

# Public Comment Response

## Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail

08-May-2025



Delivering a better world

## Accessibility Statement

We are committed to making our information accessible to all individuals, including those with disabilities. This commitment is in line with our dedication to inclusive community values and equal access to published information.

Please note there may be content within appendices to this report that are not fully accessible to individuals using assistive technology. This may be due to the technical nature of these documents, which can contain complex tables, graphics, and legal language that are not compatible with certain accessibility tools.

If you require them in an alternative format, please email <u>info@tmr.qld.gov.au</u> or telephone 13 74 68. Please provide your name, contact information, and a detailed description of the issue you encounter or the format you require.

Abbre	viations and acronyms	1
1	Introduction	1
2	Public Comment Response Report	2
2.1	Comment review process	3
2.2	Criteria for Preliminary Documentation amendment	3
3	Summary of public comments	4
3.1	Comment origin	4
3.2	Comment category	4
4	Response to Preliminary Documentation comments	5
4.1	Assessment methods	5
4.2	Heritage and culture	10
4.3	Flora, fauna and vegetation	12
4.4	Environmental and Social Impacts and Outcomes	24
4.5	Drainage and flooding impacts	26
4.6	Waterways and water quality	28
4.7	Ecologically Sustainable Development	29
4.8	Offsets	30
4.9	Community and stakeholder consultation	33
4.10	General comments about the proposed action	35
4.11	Alternatives	36
4.12	Out of scope	39
5	Changes to Preliminary Documentation Report	40
Apper	ndix 1: Statutory advertising	1
Apper	ndix 2: Email broadcast to key stakeholders	4
Apper	nd ix 3: Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project webpage	6
Apper	nd ix 4: Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail environment and cultural heritage webpage	8
Apper	nd ix 5: Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail your say page	10
Apper	dix 6: Email broadcast to key stakeholders (extended public comment period)	11
Apper	ndix 7: Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project webpage (extended public comment period)	13
Apper period	ndix 8: Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail environment and cultural heritage webpage (extended public commer )	nt 14
Apper	ndix 9: Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail your say page (extended public comment period)	15

Table of Tab	bles	
Table 1	Written notice of public comment display of the PD	1
Table 2	Written notice of extended public comment display of the PD	2
Table 3	Comment origin	4
Table 4	Number of times a category was raised in public comments	4
Table 5	Assessment method comment response	5
Table 6	Heritage and culture comment response	10
Table 7	Flora, fauna and vegetation comment response	12
Table 8	Environmental and Social Impacts and Outcomes	24
Table 9	Drainage, storm water, and flooding impacts comment response	26
Table 10	Waterways and water quality comment response	28
Table 11	Sustainability comment response	29
Table 12	Offsets comment response	30
Table 13	Community and stakeholder consultation comment response	33
Table 14	General comment response	35
Table 15	Alternatives comment response	36
Table 16	Out of scope comment response	39

# Abbreviations and acronyms

Term	Definition
АСНА	Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003
CCTV	Closed-Circuit Television
СНМР	Cultural Heritage Management Plan
CHRA	Cultural Heritage Risk Assessment
Cth	Commonwealth
DAF	Department of Agriculture and Fisheries
DCCEEW	Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water
DETSI	Department of Environment, Tourism, Science and Innovation
DoR	Department of Resources
EO Policy	Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 Environmental Offsets Policy (October 2012)
EP Act	Environmental Protection Act 1994
EPBC Act	Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999
ERG	Environmental Reference Group
ESD	Ecologically Sustainable Development
ETCS	European train control system
КНА	Koala habitat areas
КРА	Koala priority areas
LGC	Logan and Gold Coast
LIKTs	Locally Important Koala Trees
MNES	Matters of National Environmental Significance
MSES	Matters of State Environmental Significance
NC Act	Nature Conservation Act 1992
OAMP	Offset Area Management Plan
OEMP	Overarching Environmental Mitigation Plan
PD	Preliminary Documentation
Qld	Queensland
SAT	Spot Assessment Technique
SEQ	South East Queensland
SIA	Significant Impact Assessment
SI Policy	State Government Supported Infrastructure – Koala Conservation Policy
SPRAT	Species Profile and Threats Database
TMR	Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads (The Proponent)

# **1** Introduction

The Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project ("proposed action") is being assessed by the Australian Government's Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (Cth) (EPBC Act). The proposed action will duplicate the existing rail line from two to four tracks to enable more frequent rail services between Brisbane and the Gold Coast, Australia's third and sixth largest cities.

On 11 April 2023, the proposed action was determined to be a "controlled action" due to the likelihood of significant impacts on matters of national environmental significance (MNES), namely listed threatened species and communities protected under Section 18 and 18A, Part 3 of the EPBC Act. The relevant protected matters under this controlling provision are the Koala (*Phascolarctos cinereus*), Grey-headed Flying-fox (*Pteropus poliocephalus*), South-eastern Glossy Black-Cockatoo (*Calyptorhynchus lathami lathami*), Swift Parrot (*Lathamus discolor*) and Regent Honeyeater (*Anthochaera phrygia*).

On 25 February 2025, a delegate to the Minister for the Environment and Water issued a direction to publish the Preliminary Documentation (PD) for a minimum of ten (10) business days pursuant Section 95A(3) of the EPBC Act). The PD was subsequently exhibited in March 2025 together with an invitation for interested persons and organisations to provide the Proponent with written comment on the PD. The period within which comments could be made on the PD was between Wednesday 12 March and Friday 4 April 2025 (a total of 18 Business Days).

Details about the public display of the PD are provided in Table 1.

Details about the extended public display of the PD are provided in Table 2.

Table	1:	Written	notice	of	public	comment	dis	plav	of	the	PD
Table	••	<b>W</b> IIIICII	nouice .		public	comment	uis	piuy	~	uic	

Type of advertising	Details
Statutory advertising as required and approved by DCCEEW	National and State newspapers
(Appendix 1)	The Courier Mail – Tuesday 11 March 2025
	Regional newspapers
	Gold Coast Bulletin – Tuesday 11 March 2025
	<ul> <li>My City Logan – Tuesday 11 March 2025</li> </ul>
	DCCEEW
	<ul> <li>Digital copy sent – 24 February 2025</li> </ul>
	Notification on EPBC Referral Site – 11 March 2025
Email broadcasts to key stakeholders (Appendix 2)	Emails sent to 11 recipients – 10 March 2025 advising of upcoming publication of the PD
Karawatha Forest Protection Society	Targeted advice and meeting – 12 March 2025. Session to provide project update and to outline extent of details in PD suite.
Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project webpage (Appendix 3)	Live from 9am Wednesday 12 March 2025
Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail – Environment and Cultural Heritage webpage (Appendix 4)	Live from 9am Wednesday 12 March 2025
Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail your say webpage (Appendix 5)	Live from 9am Wednesday 12 March 2025

#### Table 2: Written notice of extended public comment display of the PD

Type of advertising	Details
Email broadcasts to key stakeholders (Appendix 6)	Emails sent to 12 recipients
	20 March 2025 advising of extended public display of the PD
Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project webpage (Appendix 7)	Live from approximately 9.30am Thursday 20 March 2025
Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail – Environment and Cultural Heritage webpage (Appendix 8)	Live from approximately 9.30am Thursday 20 March 2025
Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail your say webpage (Appendix 9)	Updated approximately 9am Thursday 20 March 2025

The Proponent invited the public to make written comments on the PD via:

- online comment at yoursay-projects.tmr.qld.gov.au/logan-and-gold-coast-faster-rail/EPBC
- email comments to logangoldcoastrail@tmr.qld.gov.au
- post to LGC Project Team (EPBC Submissions), Department of Transport and Main Roads, GPO Box 50, BRISBANE QLD 4001.

The PD and 11 appendices were made available free online at <u>yoursay-projects.tmr.qld.gov.au/logan-and-gold-coast-faster-rail/EPBC</u> and at the following locations:

- Logan Central Library 26 Wilbur Street, Logan Central
- Beenleigh Library Crete Street, Beenleigh
- Sunnybank Hills Library 661 Compton Road, Sunnybank Hills
- State Library of Queensland Stanley Place, South Brisbane.

All comments received during the public comment period were reviewed and are considered in this report. This report provides a summary of all public comments received summarised in table format, noting key issues and themes. The report outlines the Proponent's response to all comments and where changes were made in the PD as part of the EPBC Act approval. The public comments have been submitted to DCCEEW as part of the assessment requirements.

The Proponent collected personal information for the purpose of contacting the public about their submission where necessary. Personal information provided was managed in accordance with the *Information Privacy Act 2009* (Qld) and was not disclosed to anyone without the commentor's consent, unless as required and/or authorised by law.

## 2 Public Comment Response Report

A comment was considered as any written document relevant to the PD that was submitted online, via the advertised address, or received through other means which was clearly intended to be a comment on the PD. Single comments from user-groups, businesses, individuals, clubs and non-government and government agencies were considered as individual comments. Repeated content of submissions between numerous individual submitters were treated as a single comment noting the number of times the same comment was received.

Comments were handled by the Proponent in accordance with the *Information Privacy Act 2009* (Qld), including the collection, handling and maintenance of any personal information included within any comment.

The Public Comment Response Report is to be read in full, with appropriate consideration of each comment response and in conjunction with PD documentation, which provide complementary information on the matters assessed under the EPBC Act.

## 2.1 Comment review process

A standardised approach was used where each comment was collected, registered, stored and reviewed consistently. Each comment was date stamped and stored on a digital file to be reviewed. The process of reviewing comments on the PD was as follows:

- comments were entered into a digital database and each comment or issue raised was assigned into predetermined categories and themes. The PD comment categories and themes are presented in Table 3
- a summary was generated for each individual comment, to assist in identifying relevant categories and themes for each comment. Each comment was linked by the relevant categories and themes in a summary spreadsheet
- the issues were then reviewed to determine if they required any changes to the PD or required further investigation or research to be undertaken. The criteria against which comments were analysed for possible amendment to the PD are set out in Section 2.2
- following analysis and consideration of all comments, amendments were made to the PD as required.

The analysis of comments to the PD by category and theme is presented in Section 4.

## **2.2 Criteria for Preliminary Documentation amendment**

Amendments to the PD were considered where a comment:

- provided additional information that corrected inaccuracies or clarified unclear information in the PD
- proposed strategies that are feasible, within the scope of the proposed action to implement, and improve environmental outcomes
- identified further information and/or research required to adequately determine the impacts of the proposed action.

Amendments to the PD were not made where a comment:

- clearly supported the proposed action
- offered a neutral statement or no change was sought
- addressed issues beyond the scope of the PD as required under the Request For Information
- included statements that were considered factually incorrect
- raised issues or made comments on information that had already been considered and addressed in the PD
- suggested project alternatives beyond the scope of the PD.

# **3 Summary of public comments**

## 3.1 Comment origin

The proposed action received seven (7) distinct public comment submissions; some of which were received via multiple forms of correspondence during the public comment period. These submitters comprised of individuals, community/environmental groups, local authorities, relevant Traditional Owner Groups, and a residential facility. Table 3 lists the number of comments from each submitter type.

#### Table 3: Comment origin

Submitter Type	Number of Unique Submitters
Community / Environmental group	1
Local authority	1
Individual	3
Residential facility	1
Traditional Owner Groups	1
Total	7

## **3.2 Comment category**

Key issues and comments from the public comment submissions were assigned categories for consideration. Categories were created to reflect the focus areas of the PD, and likely nature of the issues raised. General categories were created for other common issues. The number of comments or concerns by category are listed in Table 4. Responses against each category are provided in the tables in Section 4.

#### Table 4: Number of times a category was raised in public comments

Category	Number of times raised
Assessment Methods (and suitability) (Section 4.1)	6
Heritage and culture (Section 4.2)	2
Flora and fauna impacts (Section 4.3)	15
Environment and Social Impacts and outcomes (Section 4.4)	2
Drainage and flooding impacts (Section 4.5)	1
Waterways and water quality (Section 4.6)	2
Ecologically Sustainable Development (Section 4.7)	1
Offsets (Section 4.8)	5
Community and stakeholder consultation (Section 4.9)	3
General comments on the proposed action (Section 4.10)	2
Alternatives (Section 4.11)	3
Out of scope (Section 4.12)	2

## **4** Response to Preliminary Documentation comments

Responses to comments and issues raised are set out in Table 5 to Table 16. Specific categories of issues are set out in separate tables. Where an issue raised by a comment is addressed in the PD, a cross-reference to the relevant section is provided. In some examples, a summary response is provided. In such cases, if there is any difference between the summary response and the detail contained in the PD, the detail contained in the PD should be taken to represent the Proponent's position on the issue.

## 4.1 Assessment methods

Table 5 provides a list of comments received concerning assessment methods and the Proponent's response. This section is specifically responding to concerns raised about the type, method, approach to ecological assessments whereas Section 4.3 is responding to concerns raised about the extent of impacts following the ecological assessments.

#### Table 5: Assessment method comment response

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD															
4.1.1	The assessment materials fail to appropriately assess the impacts to MNES due to deficiencies in the chosen methodology. Deficiencies have been identified in the assessment materials and methodology such	004 001 007	essment materials fail to appropriately the impacts to MNES due to cies in the chosen methodology. cies have been identified in the nent materials and methodology such ure to properly consider cumulative , seasonal variation and failure to use ictice methodology. These issues mean ambit of threatened species which may ficantly impacted, and the extent of to listed threatened species, have not operly assessed. These deficiencies ie Minister cannot be satisfied the full f impacts to listed threatened species in adequately considered.	Section 2.3 of PD report Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report, Section 2, Section 2.6.2 and Appendix F	The assessment methods are appropriate to assess the potential for significant impacts to MNES. The assessment methods adopted to support the assessment detailed in the PD are in accordance with EPBC Act and related policy and guidance documentation. The assessment of the impacts detailed in the PD has taken into consideration seasonal variation and direct, indirect and cumulative impacts.														
	as a failure to properly consider cumulative impacts, seasonal variation and failure to use best practice methodology. These issues mean that the ambit of threatened species which may be significantly impacted, and the extent of impacts to listed threatened species, have not been properly assessed. These deficiencies mean the Minister cannot be satisfied the full scope of impacts to listed threatened species				As described in Section 2.3 of the PD and Section 2.0 of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report, the assessment method responded to the Referral Decision Notice and Request for Information received on 4 May 2023 from DCCEEW following referral of the proposed action. For each MNES with potential to be impacted, a Significant Impact Assessment (SIA) addressed the relevant criteria to assess the nature, likelihood, consequence and extent of potential impacts to conservation significant species and communities identified at risk from the proposed action as set out in the Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 Matters of National Environmental Significance (the Significant Impact Guidelines) (Department of the Environment, 2013).														
	nas been adequately considered.						The requirements of the Significant Impact Guidelines are fundamental to the methods described in Section 2.6.2 of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report. The SIA, presented in Appendix F of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report, provides sufficient information for the Minister to determine the extent of significant impacts on MNES habitat values by assessing:												
				- avoidance and minimisation measures															
				- direct impacts (conservative assessment of impacts to all vegetation within Impact area), as well as consideration of indirect and cumulative impacts.															

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
				The Proponent has worked closely with key environmental approvals and impact assessment specialists to ensure the Request for Information has been adequately addressed, and the SIAs undertaken for the proposed action addressed the Significant Impact Guidelines and relevant conservation advice, recovery plans, threat abatement plans, and other guidance listed in Section 2.3.1 of the PD.
				No change to the PD.
4.1.2	4.1.2 The assessment materials are overly dependent on desktop mapping and therefore do not apply localised knowledge. Despite the Project covering an expansive 295 hectares, only seven sites were selected for spotlighting surveys. Of those, some sites were surveyed for an hour and a half or less. The assessment materials failed to address for seasonal variations in fauna behaviours as species adapt to changes in resource availability, temperature and daylight hours as seasons change. Six of the seven field assessments took place during winter (June, July or August), with only one survey taking place in other seasons. This means the field surveys may have failed to capture instances of higher occurrences of threatened species.	006 007	Section 2.3 Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report	The extent of the impact and associated assessment methodologies described in the submission comment relates to the initial impact footprint and extent of assessments presented in the EPBC referral documentation from December 2022. As such, this submission may have not been based upon the most recent material, and extent, of the proposed action as detailed in the PD.
				Since the referral stage and subsequent referral decision, significant survey effort has been undertaken to develop local site-specific knowledge and further verify habitat for MNES across the Impact area. As described in Section 2.5.2.3 of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report, the Proponent has demonstrated sufficient survey effort and timing to address requirements of recognised guidelines.
				Targeted field surveys within and adjacent to the Impact area occurred across 37 field survey events over the winter, summer and spring months of 2023 and into 2024 (described in Table 5 of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report). Habitat quality assessments were undertaken across a total of 1087 sites across areas within and adjacent to the Impact area illustrated in of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report (Appendix B, Figure 3). Specifically described in Table 8 of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report, nocturnal fauna spotlighting surveys comprising 80 person hours focused on 12 'high-risk' habitat areas, including August 2023 (2 nights), September 2023 (2 nights) and October 2023 (3 nights) and December 2023 (4 nights); in addition, spotlighting undertaken by Ausecology during July-August 2022 (4 nights).
				Detailed analysis of the actual species-specific survey effort and timing across the Impact area is compared to requirements of recognised guidelines in Table 9 of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report, which demonstrates how requirements are met for each target species. A combination of traditional techniques such as spotlighting and modern techniques such as infrared thermal drone surveys and AudioMoth acoustic recorders have been utilised to provide a robust assessment for the detection of koalas and other arboreal mammals across areas within and adjacent to the Impact area. Surveys have been conducted during breeding season when activity is high.
				For each MNES, survey requirements are met or partially met with survey effort considered sufficient due to the adoption of other techniques such as:
				<ul> <li>habitat assessments where presence of suitable habitat resources has been used as a surrogate for presence providing a conservative assessment such as suitable hollow count in key biodiversity areas</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>innovative methods such as infrared thermal drone surveys facilitated the surveying of broad landscapes providing greater detection probabilities than ground-based surveys and aided in confirming extent and location of habitat such as flying-fox camps.</li> </ul>

Ref	f Issue/Recommendation	Submission Section of Identifier PD		Proponent response/edit to PD
				No change to the PD.
4.1.3	There are deficiencies in reliance on the Spot Assessment Technique (SAT) method which may fail to record koalas when they are in low densities or where the scats desiccate and decay.	007	Section 2.3.1 and 2.3.4	As described in Section 2.5.2.3 of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report (Table 9), the survey method did not rely on the SAT method to record koalas.
			Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report, Section 2.5.2.3, Table 9	The Proponent engaged suitably qualified ecologists to design survey methods and level of survey effort for koala. The survey methods applied best practice survey techniques and considered seasonal requirements to provide a robust assessment for the detection of koalas within and adjacent to the Impact area.
				In addition to the SAT method to search for evidence of koala scat or scratches at 1087 sites, a combination of traditional techniques such as spotlighting and modern techniques such as infrared thermal drone surveys and AudioMoth acoustic recorders were utilised. Surveys were conducted during breeding season when activity is high.
				Detailed analysis of the actual species-specific survey effort and timing across the Impact area is compared to requirements of recognised guidelines in Table 9 of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report confirms the Proponent has demonstrated sufficient survey effort and timing to meet survey requirements for koala.
				No change to the PD.
4.1.4	The Project covers 295 hectares, which003includes 42.55 hectares of remnant high value006regrowth and 166.3 hectares of non-remnant001vegetation. The direct impacts of the Project on001protected listed threatened species will include007	003 006 001 007	003 Section 2.1.4 006 Section 2.1.5 001 Section 2.3.2 007 Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report Appendix C OEMP Appendix D OAMP	The extent of the impact and associated assessment methodologies described in the submission comment relates to the initial impact footprint and extent of assessments presented in the EPBC Act referral documentation from December 2022. As such, this submission may have not been based upon the most recent material, and extent, of the proposed action as detailed in the PD.
	vegetation loss, habitat fragmentation, and injury or death caused by the development. The Project may also have indirect adverse impacts on waterways, exacerbate the spread of invasive weeds and fauna species, and disturb			The PD (Section 2.3.2) and Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report (Section 5 and Appendix F Significant Impact Assessment) provide appropriate information to determine the scale and extent of direct and indirect impacts with potential for significant impacts to MNES, including vegetation loss, habitat fragmentation, edge effects, injury or mortality, hydrological change, erosion, invasive weeds and pests, noise, light and dust.
	threatened fauna through noise, light and dust. Legislation at both federal and state levels of government requires the Proponent to make all efforts at reasonable avoidance and minimisation before using offsets for residual impact, or "provide acceptable reasons as to why avoidance or mitigation of impacts is not reasonably achievable" (EPBC Act 1999, Environmental Offsets (EO) Policy).			As described below (refer Section 2.1.4 of PD), the Proponent has identified and assessed potential impacts and made reasonable efforts to avoid, minimise and mitigate loss of habitat for MNES resulting from the proposed action in accordance with requirements, guidelines or policies under the EPBC Act. The assessment method incorporated extensive baseline data to describe habitat (including remnant, non-remnant and regrowth vegetation and interconnecting areas), assessed scale and extent of impacts as required by the Significant Impact Guidelines and applied mitigation measures informed by species-specific guidance such as SPRAT Database and relevant approved conservation advice, recovery plans or threat abatement plans. After avoidance, minimisation and mitigation measures are applied, remaining significant impacts on MNES requires compensation by suitable offsets as per the EPBC Act EO Policy (2012).
				Given the setting within an existing two-track rail corridor in a highly developed area there are inherent limitations to delivering the proposed rail and stations upgrades to entirely avoid impact to natural and human assets. Although the Proponent has avoided and minimised impacts through design refinements since the time of referral, residual significant impact to habitat for koala, grey-headed flying-fox, glossy black-cockatoo, regent honey-eater and swift

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
				parrot will be compensated by a suitable offset.
				Avoid and minimise
				Throughout the proposed action's procurement phase, the Impact area has been further refined and reduced as highlighted in Section 2.1.4 and Table 3 of the PD. The referral (December 2022) reported the Impact area of 295 hectares (ha), including 42.55 ha remnant vegetation and 166.3 ha of non-remnant vegetation. Since then, the Impact area has been reduced following design refinement activities, stakeholder and asset owner input/feedback, and targeted ecology surveys. Design refinement activities have been driven to find alternative solutions to achieve reductions in overall impacts to habitat for MNES. As a result, the Impact area has been reduced to 194.45 ha, reflecting a decrease of 99.74 ha (33.90%).
				In addition to design refinements to avoid habitat for MNES, an updated understanding of habitat within the Impact area has resulted in refinement and substantial overall reduction in direct impacts to habitat for MNES. Significant effort has been undertaken to further ground truth habitat for MNES including targeted field surveys completed at 1,087 sites within and adjacent to the Impact area across 37 field survey events over the winter, summer and spring months of 2023 into 2024 (described in Table 5 of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report).
				Mitigate and manage
				An Overarching Environmental Mitigation Plan (OEMP) provided in Appendix C of the PD consolidates general and species-specific mitigations for known or potentially occurring MNES to manage risk associated with vegetation removal, fragmentation, injury/mortality, erosion, invasive weeds and fauna, water quality, noise, light and dust. General environmental controls are introduced in Table 8 and Species-specific controls are introduced in Table 9 of Appendix C OEMP. The intent of the OEMP is to provide a consolidated document for mitigations for the proposed action during its implementation and is intended to be conditioned in any approval.
				As outlined in Section 6.2 of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report, the OEMP commits the Proponent to incorporate design management measures such as fauna fencing, passage and fauna furniture in strategic locations to avoid, minimise and manage potential impacts to local scale connectivity and fauna movement, particularly for koala, greater glider and yellow-bellied glider.
				Where considered ecologically relevant (described in Section 6.4 of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report), species-specific buffer zones have been identified to assess and monitor potential for indirect impacts, particularly for grey-headed flying-fox, greater glider and yellow-bellied glider, and ecological communities.
				Offsets
				Since the referral, the Proponent has significantly reduced potential impacts to MNES threatened flora, fauna and communities through avoidance and mitigation measures. However, the nature and size of the proposed action means impacts to vegetation and habitat will occur based on the proposed enhancement to a pre-existing rail corridor. The proposed action minimises the greater environmental and social impacts that would be associated with a new greenfield corridor by planning / designing the proposed action to largely co-locate with the existing rail corridor that sits within already constrained and highly

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
				developed urban environment. Based on this, the proposed action is unable to entirely avoid impacts to vegetation and habitat immediately adjacent to the existing corridor.
				After avoidance, minimisation and mitigation measures were applied, a remaining significant impact on MNES (to koala, south-eastern glossy black cockatoo, grey-headed flying fox, regent honeyeater and swift parrot) requires compensation by suitable offsets as per the EPBC Act EO Policy (2012). Accordingly, biodiversity offsets will be delivered in accordance with the EPBC Act EO Policy through an offset portfolio to compensate for loss of potential habitat (refer Appendix D Offset Area Management Plan).
				No change to the PD.
4.1.5	The assessment materials and methodology fail to properly account for cumulative impacts using best practice methodology.	007	Section 2.3.5 Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report	Assessment of cumulative impacts is described in Section 2.3.5 of the PD and Section 5 of the Supplementary MNES Report (Appendix B). Cumulative impact assessment adopted a best practice methodology to consider the proposed action in the context of other concurrent developments at a local scale, as well as a vegetation scale analysis to consider the proposed action impacts to MNES at local and regional scales.
			OEMP	At a local scale, the proposed action primarily widens the existing rail corridor within existing urban matrix of residential areas, disturbed and undisturbed vegetation, parklands, roads, railways and industrial land. Proposed impacts to MNES will be limited to the narrow, linear alignment within the Impact area and primarily impact habitat patch edges.
				In the context of the region, the proposed action is one of several regionally strategic transport projects to increase connectivity within and between Brisbane, Logan and Gold Coast regions. Based on the known scope of projects within the Impact area, consideration has been given to the potential for cumulative impacts to MNES from planned projects as provided in Section 2.3.5 of the PD.
				The cumulative impact assessment considers the potential contribution to cumulative impacts in the context of development patterns in the locality and region. Local cumulative impacts may occur to vegetation/habitat quality (e.g. edge effects), fauna diversity and available local resources, however, comprehensive measures to avoid, minimise, mitigate and manage impacts of the proposed action are provided within Section 6.0 of the Supplementary MNES Report (Appendix B) and OEMP (Appendix C). In a regional context, impacts to undisturbed (remnant) vegetation will be minor, impacting approximately less than 0.001% of undisturbed (remnant) vegetation within the SEQ bioregion.
				No change to the PD.
4.1.6	Project impacts will amount to significant impacts on the threatened species of the Project area and therefore the Project should not proceed.	007	Section 2.3.3 Section 2.5 Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report	The Proponent has provided adequate evidence basis and supporting documentation to assess the proposed action in accordance with Significant Impact Guidelines (Department of the Environment, 2013) and relevant policy and guidance identifying significant impacts to MNES requiring suitable offset.
				The Proponent is committed to reducing potential impacts to MNES threatened flora, fauna and communities through avoidance and mitigation measures. However, the nature and size of the proposed action means impacts to vegetation and habitat will occur. This is largely brought about by expanding current rail infrastructure in an existing rail corridor, which constrains the ability to entirely avoid habitat impacts adjacent to the existing corridor. After these measures, significant impacts are expected to occur to koala, south-eastern glossy black cockatoo, grey-headed flying fox, regent honeyeater and swift parrot. Accordingly,

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
				biodiversity offsets will be delivered in accordance with the EPBC Act EO Policy through an offset portfolio to compensate for loss of potential habitat (refer Appendix D Offset Area Management Plan). No change to the PD.

## 4.2 Heritage and culture

Table 6 provides a list of comments received concerning heritage, culture and the Proponent's response.

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
4.2.1	Assessment approach is culturally inappropriate.	ldentifier 007	Section 1.5.2 and 2.6.4 Appendix E Consultation Summary	<ul> <li>Timeframe         The timeframe provided to the public within which to make submissions on the PD was consistent with the EPBC Act and did not prevent genuine engagement with the community including First Nations people.         On 25 February 2025, a delegate to the Minister for the Environment and Water directed the Proponent to publish the PD for a minimum of ten (10) business days pursuant to Section 95A(3) of the EPBC Act. In compliance with the direction, the Proponent made the PD available for public display from Wednesday 12 March 2025 to Tuesday 25 March 2025. As a result of requests from the public, the Proponent extended the time for submissions until 4 April 2025.         In addition to prescribed statutory notification periods, which the Proponent further extended, the Proponent has undertaken broader community consultation about the Project from a general sense since the initial referral, including targeted engagement with key stakeholders (as an indication, the extent of consultation to 2023 is provided by Appendix E in the PD).     </li> <li>Engagement         Beyond the standard public comment period under the EPBC Act, the Proponent has also undertaken early and ongoing engagement with the relevant Traditional Owner Groups about the proposed action. The approach to the engagement to date is consistent with the Interim Engaging with First Nations People and Communities on Assessments and Approvals under the <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> Guideline (DCCEEW, 2023).     </li> </ul>
				Traditional Owner Groups. An initial Cultural Heritage Risk Assessment (CHRA) was completed and discussed within the EPBC Referral (EPBC 2022/09439). It followed a standardised process in accordance with the Proponent's Cultural Heritage Organisational Policy (2019) and Cultural Heritage Process Manual (2022). These standards have been

#### Table 6: Heritage and culture comment response

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
	Issue/Recommendation			developed to ensure compliance with Federal and State heritage legislation and are consistently applied across all of the Proponent's projects throughout Queensland.
				Following the completion of the initial CHRA the Proponent commenced initial engagement with the Traditional Owner Groups from May 2023, with engagement currently ongoing. At the request of some of the Traditional Owner Groups representatives, a number of field assessments have been undertaken between August 2023 and May 2024, which was led through one of the Traditional Owner's consultant archaeologists/technical advisers.
				The Proponent remains committed to recognising, protecting and respecting the Traditional Owner Groups cultural rights, via ongoing consultation, negotiation of agreements such as CHMPs and seeking input and feedback on co-design and cultural recognition opportunities and other First Nations initiatives available through the contract requirements incorporated into the delivery of the proposed action.
				The Danggan Balun Applicant (being the named claimants for the Danggan Balun (Five Rivers) native title determination application) is one of the Traditional Owner Groups and an Aboriginal party for the area of the proposed action as defined by the <i>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003</i> (Qld) (ACHA).
				It is the Proponent's view that the framework of the ACHA allows for genuine engagement and involvement of the Aboriginal parties. This is reflected in the conduct of the engagement to date as further detailed below and in Section 4.7.
				The Proponent has been engaging with the Danggan Balun Applicant in this capacity regarding the proposed action since May 2023. The parties are negotiating the terms of a CHMP and the Proponent is hopeful this can be finalised shortly.
				Engagement has comprised briefings on the proposed action, three phases of site surveys, including test excavations, with the support of an expert archaeologist, numerous in-person meetings, a site visit and negotiations on a cultural heritage management plan. In the course of this engagement, the proposed action, the Impact area and clearing that would be required for the proposed action has been discussed with the Applicant.
				Through this engagement period the Applicant has provided feedback and insights on a range of matters that the Proponent understands are important to the Applicant and the People they represent. The Proponent is committed to recognising and respecting the Applicant's cultural rights, and the Proponent will continue working with the Applicant to settle an agreed approach to these issues.
				The Proponent is committed to investing in ongoing relationships and partnerships with First Nations peoples and communities and the relevant Traditional Owner Groups through the design and construction phase of the proposed action.
				Some minor updates have been included in Section 1.5.2 and Section 2.6.4 of the PD to reflect timing, duration and status of engagement with relevant Traditional Owner Groups and First Nations peoples.
4.2.2	Species being impacted are culturally significant and therefore the Project will cause significant	007	Section 2.6.4	The Proponent accepts the cultural significance of the koala and koala habitat, other MNES and non-MNES species relevant to Traditional Owner Groups and First Nations peoples.
	social harm; the cultural rights of future generations will be impacted; in light of impacts to			The Proponent is committed to recognising and respecting the impacts of the proposed action on the cultural rights of First Nations peoples, and complying with the cultural

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
	koala and its importance to indigenous culture, approval of the Project is also contrary to the principle that conservation of biological diversity		Appendix C OEMP, Table 8, 9 and 10	heritage duty of care in the ACHA. To this end, the Proponent has engaged with the Danggan Balun Applicant, an Aboriginal party for the proposed action area under the ACHA, since May 2023, as detailed in Ref: 4.2.1 above.
	and ecological integrity should be fundamental consideration in decision making.		Appendix E Consultation Summary	The impact on MNES species, and particularly on the koala and koala habitat, is a matter that has been comprehensively assessed through the PD. The design of the proposed action has been developed and refined to maximise use of disturbed areas, co-locate and site existing infrastructure to avoid and minimise further vegetation clearing wherever feasible.
				As noted above, the Impact area has been further refined and reduced as highlighted in Section 2.1.4 and Table 3 of the PD, and the OEMP (Appendix C) provides additional species-specific mitigations for protection of biodiversity, including koala (Table 9). The SIA for koala was undertaken by experienced specialist ecologist and drew on adequate site survey and assessments (see further detail on assessment method in Section 4.1 above) to determine that while there would be loss of habitat for koala, the clearing for the proposed action is unlikely to lead to a long-term decrease in any koala populations in the region or is unlikely to significantly interfere with the recovery of the species. The species will continue to persist within its current distribution and the proposed action is not likely to cause a long-term decrease in the size of the koala population. The mitigation measures outlined in the OEMP (Appendix C, Table 9) specifically for koala are designed to follow the principles of avoiding, minimising, mitigating and managing both direct and indirect impacts to koala habitat during design and construction, where practicable. As outlined in Section 3.3 of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report, the assessment undertaken supports, and the mitigations measures allow, for the continued existence of the koala for the benefit of future generations.
				The Proponent will continue to engage meaningfully with the Danggan Balun Applicant to respectfully address impacts to cultural rights through the CHMP and other First Nations initiatives available through the contract requirements incorporated into the delivery of the proposed action, including with respect to the cultural significance of the koala. Further details are provided in this Section 4.2 and Section 4.7 below.
				No change to the PD.

## 4.3 Flora, fauna and vegetation

Table 7 provides a list of comments received concerning flora, fauna, vegetation and the Proponent's response.

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD	
4.3.1	The clearing of remnant, high-value regrowth and other vegetation will reduce the area of occupancy, adversely affect critical habitat, and	007	Section 2.1.4 Appendix C	The extent of the impact described in this submission appears to relate to the initial impact footprint and extent of assessments presented in the EPBC referral documentation from	

#### Table 7: Flora, fauna and vegetation comment response

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
	destroy habitat that will lead to a decline in the population. The proposed action covers a large area of 295 hectares, which includes 42.55 hectares of remnant high value regrowth and 166.3 hectares of non-remnant vegetation. The direct impacts of the Project on protected listed threatened species will include vegetation loss, habitat fragmentation, and injury or death caused by the development, and may also have indirect adverse impacts on waterways, exacerbate the spread of invasive weeds and fauna species, and disturb threatened fauna through noise, light and		OEMP	December 2022.
				Compared to the December 2022 referral, the PD integrates new information based on the revised Impact area (Section 6.1 of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report), increased targeted field survey program (Section 2.5 of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report), and refined vegetation and habitat mapping (Appendix B and Appendix D of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report).
				Potential impacts of the proposed action on MNES, including vegetation loss, habitat fragmentation, injury or mortality, hydrological changes, erosion, invasive weeds and pests, noise, light and dust are described in Section 2.3.2 of the PD and Section 5.0 of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report. Measures to avoid, minimise and mitigate identified impacts on MNES are identified in Appendix C OEMP, including general environmental controls (Table 8) and species-specific controls (Table 9).
				The proposed action is located within an urban environment and approximately 90% of the Impact area is residential areas and developed areas including the existing rail corridor and stations comprising of non-remnant and regrowth vegetation (Appendix B, Figure 8, of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report). As the Impact area is primarily aligned to the existing operational rail corridor, roads and highly urbanised areas, adjacent habitats have been subjected to disturbance, fragmentation, weed incursion and edge effects and already restricts north-south and east-west fauna movement, in addition to existing barriers such as fences, roads, buildings and lack of canopy cover.
				The design of the proposed action has been developed and refined to maximise use of disturbed areas, co-locate and site existing infrastructure to avoid and minimise further vegetation clearing wherever feasible. However, due to the location of the existing railway line and built environment constraints, disturbance to vegetation and habitat for conservation of significant species and communities is not completely unavoidable.
				Through procurement processes, further design development has refined and reduced the Impact area. Driven to find alternative solutions to achieve reductions to habitat for MNES and refine temporary works and access planning, the Impact area has reduced to 194.45 ha, reflecting a decrease of 99.74 ha (33.90%) since the referral was submitted. Avoided impacts are demonstrated in Section 2.1.4 of the PD, highlighting changes in key biodiversity areas in Figures 3-9 of the PD. MNES impact avoided since the EPBC Act referrals is presented in Table 3 of the PD. No change to the PD.
4.3.2	4.3.2 The proposed action will have a significant impact on both the population and habitat of the koala itself, an endangered species.	007	Section 2.5 Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report Appendix D OAMP	The proposed action has identified potential for significant impact on both the population and habitat of the koala after avoidance, minimisation and mitigation measures are applied, and a suitable offset is provided as described in Appendix D OAMP.
	Koalas would use all types of habitat quality, including high, medium and low-quality koala habitat, high, medium and low value rehabilitation habitat, and low to medium value other habitat.			A level of conservatism has been applied through habitat mapping whereby a 'habitat' approach (instead of individual feature approach) has generally been adopted for the impact assessment. Areas exposed to increased development and highly fragmented from the broader landscape due to existing movement barriers such as noise walls and fauna fencing have been excluded from koala habitat classification mapping. To achieve a more thorough and detailed assessment of koala habitat than State mapping of koala habitat areas, the habitat mapping rules adopted for koala included:

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
				<b>Foraging and breeding habitat definition</b> – all vegetation types (within remnant, HVR, regrowth or non-remnant vegetation, comprising and at times dominated by Locally Important Koala Trees (LIKTs), and ancillary habitat trees that may be utilised for occasional foraging.
				<b>Shelter and dispersal habitat definition</b> – all remaining areas not dominated by LIKT or ancillary habitat trees, containing small stands of trees or individual mature trees (i.e. any tree with a canopy width over 5 metres) which may provide shelter or safe intervening ground matrix facilitating dispersal between habitats.
				<ul> <li>Shelter and dispersal habitat was mapped over to all remaining areas not considered 'foraging and breeding' habitat, excluding the following areas unlikely to be regularly used as koala dispersal pathways:</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>Railway corridors (i.e. 10 m buffer from existing railway tracks)</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>Building roofs, as per Qspatial dataset Generated building outlines – Queensland 24 September 2024 (DoR, 24 September 2024)</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>Groundtruthed wetlands, rivers as per Qspatial dataset Vegetation management watercourse and drainage feature map (1:100000 and 1:250000) - Queensland excerpt South East Queensland Version 7.01 (DNRMMRRD, 5 November 2024), and swimming pools as per Qspatial dataset Swimming pools – Queensland (DoR, 22 November 2024)</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>Noise walls</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>Koala exclusion fencing or barbed wire</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>Major road reserve corridors e.g. highways and motorways, except where koala habitat has been mapped within these corridors</li> </ul>
				Most koala habitat within the Impact area presents as scattered eucalypt trees within a fragmented landscape. However, all koala habitat within the Impact area is considered habitat critical to the survival of the species. A Significant Impact Assessment for this species has therefore been undertaken, and accounts for the local scale impacts to the species. All significant impacts will be fully acquitted in the proposed offsets package. The long-term viability of remaining populations is not anticipated to be significantly impacted as higher quality habitat will remain in the surrounding local area.
				No change to the PD.
4.3.3	The Project will have a significant impact on listed threatened species, specifically the koala, grey- headed flying fox, south-eastern glossy black cockatoo, swift parrot, and regent honeyeater;	001 005 006	Section 2.3.2.2	At the time of the EPBC Act referral (December 2022), the proposed action was assessed as having potential to result in a significant impact to greater glider (southern and central) and yellow-bellied glider (south-eastern) based on conservative assessment and information available at the time.
	other listed threatened species may also be significantly impacted, greater glider ( <i>Petauroides</i> <i>volans</i> ) and Yellow-bellied glider (south-eastern) ( <i>Petaurus australis australis</i> ) in particular.			As described in Section 2.1.4 of the PD, further design development has been able to achieve reductions in overall impacts to habitat for MNES, particularly in key biodiversity areas such as Acacia Forest Park, including refinements to:
	Acacia Forest Park is known as a breeding and foraging habitat for the endangered Greater Glider			<ul> <li>Provide more certainty to rail track alignment and construction access in the Allingham Street area</li> </ul>

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
	and the vulnerable Yellow-bellied Glider. Why were the at-risk species omitted from the MNES			<ul> <li>Incorporate value engineering options driven through procurement phase to reduce embankment heights, requiring less area to construct</li> </ul>
	list? Hollows in the impact area should be replicated in			<ul> <li>Reduce environmental impacts at Trinder Park to successfully deliver substantial avoidance outcomes.</li> </ul>
	the nearby Karawatha Forest for these marsupials, preferably using the Hollow Hog method			As a result of significant reductions to the Impact area, as well as targeted surveys and species-specific habitat mapping, direct impacts to greater glider (southern and central) habitat have substantially reduced from 49.42 ha to 34.89 ha – almost 30% reduction of direct impacts (refer Table 3 of PD). The resulting major changes for glider habitat impact in key biodiversity areas are highlighted in Figure 8 of the PD.
				The Significant Impact Assessment for this species was updated to reflect these changes resulting in the proposed action to be unlikely to result in a significant impact to the greater glider (southern and central) and yellow-bellied glider (south-eastern), with such an impact unlikely to be important, notable or of consequence – as detailed in Appendix F of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report. While habitat critical to the survival of the species is mapped, the proposed action is unlikely to significantly impact this habitat or cause impacts that are important, notable or of consequence, since:
				- Habitat primarily occurs within small, fragmented patches
				<ul> <li>Habitat is unlikely to be a significant stepping-stone for connectivity into the broader landscape</li> </ul>
				- Where contiguous habitat for the species occurs at Wally Tate Park, Karawatha/Acacia Forest Park, and Nealdon Park/Gould Adams Park, core high quality habitat will be retained and habitat edges impacted will be consistent with already high levels of disturbance, urbanisation and edge effects.
				The Proponent has committed to replacement of suitable hollows using a carved hollow replacement method. Hollows assessment was undertaken within the Impact area (and Offset area) via visual assessment from the ground over four days within representative sites within each Assessment Unit containing mapped breeding habitat for Glossy Black-cockatoo. Hollows were not assessed within mapped dispersal habitat since this is primarily located within disturbed non-remnant vegetation and unlikely to contain suitable hollows. Results of Glossy Black Cockatoo hollows assessment at the impact site are provided within Appendix G Hollow Assessment within the Benobble Offset Area Management Plan (OAMP) with more hollows created than impacted.
				The Proponent intends to establish an Environmental Reference Group to review and investigate localised ecological improvement initiatives such as hollow creation in key biodiversity areas. No change to the PD.
4.3.4	Other listed threatened species may also be significantly impacted by the proposed action, in particular the Powerful owl, Green-thighed frog and Wallum Froglet.	006 001 007	Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report	Assessments were undertaken during the referral stage (December 2022) for MNES, including threatened species and ecological communities, to identify potential for significant impacts. Following the referral decision notice (April 2023), DCCEEW outlined controlling provisions, including species and ecological communities which may be significantly impacted as a result of the proposed action. On the basis of further detailed assessments undertaken, and all reasonable efforts to avoid and minimise impacts through design

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
				refinements, no additional MNES species or ecological communities were identified with potential to be significantly impacted by the proposed action.
				The Proponent has undertaken an impact assessment of Matters of State Environmental Significance (MSES) and will meet obligations under relevant State legislation. Furthermore, potential impacts to fauna species not listed as MNES (such as the Powerful owl, Green-thighed frog and Wallum Froglet) will be mitigated and managed under the measures outlined in Appendix C (OEMP) to Appendix B (MNES report) of the PD. Additionally, prior to construction activities commencing, the Proponent's delivery partners are responsible for identifying and obtaining relevant approvals and permits for fauna protected under State legislation.
4.3.5	The Proponent is required to state how receiving	001	Appendix B	The PD identifies suitability of receiving habitat to meet the needs of displaced MNES in
	habitat will meet the needs of displaced MNES as		Supplementary	Section 5.2.1.2.1 and Table 27 of Appendix B Supplementary MNES report.
	a result of the proposed action. It's unclear whether there are any plans for translocation or relocation of displaced native fauna.		MNES Report, Section 5.2.1.2.1 and Table 27 Appendix C OEMP. Table 8, Table 9 and Appendix C	Habitat suitability of vegetation communities and species-specific habitat features outside the study area are derived from desktop assessment, Atlas of Living Australia species record databases and Logan City Council and Brisbane City Council databases. As the receiving habitat outside the Impact area is assumed to be homogenous to areas where it intersects or adjoins the Impact area, there is a high capacity of these receiving areas to support displaced MNES. Particularly in key biodiversity areas, since they are generally in moderate to high condition and associated within mapped biodiversity corridors and ground truthed fauna movement corridors, displaced MNES will be able to traverse to other areas of suitable habitat within the landscape without translocation.
				The OEMP (Appendix C) sets out the proposed objectives and mitigation measures to avoid, minimise and manage potential impacts to MNES from construction of the proposed action. The OEMP has been prepared to inform the detailed design and delivery activities with mitigation measures developed drawing from statutory documents such as species Approved Conservation Advice and National Recovery Plans.
				Appendix C OEMP (Table 8) outlines general environmental controls for vegetation clearing, including pre-clearing fauna inspections and sequential/staged clearing requirements to minimise fauna interactions. Appendix C OEMP (Table 9) identifies species-specific controls, including avoiding work during high-risk periods, temporary fencing and stop-work protocols within 50 m of an individual, among others. With implementation of work area and clearing controls, including fauna spotter catcher and stop-work protocols, outlined in Appendix C OEMP, native fauna such as koalas will be able to disperse on their own accord into the surrounding landscape.
				Generally, tracking and relocating programs such as those used for koala are undertaken when clearing extensive koala habitat supporting a large population. Given the low density of koala population within highly fragmented habitat values of the Impact area footprint, tracking and relocating individuals may cause unnecessary stress for the koala.
				The Proponent will ensure the management and mitigation strategies provided will be implemented by the Proponent's delivery partners for the purpose of mitigating potential impacts to MNES from proposed action activities, specific to a particular phase and/or occur across multiple phases. In effect, this OEMP is the action management plan for the

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
				proposed action expected to be conditioned for implementation taking place of post- approval management plans. Attached to the OEMP, the Fauna Monitoring Program sets out requirements to monitor impacts to fauna during construction.
				The Fauna Monitoring Program (Appendix C to OEMP) outlines actions for the design and pre-construction phase to enable a baseline understanding of fauna activities, during the construction phase to monitor and assess mitigation, and during post-construction phase to monitor and assess of long-term fauna measures within key biodiversity areas within the Impact area and associated buffer zones.
				The Proponent will continue to collaborate with the Local authorities via the forums already established as part of the design refinement activities which will be maintained during project delivery. This will enable any other roost consideration additional to those embodied in the PD to be considered, as relevant.
				No change to the PD.
4.3.6	4.3.6 Previous local concerns regarding consideration the dispersal of flying fox roosts dispersal to engage and educate the communities living in proximity to roosts. Dispersal of flying fox colonies goes against existing local management intent. Ongoing management becomes more complex as flying foxes may relocate to other areas within the City, requiring continuous efforts to manage new roost sites and the impacts to surrounding residents. Further consideration on how the Proponent can assist in reducing and managing impacts resulting from any roost dispersals.	004	Section 2.3.1 Section 2.3.2	The Proponent has identified two flying fox roosts in the Logan area in the vicinity of the proposed action (refer to Section 2.3 of the PD).
			Section 2.3.2.2 Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report, Figure 19 Appendix C OEMP	The Proponent has reduced encroachment into the flying-fox roosting locations as far as reasonably practicable with buffer zones applied to breeding areas to manage and monitor impacts (refer Section 2.3.1 of the PD). Appendix C OEMP includes species-specific mitigation measures that have been modelled on recent Grey-Headed Flying-Fox management plans developed for similar Projects. These measures are underpinned by:
				<ul> <li>the principles of Queensland government publications which local governments are also bound to comply with as part of their as-of-right authority to management flying fox roosts</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>the Queensland Code of Practice Ecologically sustainable management of flying-fox roosts</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>the Department of Environment, Technology, Science and Innovation (DETSI) Code of Practice Low impact activities affecting flying-fox roosts</li> <li>the intent to avoid roost dispersed if possible, and</li> </ul>
				- the interit to avoid roost dispersarili possible, and
				- Other mitigations such as influing works in breeding periods.
				regarding roost management prior to clearing works occurring in relevant roost locations.
				No change to the PD.
4.3.7	Fauna Monitoring Program prepared by AECOM is unclear whether there are plans for translocation or relocation of displaced native fauna. To date, no consultation has taken place on this matter, it would be beneficial for all parties if there are	004	Appendix C - OEMP	The Fauna Monitoring Program (Appendix C) has been developed by the Proponent in collaboration with suitably qualified and experienced ecologists, which requires pre-, during and post-construction monitoring by suitably qualified and experienced ecologists. Data collected will inform the design of fauna passage opportunities as well as verifying the mitigation measures outlined in the OEMP (Appendix C).
	collaboration as part of any relocation or translocation program. A consideration of tracking displaced species identified in the Fauna Monitoring Program; data would prove extremely			The Proponent acknowledges that translocation programs (primarily targeting the koala) have been implemented in SEQ over the last decade. Before deciding whether a translocation program was required for the proposed action, the Proponent focused on

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
	helpful for other existing management of the conservation significant fauna species addressed			developing and embedding effective avoidance (footprint reduction) and mitigation measures (fauna sensitive design).
	by the Fauna Monitoring Program.			Overall, the design of the monitoring program has taken into consideration the nature of the target species (terrestrial vs flying), extent of biodiversity habitat beyond the Impact area fauna connectivity corridor inclusive of the ability to accommodate future connectivity in the permanent design target fauna counts within and in proximity of the Impact area before considering whether translocation needed to be investigated.
				Based on this body of work, translocation was not recommended. Similarly, mandating a tagging / tracking & relocation program was not recommended, even for the Koala. Tracking and relocating individuals would provide limited benefit when considering the level of investment and the inherent risks that a program like this would introduce to koalas. Tracking and relocating koala (as for any other target species) need to consider ethical concerns about animal welfare and the potential for unintended consequences, such as stress (associated with capture, health checks and release), and introduction of diseases and parasites to the population at the relocation site, or exposure of the individual being relocated to diseases and parasites. The proposed monitoring program is therefore considered suitable.
				The Proponent acknowledges that human intervention may be required during the proposed action, such as in the event of a response to a welfare concern, which also result in a relocation (e.g. sick individual requiring specialised veterinary care before release). As part of the development of Project-specific environmental management plans to be developed by the Proponent's Delivery Partners, fauna management requirements during construction will be required to include consideration to scenarios where human intervention may be required, inclusive of how relocation / release is to be managed.
				The Proponent and its Delivery Partners will engage with local authorities to collaborate on suitable relocation areas on a fauna-specific basis, in addition to using the key expertise of qualified ecologists and fauna spotter catchers.
				No change to the PD.
4.3.8	In addition to the fauna escape poles, there are suggestions that koala gates be considered in the design, especially at locations like Gould Adams	004	Appendix C - OEMP	Fauna passage options remain the subject of further detailed design; however indicative fauna fencing and fauna passage locations are introduced in Figure 3 of Appendix C OEMP.
	Park where koalas are known to reside. Additional fauna passage measures such as these, will help ensure the safety and well-being of the local koala			Nominated personnel from the Local authorities and returned assets owners have been involved in targeted reviews of the Reference Design and associated specifications during the refinement phases.
	contribute to this important initiative and are committed to its success.			Noting the nature of the proposed action being primarily a rail project with some upgrades to local roads, the Proponent has also engaged extensively with Queensland Rail inclusive on matters pertaining to fauna strike records and permanent design considerations as fauna passages will primarily be located within the rail corridor. Complementary information/data has been appraised such as that provided by local authorities.
				To this extent, matters such as escape/refuges poles, and 'koala gates', fauna passage measures will need to:
				- be consistent and demonstrate how they comply with currently published fauna

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
				sensitive design guidelines
				- be developed in consultation with the guidance of a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist
				<ul> <li>integrate with security measures required as an outcome of the risk assessment to be undertaken in accordance with the Queensland Rail Safety and Environment Management Standards (SEMS)</li> </ul>
				- be integrated with the proposed fauna exclusion fencing.
				Working with its Delivery Partners, the Proponent will continue to engage with local authorities and returned asset owners to understand preferred fauna connectivity measures to ascertain if these can be feasibility brought into the scope of the project beyond what has been planned using industry standards as reflected in in the PD.
				No change to the PD.
4.3.9	Ecologists must be working with contractors in all areas where vegetation clearing is occurring during construction phase. Clearing should be conducted slowly and in stages, in line with mitigation requirements, to allow wildlife the	005 006 001	Appendix C OEMP	As outlined in Appendix C OEMP (Table 8 and Table 9), suitably qualified and experienced ecologists will be involved in pre-clearance surveys, throughout vegetation clearing and monitoring throughout construction. Noting that the OEMP will likely be a condition of approval, the Proponent and its delivery partners will be required to comply with this document.
	opportunity to move away safely. Spotters must be used at all impact areas to identify and relocate any fauna present. These measures should be written into contractor conditions, with ecologists actively working			It is a minimum requirement under Proponent's <i>Main Roads &amp; Technical Specification</i> ( <i>MRTS</i> ) 51 - <i>Environmental Management</i> , which the Proponent's delivery partners must comply with, that vegetation clearing and activities such tampering with breeding places (irrespective of whether vegetation is being cleared) are undertaken under the guidance and supervision of a Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person (fauna).
	alongside construction teams. Input from relevant environmental representatives is also encouraged to support best-practice outcomes.			In addition to these minimum obligations, the following requirements of the OEMP, which are also legislated under the <i>Nature Conservation (Koala) Conservation Plan 2023</i> (The Koala Plan), will be complied with:
				- Clearing of koala habitat trees to comply with the sequential clearing requirements prescribed in the Koala Plan (Queensland Government, 2023) which is recognised as a best practice document
				<ul> <li>Clearing of koala habitat trees within mapped koala habitat areas to be undertaken in the presence of a koala spotter</li> </ul>
				- Clearing methodologies allowing for the safe self-dispersal of individuals.
				Therefore, by complying with the Proponent's standards, Koala Plan and OEMP clearing requirements, the Delivery Partners will be required to manage native fauna, irrespective of its listing status at State or Federal level, under the guidance and supervision of Suitably Qualified and Experienced Personnel.
				No change to the PD.
4.3.10	Inconsistency with Koala conservation advice and clearing priority koala habitat and core habitat	007	Section 2.3.1 Section 6.1 Section 6.5	The proposed action is not contrary to the Conservation Advice for <i>Phascolarctos cinereus</i> (koala) combined populations of Queensland, New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory (Koala Conservation Advice).
			Appendix B	The PD (Section 2.3.1) identifies the relevant conservation advice, recovery plans and threat abatement plans that have informed the Proponent's assessment of the impacts of

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
			Supplementary MNES Report, Section 2.3.	the proposed action on MNES. In undertaking an assessment of the likely impacts to Koala as a result of the proposed action, the Proponent has particularly had regard to the following:
		and Ap F Signi Impact	and Appendix F Significant Impact	<ul> <li>the Conservation Advice for <i>Phascolarctos cinereus</i> (koala) combined populations of Queensland, New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory (Department of Agriculture Water and the Environment, 2022) (Koala Conservation Advice); and</li> </ul>
			Assessment, Section 3.3, and Appendix H Koala	<ul> <li>the National Recovery Plan for the koala (<i>Phascolarctos cinereus</i>) (combined populations of Queensland, New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory) (Department of Agriculture Water and the Environment, 2022 (National Recovery Plan for Koala).</li> </ul>
			Mapping letter	Potential koala habitat in the Impact area was conservatively mapped and in consideration of the factors specified in the National Recovery Plan for Koala and the Conservation Advice for Koala. The Koala Conservation Advice lists factors considered when identifying habitat that is critical to the survival of a species, including resources necessary for foraging, shelter/predator avoidance, growth, reproduction and movement (including safe intervening ground matrix). The Proponent's assessment has considered those matters in defining conservative habitat mapping rules (Appendix D of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report) and confirmed mapped koala habitat within the Impact area (107.74 ha) is considered habitat critical to the survival of the species. Of that area, a maximum of 27.48 ha of potential breeding and foraging habitat and 80.27 ha of dispersal habitat will be impacted for the proposed action (Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report, Section 3.3.11 of Appendix F Significant Impact Assessment).
				Within an already highly urbanised and developed area adjoining the existing rail corridor, the relevant threats to the species referenced in the Koala Conservation Advice, including clearing and degradation of koala habitat and mortality from vehicle strike, were considered in the impact assessment (refer to the spatial habitat mapping and SIA undertaken to assess potential impacts to koala provided in Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report, Appendix B and Section 3.3.11 of Appendix F Significant Impact Assessment).
				Informed by recommendations made in Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report, measures to avoid, minimise and mitigate potential impacts to conservation significant fauna are outlined in Table 9 of the OEMP (Appendix C). The management measures identified for the proposed action have also been evaluated against the recovery actions outlined in the National Recovery Plan for Koala in Table 10 of Appendix C OEMP.
				In addition to design refinement to further reduce the impact to koala habitat (by almost 40% of the area identified in the referral), the Proponent has completed Landscape Connectivity Modelling which is presented in Appendix of the Supplementary MNES report (Appendix B of the PD). Landscape connectivity modelling formed part of the assessment method as detailed in Section 2.3.1 and Section 2.3.4 of the PD to show potential barriers to koala movement associated with the proposed action. The model provided a comparison of current state connectivity versus future state connectivity, which allowed the Proponent to identify not only where movement may become impeded but where movement is already impeded due the urbanised nature of existing environment (either partially or where restrictions are already significant).

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
				This connectivity modelling was used to inform, amongst others, design-related management measures detailed in the OEMP. Examples of management measures targeted at improving existing conditions include:
				<ul> <li>requirements for the Proponent's delivery partners to work with local landowners / authorities to revegetate specific areas to enhance east-west movement opportunities for fauna, particularly for koala movement across the broader landscape</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>proposed installation of fauna movement infrastructure to improve habitat connectivity and better enable fauna to access previously isolated habitat</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>sequential clearing requirements prescribed in Part 3, Section 10 of the Koala Plan (Queensland Government, 2023) including carrying out the clearing in stages and ensuring not more than the prescribed amount of vegetation is cleared in any one stage.</li> </ul>
				The proposed offsets identified in the PD (detailed in Appendix D) will appropriately and fulsomely compensate for residual significant impact, which will be long term protected through proposed legal security mechanisms.
				No change to the PD.
4.3.11	Construction of the Project will also increase the likelihood of koala deaths caused by vehicles, which is also identified in the Koala Conservation	007	Appendix C OEMP	The proposed action will not build new roads, rather it will result in modifications to the existing local road network, and therefore the traffic volume is unlikely to increase the likelihood of koala injury or mortality caused by vehicles.
	Advice as an increasing trend with severe consequences.			Once the proposed action has commenced, there will be some increase in construction- related traffic. General environmental controls to mitigate injury and mortality of fauna is outlined in Table 8 of Appendix C OEMP. The OEMP (Appendix C) consolidates measures to avoid and mitigate impacts to MNES during construction, including temporary and permanent fauna-friendly fencing and safe fauna movement passage as guided by Conservation Advice and the National Recovery Plan. To manage the risk of fauna strike from moving vehicles/machinery during construction, mitigation measures as outlined in the OEMP include:
				<ul> <li>Traffic Management Plan for construction sites and access will outline the current and expected flow of vehicle movements and identify potential collision points for terrestrial fauna</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>Reduction of traffic movements and speed on arterial roads and on/off ramps during dawn and dusk periods, where animal activity is likely to be high</li> </ul>
				- Speed limits on site access roads with appropriate signage.
				Following implementation of these measures, the proposed action is not anticipated to result in an increase of koala deaths or vehicle strikes during the construction phase.
				Appendix B of the OEMP demonstrates where mitigation measures such as temporary and permanent fauna fencing will be installed to the extent providing additional protection to koala and other fauna than what currently exists from both a rail and road traffic perspective.
				No change to the PD.

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
4.3.12	Reliance on exemption to clear priority koala habitat and core habitat	007	Section 2.1.5.2 Appendix B Supplementary	The proposed action is transport infrastructure being delivered by or for the State and government supported transport infrastructure for the purposes of the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> and Planning Regulation 2017. This means that some development approvals under the Planning Regulation 2017 are not required, including for development in a koala habitat areas (KHA).
			MNES Report, 2.3.2.2	When the Planning Regulation 2017 was amended to include the identification of koala priority areas (KPA) and KHA, the Queensland government recognised that some exemptions to the requirements of those areas would be necessary. This was to "balance the need to protect koala habitat with the need to allow some clearing to cater for growth and other essential services." <sup>1</sup> . This includes transport infrastructure being delivered by or for the State.
				Notwithstanding certain State development approvals are not triggered, the Proponent has assessed the environmental effects of the proposed action for the purposes of State legislation in accordance with the Proponent's published Environmental Processes Manual, and has otherwise considered the State Government Supported Infrastructure – Koala Conservation Policy (SI Policy). The SI Policy seeks to ensure that the delivery of government-supported transport infrastructure will avoid, minimise, mitigate and offset impacts to KHA, particularly within KPAs.
				Since the referral, significant reductions to the Impact area, as well as targeted surveys and species-specific habitat mapping has resulted in substantial reductions in impacts to koala habitat from 177.15 ha to 107.74 ha – almost 40% reduction of direct impacts (refer Table 3 of PD). The resulting major change for koala habitat impact in key biodiversity areas are highlighted in Figure 8 of the PD, particularly page 1 of Figure 8 highlights the changes in the Kuraby area.
4.3.13	A large wildlife underpass under Acacia Road will also be essential to ensure safe connectivity with Karawatha Forest, which has been suffering from the "edge effect" for years now as suburbs and transport infrastructure encroach upon the forest. The loss of Acacia Forest Park as a buffer zone will further impact it.	006 001	Appendix C OEMP, Appendix B	As demonstrated in Appendix B of the OEMP, fauna passage and fencing along / adjacent to Acacia Road require further investigation throughout Detailed Design stages. This is linked with the positive changes that occurred throughout 2023 and 2024 as part of the design refinement activities. The refined solution has moved the Trinder Park Station and car park further south compared to the reference design to reduce the impact within Acacia Forest Park. Consequently, the Detailed Design process will now need to further assess if the future elevation of Acacia Road is still required as originally planned in the reference design - as this elevation would be needed to allow for the fauna passage indicated. The proposed action will work local asset owners and authorities to implement roadside fauna signage and wildlife advisory markings with the intent to increase driver awareness and improve driver behaviours in this area.
				No change to the PD.
4.3.14	The proposed alignment will require extensive clearing of the habitat in areas that form part of important and irreplaceable natural Biodiversity	006	Section 2.3 Section 2.4	While biodiversity corridors are mapped within the Impact area (refer Appendix G of PD), the Impact area has been subject to substantial prior disturbances and fragmentation for urban development agriculture industrial and linear infrastructure. Fauna movement

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See the explanatory note for the Nature Conservation and Other Legislation (Koala Protection) Amendment Regulation 2020.

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
	wildlife corridor between major ecologically significant areas.		Appendix B Supplementary MNES report,	throughout the Impact area is largely restricted to small, fragmented patches providing 'stepping stone' movement opportunities within urban environment, comprising fenced residential dwellings, roads, railways, grazing and cropping lands and industrial areas.
			Section 5.2.1.2 and 6.2, Table 34 Appendix G Landscape connectivity modelling	However, the proposed action will impact mapped and/or ground truthed biodiversity or fauna movement corridors (as outlined in Section 3.9 and shown in Figure 1 and Appendix B Figure 11 of Appendix B MNES Report) surrounding Beenleigh Park/Wally Tate Park, Karawatha Forest Park, Gould Adams Park, Nealdon Park and Logan River. These impacts to fauna movement and habitat fragmentation as a result of either partial or full clearing for the proposed action are detailed in Section 5.2.1.2 of Appendix B Supplementary MNES report.
				In Appendix G, landscape connectivity modelling has been undertaken within and surrounding the Impact area considering structural and functional connectivity. The modelling was undertaken for koala, greater glider (southern and central) and yellow-bellied glider (south-eastern) (gliders), since they were assessed to most at risk of connectivity impacts as a result of the proposed action.
				Results of the landscape connectivity modelling are detailed in Section 5.4 and Appendix G (Landscape Connectivity Modelling) of Appendix B MNES report. In summary, the following locations have a potential risk to be impacted in terms of landscape connectivity after construction is completed for the proposed action:
				- Kuraby State School
				- Acacia Forest Park
				- Anzac Park, Kingston
				- Gould Adams Park/Nealdon Park
				- Edens Landing Station.
				As a result of this landscape connectivity modelling and ongoing design work, pre- construction design management measures such as fauna fencing, passage and fauna furniture have been selected in strategic locations to ensure fauna connectivity outcomes, and to avoid, minimise and manage potential impacts to local scale connectivity and fauna movement, in particular for koala, greater glider (southern and central) and yellow-bellied glider. Pre-construction design management measures are detailed in Section 6.2 of Appendix B MNES report, with key outcomes summarised below:
				<ul> <li>Permanent connectivity structures will be incorporated in the design which will maintain or improve the current ecological connectivity for fauna across the proposed action's Impact area and existing rail line and rail corridor</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>Most connectivity solutions are associated with bridge underpasses (e.g. log rail) and culverts and will be designed and constructed consistent with Fauna Sensitive Transport Infrastructure Delivery manual (TMR, 2024)</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>In the case where the proposed wildlife movement solutions are culverts and underpasses, the wildlife movement solutions will:</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>Provide dry passage clear of batters/rock abutments/scour protection to ensure long term viability</li> </ul>

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
				- Provide connectivity and shelter
				- Maintain natural streamflow
				- Fauna furniture will be installed in culverts to allow refuge from predators for arboreal species where reasonable and feasible.
				- To enhance east west fauna movement opportunities, provision has been made for revegetation of the new rail corridor within the vicinity of Compton Road, Logan River, Edens Landing Station and Holmview Station to enhance habitat values and movement corridors which are currently sparsely vegetated.
				Proposed fauna movement corridors are detailed in Section 6.2, Table 34 of Appendix B Supplementary MNES report. These fauna movement corridors represent indicative locations, mitigation measures and anticipated benefit. Further assessment of these mitigation measures for targeted species will be undertaken during the Detailed Design phase.
				No change to the PD.
4.3.15	Please tell me where to find the results of your recent ecological survey of hollows in the impact area? Is it somewhere in the PD, or was it more recent?	001	Section 2.3.1 Appendix D OAMP (Benobble), Appendix G Hollow Assessment	Hollows assessment was undertaken within the Impact area (and Offset area) via visual assessment from the ground over four days within representative sites within each Assessment Unit containing mapped breeding habitat for Glossy Black-cockatoo. Hollows were not assessed within mapped dispersal habitat since this is primarily located within disturbed non-remnant vegetation and unlikely to contain suitable hollows. Results of Glossy Black Cockatoo hollows assessment at the impact site are provided within Appendix G Hollow Assessment within the Benobble OAMP.
				No change to the PD.

## 4.4 Environmental and Social Impacts and Outcomes

Table 8 provides a list of comments received concerning noise, vibration, air quality, social impacts, accessibility, amenity, and livability and the Proponent's response.

<b>Table 8: Environmental</b>	I and Social Im	pacts and Outcomes
-------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
4.4.1	The Proponent is to make every effort to contain dust created by the project. It is also recommended	005	Section 2.1.5 of the PD	The Proponent and their Delivery Partners will take and implement all reasonable and practicable measures to manage environmental impacts.
	to create a dense vegetation barrier to contain noise and fumes from increased traffic. There will be dust and noise both during the project and after completion, as there will be heavy traffic passing close to the retirement cottages.	Appendix C OEMP	Appendix C OEMP	Construction phase air quality and noise management requirements will be undertaken in accordance with the relevant legislation, as described in Section 2.1.5 of the PD, including but not limited to the EP Act.
				As also described in Section 2.0 of the OEMP environmental management follows the Proponent's Environment Management Process Manual (TMR, 2023) [https://www.tmr.qld.gov.au/business-industry/Technical-standards- publications/Environmental-processes-manual].

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
				Further details pertaining to the general environmental controls that underpins how risk and impacts associated with the proposed action are also presented in Section 9.1 of the OEMP.
				Construction-phase noise, vibration and air quality will be managed in accordance with TMR's Main Roads Technical Specification (MRTS) 51 Environmental Management, which requires the Proponents' delivery partners to avoid and minimise environmental harm or environmental nuisance at sensitive receivers.
				Assessments are required in advance of construction activities to identify sensitive receivers which then require management measures to be applied to mitigate and reduce noise, vibration and air quality potential impacts. These assessments must take into consideration the scale, duration and intensity of the proposed activities and their potential effect on sensitive receivers.
				The Proponent also understands the community concerns about potential future construction and operational noise impact. The proposed action is still in the planning and design phase. This involves noise and vibration assessments to help minimise operational road, rail, and construction noise and vibration impacts for neighbouring communities. These assessments will be undertaken in accordance with the Department of Transport and Main Roads' (TMR) Transport Noise Management "Codes of Practice". These codes of practice can be accessed at: <a href="https://www.tmr.qld.gov.au/business-industry/Technical-standards-publications/Transport-noise-management-code-of-practice.aspx">https://www.tmr.qld.gov.au/business-industry/Technical-standards-publications/Transport-noise-management-code-of-practice.aspx</a>
				Noise and vibration management has been a core planning and assessment aspect throughout the Reference Design stage and will continue to be assessed in accordance with the relevant requirements, standards and specifications as Detailed Design progresses. The selection of noise mitigation measures for operational noise is guided by TMR's codes of practice. Several noise attenuation strategies are available and consist of proven engineering solutions to effectively attenuate noise. Therefore, these strategies do not comprise the use of tree planting as an effective physical screen to mitigate noise emissions. The development of noise mitigation strategies is integrated as part of the broader design activities and is an interactive process where matters such as visual amenity and technical factors are considered to arrive at a preferred attenuation strategy. As such revegetation and landscaping opportunities between the rail line and the retirement village will be further considered in subsequent design phase.
				The Proponent will continue to keep the community and nearby residents informed about the proposed action, including when more information becomes available regarding the air quality, noise and vibration assessments.
				Community engagement will continue to be undertaken alongside the Proponent's delivery partners to identify key stakeholder issues / additional sensitivities that will be factored into work planning. Finally, a project hotline will be available for all community members to use in the instance that communicates concerns regarding construction management.
4.4.2	The new Trinder Park station should be designed to	005	Section 2.1.4	As part of the proposed action, all upgraded stations (including Trinder Park Station) will be
	accommodate people using wheelie-walkers and mobility scooters, potentially through the inclusion of			designed to provide improved accessibility outcomes for users in accordance with current

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
	a ramp connecting the elevated road near Trinder Park to ground level. Additionally, it is recommended			legislation, standards and specifications. In particular this includes the provision of high-level platforms, lifts, footbridges and people with disability parking.
	relocated further south to higher, flood-free ground, closer to Trinder Park for improved accessibility and resilience.			The Proponent, through the design refinement activities has developed a solution that moves the Trinder Park Station and car park further south compared to the reference design and provides a directly accessible connection from the new Station to Acacia Road. The solution also ensures that Acacia Road is closer to existing ground level (not an elevated road as outlined in the submission) and accordingly there is no need for steep ramps. No change to the PD.

## 4.5 Drainage and flooding impacts

Table 9 provides a list of comments received concerning drainage, storm water, and flooding impacts and the Proponent's response.

#### Table 9: Drainage, storm water, and flooding impacts comment response

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD	
4.5.1	The alignment could have been shifted slightly east with minimal design changes to reduce	003 001	Section 2.1.4	As described in Section 2.1.4 of the PD through design refinement activities the proposed action has minimised environmental impacts at the proposed location of the Trinder Park	
	environmental impacts and preserve nearby wetlands.			station. Throughout the design refinement activities, several alignment options through the Trinder Park	
	Concerns have been raised about the proposed alignment passing through flood-prone areas, where significant water flows from Louden Street into rare wetlands within Acacia Forest Park. These				area were investigated and assessed against a variety of key project criteria and objectives including environmental considerations. An alternative alignment to the east of the current alignment as described in the query has been investigated during the design refinement activities.
	wetlands support a range of aquatic species, including the endangered Green-thighed Frog and vulnerable Wallum Froglet, which rely on creek connections from Karawatha Forest			Locating the new rail line further east, whilst investigated, was not progressed and more details are presented in Section 4.11 to address this specific aspect of the public comment submission.	
	The proposed rail line would cross or run alongside these creeks, potentially disrupting the area's natural flood management functions and damaging critical habitat. The choice to align the rail through such a sensitive hydrological system has prompted questions about the planning and consideration of alternative routes.			With regards to the specific matters pertaining to hydrology and aquatic species considerations, moving the alignment further east had a greater propensity to result in further impacts to the existing creek channel. Due to site constraints through this area and the application of relevant design standards to achieve relevant project objectives, the new four track rail line would be located longitudinally over the channel, rather than crossing the channel at two discrete locations at a more perpendicular angle.	
			An alignment that was located in a more longitudinal manner alongside the existing waterway would likely require the significant re-alignment of the existing creek channel. This would be required in order to avoid a worsening of the existing hydrological conditions and the fish passage/habitat condition across the broader waterway system including the wetlands. In this scenario, in is expected that the creek channel re-alignment works would involve additional riparian vegetation clearing.		

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
				A key outcome of the design refinement process during the procurement phase was to replace the two culvert structures crossing the tributary to Slacks Creek with bridge sections. These bridge sections across the existing waterway will:
				<ul> <li>reduce long-term impacts direct to the creek channel that the original culvert solution would have brought about</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>will encourage improved fauna connectivity beneath the bridge sections in comparison to what culverts would have provided</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>enables any temporary impacts to the existing creek channel throughout bridge construction to be reinstated with riparian planting and instream features such as pools/riffles.</li> </ul>
				Detailed flood modelling of the solution has been undertaken to ensure compliance with the necessary requirements, standards and specifications. No change to the PD

## 4.6 Waterways and water quality

Table 10 provides a list of comments received concerning waterways, water quality and the Proponent's response.

#### Table 10: Waterways and water quality comment response

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
4.6.1	The creeks passing through Acacia Forest Park from Karawatha Forest carry Green-thighed Frogs and Wallum Froglet tadpoles from the ephemeral ponds in the bushland. There are	006	2.1.5 Appendix C OEMP	The proposed action will not degrade the quality of the water flowing in the listed Ramsar wetland protected area located 15-20 km from the Moreton Bay Wetlands Ramsar wetland. Hydrology and water quality has been a key planning and assessment aspect informing the Reference Design and will continue to be incorporated into the Detailed Design phase.
	extensive wetlands and a permanent waterhole behind the housing development which intersects into Acacia Forest Park. There is a host of			Construction phase and operational water quality management requirements will be undertaken in accordance with the relevant legislation, as described in Section 2.1.5 of the PD, including but not limited to the EP Act, the Water Act and the Fisheries Act.
	aquatic and other wildlife in that area. water from those creeks, entering from Karawatha Forest, ends up in Moreton Bay, which is a listed RAMSAR wetland protected area. The project will degrade the quality of the water flowing into the bay			Appendix C OEMP provides further details of controls to be implemented to manage impacts to hydrology, erosion and water quality in Section 9.4.1. As also described in Section 2.0 of Appendix C OEMP, environmental management follows the Proponent's Environment Management Process Manual (TMR, 2023) [https://www.tmr.qld.gov.au/business-industry/Technical-standards-publications/Environmental-processes-manual].
	uay.			The Proponent will work with their Delivery Partners to take reasonably practicable measures to prevent or minimise environmental harm to receiving waters, which include the wetlands, ephemeral ponds and waterholes present near and within the Acacia Forest Park and the Karawatha Forest.
				The significant impact assessment (Appendix F of Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report) determined no anticipated impacts to MNES aquatic species due to a lack of presence or minimal habitat disruption. Therefore, impacts related to changes to hydrology, erosion and sedimentation are low risk to MNES and expected to be managed sufficiently through business-as-usual construction controls as well as design controls expected for a linear infrastructure project of this scale.
				The Proponent notes the frog species outlined (Green-thighed Frogs and Wallum Froglet) have varied conservation status under the Qld <i>Nature Conservation Act 1992</i> (NC Act). Separately, the Proponent will be undertaking more thorough / extensive assessments of MSES and will meet obligations under relevant State legislation, which includes the NC Act. Potential impacts to conservation significant fauna species will be mitigated and managed under the measures outlined in Appendix C OEMP of the PD. Additionally, prior to construction activities commencing, the Proponent's delivery partners are responsible for identifying and obtaining relevant approvals and permits for fauna protected under State legislation. No change to the PD.
4.6.2	There was no mention of the value of wetlands and mature <i>Melaleuca quinquenervia</i> and Acacia Forest Park	006	Section 2.3.2.2 Appendix B Supplement ary MNES report,	Wetlands are identified in context of fauna habitat types and vegetation communities providing potential habitat values for MNES such as Australian painted snipe and Latham's snipe as described in Section 2.3.2.2 of the PD and mapped in Figure 8 (fauna habitat types) and Figure 9 (vegetation communities) of Appendix B to Appendix B Supplementary MNES report. Vegetation communities containing <i>Melaleuca quinquenervia</i> associated with alluvial plains (RE 12.3.6) and fringing aquatic vegetation (RE12.3.7) are mapped within Acacia Forest Park and other low-lying areas.

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
			Figure 9 of Appendix B	No change to the PD.

## **4.7 Ecologically Sustainable Development**

Table 11 provides a list of comments received concerning Ecologically Sustainable Development (ESD) and the Proponent's response.

#### Table 11: Sustainability comment response

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
4.7.1	The Project is inconsistent with the principles of ecological sustainable development; in particular the principle of conservation of biological diversity	007	Section 2.1.5.2, 2.6.4 and 2.7.3	The proposed action is not inconsistent with the principles of ecological sustainable development (ESD) or with the principles of intergenerational equity or conservation of biodiversity. The PD discusses ESD and intergenerational equity considerations at Section 2.7.3.
	as it will cause significant impact to listed threatened species, in particular the koala.			It is well established that none of the principles of ESD should be viewed in isolation or be given overriding weight compared to other factors to be considered. The Proponent has collectively considered the principles of ESD for the purposes of assessing the proposed action, including the principle of inter-generational equity and the importance of conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity.
				The Proponent is committed to reducing potential impacts on protected matters through avoidance and mitigation measures, with offsets being sought where avoidance and mitigation cannot be achieved to ameliorate any remaining significant impacts. By following the principles of avoiding, minimising, mitigating and offsetting impacts to MNES, the Proponent has sought to reduce adverse environmental impacts and maintain diversity and productivity of the environment for future generations in the context of the urban setting of the proposed action, balanced with the provision of infrastructure that is necessary for the community's environmental, social and economic wellbeing.
				With specific reference to koala habitat:
				- Although the proposed action is being constructed in a highly urbanised and built-up area, it is acknowledged that the proposed action will, or will likely, have a significant impact on koala habitat. The impact assessment in the PD determined that while there would be loss of habitat for koala, it is unlikely that the clearing for the proposed action would lead to a long-term decrease in any koala populations in the region or is unlikely to significantly interfere with the recovery of the species. The species would continue to persist within its current distribution and the proposed action is not likely to cause any long-term decrease in the size of the koala population (as discussed in Table 9 in Appendix F to Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report). The Proponent considers that the Project does allow for the continued existence of the koala for the benefit of future generations.
				- The proposed action design has sought to reduce or minimise potential impacts on koala habitat. This is discussed in Section 2.1.4 of the PD. While it is acknowledged there will be impacts, the



proposed action seeks to balance those impacts with the long-term benefits in delivering public transport infrastructure for SEQ populations now and for the future.

- Koala is known to persist in areas such as Karawatha Forest Park, Nealdon and Gould Adams Park as presented in Section 2.3.2.2 of the PD and the SIA (refer Table 9 in Appendix F to Appendix B Supplementary MNES Report), where substantial impact reductions have been achieved through design refinement activities (refer Section 2.1.4 and Figure 6 of the PD).
- As detailed in Table 7 (Section 4.3 of this document), landscape connectivity modelling has been used to inform management measures to be implemented as part of the design to maintain, mitigate and improve existing koala connectivity to broader existing koala habitat outside the impact area.
- The proposed action extends throughout a landscape that has already experienced fragmentation and has the ability to increase koala movement opportunities through the installation of fauna movement infrastructure. Pre-existing barriers occurred within the existing rail corridor; however, recognising their value within State and regional biodiversity corridors, fauna passage opportunities are proposed in Appendix C OEMP (refer Figure 1 of Appendix C OEMP) and therefore the proposed action unlikely to affect the persistence of the koala.
- As summarised in the PD, as a result of the proposed action and proposed fauna connectivity infrastructure, the proposed action is unlikely to show significant changes to koala movement from existing conditions to future conditions.
- The vegetation clearing associated with the proposed action will be undertaken in accordance with relevant legislative requirements and under the guidance of a suitably qualified ecologist.

The Proponent remains committed to recognising, protecting and respecting the Traditional Owner Groups cultural rights via ongoing consultation, negotiation of agreements such as CHMPs and seeking input and feedback on co-design and cultural recognition opportunities and other First Nations initiatives available through the contract requirements incorporated into the delivery of the proposed action.

Further updated information is provided in Section 2.1.5.2 and in Section 2.6.4 of the PD.

## 4.8 Offsets

Table 12 provides a list of comments received concerning offsets and Proponent's response.

#### Table 12: Offsets comment response

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
4.8.1	The current proposed offset sites at Benobble and Undullah will not provide adequate compensation for the proposed loss of MNES being far from the impact area, and will not benefit locally impacted fauna. The current proposal to place offsets on	001 003 004 005 006	Section 2.5 Appendix D OAMP, Section 5.0	As outlined in Section 2.5 of the PD, OAMPs have been developed to outline the Proponent's approach for offsets that will be delivered to counterbalance significant impacts of the proposed action. These OAMPs provided as part of the PD (refer to Appendix D) outline the Proponent's approach for offsets within two properties at Undullah and Benobble. The major barriers to delivering localised offsets required for the proposed action under the EO Policy include:

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
	land within the Scenic Rim and Ipswich local government areas has been made without due consideration of purchasing land within Logan to satisfy offset obligations. Further consideration is to be given to the purchase of land to accommodate at least part of the offset obligations within the Logan Local Government Area.	001 007		<ul> <li>the scale (i.e. nearly 1,000 hectares of land required) which cannot be obtained in the local area, and</li> <li>based on the scale required, even if available this would not be a commercially viable option in such close proximity to major populated areas.</li> <li>Suitable offset locations were selected based on factors considered important in improving the condition, viability and extent of habitat for the target MNES (koala, south-eastern glossy black cockatoo, grey-headed flying fox, regent honeyeater and swift parrot), including connectivity with adjacent habitat in the greater landscape:         <ul> <li>Benobble offset site – located within a regional biodiversity corridor possessing regional biodiversity values as identified by the South East Queensland Regional Plan (2023) and mapped as Koala Priority Area and Core Koala Habitat Aea (DES, 2023). Vegetated areas provide suitable habitat for relevant MNES species, with significant opportunities for habitat restoration and creation, including revegetation of canopy species and installation of hollows to support glossy black cockatoo breeding habitat.</li> <li>Undullah offset site – provides a functional stepping stone connecting legally secured</li> </ul> </li></ul>
				environmental offsets facilitating important wildlife movement along a north south corridor between Flagstone (8 km south) to Flinders Peak Conservation Park (approximately 5.5 km north). This area was strategically selected based on its potential to enhance the condition, viability and connectivity of habitat for target MNES species, while also providing conservation gains.
				Full details of the evidence supporting suitability of the Offset Area based on the requirements of the MNES being compensated are provided in Section 5 of Appendix D OAMP, which addresses Offsets Policy guidance, Commonwealth Offsets Assessment Guide and the How to use the Offsets assessment guide (SEWPaC, 2012b).

Appendix D

OAMP

010

Although the current proposed offset areas will not change based on this submission, the Proponent will continue to engage with the relevant local key stakeholders to evaluate local environmental improvement initiatives in addition to the planned offsets in the Scenic Rim through the establishment of an Environmental Reference Group. The proposed action will intend to bring this into the remit of the Environmental Reference Group following its establishment subject to its Terms of Reference being developed.

#### No change to the PD.

As part of recent and ongoing engagement with key stakeholders, the Proponent intends to establish an Environmental Reference Group (ERG). The ERG will seek contributions from an array of stakeholders, for example, local interest groups, local councils/authorities, and the Proponents' delivery partners. Necessary establishment activities will occur at a later time including the development of an ERG Terms of Reference. The function of the ERG will include, for example, assessing and having input into local initiatives and improvements – such as those suggested by this public comment submission – and where feasible these initiatives will be implemented throughout the delivery of the proposed action. Given the current status of the EPBC approval process, local initiatives that may be delivered throughout the proposed action will be in addition to the offset requirements already incorporated into the PD (OAMPs); as habitat features such as replacement hollows and vegetation impacts have already been accounted for.

4.8.2	Given the proposed removal of several
	areas from the koala habitat listing and the
	fragmentation of habitat corridors, further
	revegetation and connectivity improvement
	works should be undertaken in appropriate
	nearby locations. To offset the residual
	impact, an equivalent number of trees
	should be planted to replace koala habitat
	in the local area.
	It is requested that the Proponent

It is requested that the Proponent implement early habitat replacement measures, such as installing nesting boxes

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
	or creating hollows in nearby bushland prior to clearing, to support displaced wildlife. Additionally, equivalent tree planting should occur in nearby areas as offsets for lost koala habitat.			No change to the PD.
4.8.3	The presence of wild dogs in packs on the Undullah property was also concerning. One camera trapped a pack of six dingoes on the site (PD, p3277). How will the Proponent manage protection of koalas? Will the dingoes be culled? Koalas can't be	001 006	Appendix D OAMP (Undullah)	As outlined in the OAMP for Undullah (Section 5.1.3.3), wild dogs ( <i>Canis lupus</i> ) were confirmed as present within the Offset Area with individuals detected on remote cameras and additional evidence (scat, tracks, audible barking, etc.) recorded during field surveys. Given the documented risk of wild dog predation on koalas (Endeavour Veterinary Ecology Pty Ltd, 2015), particularly on the ground or in low vegetation, these areas may pose a significant predation risk where koalas are forced to traverse open spaces.
	isolated by fencing.			Pest control is crucial for enhancing habitat quality in the offset area. Targeted pest control for wild dogs will assist in reducing threats to the species. Although impacts to wildlife by wild dogs are not fully understood (Department of Agriculture and Fisheries, 2024), studies indicate a direct link between wild dogs and koala mortality (Beyer et al., 2018; Gentle et al., 2019).
				As described in Section 6.4.5.2 of Appendix D OAMP, pest control closely tied with ongoing monitoring before and after active control will be undertaken on a biannual (twice yearly basis). Pre-control pest monitoring and incidental observations will be used to determine the baseline wild dog relative activity level to be used by a specialist pest control professional to determine the extent of pest control will be conducted as close as possible (i.e. within 1-month) of the completion of pre-control monitoring. Post-control monitoring will commence within 1-month of pest control being completed and occur at the same fixed locations surveyed during pre-control monitoring. Results of post-control monitoring will be used to determine the annual post-control wild dog relative activity level and determine whether additional follow up control and monitoring is required.
				While pest control efforts will be guided by wild dog abundance, control measures will also be implemented to control other pests including feral pigs, red foxes and feral deer. All control measures for wild dogs, feral pigs and red foxes will be undertaken in accordance with guidance provided by the Centre for Invasive Species Solutions, the Biosecurity Act and the Animal Care and Protection Act. Implementation of these measures will ensure quality and condition of the habitat for the species improves over the duration of the offset, increasing ecosystem resilience and creating an enduring benefit.
4.8.4	Council will pursue compensation for loss of Council-delivered offsets on Lot 35 RP25866 along with the loss of Council- delivered riparian vegetation on Lot 14 RP209342 in collaboration with the Department via other avenues when it seeks to finalise land acquisitions.	004	-	Noted. The council are entitled to a compensation claim based on the market value of land in accordance with the provisions of the Queensland <i>Acquisition of Land Act 1967</i> .
4.8.5	Specific queries were raised about the acquisition process, financial arrangement/s and land management proposed at the offset properties. Specific queries were	001	Appendix D OAMP	Suitably qualified offset specialists were engaged to assist in identifying and shortlisting offset properties, which incorporated a range of factors including land size availability, suitability for the potentially impacted MNES, quality of existing habitat, and proximity to impact area as detailed in Section 5.0 and Appendix B of Appendix D OAMP for each property. The Proponent will secure the

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
	raised.			properties under a legal mechanism (e.g. covenant) to preclude development activities and manage these properties for conservation purposes to benefit the impacted MNES species. The Proponent will be accountable for delivering the offset to bring about ecological improvements as outlined in Appendix D OAMP. The Proponent will secure the properties under a legal mechanism (e.g. covenant) to preclude development activities, manage these properties for conservation purposes to benefit the impacted MNES species. The Proponent will be accountable for delivering the offset to bring about ecological improvements as outlined in Appendix D OAMP.

## 4.9 Community and stakeholder consultation

Table 13 provides a list of comments received concerning community and stakeholder consultation, and the Proponent's response.

#### Table 13: Community and stakeholder consultation comment response

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
4.9.1	Concerns have been raised regarding the effectiveness of community consultation for the project; noting a lack of meaningful engagement, limited access to scientific expertise, and insufficient opportunities to share or consider local knowledge. Meetings were often held at short notice, with volunteers asked to provide local data without compensation or adequate support. Earlier consultation with local stakeholders, especially those with local knowledge of the natural and built environment, would have resulted in a much better initial plan. Despite the consultation process beginning in 2021, community questions went unanswered, and new project teams appeared unaware of prior discussions. This breakdown in continuity meant early input and suggestions to reduce environmental impacts were overlooked. Additionally, during the EPBC referral process, the local community was not informed of key dates, documents, or mapping. Materials shared during consultations were not permitted to be copied or retained, limiting transparency and hindering informed community participation.	003	Section 2.6.3 Appendix E Consultation summary	The Proponent has undertaken significant consultation with the public in relation to the proposed action ensuring key stakeholders are informed of key dates and progress. Engagement of key stakeholders intended to ensure meetings were timely and provided key updates on progress milestones being mindful of interruption to personal circumstances for little value. Briefings were held with key stakeholders generally at 6-monthly intervals – at times more so at a quarterly interval when there was meaningful progress to share. In addition to targeted engagements, the Proponent has undertaken extensive broader engagement, which has included over 54,000 flyers delivered to households, signage at train stations and on-board services, five (5) awareness raising sessions at key stations, email subscription service with over 1,800 subscribers receiving updates, social media as well as radio, print and digital advertising. Appendix E of the PD has been updated to help demonstrate the extent of general public engagement that has occurred in relation to the proposed action.

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
4.9.2	The Proponent is encouraged to establish a local environmental reference group, comprising representatives from community groups, academic institutions, and local government. This group should work collaboratively with the Proponent's ecologists, engineers, and contractors before, during, and after construction to ensure informed environmental decision- making and to help prevent avoidable impacts.	003 005 006	-	The Proponent intends to provide ongoing consultation with key stakeholder groups as the proposed action is being designed and delivered. Additionally, as part of recent and ongoing engagement with key stakeholders, the Proponent intends to establish an ERG. The ERG will seek contributions from an array of stakeholders, for example, local interest groups, local councils/authorities, the Proponents' delivery partners. Necessary establishment activities will occur at a later time including the development of an ERG Terms of Reference. The function of the ERG will include, for example, assessing and having input into local initiatives and improvements – such as those suggested by this public comment submission – and where feasible these initiatives will be implemented throughout the delivery of the proposed action. Given the current status of the EPBC approval process, local initiatives that may be delivered throughout the proposed action will be in addition to the offset requirements already incorporated into the PD (OAMPs); as habitat features such as replacement hollows and vegetation impacts have already been accounted for. Additional information included in Appendix E of the PD helps demonstrate the extent of general public engagement that has occurred in relation to the proposed action. No change to the PD.
4.9.3	Volunteers from the Community were expected to respond to 3,839 pages of reports and maps within 10 Business Days. Under Community pressure, the timeframe was increased to 18 Business Days - still not a long period considering the project has been going over 2 years and construction has commenced.	003	Section 2.6.3 and 2.6.4 Appendix E Consultation summary	The timeframe provided to the public within which to make submissions on the PD was consistent with the EPBC Act and did not prevent genuine engagement with the community. On 25 February 2025, a delegate to the Minister for the Environment and Water directed TMR to publish the PD for a minimum of ten (10) business days pursuant to Section 95A(3) of the EPBC Act. In compliance with the direction, the Proponent made the PD available for public display from Wednesday 12 March 2025 to Tuesday 25 March 2025. As a result of requests from the public, the Proponent extended the time for submissions until 4 April 2025 (a total of 18 business days). The timeframe for public submissions on PD is prescribed under the EPBC Act. Those provisions are a mandatory requirement informed by policy to ensure a consistent and predictable process for all projects. Notwithstanding the prescribed statutory notification period, which the Proponent further extended, the public has had previous engagement on the proposed action commencing at the referral stage. In addition to the statutory public notification, the Proponent has had early and ongoing engagement with the community as presented in Appendix E and Section 2.6.3 of the PD and local environmental groups. Specific briefings were also offered to KPFS in addition to the community consultation events. It should be noted that the proposed action is yet to commence construction activities.

## 4.10General comments about the proposed action

Table 14 provides a list of comments received concerning general comments about the proposed action and the Proponent's response.

#### Table 14: General comment response

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
4.10.1	The removal of the Beenleigh Road level crossing at Kuraby is expected to significantly improve traffic flow. However, additional upgrades are needed at Kuraby Station, including improved lighting, CCTV, and safer pedestrian access, as current walking paths are inadequate. To improve public transport integration, it is recommended that connections between the new Metro at Eight Mile Plains, local bus services, and rail be enhanced. A more holistic approach is needed to ensure these modes work together rather than in isolation. There is also a suggestion to reconsider the current rail stopping pattern. Kuraby could serve as a more logical interchange point than Altandi due to its proximity to bus and metro infrastructure. A shuttle service or improved connections at Kuraby would better support passenger transfers and reduce the need for multiple modes to remain disconnected. Finally, with the addition of a new rail line, more frequent and direct services— particularly between Kuraby and the Gold Coast—should be prioritised to avoid the current inconvenience of changing trains and long wait times at Loganlea. A more seamless, interconnected network is needed to meet growing demand.	002	-	The proposed action will upgrade park 'n' ride facilities at each of the nine stations between Kuraby to Beenleigh including upgrades to lighting and CCTV in compliance with current Queensland Rail and associated standards. Stations, associated precincts and park 'n' rides will include upgrades to walking paths (within the scope of the proposed action) in line with current standards and specifications. Stations delivered by the proposed action include allowance for bus facilities aligned with current and future bus route planning. Bus route planning and timetabling is undertaken by Translink as part of their integrated approach to whole of network management. Since the proposed action is only one element of the public transport network, future bus route planning and timetabling will be considered more broadly by Translink. The proposed action in conjunction with other projects such as Cross River Rail, the Queensland Train Manufacturing Project and ETCS, will provide more capacity on the network to enable more frequent services. The proposed action will facilitate more efficient and effective multi-modal transfer through the provision of improved park 'n' ride, kiss 'n' ride, bus facilities and rail interchange (at Beenleigh and Kuraby stations).
4.10.2	Those living in the Chapman Dr / Spanns Rd area of Beenleigh are in opposition of the planned Spanns Rd closure due to the rail expansion, which provides the only safe exit into Boundary St during a flood event and is also a convenient way to access Logan River Rd to avoid the traffic jams occurring regularly throughout the day along Boundary St.	002	-	Concerns regarding flooding of Boundary Street are noted and have been considered. The Proponent has considered flood data and modelling in this area and understands the area around Holmview station and surrounding roads (Chapman Drive, Boundary Street, Kokoda Street) experiences flooding. The removal of Spanns Road level crossing is being delivered under the SEQ Level crossing program 2024, to improve safety and allow for more reliable train services. This decision was informed by a range of factors including safety, flood modelling, and current and projected future traffic counts in the area.

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
				As part of closing Spanns Road level crossing, the Proponent will upgrade the intersection at Chapman Drive and Boundary Street, as well as at Boundary Street and Kokoda Street. Flood resilience upgrades will also be delivered along Kokoda Street. Upgrades will provide improved flood immunity on these alternative routes and ensure community connections are maintained.

## 4.11 Alternatives

Table 15 provides a list of comments received concerning alternatives and the Proponent's response.

#### Table 15: Alternatives comment response

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
Ref 4.11.1	Issue/Recommendation The current alignment of the proposed rail line along a waterway is considered poorly located, as a slightly adjusted route further east—with a modest curve—could have significantly reduced environmental impacts. This adjustment would help preserve sensitive wetlands and remnant vegetation. If the existing alignment is maintained, it is strongly recommended that the rail be elevated on a bridge rather than built on an embankment. A bridge structure would allow for the continued flow of water, safe fauna passage, and the eventual rehabilitation of the area beneath, preserving wetland and remnant vegetation values and retaining ecological connectivity. If the alignment remains unchanged, it is strongly recommended that the rail line be elevated on a bridge rather than constructed on an embankment. A bridge would allow for continued fauna movement and maintain the natural hydrology of the site, enabling rehabilitation beneath the structure and long-term ecological connectivity with minimal habitat loss. The proposed alignment passes through a	Submission Identifier 003 005 006 001	Section of PD Section 2.1.4 Section 2.1.5.2	<ul> <li>Proponent response/edit to PD</li> <li>As described in Section 2.1.4 of the PD through design refinement activities the proposed action has minimised environmental impacts at the proposed location of the Trinder Park station.</li> <li>With regards to the specifics of this submission, the Proponent confirms the following:</li> <li>Alternative Alignment</li> <li>Throughout the design refinement activities, several alignment options through the Trinder Park area were investigated and assessed against a variety of key proposed action objectives including environmental considerations. An alternative alignment to the east of the current alignment as described in the query has been investigated during these design refinement activities.</li> <li>Locating the new rail line further east was not progressed due to: <ul> <li>The alternative alignment results in tighter curvature to the rail alignment to the extent that results in train speeds needing to be reduced and therefore increasing journey times. The alternative alignment not achieving the requirement for new stations to have straight platforms to achieve the required safety and accessibility outcomes for passengers boarding and alighting trains</li> <li>The alternative alignment not facilitating the required infrastructure for Queensland Rail maintenance of the rail line</li> <li>Additional waterway and riparian considerations as expanded below.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Moving the alignment further east had a higher propensity in resulting in further impacts to the existing waterway channel. Given the existing meander of the waterway channel, a slightly adjusted route further east would therefore potentially result in the rail alignment does not encroach as significantly on the eastern portion of the channel and rather crosses at two discrete locations at a more perpendicular angle.</li> </ul>
	into rare and sensitive wetlands. These			

#### Ref Issue/Recommendation

wetlands support endangered and vulnerable amphibian species and form part of a broader ecological and hydrological system that helps manage flooding. The current design, which includes a 4-track embankment through this area, is likely to cause severe and permanent damage to both habitat and hydrology, particularly in areas of remnant vegetation.

It appears that alternatives, such as the use of a bridge, were not fully investigated, as project representatives were unable to provide cost comparisons when queried. Greater investment in impact avoidance, such as through a less destructive structure, could reduce the need for extensive offsetting and avoid long-term environmental degradation.

It has also been noted that a proper investigation into the cost comparison between a bridge and an embankment does not appear to have been conducted. The lack of information from project representatives on this matter is concerning. Greater investment in impact avoidance, rather than relying heavily on offsets, would result in better long-term environmental outcomes. It is requested that a bridge structure be used through the impacted area to minimise irreversible loss.

	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
			As discussed in section <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> , Table 9 of this document, if the alignment cannot cross waterbodies channels as perpendicularly as possible, additional vegetation clearing (including riparian areas) would be required to maintain the existing hydrological function and fish passage.
			Alternative Technical Solution
			The Proponent, through design refinement activities has further reduced the environmental impact of the proposed action through the Acacia Forest area. As described above, the straightened rail alignment crosses the existing Slacks Creek tributary at two discrete locations.
a			A key outcome of the design refinement was to elect to replace the two culvert structures crossing the tributary to Slacks Creek with bridge sections. These bridge sections across the waterway will:
ŧ.			<ul> <li>reduce long-term impacts direct to the creek channel that the original culvert solution would have brought about;</li> </ul>
ĺ			- will encourage improved fauna connectivity beneath the bridge sections in comparison to what culverts would have provided; and,
			<ul> <li>enables any temporary impacts to the existing creek channel throughout bridge construction to be reinstated with riparian planting and instream features such as pools/riffles.</li> </ul>
on .			Detailed flood modelling of the solution has been undertaken to ensure compliance with the necessary requirements, standards and specifications.

The rail embankment through this location is generally between 1-2 m higher than the existing surface level, with some isolated sections of higher embankments on the approach to the existing rail bridge across Compton Road which the straightened portion of the rail alignment will tie into.

It is not practicable to substitute such an embankment of this height with a bridge solution. This is due to, if a bridge solution was to be considered at this location, there would be insufficient clearance between the ground level and the underside of the bridge to facilitate operational access for maintenance of the bridge by Queensland Rail.

A higher bridge solution that would allow for such maintenance access, is limited by:

- the maximum allowable grades
- the site specific constraints including tie-ing into the existing rail bridge at Compton Road to the north
- the clearance to the road over rail bridge at Acacia Road-Railway Parade to the south.

If the Proponent was to ignore the vertical constraints when assessing practicable technical solutions at Trinder Park, impact would likely increase or be displaced to other geographical locations of the proposed action.

The flood modelling has also demonstrated that a bridge solution for the full extent of the forest is not required for flooding reasons.

Finally, if a bridge solution through Acacia Forest was provided, clearing would still be required beneath and immediately adjacent the bridge structure to facilitate construction activities, including piling (which require piling pads for the safe operations of piling rigs), installation of girders (which require cranes).

#### **Cost Impacts**

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
				The Proponent acknowledges the interest regarding cost considerations associated with selecting a primarily civil (embankment) solution compared to a structural (bridge) solution. Outside of cost considerations, and as detailed above, the technical, safety, equitable access and environmental factors are key inputs in determining the alignment solution throughout the Acacia Forest Park area. As noted, design refinement has resulted in the incorporation of bridge sections across the waterway at two locations- and as such the solution is therefore not entirely an embankment. It is known that bridges typically cost substantially more than other less-complex options such as embankments. Furthermore, an alternative solution attempting to bridge the majority of Acacia Forest Park area is significantly limited by aspects beyond cost, including for example, the civil (cut/fill) constraints, the grade requirements for train infrastructure, and the existing Compton Road bridge tie-in point. No change to the PD.
4.11.2	Is this new alignment warranted given the indeterminate (potentially very short) time saving and the expense and environmental impact of the	003	Section 2.6.1	As described in Section 2.6.1 of the PD the proposed action will deliver a range of benefits inclusive of direct and indirect social benefits, including but not limited to improved corridor safety, improved access to social infrastructure and improved equity of access to rail for all users.
	new alignment			As discussed above, the new alignment is warranted to contribute to achieving the overall proposed action outcomes and benefits. The drivers for the proposed action and associated benefits are outlined in Sections 2.1 and 2.6 of the PD which outlines a predicted shift of individuals trips from private transport (car and road) to public transport (rail) which provides significant benefits to road users.
				The proposed action also includes the following features directed at the conservation of connectivity: fauna movement corridors and fauna movement infrastructure such as underpasses, culverts, fauna furniture, fencing and glider poles.
				As part of the proposed action, the Trinder Park train station upgrade will provide a new straight section of track, eliminating a considerable curve and improving safety.
				Train speeds along the proposed action corridor are restricted by the number and location of stations, and the curvature and grade of the track alignment. The section of track through Trinder Park has some of the tightest curves on the SEQ rail network, restricting current train speeds.
				Similarly, the existing Trinder Park Station currently limits equitable access to rail for all users.
				Straightening the alignment to eliminate the curve at Trinder Park, as well as other improvements to the alignment between Kuraby and Beenleigh, will enable greater safety compliance with contemporary rail standards, along with improved train speeds and journey times for customers.
				The key benefit of the proposed action is unlocking more rail capacity through additional tracks, enabling express and all-stops services to run more frequently, with less waiting time between trains.
				Improvements to the operational line speed and customer travel time will be further reviewed and confirmed as the track design is finalised
				No change to the PD.
4.11.3	The proposal includes a new vehicle parking facility at a local station, which would require the	003	Section 2.1.4	The delivery of the Trinder Park Station must include the provision of a Park and Ride facility. Park 'n' ride provision at all upgraded stations is a requirement of the proposed action.
	clearing of existing vegetation. Given the currently low patronage at this location and the availability of existing or potential parking at nearby stations, including cleared land near another station that could be utilised, the			The proposed action will improve access to the rail network through the provision of active transport, bus interchange, kiss 'n' ride and park 'n' ride facilities. Park 'n' ride represents a significant portion of customers access to Trinder Park station. Removing Park 'n' Ride facilities at Trinder Park and replacing with kiss 'n' ride facilities would not result in a corresponding change to customer behaviour, and would direct more traffic to Woodridge, resulting in unacceptable traffic impacts to intersections

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
	construction of a new parking facility in this sensitive area is not justified. It is recommended that a full Park and Ride not be developed at this			between Trinder Park and Woodridge Station. Further, more park 'n' ride facilities at Woodridge Station are not supported by local government as this will use further land already earmarked for other residential or commercial uses.
	site. Instead, a limited drop-off area ("Kiss and Ride") could be considered to support passenger access without significant environmental impact.			The number of car parks at each station park 'n' ride has been determined based on the combination of a review of existing utilisation and the forecast demand in the future. This analysis supports the provision of the park 'n' ride facility at Trinder Park.
				The Proponent has received feedback regarding the clearing of vegetation in the Trinder Park area and has been focused on reducing the clearing of vegetation throughout the design refinements undertaken to date.
				The footprint of vegetation clearing has been significantly reduced through the Trinder Park area and the park 'n' ride has since been further relocated away from the Acacia Forest and into residential zoned land already acquired by the proposed action. Footprint reductions in this area are shown on page 4-5 of Figure 2 Overall Impact area reduction from 2022 EPBC Act held within the PD.
				No change to the PD.

## 4.12Out of scope

Table 16 provides a list of comments received concerning out of scope comments and the Proponent's response.

Table 16:	Out of	scope	comment	response
	outor	Scope	comment	response

Ref	Issue/Recommendation	Submission Identifier	Section of PD	Proponent response/edit to PD
4.12.1	Appropriateness of mechanisms to preserve species in Queensland	003 007	-	Numerous submissions received refer to the deficiencies in the current frameworks in place for the protection of certain species and in relation to offsets. Whether these frameworks are appropriate for protecting against impacts to biodiversity is a matter for State and Commonwealth policy considerations, rather than being a matter of relevance to assessment of the proposed action under the current frameworks.
				These comments are criticisms of the current regulatory requirements, rather than being relevant to assessment of the proposed action specifically.
				The PD seeks to ensure that the delivery of the proposed action is in accordance with the requirements of the EPBC Act and current regulatory requirements relevant to its assessment.
4.12.2	Is the administering agency for the LGC Project the state and/or federal government?	001	Section 2.1.5	An administering agency is the entity in which regulates certain Acts, Regulations or Policies. For the LGC Project, both Federal and State-level legislation will be applicable and as such the EPBC Act (inclusive of the EPBC Act Environmental Offsets Policy 2012) will be regulated by the Federal DCCEEW, whilst the State Department of the Environment, Tourism, Science and Innovation (DETSI) will regulate State-level legislation, for example including, the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> and the <i>Environmental Offsets Act 2014</i> .

# **5** Changes to Preliminary Documentation Report

The following changes have been made to the PD documentation:

- Section 2.1.5.1 Native Title Act section has been updated to reflect the most current information and assessments relative to Native Title matters.
- Section 2.1.5.2 Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003 section has been updated to reflect the most current information and assessments related to the area's cultural and historical significance.
- Section 2.6.4 Indigenous stakeholder engagement section has been updated to reflect the most current information and assessments related to the area's cultural and historical significance and broader First Nations people.
- Appendix E Consultation activities and outcomes revised to include engagement efforts and feedback received from stakeholders from the 2023 engagement program.

# **Appendix 1: Statutory advertising**

Tear sheet from My City Logan:







# Appendix 2: Email broadcast to key stakeholders



## Environmental approval public comment period

#### Have your say from Wednesday 12 March 2025.

You are invited to comment on the Preliminary Documentation for the Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail (LGC) project under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act). Comments must be lodged by 5pm, Tuesday 25 March 2025.

To view the materials and provide comment online, from Wednesday 12 March 2025, visit LGC - Have your say.

Written submissions can be lodged online, emailed to logangoldcoastrail@tmr.qld.gov.au or posted to:

LGC Project Team (EPBC Submissions) Department of Transport and Main Roads GPO Box 50 BRISBANE QLD 4001

Documentation is also available to view in person from Wednesday 12 March 2025 until 5pm, Tuesday 25 March 2025 at the following locations:

- · Logan Central Library, 26 Wilbur Street, Logan Central
- Beenleigh Library, Crete Street, Beenleigh
- · Sunnybank Hills Library, 661 Compton Road, Sunnybank Hills
- · State Library of Queensland, Stanley Place, South Brisbane.

For further information or for alternative accessible formats, please contact the project team.

Have your say



If you have any questions about the personal information held by us, please read our Privacy and Security statement.

## **Appendix 3: Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project** webpage

### Queensland Government Department of Transport and Main Roads

ne Licensing Registration Safety Travel and transport Drojects Business and industry Community and envir

Home > Projects > Programs > Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail

#### Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail

Central West	> We're freque Logan	connecting our growi ent and reliable train s and the Gold Coast.	ng communitie services betwe	en Brisbane,				
arling Downs	> The rail li	ine between Kuraby and Beenlei	gh is a key capacity b	ottleneck on the				
ar North Queensland	> network, stop Bee pass thro	where trains share a single trac nleigh trains need to be held to rugh.	k in each direction. D one side to allow Gold	uring peak periods, all- l Coast express trains to				
itzroy	> The Loga > number of all-stops	n and Gold Coast Faster Rail pro of tracks between Kuraby and Bo and express trains. The project	ject will address this eenleigh to allow the f will also upgrade stat	problem by doubling the ree movement of both ions to improve				
ackay/Whitsunday	> new cont corridor.	lity, remove 5 level crossings, in inuous active travel path conne	prove park 'n' ride fa ting to stations along.	cilities, and provide a the 20km project				
etropolitan	Key f	eatures						
orth Coast	Logan an	d Gold Coast Faster Rail will del	ver:					
	<ul> <li>acces</li> </ul>	sibility upgrades to stations at	Curaby, Trinder Par	k, <u>Woodridge</u> ,				
	King	ston, Loganlea, Bethania, Ed	ens Landing, Holmy	iew, and Beenleigh				
orth West Queensland	> • doub	<ul> <li>double the capacity of the Gold Coast rail line and reduce waiting times at stations between Briebane Legan and the Gold Coast</li> </ul>						
	. anno	een prispane, Logan and the Go primately 20km of new tracks a	nd rail systems betwee	en Kuraby station and				
lathan Quanta 1	- appro	leigh station, increasing the cor	idor from 2 to 4 track	(S				
ortnern Queensland	<ul> <li>been</li> <li>bette</li> </ul>	r connected communities through	h dedicated active tr	ansport facilities and				
	nath	along the corridor	and a second second of the tax					
outh Coast	• impri	<ul> <li>improved road network efficiency and reduced peak hour traffic concession through</li> </ul>						
outil coast	inter	section upgrades and level cross	ing removals at Kural	oy, Woodridge, Bethania,				
	Holm	view, and Beenleigh						
outh West	> • new!	<ul> <li>new train signalling technology between Salisbury and Varsity Lakes</li> <li>extension of the cattle siding at Holmview.</li> </ul>						
	<ul> <li>exter</li> </ul>							
	Logan Watch or Video Tr	and Gold Coast Fast ogan and Gold Coast Faster Rail	project flythrough	ışıh video				
	Benefits							
	<i>\$</i>	Improves network efficiency		ives safety				
	11	Better road access	Reduc	es travel time				
	<b>1</b>	Contributes to regional growth	Increa	ases capacity				

consultation Have your say about this project. So to consultation 12 Stay up to date

Community

₽ Search

Site map Contact us Help

mment About us

Project Update

 Learn about the <u>findings</u>
 <u>from the 2023</u> • TMR has announced the

successful contractors to deliver the Loganlea Station Relocation project and the Kuraby open level crossing removal.

Active transport corridor

nd out more about the Logan and old Coast Faster Rail active ansport corridor. Ľ

Environment and Cultural Heritage Learn more about how we will protect and minimise environmer mpacts for the Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project.

Ľ Contact Us

mail: logangoldcoastrail@tmr.qld.gov, au Phone: 1800 957 066

#### Downloads

Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project update August 2023 (PDF, 645 kB)

Consultation summary 2021 (PDF, 1.7 MB)

Engagement summary 2023 (PDF, 6 MB)



Contributes to economy

The Australian Government and Queensland Government are funding the project. Investment ID 2008163. Funding figures updated December 2023 to reflect increased Australian Governm and Queensland Government contributions.

P<sup>+</sup> Increases car parks

Current status

Funding

#### Public comment open

Reduces peak hour congestion

The preliminary documentation prepared under the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity, Conservation Act 1999 (EBIC Act) is now open for public comment from Wednessky 12 Nardu nutil Spm, Flavidy 25 March 2025, Learn more on our <u>Environment and Cultural Heritage page</u>.

## **Current status**

## **Public comment open**

The preliminary documentation prepared under the *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act) is now open for public comment from Wednesday 12 March until 5pm, Friday 25 March 2025. Learn more on our <u>Environment and Cultural Heritage page</u>.

## Appendix 4: Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail environment and cultural heritage webpage

Site map Contact us Help

P Search

#### Queensland Government

Department of Transport and Main Roads Home Licensing Registration Eafory Travel and transport Projects Business and industry Community and environment. About us

#### Projects Programs Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail Environment and Cultural Heritage for Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail

# Environment and Cultural Heritage for Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail

Central West	Protecting Queensland's unique natural environment is an important part of our planning for the Logan and Gold Coast Easter Ball project We are committed to minimizing	
Darling Downs	the project's environmental impacts and ensuring matters of cultural heritage significance are appropriately	
Far North Queensland	Considered and managed throughout the project.	date
Fitzroy	Environmental considerations     Biosecurity     Flood mitigation	Subscribe to receive email updates and notifications.
Mackay/Whitsunday	Noise mitigation     Cultural heritage considerations	
	Environmental considerations	Contact Us
Metropolitan	To ensure the project is designed and delivered in an environmentally sensitive manner, we have been working with a range of subject matter experts and	Email: logangoldcoastrail@tmr.gld.gov.
North Coast	stakeholders. Extensive environmental investigations have taken place along the corridor including surveys to determine habitat values for native fauna and flora, aquatic ecology surveys and water quality monitoring, and cultural heritage	<u>au</u> Phone: <u>1800 957066</u>
North West Queensland	assessments in conjunction with Traditional Owner groups.	
Northern Queensland	mitigation measures will be taken to meet legislative requirements under the Australian Government's Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.	
South Coast	Public comment open from Wednesday 12 March	
South West	As part of our planning and environmental approval process, we are inviting the community to provide comments on the environmental report and appendices for the LGC project under the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act topo (crock stat)	
Wide Bay/Burnett	2999 (EPE AK). The report, and associated appendices, provides outcomes from the significant ecological flora and fauna assessments undertaken along the length of the project corridor, covering the koala, grey-headed flying-fox, south-eastern glossy black- cockatoo, swift partor and regent horeveater.	
	Find out more and have your say by 5pm, Tuesday 25 March 2025.	
	Copies of the report will be available at the following locations to view in person during the public comment period:	
	Logan Central Library 26 Wilbur Street Logan Central	
	Beenleigh Library Crete Street Beenleigh	
	Sunnybank Hills Library 661 Compton Road Sunnybank Hills	
	State Library of Queensland Cultural Precinct Stanley Place South Brisbane	
	If you are unable to have your say online, you can submit your comments in writing to:	
	LGC Project Team (EBPC Submissions)	

## Public comment open from Wednesday 12 March

As part of our planning and environmental approval process, we are inviting the community to provide comments on the environmental report and appendices for the LGC project under the *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act* 1999 (EPBC Act).

The report, and associated appendices, provides outcomes from the significant ecological flora and fauna assessments undertaken along the length of the project corridor, covering the koala, grey-headed flying-fox, south-eastern glossy black-cockatoo, swift parrot and regent honeyeater.

#### Find out more and have your say by 5pm, Tuesday 25 March 2025.

Copies of the report will be available at the following locations to view in person during the public comment period:

Logan Central Library 26 Wilbur Street Logan Central

#### Beenleigh Library Crete Street

Beenleigh

Sunnybank Hills Library 661 Compton Road Sunnybank Hills

### State Library of Queensland

Cultural Precinct Stanley Place South Brisbane

If you are unable to have your say online, you can submit your comments in writing to:

LGC Project Team (EBPC Submissions) Department of Transport and Main Roads GPO Box 50 BRISBANE QLD 4001

# Appendix 5: Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail your say page

#### Queensland Government Search the site... 🛛 English 🕤 Login 🛛 Join **Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation** Have your say Home / Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail / Environment Protection and Biodiversity Cor Document library Invitation for public comment The Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail (LGC) project will duplicate the existing rail line from 2 to 4 tracks to enable more frequent rail services between Brisbane and the Gold Coast, Australia's third and sixth largest cities. Access the Preliminary Documentation from the Queensland Government Publications Portal and sixth largest cites. Protecting Queeniand's unique natural environment is an important component of the planning for the project. As part of the project's environmental approval, the Department of Transport and Main Roads (TNR) has assumed the thereimany Documentation for assessment by the Federal Government under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPIC Act). The Federal Networks and Water determined that the LCG project regainses assessment and approval under the EPIC Act as a "Controlled Action" due to the likelihood of significant impacts on matters of national environmental significance, namely laided threatened species and communities protected under Section 18 and 18A, Part 3 of the EPIC Act. The advanced metaler lamitates used the is correlling metalement and the Rosendenfrage Queensland Government Publications Portal Timeline Preliminary report submitted Public notification period 12 March - Spm, 25 March 2025 The relevant protected matters under this controlling provision are the Mola (Phasochart cinerus), Grey-headed Flying-fox (Pteropus policoephalus), South-eastern Glossy Black-(Calyptorhynchus lathami lathami), Swift Parrot (Lathamus discolor) and Regent Honeyea (Anthochaera phrygia). Formal assessment decision Mid-2025 View the Preliminary Documentation See less The complete Preliminary Documentation can be viewed and downloaded from the Queensland Government Publications Portal here: www.publications.qld.gov.au/dataset/logan-and-gold-coast-faster-raii-invitation-for-public-comment-eppic More information state i serimetautri or planci commense. 13 V 46. Rese provide your mane, contact information, and a detailed description of the issue you executed or the finanzi you require. Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail Documentation will also be on public display from Wednesday 12 March 2025 at the following ocaoons: • Logan Central Library, 26 Wilbur Street, Logan Central • Beenleigh Library, Crete Street, Beenleigh • Sumybank Hills Library, 661 Compton Road, Sumybank Hills • State Library of Queensland, Stanley Place, South Brisbane Contact us Have a question or want to learn more about the project? Contact us below: Interested persons and organisations are invited to comment in writing on the Preliminary Documentation by **Spin**, **Tuesday 25 March 2025**. In addition to the below form, written submissions can also be emailed to logangidooastrail@tmc.id.gov.au or posted to: 1/0 Provert Tame (TSMP: Challenger) 1800 957 066 logangoldcoastrail@tmr.qld.gov.au Ibw Sar Ac Iogangaldcoastrail@tmr.qid.gov.au www.tmr.qid.gov.au/logangoldcoastrail LGC Project Team (EPBC submissions) Department of Transport and Main Roads GPD Box 50 BRISBANE QLD 4001 LGC Project Team (EPBC Submissions) Department of Transport and Main Roads GPO Box 50 BRISBANE QLD 4001 Have your say by 5pm, Tuesday 25 March 2025 For further information, or if you require translation or support services to access the documentation, please contact the LGC project team on 1800 957 066 (9am – Spm Monday–Friday) or email insamplemental lifetime pile access the second Join the conversation today Create an account or log in to share your thoughts and ideas. Join Log In Open Submit a comment TMR welcomes all comments from interested individuals and organisations regarding the Preliminary Documentation. The public comment period will close at **5pm, Tuesday 25 March 2025.** First Name Required Last Name Required Email address Required Postcode Required You have 4 characters lef Organisation Add your comments Required By clicking below to submit your comments, you acknowledge that the information you provide will be used in accordance with our Privacy Policy. Submissions will also be provided to the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) to inform the assessment process. Submit What happens next? Following the closure of the public comment period, TMR will advise DCCEEW if comments were received and provide a report demonstrating how these comments have or will be addressed. This report will be published as part of the updated Preliminary Documentation that is then formally submitted to DCCEEW for assessment. 戀 1 This project is jointly funded by the Australian and Quee G Faceb Other Queensland Governme www.getinvolved.qld.gov.au Right to info

in Linked

socialpinpoint

Contact us

D The State of Que

# Appendix 6: Email broadcast to key stakeholders (extended public comment period)

Having trouble viewing this email? View online



### Environmental approval public comment period

Have your say extended to 5pm, Friday 4 April 2025.

We are pleased to announce an extension of the public comment period for the Preliminary Documentation for the Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail (LGC) project under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act* 1999 (EPBC Act).

The new deadline for submitting comments is now 5pm, Friday 4 April 2025.

To view the materials and provide comment online, visit LGC - Have your say.

Written submissions can be lodged online, emailed to logangoldcoastrail@tmr.qld.gov.au or posted to:

LGC Project Team (EPBC Submissions) Department of Transport and Main Roads GPO Box 50 BRISBANE QLD 4001

Documentation is also available to view in person until 5pm, Friday 4 April 2025 at the following locations:

- Logan Central Library, 26 Wilbur Street, Logan Central
- · Beenleigh Library, Crete Street, Beenleigh
- Sunnybank Hills Library, 661 Compton Road, Sunnybank Hills
- · State Library of Queensland, Stanley Place, South Brisbane.

For further information or for alternative accessible formats, please contact the project team.

Have your say



## Contact us

Phone: 1800 957 066 (Monday to Friday, 9am - 5pm)

Email: logangoldcoastrail@tmr.gld.gov.au

Website: tmr.qld.gov.au/logangoldcoastrail

Contact us for alternative accessible formats



BUILDING AUSTRALIA





If you have any questions about the personal information held by us, please read our Privacy and Security statement.

# Appendix 7: Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project webpage (extended public comment period)

## Public comment open

The preliminary documentation prepared under the *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act) is now open for public comment from Wednesday 12 March until 5pm, Friday 4 April 2025. Learn more on our <u>Environment</u> <u>and Cultural Heritage page</u>.

## Appendix 8: Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail environment and cultural heritage webpage (extended public comment period)

## Public comment open from Wednesday 12 March

As part of our planning and environmental approval process, we are inviting the community to provide comments on the environmental report and appendices for the LGC project under the *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act* 1999 (EPBC Act).

The report, and associated appendices, provides outcomes from the significant ecological flora and fauna assessments undertaken along the length of the project corridor, covering the koala, grey-headed flying-fox, south-eastern glossy black-cockatoo, swift parrot and regent honeyeater.

Find out more and have your say by 5pm, Friday 4 April 2025.

Copies of the report will be available at the following locations to view in person during the public comment period:

Logan Central Library 26 Wilbur Street Logan Central

Beenleigh Library Crete Street Beenleigh

Sunnybank Hills Library 661 Compton Road Sunnybank Hills

State Library of Queensland Cultural Precinct Stanley Place

South Brisbane

If you are unable to have your say online, you can submit your comments in writing to:

LGC Project Team (EBPC Submissions) Department of Transport and Main Roads GPO Box 50 BRISBANE QLD 4001

# Appendix 9: Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail your say page (extended public comment period)

Queensland Government	Search the site Q
Home Closed consultations	🕹 English - Login Join
Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation	
Home / Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rall / Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation	
Enclosed and the set of the set o	to 4, struct       Access the Preliminary Documentation from the Queensland Government Publications Portal         value       Image: Comparison of Com
Decomeration will also be on public display from Wednesday 12 March 2025 at the following interneting Linnary, Cette Strate, Leonengial interneting Linnary, Cette Strate, Beeneigh interneting and the Reads interneting Linnary Cette Strate, Beeneigh interneting Linnary, Cette Strate, Be	Image: An and Good Coast Paster Rail         Contact us         Have & question or want to learn more about the provide contact to be the second to be the second to be s
I agree to be metilied on the autoeme of the environmental report.      deal of below to submit your comments, you acknowledge that the informations you goe     grant and a set of the pole     for the pole of the pole     for the pole of the	de will de research adamiti ere . This wronnent of ada, 
For more project information on what's happening in your region visit Copyright www.tmc.gld.gov.au/Projects Disclaimer Other Queensland Government consultations can also be found at Right to inform www.gdfmchred.gl.gov.au	O Facebook X X B LiviedIn

🚦 socialpinpoint