of the highway near the railway should also be given option to further straighten tracks. • EA does not adequately address desire to get more freight onto rail or scope of shared corridors; • Would like to support highway however until issues of upgrades reduce heavy movements, getting greater freight onto rail and shared corridors are addressed.
19	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EA identifies that Lyall lane property will access Crescent Head Road via Yabsleys Lane. • Currently property manufactures blinds etc and dust is currently an issue from traffic. • Diversion will increase traffic and therefore dust- requests this be mitigated by sealing road. • Property water meter on Lyall lane with service running underground the laneway, if road to be utilised for traffic associated service(s) be located on property.
20	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage on property as a result of construction; • Disturbance of soil, specifically Acid Sulphate Soils; • Peace and quietness disturbance; • Higher chance of animals being killed.
21	Did Not Specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action Group Supports submission 23 by Phillip Laird; • Spending biased to roads rather than railways; • Questions whether public hearing will be exercised considering scale of proposal.
22	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of land has increased as access road has increased total area; • RTA study is biased; • Cheaper alternative route ignored (\$30 million cheaper) (Tamban Forest) • No study undertaken on impacts of families affected.
23	Did not Specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desirability for a shared road and rail corridor; • Includes submission dated 4 August 2005 for Moorland to Herons Creek and 1 July 2005; • Issue of shared road-rail corridors not addressed in EA and should be considered prior to any approval of the Project; • EA does not also consider the GPSC (May 2006) for Pacific Highway Upgrades and associated community concerns- specifically greater rail freight as opposed to road; • Corridor to upgrade telecommunications and other facilities should be investigated; • Lack of detail of route selection process; • Low cost/benefit ratio for a major project • EA does not consider increase in greenhouse gas emissions from heavy traffic with less freight on rail; • Community concerns associated with increased heavy vehicles;
24	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistency with figures (1.1 vs. 2.1) identifying property; • Fencing on property- will it only extend to the creek or along the whole property as existing are 25-30 yrs old;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inches Road only partially sealed, requests whether the new portion could also be sealed; • Dam stocked with Silver perch next to proposed cutting. How will pollution and fumes impact them as fish are caught to eat; • Noise- already can hear traffic etc from 6km away. Property subject to already frequent noise issues associated with rural area and highway will add substantially increase. • Visual impacts, current vistas to East Kempsey will be replaced by highway; • Impacts to property and pool area through blasting and vibration.
25	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater bores- DWE considers no requirement for licences under Part 5 of the Water Act 1912. If required, need to be constructed in accordance with Construction requirements for Water bores in Australia; • Proposal is not within gazetted water sharing plan area; If water extraction required, the proposal must satisfy statutory requirements; • Proposals to change the course of a river (flowing, third or higher order) requires a permit under Part 2 of the water act 1912.
26	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owns several properties directly impacted by the upgrade and concerned it will impact on the dairy business; • Owns three houses on properties which will suffer increased flooding via construction of embankment road across floodplain; • One property access will be cut by embankment; • Environmentally, socially and economically any change to flood behaviour can only spell disaster after completion of project; • Figure 15-4B (does not indicate additional property (Lot D) which contains structures/dwellings; • EA identifies property as a dairy farm and only land on eastern boundary will be acquired which is minimal- land in question used for cropping and best land, configuration of land does not allow for cropping in other areas; • Properties are being considered as one allotment where, in fact they are 7 separate allotments purchased over time; • Land identified as regionally significant farmland- does not need irrigation and is highly productive and viable; • Flooding a big concern for property – Any increase in levels, periods of inundation is unacceptable as changing characteristics will bring uncertainty and may contribute to stock and person loss; • Will impact on operational capacity and associated feeding/ re-establishment after incident; • Stock mounds and raising of houses integral mitigation to be implemented prior or in conjunction with the highway embankment; • No mention of mitigation to other farm infrastructure (i.e. sheds, lads yards); • EA does not show increases for South West Rocks Road (Red Hill Lane) and is important as it is only access and evacuation route for property- considers raising low point of red hill lane to same as south west rocks road will permit greater evacuation time for residents and stock (up to 2 days earlier) than current case; • Soft soil issues- land is alluvium soils- possible sinking of road exaggerated by vibration from heavy vehicles; • Runoff from road could cause contamination to soils/crops; • Safety-area known to suffer from high hazard fogs and associated visibility issues; • Ferry lane memorial avenue of family significance which will be impacted; • No survey undertaken of agricultural economic losses;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visual impacts- structures will block current views across other side of road
27	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hopes that disabled workers will also be employed in the project; Wishes for the Minister to permit additional two months to review options- specifically West of Kempsey not East over floodplain; Pola Creek- fish and turtle habitat; Friilled neck lizards along the route 5-6 types of finches nesting in grasses along with other birds; run off during/post construction- chemical dangers/spill incidents, pollution and rehabilitation; Construction of Levees are of concern; Flood evacuation measures during construction; No cycle ways for proposal; Deals with Council and RTA should be made public (i.e. Quarries etc); Employment training made available to those impacted by the bypass and loosing employment; 'Hand over' costs to Councils by reverting roads/infrastructure to Council ownership;
28	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint submissions property 95 and 96 (80 Hills Lane and 2693 Pacific Highway) Property 95; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of emergency fire/flood escape and access as Hills Lane will be closed and no access to Barraganyatti Hutt Rd which is an alternative route; Bridge Upgrade, existing wooden bridge goes under (annual occurrence at least) in heavy rain; Road upgrade, minimum all weather gravel surface required to facilitate 2wd movements; Loss of dam on property which is connected to house. Request new dam supplied and redirected pipe implemented at least 18months prior to demolition to permit fill, settle and continued supplies; Additional 10,000 gallon concrete tank for RFS service; Increased noise level- noise reduction i.e. walls double glazing prior to construction; Loss of land/property value due to reduction- requires compensation; Loss of income from future timber sales- compensation Property 96; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of emergency fire/flood escape and access as Hills Lane will be closed and no access to Barraganyatti Hutt Rd which is an alternative route; Bridge Upgrade, existing wooden bridge goes under (annual occurrence at least) in heavy rain access is via neighbours property to get to their house; Road upgrade, minimum all weather gravel surface required to facilitate 2wd movements; Loss of land/property value due to reduction- requires compensation; Loss of income from future timber sales- compensation Increased bush fire threat due to decrease of escape routes and need increased water holding capacity to stay

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and fight fires and therefore 2x10000gallon concrete tanks with rfs fittings required; o Loss of dual street frontage and development potential;
29	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Route selection – should be to the West of Kempsey away from floodplain and soft, swampy ground; • Terrain means it results in 1.5-2.5 greater than over higher ground and 3 times longer; • New route not flood free- 2001 floods had velocities of 80km/h, restricted openings could result in increased velocities through bridges, concerned could be like a Tsunami and cause significant damage; • Frederickton levy confirms this however does not permit drainage for heavy local rains to avoid damage; • Livestock safety in floods and crop security; • Cars swept of highway in high floods.
30	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes the route contains numerous built heritage, sites of non-Aboriginal heritage significance and landscapes of heritage significance. Potential to affect through direct or indirect 11 items; • No items in area in NSW State register, Commonwealth register or S170 register by RTA; • Substantial impact on 3 sites: Ferry Lane Memorial Avenue, Frederickton Ferry Ramp and the early 20th century house. • Notes that memorial avenues are a relatively rare phenomenon and should be treated with respect. Mitigation measures in SoC sufficient and need to be carried out to fullest extent; • Mitigation measures to be incorporated include Non-Indigenous Heritage Management Plan in consultation with Heritage within CEMP; • Appointment of a specialist heritage manager for works; • Induction for contractors on the heritage issues for worksites; • Protection of significant heritage items and built elements to be protected; • Further detailed investigations as to impacts in vicinity of levee and associated maritime impacts;
31	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Route option has minimal impact on Forests NSW estate; • Chapter 15- Table 15.1 contains error- Property 93 and associated forestry rights/dedications; • Verification required that B Double access from forest roads travelling North and South will be available; Frederickton, Barraganyatti Hut Road to the Joneses Road interchanges specifically; • Consultation required to ensure fire trail network is adequate to meet safety concerns in emergency;
32	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 300m from centre of freeway; • Concerned about construction impacts – vibration, use of explosives, dust and noise. Specifically brickwork and other damage as experience in past assuring everything will be ok has proven otherwise; • Go from quiet rural setting to noisy highway- steps taken during construction to protect residents from dust, damage, noise an inconvenience; • Noise mitigation measures at operation stage also required; • Request that RTA inspect property pre and post construction for damage and appropriate compensation if required.

33	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Property to be acquired- concerned that the price will not be adequate to purchase another property in area as currently free from mortgage and considers that forced moving requires family to purchase same sized property and dwelling.
34	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current tenants not been notified by RTA, PB or property owners that highway will have an affect on business. They are aware that there may be an impact on property-specifically corner boundaries. Clearly a variation to access roads or corridor itself will have substantial impact on business and financial damage to tenants let alone owners, and if this is the case they require appropriate and just compensation for business; Currently leased as a commercial sports and recreation facility for five years and addition five year option which is current large part of local community, sporting and recreational; fabric of area; Largest indoors sports centre of mid north coast with significant facilities, 300+ school children, 500+ public members use it weekly in addition to others and any disruption will cause flow on affects to community as a whole in terms of recreation and social impacts; Any disruption to access etc should result in compensation to tenants.
35	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Levy proposed to mitigate affects of highway on floodplain which is to be around property; 2.4m high concrete bank proposed for 1m from house, this will remove entertaining area and children's area and restrict access to river as opposed to current direct access. Amenity and value of property will be impacted; Recent rain sees stormwater drain into gravel pit next to house which was not sodden, water currently passes through silt soil down to river level, a levy will work in reverse as a concrete or earth levy will not hold back water and come through ground. Engineers aware of circumstances when designing bridges and result will be water under levy blamed on local flooding in area; Noise- currently hear traffic at 500m at 50km/h and now will be 4km at 100km/h; Designed and built property with existing highway in mind, no living or bedroom areas facing highway and open windows etc to view floodplain and river. New highway will be visible from property and noise will be greater as noise will carry across directly to property, deflected by riverbank and into property- cant redesign property to avoid new highway noise or visual impacts;
36	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns as to impacts levy will have on property. Specifically height, width etc; Noise currently an issue; Visual impact of highway esp. views to crescent head, hat head and smoky cape lighthouse, how will levy and highway affect such vistas and what options are available if this is the case.
37	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EA was inconclusive as no flora/fauna studies done on property or neighbouring properties; No study undertaken of Barranganyatti Creek which runs through property and into neighbouring wetlands; No noise studies of residential dwelling even though proposed route within Metres of property; Agricultural activities will be impacted on property which supplements income; Encroaches on main foaling paddocks which house thoroughbred mares which at foaling time are susceptible to disturbances and interruptions; Children safety issue as route will run adjacent to area where they train horses;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aware of route options to West considered a better option but disregarded which is 1.8km shorter and 30 million cheaper; • RTA currently own large parcel of land adjacent to existing highway at Kawanna Lane to South, 500m past northern side of Barraganyatti Creek Bridge. Could easily accommodate upgrade.
38	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies ongoing discussion with board and impacts on Travelling Stock Route 85050 Old Station Road. • Considers appropriate that substitute parcel of land be provided with same facilities as crucial in flooding and not impact on integrity of the TSR network; • Concerns as to loss of viable agricultural land
39	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned as no input in design of highway; • Making reference to number 83, figure 15-4 as total land of 29.3ha will impact on operation capacity associated with agricultural use; • Drains were constructed in 1930's to remove excess water off floodplain and any new structures will restrict flow of water increasing prolonged flooding which will result in property soil and pasture damage increasing costs; • Current management practices will need to be changed- how will they be compensated? • Attached photograph illustrates 8-10 inches of rain and requests consideration of heavy rainfall through planing of freeway; • Farm underpass (22000 and 22,500) is required for stock movement as land isn't for sale, yards required either side for safe movement through; • Width of openings at current length will result in disaster for farming property. Current cropping practice contributes to approximately \$40,000 used as supplementary feeding. New road will result in unusable land as a result of afflux. Important to drain water of land as quick as possible; • Northern bridge at 21000 needs to be 5x specified length of 20m at base. Brings total to 100m at base. • Southern bridge, concern as should be 120m span as opposed to 90m. If bridges not extended will cause scouring and kill pastures. • Inundation and velocity concerns and therefore long term land use and productivity. • Water currently supplied via deep spring in Collombatti Creek via windmill and troughs that will be separated by road. Second facilities required due to separating into two paddocks. • Dry access culvert 20,000 running parallel to existing highway (western side over Collombatti Creek for land btw Seven Oaks drain and creek) for stock and vehicle movement required; • Underpasses: height 5.3m at top, will this be sufficient height and clearance for machinery. Cattle truck is 4m and is required for movement. OH&S and QA reasons require stockyard on either side of pass along with sufficient design for drainage, stock movement and also contain a base suitable for constant movement (i.e. gravel); • Fencing required a minimum of 180cm and 6 barbed wire along with electrification to minimise public liability as responsible for stock entering shoulders of road; • 1800 acre property consisting of 4 properties and 50yrs of hard work to accumulate and self supportive. Quiet with 360 degree view and is at end of a no through road. Resale value will be forever impacted and undervalued, what value can be placed on this. • Identifies no other land other than corridor available for acquisition.

40	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation process inadequate- agricultural specialist was not made available to owners contrary to EA; • Economic impacts will be greater than that considered in the EA; • Physical impact of road will change land use; • Property continuously incorrectly described in EA • Noise mitigation is inadequate by assessments own evaluation; • Concept design shows greater distance from edge of cut downhill in 6.1b (2800) than comparable cuts i.e. 33500 (20-30m) although small is very important to productive capacity i.e. established cut flower plantation referred incorrectly as orchard; • Upgrade will reduce productive area by 50% but could be reduced significantly by adjustment of 50m to west; • Refinement of design now concern as will exceed boundary and require demolition of greenhouses and integrity of dams and contradicts with assessment conclusion that will 'not impact on operation capacity of business' • If construction footprint has such impact, RTA should fully acquire land; • Trappaud Road is a public road not private access, new access should be same; • No meetings to discuss process as an affected 'primary producer' and was classified incorrectly as a rural/residential property when it is an agricultural/horticultural land use; • Acquisition of 3% of land impacts on 75% of productive area for farm with area acquired well drained and frost free and provides high gross revenue per hectare than traditional cropping/grazing. Appropriate compensation required. • Requests low noise pavement and barriers similar to Crescent Head Road for mitigate noise as well as perimeter landscaping • No provision for either access or acquisition of residual land to west of upgrade although proposed for other properties; • Removes subdivision potential on land and requests compensation; • Reinstatement of fencing required- currently have elaborate electrified fencing to animals that would otherwise damage crops; • Anti pollution/siltation measures for water supply which is crucial to viability; • Impacts on ceramic art business in addition to current activities; • No evidence that shielding is appropriate mitigation as a result of rock crushing; • Blasting concerns- building closer than stipulated in EA. Dwelling 150m and buildings 100m; • Noise mitigation required; • Suggests can mitigate economic impacts through moving upgrades eastern boundary to the west slightly (closer to edge of cuts batter and allow native tree plantings that could generate additional income); • No highway runoff wanted as would be contaminated by hydrocarbons contradicting organic farming practices; • Local business impacts- Kempsey wholesale nursery, mountain nursery, tropical ornamentals nursery, macleay valley nursery and timber recycling centre.
41	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers the process flawed , secretive and superficial and requires further research specifically flooding and associated velocities; • Noise barriers, how many and their locations; • Construction period timeframe; • Pollution monitoring pre, during and post construction;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic issues • Koala colonies and flying fox colonies on verge of crescent head road which will be crossed, along with wildlife corridors in area; • Impact to local school which is expanding
42	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Niche market business with significant turnover in recycled products; • Eco friendly premises which is surrounded by bushland with resident mob of kangaroos and bird life that feed/nest in native plants on the site; • Rural setting integral to success of business- offices even have large mahogany tree growing from roof; • Land is away from residences with vegetation that provides visual and acoustical buffer with access road maintained by company; • Flat land for business and room for expansion and current DA with Council for expansion which is on impacted land; • Route will now transect their property and any realignment will be only 5-10m, which will result in 43% of property needing to be acquired that will result in reduction of key areas for business viability. 71% reduction in hardstand areas, inadequate safe heavy vehicle turning area and office/showroom will be transacted by roadway and therefore not fit for ongoing use; • Ecofriendly ambience will be destroyed and this will in turn impact on viability; • Proposal will remove only area for expansion and remove sewerage system; • Aerial photos 6yrs out of date and do not show improvements with consultants not considering/approaching property owners to gain business understanding as referred to as a 'timber mill'. • Business cannot operate on site if bypass proceeds and requires alternate site with costs fully borne by RTA.
43	Support provided comments are incorporated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SoC amendment to modify fauna underpass locations and increase in numbers with agreement from DECC and development of sub plans; • Artificial breeding bonds must be designed in consultation with DECC and experts; • Comprehensive offset strategy required for the project prior to construction; • Habitat clearing- additional mitigation outside spring-autumn if applicable, marking to remain for 72hrs and replacement of riparian vegetation; • No justification for investigation of groundwater impacts exceeding 5m; • Biodiversity studies undertaken in 2004/2005 prior to requirements issued. Seek clarification if were comprehensively conducted to meet requirement. • Threatened species generally concentrated, specifically Collombatti area; • Notes EA identifies only 1 threatened species sighting in Tamban Forest (owl), known foraging area for glossy black cockatoo and phascogales, micro bats etc, further information regarding survey methodology required to justify such recording and if not justified further study required. • Key specialised habitats not investigated – large fig resources, rocky outcrops and remnant vegetation; • Mitigation strategies required for all threatened species either directly or indirectly impacted by proposal. Is not currently the case;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal reference provided for fauna fencing. Against DECC recommendations; • Consideration required to functionality of fauna crossings (length and some farm crossings); • Greater provision required for crossing in Tamban Forest, current proposal inadequate considering habitat value; • Current design of 7 crossings inadequate fro koala crossing (3m high from wild dog reach) redesign required; • Nest box placement prior to construction; • Threatened species issues- phascogale, koala, glossy black cockatoo, black necked stork, square tailed kite, bats, owls and gliders along route- namely hollow bearing tree retention, habitats, suitable crossing structures and mitigation for each needs to be further considered; • EEC's- steps taken to avoid communities and minimise fragmentation along with encouragement of revegetation; • Potential noise impacts of route will exceed environmental criteria for road traffic noise for properties in and outside 300m road reserve. Needs to be further investigated; • Non identified receivers may emerge when operational- mechanisms to exist to address issues as they arise; • Sleep disturbance criteria to be considered- quotes Brunswick Heads to Yelgun recent operational issues; • Noise mitigation measures required to be reasonable, appropriate and feasible; • Indigenous sub plan required for PAD sites; • Water quality impacts could potentially occur- require mitigation;
44	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frederickton Levee- Significant consultation required as height will be 2m above natural ground level and remove amenity from residents; • Relocation of services, specifically Macleay Water consultation due to numerous service conduits, major potable water and sewerage infrastructure potentially being disrupted; • Separation of STP at Frederickton to the area be carefully considered; • Construction staging and traffic management- anticipated staging (2) isn't clear where proposed southern section from Kempsey to Frederickton will intersect with existing highway; • Appears bottleneck maybe created (p76) as a result of construction; • Proximity of round about at existing highway and Great North Road requires additional investigation; • Consideration to increasing waterway area north of Frederickton in relation to natural watercourse and flood drain through town proceeding under exiting highway near new roundabout; • Compensatory habitat supported which should be resolved prior to construction. Should be reassessed prior to construction if a significant lag time as behavioural changes may occur; • Acid Sulfate Soil management required; • Road hierarchy, will cause grater strain to council by reverting ownership out of RTA- specifically Kempsey Traffic Bridge across Macleay River and will require ongoing funding in this regard; • Council not in financial position to maintain existing network let alone any more in future; • Existing highway traffic increases between Kempsey and Frederickton will require road to be duplicated. Not currently in financial position;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council supports EA indicating that South Kempsey be a suitable highway service centre and road/rail interchange at this location prior to construction; • Concern as to removal of flood refuges and that equivalent land be replaced; • Concern as to loss of viable agricultural land with no replacement; • Concern as to impacts on economy and local employment/business; • Landscaping and visual impacts without mitigation proposed.
45	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests riparian plantings either side of the river crossings. Specifically Frederickton and use Jerseyville as an example on Macleay floodplain which was instigated by Kempsey Shire Council; • Requests opportunity to review plans for new wharf/boat ramp parking etc at Frederickton which need to comply with estuary management guidelines; • Destruction of EEC's- compensatory package required prior to construction. Options include Eat Kempsey Swamp and Gills Creek area/freshwater wetland 2km North of Frederickton or addition to Yarrahapinni wetland; •
46	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not been sufficient attempt to analyse risk to habitat or incorporate mitigation/compensation to offset impacts to ensure no net loss of fish habitat as per current Government policy. Current experience indicates that must be preconstruction as agreements prior to works unsuccessful. • Proposed width of predicted temporary crossings and haulage routes to identify footprint over waterways and their impacts on aquatic vegetation; • Potential staging of works to consider migratory fish passage- i.e. Australian Bass in winter (predominant in affected waters); • Description of temporary and permanent retention ponds adjacent to waterways; • Detailed risk assessment of impacts to fish and fish habitat after works including oyster industry, commercial operations and recreational issues. Australian Bass specifically with Bass Kempsey largest recreational fishing clubs; • Measures to mitigate, minimise and manage impacts to waterways; • Significant loss of rural land (656ha or 12% of properties affected); • Flood mitigation to properties required as per EA; • Severance of stock reserves must be addressed with conditions such as increased velocities as a result of the upgrade; • Locked gate arrangements to manage stock or other options during emergencies required; • Flood mounds supported and should include fodder storage and supply in flood events. This will reduce emergency service pressure to provide fodder in events and should also be incorporated on other private property; • Noxious weed management required; • Maintenance of property access during and post construction to minimise severance required.
47	Did not specify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wants the project to start ASAP; • Will reduce accidents, holiday delays and associated repairs to road; • Finalise properties subject to acquisitions to get on with their lives and rebuild.

