

Project: Beach to Beach Detailed Design & EIS Project Design Phase: Development Application (EIS)								
Deliverables Issued for Review:			Environmental Impact Statement - Development Application (DA)					
Stakeholders invited to review & provide comment:			PMHC / Department of Primary Fisheries / B2B Community and others					
Item Number	Date Issued	Drawing Sheet	Comment	Review Comment	Designer Response	Responded		
			By			Date	By	
0001	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Submissions: Exhibition of the proposal has been completed. 19 submissions have been received. Most are in support with 3 submissions received raising some detailed concerns to work through. Please see attached copies of redacted submissions. Can you please in particular attend to providing a response and/or amendments to propose an approach to addressing the concerns (highlighted on the attached) raised to assist with assessment of the application.	Additional information to be included in the EIS/BDAR concerning design of project and construction methodology. This will be tailored to address comments from the submissions. Construction methodology has been included in Section 2.4.2 of the EIS Document.	10-May-22	KBR	
0002	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Crown land owners consent: Can you please provide an update as to how this process is tracking? Have all land owners or agencies provided any comments or feedback from notified of lodgement of the DA and advised whether a Crown lands license maybe required? In consideration of the impacts to Littoral Rainforest, Coastal Wetlands and biodiversity values I have been advised we need to have some level of comfort that the status of all parcels have been adequately determined in order to ensure all agencies are able to comment on the proposed impacts and provide conditions or other requirement such as a licence. I note that Jo Bramma has provided advice on how to work on progressing this.	Throughout the development of the EIS and DA, land owners have been consulted in particular Crown Lands. Comments and feedback have been captured on emails. KBR to provide the correspondence to Crown Lands as an attachment to the EIS. 15-03-2022: See packaged information "15-03-2022 Responses" provided. 21/04/2022: New Appendix L has been added to the EIS with all the correspondence with Crown Lands.	10-May-22	KBR	
0003	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Fisheries additional information request: The Department of Primary Fisheries have requested additional information with some concerns as outlined in the attached letter. If you can let me know your initial thoughts on how you would like to approach the issues raised it would be appreciated. Happy to organise a meeting with Fisheries to talk through the other options you have explored.	See response to comment no. 0020 to 0026	10-May-22	KBR	
0004	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Integrated Development under the Water Management Act 2000: It appears that the proposal will be integrated development under this Act with a separate requirement to obtain a controlled activity permit from the NSW Government Natural Resources Access Regulator (NRAR). It is recommended that the DA be amended to propose this second integrated development request (in addition to the Fisheries permit concurrence) to seek integrated concurrence terms to the proposal as this stage of the project. This may require amendment of the DA in the Planning Portal and/or we will need to commence the referral process in the Portal. It would be recommended that a separate cover letter be provided to address this matter and additional fees required to be paid to NRAR.	The Water Management (General) Regulation 2018 provides certain exemptions in relation to the approvals under the Water Management Act. For example, clause 41 of the Regulation provides that public authorities are exempt from the need to obtain a controlled activity approval for works on waterfront land. It's KBR's view that PMHC does not need a controlled activity approval.	10-May-22	KBR	
0005	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Shape files Biodiversity Assessment report (BDAR): Can the shape files as per Appendix L of Biodiversity Assessment Method (BAM) 2020 be supplied through Zip File using MS OneDrive?	Agreed. KBR will provide shape files 10/05/2022: Shape files were submitted post draft review of BDAR and EIS.	10-May-22	KBR	
0006	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Temporary/ancillary construction impacts and trimming of trees: BDAR Figures 1.1 and 1.2 show the typical construction of boardwalk however the construction footprint and any clearing associated with temporary/ancillary construction is to some extent unknown. Is it possible to provide an updated BDAR to provide details about construction methodology and how the impacts to adjacent vegetation will be minimized and avoided. This is particularly important for areas in Coastal Wetlands, mangroves and littoral rainforest. Reference to BAM 2020 Chapters 2 and 3. Is it also possible to explore consideration to some trimming of existing trees rather than full removal for some of the sections of the path?	The calculated impact of the SUP includes a 0.5m buffer of the proposed impact area (i.e., the 2.5m width of the path and any proposed batters). Construction of SUP should use methods to limit vegetation impacts to this footprint. Trimming of trees as opposed to removal may be possible where stems occur outside of 2.5m path (subject to arborist advice). If provided, detailed construction methodology showing how impacts to adjoining vegetation would be avoided can be added to the BDAR. Any ancillary areas (site compounds, stockpile areas) use existing PMHC sites or existing cleared areas. No additional native vegetation to be impacted by use of temporary ancillary facilities. 10/05/2022: For construction methodology refer to Section 2.4.2 of the EIS Report. The BDAR (Appendix D) has been updated as per above.	10-May-22	KBR	
0007	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Likely detailed design footprint impacts and mitigation measures: Section 7 Mitigation Measures discusses exclusion zones and states that measures to further avoid and minimize the construction footprint and vegetated clearing limits will be investigated during detailed design. Can the BDAR be updated with any further details of detailed design and final proposed footprint including all clearing associated with temporary/ancillary construction facilities and infrastructure? The revised BDAR should provide more detail to articulate how the proposed boardwalk installation will avoid and minimize impacts through areas that contain coastal wetlands, mangroves and littoral rainforest. For instance, where a mangrove can be trimmed and not removed and how will the boardwalk be installed through mangrove areas.	BDAR to be updated with details of construction footprint and methodology. 10/05/2022: For construction methodology refer to Section 2.4.2 of the EIS Report. 19/05/2022: BDAR (Appendix D) has been updated to include Native Guava impacts. The update included survey results, species poygon, SAIL assessment and EPBC Act assessment.	19-May-22	KBR	
0008	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Native guava presence: Reference is made to BAM 2020 Chapter 5- Additional effort for targeted search is required at D10. At least 10 juvenile Native guava (<i>Rhodomirtus psioides</i>) were located during a site inspection adjacent to existing path at D10. Request to re-inspect the location, confirm presence of <i>Rhodomirtus psioides</i> and extent of occurrence and update BDAR as the project is at risk of interfering with this SAIL species. Collect sample to verify with the NSW Herbarium. The polygon for <i>Rhodomirtus psioides</i> required and BDAR must also prepare a Serious an Irreversible impact assessment for the <i>Rhodomirtus psioides</i> as per section 9.1 of the BAM.	KBR will reinspect the site and confirm. Targeted surveys were undertaken well over a year ago. Bionet states the following: "Flowering and fruiting has been severely affected by myrtle rust infection. This species is still known to flower and set fruit although production of viable seed is very limited or non-existent. Fruit consumed by birds, species is very bird attracting. Recent surveys suggest that seedling recruitment is not occurring. Most small plants found in the wild are root suckers, not seedlings... Most individuals are no longer flowering or setting seeds since infected. Infected plants may sucker from the roots and survive for many years. Defoliated plants may be hard to identify. Seedling recruitment does not appear to be happening due to the extremely high susceptibility of germinating seedling to myrtle rust infection. Re-inspection was done on the 12th and 13th February 2022. 10/05/2022: Sections 6.1.2, 6.1.4 and 6.1.6 of the EIS Report have been updated.	10-May-22	KBR	
0009	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Presence of Acronychia imperforata and Acronychia littoralis: The BDAR identified the presence of Acronychia imperforata and concluded that habitat for the threatened species Acronychia littoralis was present however no specimens were located. A reinspection of the site is recommended to ensure that Acronychia imperforata is not the only species present. Features of several plants identified in the area of D10 were consistent with the key diagnostics of other Acronychia species that have pleasant aroma when leaves are crushed. Acronychia imperforata is known to have little to no aroma or the aroma is not pleasant. A more thorough search is recommended to include the sampling and verification with the NSW herbarium to ensure presence of absence of Acronychia littoralis is fully verified.	As above. 10/05/2022: Sections 6.1.4 and 6.1.6 of the EIS Report have been updated. 19/05/2022: Luke Pickett - Additional surveys undertaken during fruiting to exclude presence. Fruit confirmed the presence of Acronychia imperforata. Species added to BAM-C credit listed and excluded following survey. Details provided in BDAR Table 5.2 and Appendix III.	19-May-22	KBR	
0010	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Alternative footprints mapping: Reference to Chapter 7 of BAM 2020 Maps of alternative footprints should be provided as per BAM Section 7.2.1(3.)) Some discussion about alternative designs are noted to have been included in the EIS and in table 6.1 of the BDAR however no plans are available to help with showing those alternative designs. Request more detail including maps to show the proposed alternative designs to demonstrate how the least impacting route was selected for each location.	Alternative design and maps have been included in the EIS Main Report and in Section 6.1 of the BDAR (Appendix D).	10-May-22	KBR	
0011	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Compliance verification of BDAR: The BDAR is recommended to be revised to include a checklist to verify compliance as per BAM 2020 Appendix L including reference to page numbers and sections in the BDAR. Revised BDAR must be finalised and certified and lodged back to Council within 14 days of finalisation.	The BDAR (Appendix D of the EIS) has been updated to show compliance verification. The information is indicated in Appendix IV of the BDAR.	10-May-22	KBR	
0012	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Path Section D3 avoidance approach: Lot: 1 Plan No: DP1267234 owned by PMHC narrow and linear lot traverses through Lot: 2 Plan No: DP1267234 privately owned. The proposed path section D3 is mapped under Biodiversity Values Map and Coastal Wetlands under SEPP (Coastal Management) 2018. There is some initial concern about demonstrating avoidance as per Part 7 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act and Section 10 of SEPP (Coastal Management) 2018: (4) A consent authority must not grant consent for development referred to in sub-clause (1) unless the consent authority is satisfied that sufficient measures have been, or will be, taken to protect, and where possible enhance, the biophysical, hydrological and ecological integrity of the coastal wetland or littoral rainforest. Particular concerns about protecting and enhancing the coastal wetlands that will require clearing at this location should be further detailed. It is noted the BDAR states this option allows the Shared User Path (SUP) to be aligned between existing trees and mangroves following detailed survey and design. Has any more detailed design been completed to provide a more accurate area of clearing proposed in D3 and how many of each tree species would require removal with this option?	The option to use a boardwalk through Lot 2 DP1267234 was considered the best option to minimise impacts and there is scope to avoid trees (or target large Camphor Laurels) within the 5m corridor of Lot 1 DP1267234. The option extending along the western side of The Boulevard was excluded as the steep embankment and narrow verge would have required significant amounts of fill and clearing into the adjacent Swamp Oak and Mangrove vegetation. 10/05/2022: For construction methodology refer to Section 2.4.2 of the EIS Report.	10-May-22	KBR	
0013	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Path Section D10 and native guava: A site inspection identified that this path section has avoided most impacts. However at least 10 juvenile <i>Native guava</i> (<i>Rhodomirtus psioides</i>) listed as critically endangered under the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 were located during a site inspection adjacent to existing path at D10. Further analyses are required with probable update to BDAR including significant and irreversible impact assessment and polygon with adjusted offset credits for this species.	As noted on the response to comment no. 0008, BDAR will be updated to include offsets and SAIL assessment for Native Guava if impacts cannot be avoided. 10/05/2022: Updated in Sections 6.1.2, 6.1.4 and 6.1.6 of the EIS Report. 19/05/2022: L Pickett - As for Comment #008. BDAR updated to include offsets and SAIL assessment for Native Guava.	10-May-22	KBR	
0014	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Path Section D11 coastal mapping: The submitted details shows littoral rainforest north of Pilot Beach Road between second unsealed road and break wall road however this section is mapped as Coastal Wetlands or the actual vegetation is littoral rainforest and appears as an error to have been mapped incorrectly under SEPP (Coastal Management) 2018?	Appears to be an error in the Coastal Wetlands mapping but may be attributed to existing flood-prone mapping. The vegetation transitions to the coastal wetlands further north of Pilot Beach Road. Clarity will be added to the BDAR that this is not consistent with the Coastal Wetlands mapping, and is more consistent with littoral rainforest mapping. 10/05/2022: Updated in Section 6.1.2 (page 58) of the EIS Report.	10-May-22	KBR	
0015	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Consider avoidance of trees for pathway section D11: There appears opportunity to retain the existing trees that offer amenity in the parkland setting running along the last section of D11 running beside the breakwall access road?	Agree, BDAR states that trees within parkland area are to be avoided. Previous plan showed SUP extending through the park. Drawings will be reviewed with a focus on the shadowing of trees where the SUP alignments are as well as checking the alignment along Breakwall Access Road will avoid all trees. 10/05/2022: The D11 Shared User Path design drawings have been updated to avoid impact to existing trees. Refer to Appendix A of the EIS Report.	10-May-22	KBR	
0016	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) mitigation measures statement: The EIS states <i>'The assessment has identified all reasonable measures and strategies to avoid and minimise impacts to biodiversity associated with the project. Mitigation measures proposed include the provision of fauna connectivity structures, fencing to prevent fauna accessing the motorway and revegetation of disturbed areas in accordance with relevant guidelines.'</i> There appears to be typo with reference to a motorway and fauna connectivity structures or fencing are not proposed?	Text associated with "motorway" will be removed from the EIS. 10/05/2022: The text has been updated to address the comment.	10-May-22	KBR	



Project: Beach to Beach Detailed Design & EIS Project																																													
Design Phase: Development Application (EIS)																																													
Deliverables Issued for Review:			Environmental Impact Statement - Development Application (DA)																																										
Stakeholders invited to review & provide comment:			PMHC / Department of Primary Fisheries / B2B Community and others																																										
Item Number	Date Issued	Drawing Sheet	Comment	Review Comment	Designer Response	Responded																																							
			By			Date	By																																						
0017	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Reference to draft Coastal Koala Plan of Management (KPoM): The EIS makes reference to a draft C-KPOM however this KPoM was not adopted by Council and is therefore not considered as a Draft and could not in fact be adopted in its current format as it is not consistent with SEPP (Koala Habitat Protection) 2021. Suggest to remove reference to the C-KPoM as it is not relevant.	Reference to C-KPoM in EIS will be removed 10/05/2022: Reference to C-KPoM have been removed in Sections 4.1 and 4.17 of the EIS.	10-May-22	KBR																																						
0018	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Ongoing safety of existing trees to be retained: Do you have any thoughts for an approach to manage any potential safety concerns after the project is completed with regards to existing trees that may require removal at a later date?	Trees close to the SUP will be subject to an Arborist assessment. If trees will be removed or retained close to the SUP an arborist report will be included as a condition of consent. The mitigation measures in the EIS will be updated following arborists report. 10/05/2022: Section 7.2 of the EIS has been updated.	10-May-22	KBR																																						
0019	23-Dec-21	PMHC email	Patrick Galbraith Robertson	Landuse permissibility: The submitted information doesn't provide any detail on how the pathway and boardwalks can be considered permissible in the particular zones across the project. The details addressing the objectives in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is good however I need assistance to resolve how to justify the proposal's landuse permissibility. Looking at the different sections of the proposal my initial thoughts are as per below. If you can let me know your thoughts it would be greatly appreciated. It maybe appropriate to amend the current EIS to include this information. <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Section</th><th>Land use zone</th><th>Permissibility</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td rowspan="4">D3</td><td>RU1 Primary Production</td><td>Part section ancillary to a 'Road' within The Boulevard road reserve.</td></tr><tr><td>E3 Environmental Management</td><td>Part section 'Recreation area'</td></tr><tr><td>E2 Environmental Conservation</td><td>Part section 'Recreation area'</td></tr><tr><td>R1 General Residential</td><td>Part section ancillary to a 'Road' within The Boulevard road reserve.</td></tr><tr><td rowspan="2">D5</td><td>R1 General Residential</td><td>Part section 'Innominate' use not inconsistent with the zone objectives.</td></tr><tr><td>W1 Natural Waterways</td><td>Part section 'Environmental Protection Works'??</td></tr><tr><td rowspan="4">D8</td><td>RE1 Public Recreation</td><td>Part section 'Recreation area' and part section ancillary to a 'Road' within Camden Head Road road reserve.</td></tr><tr><td>R1 General Residential</td><td>Part section ancillary to a 'Road' within Camden Head Road road reserve.</td></tr><tr><td>RU1 Primary Production</td><td>Part section ancillary to a 'Road' within Camden Head Road road reserve.</td></tr><tr><td>E2 Environmental Conservation</td><td>Part section 'Recreation area'</td></tr><tr><td rowspan="2">D10</td><td>E2 Environmental Conservation</td><td>Part section ancillary to a 'Road' within Camden Head Road road reserve and part section 'Recreation area'.</td></tr><tr><td>E1 National Parks and Nature Reserves</td><td>Are the works clear of this zoning ??</td></tr><tr><td rowspan="3">D11</td><td>R1 General Residential</td><td>Part section ancillary to a 'Road' within Camden Head Road road reserve.</td></tr><tr><td>E2 Environmental Conservation</td><td>Part section 'Recreation area'</td></tr><tr><td>RE1 Public Recreation</td><td>Part section 'Recreation area'</td></tr></tbody></table>	Section	Land use zone	Permissibility	D3	RU1 Primary Production	Part section ancillary to a 'Road' within The Boulevard road reserve.	E3 Environmental Management	Part section 'Recreation area'	E2 Environmental Conservation	Part section 'Recreation area'	R1 General Residential	Part section ancillary to a 'Road' within The Boulevard road reserve.	D5	R1 General Residential	Part section 'Innominate' use not inconsistent with the zone objectives.	W1 Natural Waterways	Part section 'Environmental Protection Works'??	D8	RE1 Public Recreation	Part section 'Recreation area' and part section ancillary to a 'Road' within Camden Head Road road reserve.	R1 General Residential	Part section ancillary to a 'Road' within Camden Head Road road reserve.	RU1 Primary Production	Part section ancillary to a 'Road' within Camden Head Road road reserve.	E2 Environmental Conservation	Part section 'Recreation area'	D10	E2 Environmental Conservation	Part section ancillary to a 'Road' within Camden Head Road road reserve and part section 'Recreation area'.	E1 National Parks and Nature Reserves	Are the works clear of this zoning ??	D11	R1 General Residential	Part section ancillary to a 'Road' within Camden Head Road road reserve.	E2 Environmental Conservation	Part section 'Recreation area'	RE1 Public Recreation	Part section 'Recreation area'	Land use zone table will be included in the EIS. E1- National Parks. Confirmation that no National Park land will be impacted. EIS to be updated. 10/05/2022: The table in Section 4.20 has been updated to address the comment.	10-May-22	KBR
Section	Land use zone	Permissibility																																											
D3	RU1 Primary Production	Part section ancillary to a 'Road' within The Boulevard road reserve.																																											
	E3 Environmental Management	Part section 'Recreation area'																																											
	E2 Environmental Conservation	Part section 'Recreation area'																																											
	R1 General Residential	Part section ancillary to a 'Road' within The Boulevard road reserve.																																											
D5	R1 General Residential	Part section 'Innominate' use not inconsistent with the zone objectives.																																											
	W1 Natural Waterways	Part section 'Environmental Protection Works'??																																											
D8	RE1 Public Recreation	Part section 'Recreation area' and part section ancillary to a 'Road' within Camden Head Road road reserve.																																											
	R1 General Residential	Part section ancillary to a 'Road' within Camden Head Road road reserve.																																											
	RU1 Primary Production	Part section ancillary to a 'Road' within Camden Head Road road reserve.																																											
	E2 Environmental Conservation	Part section 'Recreation area'																																											
D10	E2 Environmental Conservation	Part section ancillary to a 'Road' within Camden Head Road road reserve and part section 'Recreation area'.																																											
	E1 National Parks and Nature Reserves	Are the works clear of this zoning ??																																											
D11	R1 General Residential	Part section ancillary to a 'Road' within Camden Head Road road reserve.																																											
	E2 Environmental Conservation	Part section 'Recreation area'																																											
	RE1 Public Recreation	Part section 'Recreation area'																																											
0020	06-Dec-21	DPI Fisheries Re: Additional Information Request	Jonathan Yantsch	The DPI Fisheries P&G considers SEPP Coastal Wetlands, saltmarsh, and seagrass as TYPE 1 Highly Sensitive Key Fish Habitat while mangroves (when outside of mapped Coastal Wetlands) are considered as TYPE 2 Moderately Sensitive Key Fish Habitat. Section 3.3.3.2 of the DPI Fisheries P&G notes that DPI Fisheries enforces a 'no net loss' habitat policy as a condition of consent requiring proponents to conduct habitat rehabilitation and/or provide environmental compensation for all unavoidable impacts to marine vegetation. An offset to impact ratio of 2:1 applies for harming of marine vegetation. As there is no suitable way of offsetting seagrass within the Camden Haven River estuary, impacts to seagrass will incur a compensatory offset payment of \$113.50 per square metre. It should be noted that offset proposals and compensation are considered to be part of the cost of development and are to be met by the proponent. Aerial imagery indicates that sections of the boardwalk are within or are close to key fish habitat (which includes mapped Coastal Wetlands). Impacts to key fish habitat, including marine vegetation, can be both direct (e.g. cutting, removing, etc.) or indirect (e.g. shading from the boardwalk and viewing platform). The current application does not provide any indication of the extent of harm to marine vegetation, whether options of lesser impact have been considered, mitigation measures, an offset proposal that will offset the loss of marine vegetation at a rate of 2:1, or monitoring program that will measure the effectiveness of mitigation measures and compensation measures to inform adaptive management or further offset requirements (e.g. a monitoring program and bond would be required where seagrass may be shaded or indirectly impacted by construction activities).	This information is mostly covered in the BDAR. Extra detail regarding the offsets will be included in the updated BDAR. Impacts to mangroves and saltmarsh would be offset in accordance with BC Act and would be greater than a ration of 2:1. Marine vegetation has been quantified (offset) under the Biodiversity Scheme. Accuplan will clarify this in the revised BDAR. 10/05/2022: Section 6.1.2 (page 65) of the the EIS Report has been updated.	10-May-22	KBR																																						
0021	06-Dec-21	DPI Fisheries Re: Additional Information Request IDA21/147	Jonathan Yantsch	Request for additional information under clause 54 EPA (reg) 2000 DPI Fisheries requests additional information on the proposed development under Clause 54 of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment (Regulation)</i> 2000. The additional information includes: A description of all works, including final built designs and construction methodology, for all works within key fish habitat (i.e. tidal areas below highest astronomical tide and Coastal Wetlands).	EIS / BIDAR to be updated to include construction methodology for the boardwalk. 10/05/2022: For construction methodology refer to Section 2.4.2 of the EIS Report.	10-May-22	KBR																																						
0022	06-Dec-21	DPI Fisheries Re: Additional Information Request IDA21/148	Jonathan Yantsch	A discussion on options of lesser impact to key fish habitat that have been considered and justification for why options of lesser impact, such as avoidance, have been discounted or are not viable.	Options analysis was done throughout the design process. 10/05/2022: The BDAR (in Appendix D of the EIS) has been updated. 19/05/2022: L Pickett - The options analysis was discussed in Section 6.6 of the BDAR (Appendix D of the EIS) and in Section 6.1 of the EIS Report.	19-May-22	KBR																																						
0023	06-Dec-21	DPI Fisheries Re: Additional Information Request IDA21/149	Jonathan Yantsch	A description and plans showing the area of harm to marine vegetation with quantification of the area of both direct and potential indirect harm provided for each vegetation type (e.g. for mangroves, saltmarsh and seagrass). Note: seagrass would be considered to be indirectly harmed if shaded by any part the pathway or viewing platform or where smothering by sediment may occur as a result of piling or other excavation activities.	This has been included in Figures 3.1 to 3.3 of the BDAR (Appendix D in the EIS Report).	10-May-22	KBR																																						
0024	06-Dec-21	DPI Fisheries Re: Additional Information Request IDA21/150	Jonathan Yantsch	Confirmation that payment of a compensatory offset to the value of \$113.50 per square metre will be paid for all direct impacts to seagrass.	PMHC to draft letter to confirm payment of offset value of \$113.50. 10/05/2022: Section 6.1.2 of the EIS has been updated. 24/05/2022: Confirmation of payment is provided in Appendix K of the EIS Report.	24-May-22	KBR																																						
0025	06-Dec-21	DPI Fisheries Re: Additional Information Request IDA21/151	Jonathan Yantsch	Confirmation that payment of a monetary bond equating to \$113.50 per square metre would be paid for all potential indirect impacts to seagrass associated with shading and construction impacts, and provision of a long term (preferably three years) monitoring program that will quantify the extent of actual indirect impacts to seagrass (note: the bond would be returned, partly returned or retained depending on the results of the monitoring program).	PMHC to draft letter to confirm payment of offset value of \$113.50. 10/05/2022: Section 6.1.2 of the EIS has been updated. 24/05/2022: Confirmation of payment is provided in Appendix K of the EIS Report.	24-May-22	KBR																																						
0026	06-Dec-21	DPI Fisheries Re: Additional Information Request IDA21/152	Jonathan Yantsch	Submission of an offset proposal that accounts for all impacts to mangroves, saltmarsh and Coastal Wetlands that is consistent with the guidelines outlined within the DPI Fisheries P&G (i.e. is undertaken in the same catchment, applies to the same vegetation types, meets the 2:1 offset to impact ratio, etc.). The offset proposal should include a suitable monitoring program to identify any long term deficiencies that may arise.	KBR will discuss the offset proposal within the BDAR regarding how offsetting under FM Act would apply. Information will be included regarding where offsets overlap with BC Act. 10/05/2022: Section 6.1.2 of the EIS has been updated.	10-May-22	KBR																																						
0027	02-Mar-22	Department of Planning and Environment - Biodiversity and Conservation Division (BCD)	Bill Larkin / Dimitri Young	BCD recommends that: 1. The Biodiversity Development Assessment Report must be revised to either assume presence of Southern myotis (<i>Myotis macropus</i>) as a species credit species or undertake threatened species survey in accordance with 5.3.2 of the Biodiversity Assessment Method (BAM) or obtain an expert report in accordance with Box 3 of the BAM.	15-03-2022: information will be provided in the updated BDAR (BDAR will need to be updated to assume presence and include species credits for Southern myotis (<i>Myotis macropus</i>)). 10/05/2022: Updated in Sections 6.1.2, 6.1.4 and 6.1.6 of the EIS Report.	10-May-22	KBR																																						
0028	02-Mar-22	Department of Planning and Environment - Biodiversity and Conservation Division	Bill Larkin / Dimitri Young	2. Further flood impact assessment should be carried out to ensure that the proposed D3 and D5 boardwalks do not cause adverse flood impact to the surrounding area.	10/05/2022: Flood impact assessment has been developed as part of the project and documented in Appendix H of the EIS Report. The assessment showed no adverse impact to existing flood levels. Based on the 20% (5yr ARI) flood maps (in Section 3 of Appendix H), D3 and D5 are located above the flood level of 1.2m for the storm event. The various flood depths are shown on Figures 3-1, 3-4 and 3-5 of Appendix H (of the EIS document).	10-May-22	KBR																																						

