Airport Link

Supplementary Report

Appendix A
Submission Analysis

Airport Link
Environmental Impact Statement Supplementary Report

SUBMISSION ANALYSIS

- April 2007

Public Submission Summaries

Submission No.		1
Date Received		30 October 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
5	5.3.4	Intersection of Gateway Motorway and East-West Arterial is already under pressure and is unlikely to cope with improved and increased flow from the East-West Arterial
5	5.6.2	Airport Link will exacerbate traffic problems, especially during peak periods, at the T-intersection at Sandgate Road and the East-West Arterial. Don't think that the existing traffic light systems to produce a smooth flow through the intersection given the anticipated traffic numbers.
5	5.6.9	Will the project seek to synchronise traffic lights along the route to minimise disruptions as cars enter/ exit the road?

Submission No.		2
Date Received		2 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3	3.5.1 3.5.2	Do not support the location of the tunnel ventilation outlet site Option D, B or C [at Clayfield]. Option A appears to provide the greatest buffer to residents, considering prevailing winds are from a south-easterly direction.
9	9.5.1 9.5.3	Ventilation outlet should be equipped with filtration equipment (i.e. ESP). This should be in place when the tunnel is open. Filtration's ability to remove fine particulate pollution justifies the cost.
20	20.6	There should be no net loss of parkland as a result of the project proceeding. Open space lost due to the project should be compensated through the provision of additional parkland in close proximity.
5	5.6.2 5.6.9	Concerned with increasing traffic on Sandgate Road north of the tunnel. Consideration should be given to upgrading intersections between the Airport Link and Virginia to cope with higher traffic volumes.

Submission No.		3
Date Received		2 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
2	2.3.4	Project will only encourage increased car usage at a time when we should be doing everything in our power to reduce car usage.
2	2.3	To build further expensive road infrastructure at this point in our history of our society is a retrograde step and this proposal should be canned immediately.

Submission No.		4
Date Received		3 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
5 21	5.6.7 21.3.7	Concerned by the Airport Link EIS and other projects that further inhibit cycle access from the City's northern suburbs.
5	5.6.7	Should endeavour to ensure space is maintained to achieve service rerouting, including the need to offer a cyclist corridor with growth capacity.
5	5.6.7 5.6.9	Number of solutions recommended for Bowen Bridge Road, including lane dividers to minimise / eliminate the one metre traffic offset: ■ Valve divider: roll over kerb with edge to cars, enabling a slow crossing from the traffic lane; ■ X-able: Roll over kerb, promoting awareness and avoiding accidents; and ■ Visual divider: coloured strip marking bicycle lane.

Submission No.		5
Date Received		13 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 9	3.5.1 3.5.2 9.6.2	Location of ventilation outlet at Clayfield is not good and will be unhealthy to have near where we live.

Submission No.		6
Date Received		24 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3	3.5.1	Object to the sitting of the tunnel ventilation station at Alma Road and do not consider this the ideal site.
3	3.5.2	Understand that the site [for Clayfield ventilation outlet] was chosen as it was the cheapest option and not because it might offer the best performance as claimed in the EIS.
3	3.5.1	Option to build the ventilation station closer to Toombul Shopping Centre is more desirable from aesthetic, environmental and public relations reasons, as already commercial location.
9	9.5.2 9.5.3	Surprised that ventilation system will be unfiltered. EIS statement that filtration is would not have any significant benefit as air quality is projected to remain within acceptable limits is naive and grossly negligent
9	9.3.3	Air quality projections can't realistically account for induced demand, which has been terrible problem with similar projects in the UK and other European cities.
9	9.5.3 9.6.2	If you discover too late that air should have been filtered, then there will be associated health costs and very costly litigation. Recommended that the project err on the side of caution when considering health and environmental issues.

Submission No.		7
Date Received		24 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 Appendix B	3.5.2 B2.2	Extremely disappointed with the choice of location for the Clayfield ventilation outlet. This is closer to more residential houses than previously indicated in options shown.
15	15.3.4	Visual impact will now affect substantially more local residents
3 Appendix B	3.5.1 B2.2	Wrong to have concealed this location [of ventilation outlet] from us. Should revert back to options previously shown.

Submission No.		8
Date Received		24 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 Appendix B	3.5.2 B2.2	Extremely disappointed with the choice of location for the Clayfield ventilation outlet. This is closer to more residential houses than previously indicated in options shown.
15 16	15.3.4 16.3.5	Local residents will have to suffer visual impact of ventilation outlet and property prices will be detrimentally affected.
3 Appendix B	3.5.1 B2.2	Wrong to have concealed this location [of ventilation outlet] from us. Should revert back to options previously shown.

Submission No.		9
Date Received		13 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3	3.1	Airport Link EIS has not considered feasible alternative ways to carry out the project.
3	3.1	Why was the original "above ground" proposal not investigated by the Airport Link team? This would clearly have been cheaper to construct, even with east-west link through Eagle Junction in tunnel.
5	5.4.6	How is it physically possible to achieve a predicted traffic volume of 5,700 vph in 2026, in the North South Tunnel? A volume of 2,200 vph per lane is at the limit of capacity of a single lane as defined in the Highway Capacity Manual of the United States Federal Highway Administration.

Submission No.		10
Date Received		13 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
10 15	10.3.2 15.3.2	Concerned about visual and noise impacts of elevated structures [at Kedron] and effect on life if these issues aren't addressed.

Submission No.		11
Date Received		24 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 9 14 15	3.5.2 9.3.4 9.5.3 9.6.2 14.3.2 15.3.2	Object to the plans to construct a ""smoke stack"" at the end of Alma Road, Clayfield as: ■ Family's health will be adversely affected; ■ Prevailing north east winds will push consolidated fumes into his high-set home; ■ The stack is not filtered and can only contain a high level of concentrated toxins; ■ Toxic particles will make contact with the walls and floor of the house and will be a health risk to his children when they touch or eat these toxic particles; ■ The unmanned stack building will promote unlawful activity in and around the building; and ■ Smoke stack will damage visual appearance of Clayfield.
9		Residents in Sydney were met with similar situation in which their M5 East Sydney tunnel created negative environmental impact on the community of Arncliffe and Bardwell Park suburbs. Community pressure and an obligation for the well being of these people have forced the internal tunnel fans to be switched off. The current visual smoke emissions in these tunnels further highlights the reason people objected to these fumes being fanned out and dumped into their backyard. Need to avoid making the same mistake in Clayfield.
3 9	3.5.2 9.5.3	Smoke filtration and a different location for expelling the fumes must become the solution to the current plans for the "smoke stack" [at Clayfield].

Submission No.		12
Date Received		24 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3	3.5.1	Strongly against the location of ventilation stack sites 'C' and 'D' as they are too close to residences and community parklands. Supports either option 'A' or 'B'.
9	9.5.1 9.5.3	Ventilation outlet should be equipped with filtration equipment (i.e. ESP). This should be in place when the tunnel is open. Filtration's ability to remove fine particulate pollution justifies the cost.

Submission No.		13
Date Received		13 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 5	3.4.3 5.2.2 5.3.4 5.6.2 5.6.3	Concerned about the proposed exit for Airport Link being located before Nudgee Road traffic lights and the Airport roundabout and impact this will have on the East-West Arterial. This should be extended to allow traffic travelling to the Airport to avoid the already congested roundabout.

Submission No.		14
Date Received		13 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
5	5.6.2 5.6.5	Very concerned about the increase in traffic on Stafford Road and implications for Waroon Street
5	5.2.2 5.3.2	Already have massive amount of traffic taking a short cut from Webster Road along Waroon and down Crawford Street to Stafford Road
5	5.6.9	To ensure that Council protect residents right to a safe street, recommend that lights be placed at the end of Waroon Street or island or traffic diversion system set up in Waroon Street.

Submission No.		15
Date Received		13 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 5	3.4.3 5.3.4	Extending the tunnel beyond the Gateway Arterial would alleviate rather than exacerbate existing traffic conditions at Nudgee Road and East-West Arterial intersection and Gateway roundabout.
3	3.5.1 3.5.2	Extending the tunnel beyond the Gateway Arterial would mean the ventilation outlet could be located in an industrial area, rather than residential area.
3	3.5.1 3.5.2	Object to the location of the ventilation stack at the end of Alma Road, right up against a residential area.
15	15.3.4	Personally affected, as house will now overlook ventilation stack and "monstrosity of building that goes with it".
15	15.3.4	Ventilation outlet and station would be an eyesore in midst of residential and park environment (and from unit).
10	10.3.2	Concerned with potential noise from ventilation outlet [at Clayfield], from 24-hour operation.
9	9.5.3	Not including filtration reinforces belief that cost, rather than health and welfare of community is overriding concern.
9	9.5.1 9.5.3	As the EIS gives no detailed information about filtration and the experiences of other countries, can only assume that it is not seen as cost-effective at this time.

16	16.3.5	The placement of the ventilation outlet [at Clayfield] will impact on the value of property. Some properties have been taken off the market due to lack of interest, of sales fallen through due to potential construction impacts (disruption, noise and dust).
3 Apndx B	3.5.1 3.5.2 B2.2	The preferred outlet site was not one of the locations originally proposed.
3 10 15	3.5.1 3.5.2 10.3.2 15.3.4	Locating the ventilation outlet at the Toombul shopping centre would be the most appropriate, environmentally sensitive and community minded solution, with less visual and noise impacts.
3	3.5.1	An option that was never considered for the location of the ventilation outlet was in Kalinga Park, either between the Northern railway line and the Airtrain or west of the main railway line.
3	3.5.2	Believe that cost was the deciding factor in locating the ventilation outlet rather than seeking the best solution for the long term and for the local community.
9 10 14	9.2.2 10.3.2 14.3.1 14.3.2 14.4.1 14.4.2	The residents of Alma Road will be disadvantaged and inconvenienced by noise, dust and general disruption to our community and life-style during construction.
10	10.3.2	[Residents of Alma Road] will be exposed to additional traffic noise that will come with increased use of the tunnel. Do not find the general level of noise at present to be intrusive, except at peak hour.
10 15	10.3.2 15.3.4	Effective and attractive sound barriers and noise reducing road surfaces will be essential to achieve an acceptable environment.
9 10	9.6.2 10.3.2	Concerned about noise impacts and health effects [from the Clayfield ventilation outlet] on the adjacent housing commission units for terminally ill people.
3 14	3.5.2 14.3.1 14.3.2 14.4.1 14.4.2	Unreasonable to have additional burden of the [Clayfield] ventilation outlet imposed in our midst when Alma Road residents are already "paying a huge price" for the benefit of road users throughout Brisbane.
3	3.5.1	Most appropriate location for the ventilation outlet would be on top of the Toombul shopping complex.

Submission No.		16
Date Received		24 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
3	3.5.1 3.5.2	Concerned with the location of the ventilation outlet and stack close to the end of Alma Road as this is too close to residential properties and will have a negative impact on the area.

15 9	15.3.4 9.5.1 9.5.3	Following measures recommended to reduce impact of ventilation outlet: ■ The building attached to the ventilation outlet should be underground, to reduce the visual impact; ■ Design the ventilation stack so that it is visually and artistically appealing (could involve artists and engage the community in the design selection process); and ■ Ensure the latest exhaust filtration equipment is fitted.
11	11.1.3	Number of beautiful large trees in the construction area that bring great joy to the users of the park and nearby residents. Particularly concerned for approximately nine trees at the end of Stuckey Road.
11 20	11.3.1	Recommended mitigation measures: ■ Retain trees at the end of Stuckey Road; ■ Employ experts to ensure survival of trees [at end of Stuckey Road]; ■ During rehabilitation of the construction area, plant large trees, shrubs and flowers, including water hardy natives; ■ Provide avenue to Jacaranda trees and avenue of Frangipani trees; and ■ Include shaded seating areas and children's play areas in grassed sections over top of tunnel.

Submission No.		17
Date Received		24 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
2 3	2.3 3.2	Recognises the need for the project but objects to the present route as it runs under her residence.
16	16.3.5	Project will result in the reduction in value of her property.
3 14	3.2 14. 3	Tunnel could be located under public land, however this would add to the cost of the project. Have chosen to put dollars above the health and well-being of people.

Submission No.		18
Date Received		29 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
3	3.5	Home in Elliott Street will be severely affected by the placing of a 10 storey unfiltered noxious emission stack at the end of Alma Road. Opposed to the location of this "massive building" and portal in a quiet residential area.
4 8 11	4.2 8.2 11.2	Strongly believe tunnel should not exit in Kalinga Park causing the creek to be relocated and beautiful historic old trees to be destroyed.
4 15	4.3 15.3	Will be subjected to four years of construction with dust, trucks and noise, followed by uninterrupted view of 10 storey noxious unfiltered emission stack and industrial building 5 storeys high.
3 9 10 14 16	3.5.1 3.5.2 9.6.2 10.3.2 14.3.2 14.4.2 16.3.5	Ventilation outlet will: ■ Put health of residents at risk s a result of proximity to homes; ■ Stated in the EIS that no ""significant"" increases in deaths and asthma would occur. This indicates that there will be some people seriously affected by the emissions for this unfiltered stack.; ■ House values will plummet, making selling impossible. This has already occurred; ■ Drastically increase noise levels, both with train noise and traffic noise and noise from exhaust fans; and ■ Encourage vandals to view 10 storey industrial building as a challenge to decorate with graffiti.

3 Apndx B	3.5.1 3.5.2 B2.2	[Ventilation] site at Alma Road was NEVER discussed or even indicated in all the prior plans.
3	3.5.1	Preferred location for the ventilation outlet is on Council owned land at Toombul Shopping Centre, which is already industrial/ retail.
3 4	3.5.1 3.5.2 4.2.5	The only options are: ■ Extend tunnel under Sandgate Road; ■ Place 10 storey portal and accompanying building at Toombul Shopping Centre; and ■ No tunnel at all would be the best option.
		DO NOT want to be forced to live in an area I know will be dangerous to my health. I WANT to be BOUGHT out because the HARDSHIP this will cause me will be unendurable.

Submission No.		19
Date Received		29 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
14	14.3.1 14.4.1	Support Airport Link but have concerns that the impact on some local residents is unacceptable.
3 Apndx B	3.5.1 3.5.2 B2.2	Primary concern is the location of the eastern tunnel ventilation outlet. Location of the ventilation outlet is close to the consultation map's "Location A" but is not an accurate representation of the location presented to the community during consultation.
3 14 16	3.5.1 14.3.1 14.4.1 16.3.5	Proposed location will have detrimental effect on the local residents due to proximity of the ventilation building and outlet to homes. Property values will also be adversely affected. Note that residents are not entitled to compensation under current laws.
3	3.5.1	Ventilation outlet should be located to the northeast in the grounds of the Centro Toombul Shopping precinct to best protect visual amenity of the area. This location would also ensure adequate distance from residential properties and place it amongst similar industrial architecture. Also allow emissions to disperse over wider area and have no discernible impact on air quality standards.
9	9.5.1 9.5.3	Encourage State Government to investigate all aspects of filtration, and the ventilation outlets should be built in such a way that filtration can be retro-fitted
4		Construction access should be planned to minimise disturbance to local residents and to residents along Kingsford Smith Drive.
4 5	4.3.5 4.3.18 4.3.19 5.7.1 5.7.3	When combined with spoil haulage from NSBT, Airport Link will add another two-three years of heavy truck movement along Kingsford Smith Drive. Alternative means of transporting the spoil in a manner that does not increase the load on Kingsford Smith Drive should be investigated and Kingsford Smith Drive should only be used as a last resort. If not alternative should be condition of project that all loads are covered and that no spoil transportation occurs between 10.00pm and 7.00am.
4 14	4.3.5 14.3.2 14.4.2	Construction must be undertaken in a way as to minimise risk of any environmental or physical harm to students and staff at Wooloowin State School and Kedron State High School. Reinstatement of grounds at Kedron State High School should be undertaken to a high standard.
14	14.2.4 14.3.2 14.4.2	Opportunities should be investigated for providing better vehicular access to Wooloowin State School. Access is currently extremely limited. Consideration should be given to acquiring property to allow parents easier access to Wooloowin State School, perhaps from Norman Avenue.

10 14	10.2.4 14.5	Investigation into appropriateness of providing air conditioners to Wooloowin State School and music rooms of Kedron State High School to enable it to combat expected construction noise should be considered.
5	5.3.4 5.6.2 5.6.3	Increasing traffic load on East-West Arterial is a concern. Increased congestion is inevitable without remediation work. These intersections [are currently] operating at or beyond capacity. State Government must act to improve these intersections to ensure traffic flows freely along East-West Arterial. EIS identifies the intersection congestion as major factor in slowing traffic along East-West Arterial as does the Brisbane Airport Corporation second parallel runway EIS.

Submission No.		20
Date Received		29 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
3	3.5.1	Request that the exhaust stack [at Clayfield] be located as far away as possible from residential housing around Kalinga Park and from the park itself.
9 12	9.3.4 12.2.7	Noisy, polluting vehicle emissions stack [at Clayfield] is sure to adversely affect the current development occurring at Nundah Village.
9	9.3.4	Significant for health in low-lying areas around the park if the emissions tended to accumulate there.
9	9.5.3	It is worth scrubbing the exhaust before emitting it into the atmosphere.

Submission No.		21
Date Received		29 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
9	9.6.2	Dispute findings of the EIS in regards to conclusion that there will be no appreciable change in community health as a consequence of (untreated) emissions for the tunnel's ventilation outlets.
9	9.3.3	Interpretation of the results of modelling (untreated) air emissions is misleading and wrong because of fundamental errors and scientific uncertainty underlying the results.
9	9.3.3	Air quality standards from EPP and NEPM which were used to compare emission predictions were designed to be measured over an averaging period. These standards were not designed to apply to peak concentrations of pollutants from significant point sources where human exposure is possible over critical shorter periods.
9	9.3.3	Standards from ambient air quality NEPM in particular were designed to be measured to give an 'average' representation of general air quality in major air sheds. They were not intended to apply to air quality in a localised area influenced by a major stationary source of pollutant.
9	9.3.3	Predicted levels of air toxics are further concern as they were compared to 'investigation levels' of NEPM. These values are not standards, nor were they designed to apply to peak concentrations where human exposure is possible.
9	9.3.3	To use air quality standards and investigation levels from EPP and NEPMs on which to base the conclusion that there will be no appreciable change in community health as consequence of (untreated) emissions from the outlets is not only wrong, but both reckless and irresponsible.

9	9.3.3 9.3.4	No consideration given to scenario of local residents being exposed to peak concentrations of untreated toxic emissions from the ventilation outlets, particularly during periods of extreme adverse atmospheric conditions. Extreme conditions to local weather conditions can lead to very poor dispersion of toxic pollutants. This can lead to exposure to highly concentrated peak emission levels
9	9.3.3	No proper consideration has been given to the relevant principles of environmental impact assessment processes outlined in The Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment (IGAE 1992). Under this agreement, the Government has a duty to: ■ Ensure that there is a proper examination of matters which significantly affect the environment; and ■ Consider the precautionary principle.
9	9.3.3	There is no evidence in the report to clearly demonstrate that the precautionary principle has been followed. This is disturbing given that the report has made both reference to and omissions of the following:
9	9.3.3	■ Air quality standards of NEPM were designed to be measured to give an 'average' representation of general air quality and not to apply to monitoring peak concentrations from major emissions sources. These standards have been incorrectly used on which to base conclusions without proper qualifications; ■ Air toxic values of NEPM are not environmental protection 'standards' nor were they designed to apply to peak concentrations from major emissions sources. They are set of 'investigation levels' developed to assist in interpretation of data that is currently being collected at specific monitoring sites; and ■ NEPC found it inappropriate to develop an environmental protection standards for air toxics in NEPM because of limited data available of these pollutants. Yet these 'investigation levels have been used on which to wrongly base their conclusions that emissions (untreated) from the ventilation outlets will result in no appreciable change to community health.
9	9.3.3	Potential health risks associated with exposure to air toxics are well established and there is growing recognition of the need to minimise those risks. Consultants report clearly mentions that these pollutants, in minor amounts, not only have significant long-term effects, but are also carcinogenic
9	9.3.3 9.3.4	Association between harmful health effects and exposure to ultra fine particles in particulate matter has also been well documented, but still no clear understanding on the role they play in this area. Consultants have reported that there are no safe exposure standards and that there is limited data available on ultra fine emission rates from vehicles, yet conclude that there is little difference to the air quality with respect to ultra fine particles from the ventilation outlets. This is of some concern considering there is no information in the report about peak concentrations of ultra fine particles at any location within the vicinity of ventilation sites. No doubt that there is much uncertainty about the health risks to which residents will be exposed as a result of emitting high volumes and high concentrations of ultra fine particles from ventilation outlets.
9	9.5.1 9.5.2 9.5.3	Air filtration technologies have been dismissed by SKMCW as having 'no benefit in terms of public health'. This claim is nonsense, when a high removal rate of pollutants at peak concentrations can be achieved. Performance of these systems has been reported as having 80-90% removal efficiency for total suspended particulates and 60% for total oxides of nitrogen. Emission filtration would afford the greatest level of protection to residents during those critical times when the air is calm for extended periods and pollutants are poorly dispersed.
9	9.3.3	Report makes no mention of fact that best practice environmental management is a key consideration in the assessment of any development proposals dealt with by the Queensland EPA. Precautionary principle enshrined in Queensland's environmental protection legislation.
9	9.5.3	There is an unacceptable risk to the health of residents near the ventilation outlets. If proper consideration were given to the assessment of air pollution impacts, then the installation and operation of an effective emission filtration system at the ventilation outlets would have been recommended.

Submission No.		22
Date Received		29 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 9 15 16	3.5.1 3.5.2 9.5.3 9.6.2 15.3.4 16.3.5	Object to the proposed plans to construct an emissions stack at the end of Alma Road, because: ■ Inappropriate for a building of this nature to be erected in a residential area; ■ Outlet will emit toxic fumes, including consolidated fumes from constant traffic using the tunnel; ■ There is no filtering; ■ The visual appearance of the 10 storey high stack and large building in a residential area; ■ The resumption of people's homes; ■ Decline of property values in close proximity to the stack; and ■ The health effect on the community and families.
3 4 8 11	3.5.1 3.5.2 4.2.5 8.2.1 11.2.1	Please reconsider the location of the emission stack and building associated with it, away from residences, perhaps to the Toombul Shopping Centre, or build the tunnel underground the whole way and put the stack out near the Airport Drive. This would preserve the old trees and Melrose Creek.
9	9.5.1 9.5.3	The best smoke filtration available in the world should be sourced for the emission stacks in Brisbane. The additional cost should not be the reason for foregoing filtration.

Submission No.		23
Date Received		29 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
9	9.3.4 9.6.2	Concern over the quality of air and associated health impacts of the [Clayfield] ventilation for people in Toombul/ Nundah.
9 21	9.1 21.3.4	Already live with unhealthy air from local or nearby industries and frequent odours from animals transported by rail. Also being asked to accept the inevitable fallout and noise from the new airport runway.
3 14	3.5.1 14.3.2	The exhaust stack to release concentrated vehicle fumes in the vicinity of the Toombul Railway Station or Toombul Shopping Centre is unacceptable by the community of one high school, two primary schools, three preschools and three nursing homes (with a fourth under construction)

Submission No.		24
Date Received		29 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 9	3.5.2 9.5.1 9.5.3	Opposed to any unfiltered ventilation outlets to be placed in any residential area. Should consider the implementation of ventilation technologies that aim to reduce pollution in the tunnel and surrounding residential areas. Filtration technologies are planned to be trailed as part of the NSW Government's M5 East tunnel project.
9 19	9.3.5 9.6.2	Opposed to "least cost" options at the expense of the health and well-being of Northside communities. Pollution management systems should be supposed by ongoing monitoring and reporting systems with strict air quality targets being met.

5 14	5.6.7 14.3.2	There should be no detrimental effect on adjoining parklands and bikeways as part of this project.
5	5.6.3 5.6.9	Increased traffic congestion in the area as a result of Airport Link should be offset by improvements in traffic management systems.

Submission No.		25 35
Date Received		29 November 2006 (25); 4 December 2006 (35)
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
3 9 14 15	3.5.2 9.3.4 9.5.3 9.6.2 14.3.2 15.3.2	Object to the plans to construct a ""smoke stack"" at the end of Alma Road, Clayfield as: ■ Family's health will be adversely affected; ■ Prevailing north west winds will push consolidated fumes into his high-set home; ■ The stack is not filtered and can only contain a high level of concentrated toxins; ■ Toxic particles will make contact with the walls and floor of the house and will be a health risk to his children when they touch or eat these toxic particles; ■ The unmanned stack building will promote unlawful activity in and around the building; and ■ Smoke stack will damage visual appearance of Clayfield.

Submission No.		26
Date Received		30 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
3 9	3.5.1 3.5.2 9.5.3 9.6.2	Concerns regarding the locations of exhausted stacks [at Clayfield] because: ■ Proposed locations are too close to residential properties. Single point release of concentrated pollution without any filtration; ■ Concern about air quality in neighbourhood and health effects fumes will have on the community and family who suffer from asthma; ■ Every effort should be made to reduce the potential risks, including filtration from the outset; ■ An alternative study should be done to relocate stacks further to the east in non-residential areas; and ■ Proposal as it stands is unacceptable and should be reconsidered.

Submission No.		27
Date Received		30 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
3 9 14 15	3.5.2 9.3.4 9.5.3 9.6.2 14.3.1 15.3.4	Protests strongly against the proposed location of the exhaust stack [at Clayfield] because: ■ To locate tunnel close to residences with no filtration equipment would be putting health of residents at risk; ■ It would be unsightly construction and impossible to camouflage; and ■ Air quality in surrounding suburbs would suffer and impact on for residents.

2 5	5.2.4	The need to the project that travels through highly populated suburbs must be questioned. Could upgrade the non-existent public transport system and have a long-term result. Should be looking at projecting the huge amount of money required into the public transport system.

Submission No.		28
Date Received		30 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
9 19	9.3.5	Undertaking air quality monitoring around the ventilation stations for five years only shows a negligent lack of foresight. Traffic is expected to increase over the next 15-20 years and it is ridiculous to monitor air quality only during early years when traffic flows will be relatively low. Insists that permanent monitoring stations be installed.
3	3.5.1 3.5.2	Objects to the location of the Clayfield ventilation stack at Alma Road, where it is planned to be in a residential area even though ample space in Toombul Shopping Centre and unused land either side of Kedron Brook.
3	3.5.2	Not being able to build the structure in an area prone to flooding is a fallacy as there are ample examples of structures exposed to intermittent flooding and which are required to be stabilised by rafting or deeper penetration into bedrock.
3 9	3.5.2 9.6.2	Do not think that you should prioritise cost savings over public health [in relation to ventilation outlet].
9	9.3.5	What are the contingency plans in the event of air quality falling below an acceptable standard during the building and operation of the tunnel?
10	10.3.2	Will there be noise pollution monitoring as well as air quality monitoring?

Submission No.		29
Date Received		4 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
11	11.2.1	In previous community consultation assurances were given that construction would be confined to the general tunnel alignment. The EIS contradicts these assurances (particular Sec.11.2 and Fig.11-2). In the open space and parkland area adjacent to Gorman Street the area of impact is some 200 metres wide and runs well beyond the cut and cover area all the way to the 'Airport Link study boundary'.
11 14 15	11.1.3 11.2.1 14.3.2 15.3.4	Concerned that the proposal will impact on significant vegetation and valuable community open space. Particularly significant vegetation that runs along Gorman Street edge of Brook Road Park. This is one of the few park areas that have not been modified by previous flood mitigation works. A large stand of 'Remnant Forest Red Gums', Figs and other local tree species create a pleasant outdoor grassed area, contributing greatly to the park's recreational value. During construction these area will be invaluable to local residents.
11	11.1.4 11.3.2	This parkland (Brook Road Park) is rich in bird life and contributes significantly to the natural character of the residential precinct. As this area is beyond the cut and cover area efforts should be made towards its protection.
11	11.1.4 11.3.2	There are other groupings of trees that occur in the open space adjacent to the Kedron State High School fields that is also shown to be potentially impacted. These trees occur outside of the tunnel alignment and it would be hoped that measures are made towards their retention.
15 20	15.3.2 20.6	Support landscaping of parkland as part of the overall Airport Link concept. However, believes the retention of mature trees where possible is important in maintaining immediate shade, screening and habitat within our open space.

11 15	11.3.2 15.3.2	Native corridor planting well in advance of the project would create important buffers from construction for residents and park users along the Brook. This would be consistent with Council's initiatives to improve the environmental values of Brisbane's waterways. Suggested locations of buffer planting, which would be of greatest benefit if undertaken as soon as possible.
11 15	11.3.2 15.3.2	If retention of trees is not possible, important specimen trees such as Figs should be relocated to maintain park amenity during and beyond the construction period. These trees could also provide buffering for park users or Gorman Street residents facing onto park construction who have until now been accustomed to living in a quiet and natural setting.

Submission No.		30 32
Date Received		4 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
9	9.3.3	Key issue of air quality and the establishment of an independent committee would allay significant community concerns about air quality issues. Current scope of air quality modelling by Holmes Air Sciences represents a significant on-going risk for the State Government, as demonstrated in NSW. Review committee would demonstrate that recommendations in terms of air quality have been rigorously tested. Also show that the Government is balancing engineering outcomes with community concerns.
3 Apndx B	3.5.1 3.5.2 B2.2	Request for the N-E ventilation complex be located from Alma Road to Centro Toombul is based on the urban and community impacts of placing an industrial complex in a suburban street. Alma Road location has breached conditions of the EIS TOR and the community was misled. While there are engineering challenges and costs associated with moving the complex to Centro Toombul, these must be balanced with the inequitable situation of placing the complex in a residential area.
		While project of this nature will significantly impact on the Eagle Junction community, as a resident and community member, have supported the Airport Link concept. Issues raised are not insurmountable and will fairly balance the project with impacts on the community.
9	9.1.2	Despite repeated calls for the modelling to include baseline data from Kalinga Park to reflect current ambient air quality and establish of the North-East connection, no baseline modelling has been included. The [air monitoring data] inputted from monitoring sites [at Eagle Junction, Bowen Hills and Kedron] does not reflect the whole Airport Link corridor and particularly impacted areas around the North East Connection. Lack of baseline data is a significant flaw in the modelling, as it excludes a major part of the Airport Link corridor.
Apndx B	B5.1.2	While omitted from the EIS Consultation Report as a specific issue highlighted, call for baseline monitoring has been raised directly with the Airport Link consultation team by individuals, community groups, Councillors and State Parliamentarians.
9 19	9.3.5 19.7	Positive outcome of the EIS is the establishment in the EMP of at least two monitoring sites near each ventilation station.
9 19	9.3.5	Recommendations in relation to air quality monitoring: ■ Monitoring sites be established at the North-East Connection as soon as the project is approved to provide baseline data; and ■ One of the monitoring sites should be located in green space to reflect impacts on the surrounding communities away from elevated emission points adjoining surface road connections.

9	9.3.3 9.6.2	Not questioning the technical expertise of Holmes Air Sciences, use of a southern consultancy firm associated with already continuous tunnel projects, exposes State Government and Council as project proponents to potential criticism. Appears to be differing views of the impact of fine and ultra fine particle emissions on community health, which may be the reason why QUT has not been consulted as part of the EIS. The opportunity for independent peer review of the EIS modelling and air quality impacts would allay significant community concerns associated with fine and ultra fine particle emissions and impact of the ventilation complexes on sensitive areas.
9	9.3.3 9.6.2	Recommendations in relation to air quality peer review: ■ The establishment of an independent air quality committee to be chaired by the Queensland Chief Scientist or nominee, including relevant agencies and QUT's International Laboratory for Air Quality and Health; and ■ That the committee establish air quality benchmarks for the EMP (Operational), including trigger points to implement strategies to address any deterioration in ambient air quality, including filtration, adjacent to ventilation complexes
4 9	4.2.6 9.5.1 9.5.3	Acknowledged that scientific analysis should be used as the basis for establishing the need for filtration. Decision to investigate only the longitudinal ventilation system is not balanced in the EIS with consideration of other options and has impacted on the tunnel's engineering design (i.e. longitudinal ventilation system directly resulted in tunnel design requiring large volumes of air being drawn through the tunnel entry/exits and extracted by 10 storey ventilation outlet to achieve volumes of extraction and dilution. There is no significant study of alternative ventilation systems including filtration to provide both the proponents and the community with alternative options for consideration, including potential removal of the ventilation complexes, which is demonstrated by limited information presented in the EIS. Noted that filtration can achieve up to 95% of removal of suspended particles, which itself would improve Brisbane's air quality.
9	9.5.1 9.5.3	Recommend that the Chief Scientist's independent air quality committee review world's best practice filtration technologies and confirm EIS conclusions that filtration would not delivery community benefits in terms of ambient air quality.
3 Apndx B	3.5.1 3.5.2 B2.2	Community was not advised that the North East Ventilation Complex was being considered for Alma Road. The Alma Road location represents a fifth previously undisclosed location, despite public comment that it is adjacent to one of the proposed sites.
3	3.5.1 3.5.2	Of the [Clayfield ventilation outlet] sites released for comment, only two were used in air quality modelling (NE-A and NE-B). Air quality modelling has shown there is very little difference in air quality outcomes comparing NE-B (Centro Toombul) and NE-A (top of the cut and cover tunnel). The two sites in Parkland Road adjacent to Toombul Railway Station (NE-C and NE-D) were discounted prior to air quality modelling because of their proximity to a completed 7-storey residential complex and a further multi-storey building approval. The impact of these developments wood require a 15 storey ventilation complex to achieve appropriate emission dilution levels. The proposed Alma Road location does not meet the design modification consultation outcome for Toombul as stated in the EIS - "adopt a high-quality design response for the ventilation station and ventilation outlet, having regard for the proximity of the residential development and the scale and form of nearby buildings.
3 14 15	3.5.1 3.5.2 14.3.1 15.3.4	Of the ventilation complexes for Airport Link and the NSBT, the Alma Road location is the only one which is in a low-medium density 100% residential area. There will be a diminished liveability by the harsh urban characteristics of the complex in a residential area. The proposed [Clayfield ventilation outlet] site will have a significant impact on urban/local amenity for a large precinct at Eagle Junction/ Clayfield.

3 9 12 14	3.5.1 3.5.2 9.6.2 12.1.4 14.2.2 14.3.3 14.3.4	Assessment of the Centro Toombul site identified a development application for a childcare facility 200m east of the potential site. Decision to grant approval [for the childcare facility] should not proceed pending a final decision on the N-E ventilation complex. Equal consideration should be given to the significant number of young children living in homes within 200m of the proposed Alma Road location, given the extended hours they will spend in homes adjacent to the proposed ventilation complex compared to the operation hours of childcare facility. There is also a significant senior population in the area and a Department of Housing complex which will need to be removed for the ventilation station. The close proximity of the [Clayfield ventilation outlet] location to homes ignores the health status of the area. Despite EIS results, there is still an unknown factor in terms of community health and safety from ventilation emissions. These factors demonstrate inequity of placing the ventilation complex at Alma Road, even when considering broader outcome goals of the project.
12	12.1.4	Recommend that The Coordinator-General request that Brisbane City Council hold any development applications for childcare facilities adjacent to Centro Toombul and building applications in Parkland Road pending a final decision of the location of the North-East ventilation complex.
15	15.3.4	The urban design of the Alma Road complex doesn't meet the EIS Urban Design Principles. No amount of urban design will enable the complex to be constructed in keeping with the low-medium density "tin and timber" nature of Eagle Junction.
3 15	3.5.1 15.3.4	There is the opportunity to build the complex into Centro Toombul away from homes. This would be less intrusive and more in keeping with the urban landscape. This would also create a buffer zone away from homes for the complex. Given the engineering extent of the project, it would appear that engineering issues associated with Schulz Canal and placement of the complex at Centro Toombul should not be insurmountable.
3	3.5.1 3.5.2	Recommend that the project approval is conditional on locating the North-East connection ventilation complex at EIS Option N-E B (Centro Toombul).
19	19.6	Mitigation measures for construction at worksites [at Clayfield] should be extended for residents at the end of Elliott Street, especially for noise. Consideration of the impacts on residents on both sides of the North Coast railway line should be taken into account given that work will be conducted overnight.
11 15	11.2.1 15.3.4	The project significantly impacts on the Eastern entrance of Kalinga Park, including removal of hoop pine trees and other mature introduced species, which provide a green edge to Kalinga Park and buffer zone for Eagle Junction residents between Sandgate Road and the Airtrain.
19	19.6	Recommend that the EMP (construction) allow for mitigation measures for all residents directly impacted by construction activities associated with work sites and major night time activates.
4 5 11	4.2.5 5.3.5 11.2.1	A more strategic view of the Airport Link corridor could have extended the closer to Airport Drive. This would have saved the valuable greenspace at the eastern entrance of Kalinga Park, reduced impacts on the surrounding low-medium density residential precincts, and potentially solved traffic issues at Nudgee Road intersection and Airport roundabout.
19	19.6	Recommend conditions for the project approval include direct consultation with Eagle Junction residents on rehabilitation and mitigation measures for both Kalinga Park and the North East Tunnel Connections, including Sandgate Road tunnel ramps.
3 Apndx B	3.5.1 3.5.2 B2.2	The proposed location of the Alma Road NE ventilation complex is in the middle of a residential community with many young families in the vicinity. The community was misled on the location as it was never discussed in the consultation process as an option (Sub. # 32)
14	14.3.2	The impact of Airport Link will significantly change my suburb and impact on an attractive community where I wish to raise my two young children (Sub. # 32)
3 4 9	3.5.1 3.5.2 4.2.5 9.1.2 9.3.3	Request further studies are conducted to address concerns, including: ■ North-East ventilation complex is located at Centro Toombul; ■ Baseline air quality is established for the North-East connection at Kalinga Park; ■ An independent review of air quality impacts is established to allay community concerns; and ■ The spur road turning from Sandgate Road into the tunnel on the south-western side be covered up completely, up to Sandgate Road (Sub. # 32).

Submission No.		31
Date Received		4 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 15	3.5.1 15.3.4	The Clayfield ventilation outlet will transform our gorgeous cul-de-sac [Alma Road] into an unsightly cul-de-stack. Such a monstrosity would be at extreme odds to our streetscape. This proposal [Clayfield ventilation outlet] would make an absolute mockery of our efforts to renovate their houses and challenge the zoning classification of the area.
11	11.2.1	Nature is also to take a fall with the felling of many of the parks magnificent hoop pines and gums [in Kalinga Park].
16	16.3	Why is it that the people of Alma Road have not offered a property guarantee? NSW government recognised the need to oblige its residents with this form of security and it would only seem appropriate and moral that such an offer be given to the residents of Alma Road. From the moment the announcement was made that 83 Alma Road was to be resumed for the stack, our area has become a hunting ground for the opportunistic buyer.
15 16	15.3.4 16.3	Not prepared to raise our children in the shadow of the stack but our choices are limited. We like other residents, either cop the loss in the pocket or begrudgingly stay put, constantly being psychologically taunted by the stigma of this eyesore [Clayfield ventilation stack].
16	16.3	Worked extremely hard renovating our house. This proposed development would be directly responsible for our substantial financial loss.
9	9.6.2	Air quality is a legitimate concern for local residents. Family is located very close to the [Clayfield] stack and almost certain statistic for exposure to high levels of pollutants. It would appear that an ironclad guarantee in terms of health cannot be offered to this community. The young, elderly and the immune compromised would certainly be challenged, as will asthmatics and anyone with an underlying health condition.
		It is most apparent that this pocket of the community has been earmarked as the sacrificial lambs for the "good" of the wider community.
2	2.3.4	Significantly upgraded measures for public transport, pedestrians and cyclists would provide for sustainable future transport. Should we as a community consider the adoption of the Airport Link tunnel project, it should be at the very least a shared community initiative.

Submission No.		33
Date Received		4 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
4 11	4.2.5 4.3.10 11.1.3 11.2.1	Construction of the tunnel and use of Kalinga Park for a construction worksite will require the clearance of trees, including a group of Eucalyptus and Hoop Pines. Shocked that the parkland will be destroyed rather than using the unused car park opposite to these trees. These trees are part of Brisbane's natural heritage and so should be saved for future generations. The trees are rare because of their size and species. Sure there is a way to use the car park and not the parkland for the construction work site and for the tunnel.

Submission No.		34
Date Received		4 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
		Airport Link forms an important part of Brisbane's traffic system because it links arterials of Gympie Road, Sandgate Road and East-West Arterial to ICB and NSBT.
4 10	4.3.5 4.3.10 10.3.2	The route for Airport Link and the Northern Busway should consider: ■ Integration of Airport Link and Northern Busway e.g. dropping off passengers to use Busway; ■ Tunnel/cut and cover connections to existing roads; ■ Tunnel/cut and cover connections to underground space locations (for businesses) in appropriate areas; and ■ Environmental issues such as noise & visual amenity.
		The importance of underground space in Brisbane has not been clearly identified. Brisbane lends itself to underground space development for the following reasons: ■ There is a need to develop high density population areas which are close to rail, water & bus transport infrastructure; and ■ Ground conditions in the North-South Corner of the Airport Link and between Bowen Hills and Gordon Park are suitable for underground space development.
4	4.3	Recommended that Airport Link and Northern Busway take into account following key issues: ■ The potential demand for underground space in Brisbane needs to be assessed based on use, type & population growth; ■ Key areas for underground space need to be identified so that they can form the basis of future underground space planning; and ■ Value adding of construction projects which can be integrated into the transport infrastructure projects needs to be assessed (i.e. provision should be made for future access).

Submission No.		36
Date Received		4 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 4 9 11	3.5.1 3.5.2 4.2.5 9.5.3 11.2.1	Object to the termination of Airport Link at Sandgate Road and to the location of the ventilation stack at Alma Road for the following reasons: ■ The close proximity of emissions stack to surrounding residents; ■ Lack of exhaust fume filtration; ■ Tunnel termination at Sandgate Road; and ■ The destruction of public parkland, including Melrose Creek and stately old trees
5	5.6.2	Airport Link will create more traffic congestion on Sandgate Road and do nothing to alleviate traffic along the East-West Arterial to the airport roundabout.
3 4	3.5.1 3.5.2 4.2.5	The tunnel should finish on the airport side of the airport roundabout. The emission stack could also be located there away from residential area.
9	9.5.3	Prime importance is to ensure any emission stack built should be filtered with the best technology and request authorities to reconsider the location of the one planed for Alma Road, Clayfield.

Submission No.		37
Date Received		4 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 9 14 15	3.5.2 9.3.4 9.5.3 9.6.2 14.3.1 15.3.4	Protests strongly against the proposed location of the ventilation outlet [at Clayfield] because: ■ To locate tunnel close to residences with no filtration equipment would be putting health of residents at risk; ■ It would be unsightly construction and impossible to camouflage; and ■ Air quality in surrounding suburbs would suffer and impact on for residents.
2 5	5.2.4	The need to the project that travels through highly populated suburbs must be questioned. Could upgrade the non-existent public transport system and have a long-term result. Should be looking at projecting the huge amount of money required into the public transport system.

Submission No.		38
Date Received		4 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
4	4.2.5	Strongly object to the construction of Airport Link adjacent to The Mews apartment [Campbell Street].
15 16	15.3.1 16.3.5	Roadway will destroy the outlook from the living area on the 3rd floor of the apartment block and the value of the apartment. If Airport Link proceeds, will be seeking compensation based on the value preceding the construction of Airport Link.
15	15.3.1	While The Mews is recognised in the EIS as an exception to the commercial character of Bowen Hills, this exception should not exclude due consideration of the visual impact to residents this elevated section will incur for which no effective mitigation is apparent.
15	15.3.1	The proposed elevated roadway would effectively obliterate any view now has as well as possibly adversely affecting airflow.

Submission No.		39
Date Received		4 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
4 11	4.2 4.3 11.1 11.2	Construction of the tunnel and use of Kalinga Park for a construction worksite will require the clearance of trees, including a group of Eucalyptus and Hoop Pines. Shocked that the parkland will be destroyed rather than using the unused car park opposite to these trees. These trees are part of Brisbane's natural heritage and so should be saved for future generations. The trees are rare because of their size and species. Sure there is a way to use the carpark and not the parkland for the construction work site and for the tunnel.

Submission No.		40
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
14	14.3.1	The impact of Airport Link will significantly change our suburb and impact on our family. The Airport Link plans, specifically the building of a ventilation stack [at Clayfield] very close to our property have bought us concerns relating to health, lifestyle and decrease in property value.
3 9 14 16	3.5.1 9.6.2 14.3.1 16.3.5	Request that further studies are conducted in relation to: ■ The North East ventilation complex is located to Centro Toombul; ■ A property value guarantee is established; and ■ An independent review of air quality impacts is established to allay community concerns.
3 15	3.5.1 15.3.4	There is the opportunity to build the complex into Centro Toombul away from homes. This would be less intrusive and more in keeping with the urban landscape. This would also create a buffer zone away from homes for the complex. Given the engineering extent of the project, it would appear that engineering issues associated with Schulz Canal and placement of the complex at Centro Toombul should not be insurmountable.
3	3.5.1 3.5.2	Recommend that the project approval is conditional on locating the North-East connection ventilation complex at EIS Option N-E B (Centro Toombul).
16	16.3.3 16.3.4 16.3.5	People's homes are both a major asset and contributing lifestyle factor. While the EIS seeks to compare property market responses to similar development, the listed examples are primarily in industrial areas and not residential precincts as characteristic of Airport Link corridor.
		While acquisition of property directly impacted by Airport Link and volumetric titles will occur, consideration needs to be given to broader compensation options of residents not directly impacted.
16	16.3.5	Recommend that The Coordinator-General request: ■ Additional property assessment impact reviews from tunnel projects in Australia which have a direct impact on residential precincts; ■ A property value guarantee to be established for residents impacted by Airport Link within set distance parameters of the corridor; and ■ A review committee be established to consider hardship cases of home owners directly and indirectly impacted.
9	9.3.3 9.6.2	Not questioning the technical expertise of Holmes Air Sciences, use of a southern consultancy firm associated with already continuous tunnel projects, exposes State Government and Council as project proponents to potential criticism. Appears to be differing views of the impact of fine and ultra fine particle emissions on community health, which may be the reason why QUT has not been consulted as part of the EIS. The opportunity for independent peer review of the EIS modelling and air quality impacts would allay significant community concerns associated with fine and ultra fine particle emissions and impact of the ventilation complexes on sensitive areas.
9	9.3.3 9.6.2	Recommendations in relation to air quality peer review: ■ The establishment of an independent air quality committee to be chaired by the Queensland Chief Scientist or nominee, including relevant agencies and QUT's International Laboratory for Air Quality and Health; and ■ That the committee establish air quality benchmarks for the EMP (Operational), including trigger points to implement strategies to address any deterioration in ambient air quality, including filtration, adjacent to ventilation complexes
15	15.3.4	The urban design of the Alma Road complex doesn't meet the EIS Urban Design Principles. No amount of urban design will enable the complex to be constructed in keeping with the low-medium density "tin and timber" nature of Eagle Junction.

Submission No.		41
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
		Object to proposed Airport Link.
9	9.3.4 9.5.3	There is no filtration on the smokestacks, hence toxic particles will be permeating the environment. These toxins will be carried over a larger area of residential Brisbane, not just the surrounding suburbs of the smokestacks.
4 5	4.2.5 5.3.5 5.6.2	The tunnel does not go to the airport. It will create more congestion in Sandgate Road, Toombul, instead of the bypassing the area (and the already chaotic area) and going directly to the airport.
2	2.3.4	The billions of dollars should not be spent on tunnels, but be put into a better public transport system and getting cars off the road.
11 15	11.2.1	Removing 120-year-old trees in Kalinga Park to make way for a 10-storey smoke stack building and 30m stack. It will damage the visual appearance of Clayfield and promote unlawful activity in or around the building.
11	11.2.1 11.3.2	Destroying the habitat/eco system of the many wildlife species in Kalinga Park east, which include lizards, possums, birds, snakes, and water dragons. Tell me how you plan to capture, relocate and then bring them all back? You can never replace this valuable green space back to what it is now.

Submission No.		42
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
2 4 5 9 11 15	2.3.4 4.2.5 5.3.5 5.6.2 9.3.4 9.5.3 9.6.2 11.2.1 11.3.2 15.3.4	Object to the proposed Airport Link as: ■ No filtration on the smoke stacks and effects this will have on public health; ■ Prevailing winds will carry this toxic air over a greater Brisbane area; ■ There should be no tunnel unless it goes directly to the airport; ■ Billions of dollars should be put into public transport infrastructure, not wasted on more tunnels; ■ Removal of green space in Kalinga Park, including 120 year old trees; and ■ It will destroy the habitat/ eco system of the many wildlife species in Kalinga Park.

Submission No.		43
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
2 4 5 9 11 15	2.3.4 4.2.5 5.3.5 5.6.2 9.3.4 9.5.3 9.6.2 11.2.1 11.3.2 15.3.4	Object to the proposed Airport Link as: ■ No filtration on the smoke stacks and effects this will have on public health; ■ Prevailing winds will carry this toxic air over a greater Brisbane area; ■ There should be no tunnel unless it goes directly to the airport; ■ Billions of dollars should be put into public transport infrastructure, not wasted on more tunnels; ■ Removal of green space in Kalinga Park, including 120 year old trees; and ■ It will destroy the habitat/ eco system of the many wildlife species in Kalinga Park.

Submission No.		44
Date Received		5 December
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
2 4 5 9 11 15	2.3.4 4.2.5 5.3.5 5.6.2 9.3.4 9.5.3 11.2.1 11.3.2 15.3.4	Object to the proposed Airport Link as: ■ No filtration on the smoke stacks; ■ There should be no tunnel unless it goes directly to the airport; ■ Billions of dollars should be put into public transport infrastructure, not wasted on more tunnels; ■ Removal of green space in Kalinga Park, including 120 year old trees; and ■ It will destroy the habitat/ eco system of the many wildlife species in Kalinga Park.

Submission No.		45
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
2 4 5 9 11 15	2.3.4 4.2.5 5.3.5 5.6.2 9.3.4 9.5.3 9.6.2 11.2.1 11.3.2 15.3.4	Object to the proposed Airport Link as: ■ No filtration on the smoke stacks; ■ Community health will be at risk from toxic fumes; ■ Prevailing winds will carry this toxic air over a greater Brisbane area; ■ There should be no tunnel unless it goes directly to the airport; ■ Billions of dollars should be put into public transport infrastructure, not wasted on more tunnels; ■ Removal of green space in Kalinga Park, including 120 year old trees; and ■ It will destroy the habitat/ eco system of the many wildlife species in Kalinga Park.

Submission No.		46
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
3 9 14 15	3.5.2 9.3.4 9.5.3 9.6.2 14.3.2 15.3.2	Object to the proposed exhaust stack at the end of Alma Road, Clayfield as: ■ Health of 2 children will be jeopardised; ■ Unfiltered fumes will be funnelled into home by prevailing winds 24 hours per day; ■ Scientific fact that within 150m of major thoroughfare there is an unhealthy concentration of toxic chemicals from exhaust. Choose to live a distance from the main road but stack and prevailing winds will bring it to us in a concentrated form; ■ Fall-out particles will provide my children with a residue that can harm them when playing; ■ The stack will be another government owned building that is unmonitored, promoting graffiti and illegal operations; and ■ There are far more secluded sites for this structure to be placed and the reason for placing it in our backyard is purely economic.
9	9.5.1 9.5.3	Request that a better and property filtration system is devised for the exhaust stack. This is prime opportunity to reduce pollution in Brisbane.
		If proper steps not taken to prevent environmental and health effects, it is our intention to commence legal action in the event our health or health of our children is harmed in any way.

Submission No.		47
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
2 4 5 9 11 15	2.3.4 4.2.5 5.3.5 5.6.2 9.3.4 9.5.3 11.2.1 11.3.2 15.3.4	Object to the proposed Airport Link as: ▪ Smoke stacks have no filtration; ▪ There should be no tunnel unless it goes directly to the airport; ▪ Billions of dollars should be put into public transport infrastructure, not wasted on more tunnels; ▪ Removal of green space in Kalinga Park, including 120 year old trees; ▪ It will destroy the habitat/ eco system of the many wildlife species in Kalinga Park.

Submission No.		48
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 15	3.5.1 3.5.2 15.1.3	The proposed location of the ventilation stack [Clayfield] is diagonally opposite our family home, only six doors away. The proposed location of the enormous concrete stack is in a 100% residential location, which is occupied by families 24 hours a day. Have been renovating our home, adhering to Brisbane City Council's guidelines. Our home has enhanced our streetscape along with other homes that are currently being renovated.
9 14 15	9.6.2 14.3.1 15.3.4	The stack will severely impact the liveability of our desirable cul-de-sac. The quality of our lifestyle will be ruthlessly diminished, as there will be no escape from the view of the stack for our family. Not only is this taking away our basic right to enjoy the current liveability of our street that we chose to buy in, but it is a huge psychological impact on our family and will ruin our . We object to this intrusion into our home and object to the liveability of our street being diminished and the that we currently enjoy being taken away from us. We object to the psychological impact being placed on our family and the health concerns.
3 15	3.5.1 15.3.4 15.4.3	There is no landscaping or suitable mitigation that will hide this 30m exhaust stack from our family home. It is outrageous that a 100% residential location be considered for such a structure. Object to this structure being placed on our resident street and find it insulting that the Airport Link team believe that the bougainvillea canopy is suitable mitigation to hide this structure. There is nothing that will make it fit into the character of our streetscape.
15	15.1.4 15.3.4	The photograph in the EIS [Fig 15-64] does not give a true perspective of Alma Road and we trust that it isn't going to be included as part of the recommendation for signing off on the location of the stack. This photograph gives the impression that the stack can be hidden from the residents and that it will be hardly noticeable. Believe the EIS photo is giving a false impression of our streetscape and makes it look as if residents will barely see the stack over the trees, which will not be the case. Object to the portrayal of Alma Road as a dark, dingy depressing scrubby streetscape, and to a photograph that doesn't show the true perspective of our streetscape being used to show how the stack can be hidden from the view of Alma Road residents.
14 15	14.3.1 15.1.3 15.3.4	Proposed mitigation will not hide the stack [Clayfield] from the residents view. The artist's impression shows that we are effectively being planted into our homes by massive bushy trees, taking away our natural light, and the lovely breezes. This will diminish the visual quality of our cheerful streetscape, alienating us from our neighbours; our will be changed for the worse forever.

15 Apndx B	15.4.3 Appendix B	EIS states that the ventilation station and outlet are proposed on the southern side of the ramps between Sandgate and Alma Roads. The aerial view clearly shows that the footprint of the emission stack complex predominantly on the apartments at 83 Alma Road. We raised this during the consultation as to how a 100% residential location could be considered for a permanent industrial exhaust stack and how this could be considered a short-term impact to the residents of Alma Road. The response that the principal frontage was to Sandgate Road and that there was no access from Alma Road was insulting and does not change the fact that the stack will be sitting on Alma Road and that it will be in full view of our homes.
3	3.5.1 3.5.2	An industrial structure of this nature [Clayfield ventilation stack] would be better suited to an area such as Toombul Shopping Town, where it would be keeping with the surrounding industrial design.
16	16.3.4 16.3.8	Table 16-9 of the EIS states that the only negative impact on single residential properties is volumetric acquisition. Why is this the only impact to residential properties noted in the EIS? We have not been able to sell our home because buyers are too concerned about the tunnel entry/exit portal proposed at the end of Alma Road.
3 14 16 Apndx B	3.5.1 14.3.1 16.3.5 B: 5	We have been consulting with the Airport Link team for months and they haven't been listening to us. Understand that the consultation process was in place to gauge what impacts will affect local residents. Not only has this Information been completely ignored, the location of the stack was never released to residents of Alma Road or the rest of the community as an option, and this is a major impact on our property and lifestyle.
4 16	4.2.3 16.3.4 16.3.5 16.3.7	The EIS fails to include any research from NSW where they recognise the impacts on residents within 400m of the stacks and portals. Why is there no market value guarantee in place in Queensland for impacted residents like ourselves? Why is there no duty of care or goodwill coming from BCC and the Queensland Government to ensure that we are taken care of? Why should we take a financial loss because our property has been blighted? The value of our property has been impacted and will continue to be if the stack is placed on Alma Road or the cut and cover park of the tunnel in Kalinga Park.
		EIS states that the project will cause only short term impacts, how can this be the case when a permanent industrial concrete stack is being placed in a 100% residential location which is occupied by families 24 hours a day.
3	3.5.2	At consultation meeting, were advised that the benefits of the location of the stack outweighed the disadvantages to our family. We have further questioned the Airport Link team on what the benefits of the stack are to residents of Alma Road. We received no response outlining the benefits to us.
3 Apndx B	3.5.2	Where is all of the eight months of consulting with the Airport Link team have they worked with us to find better solutions? Our concerns have been completely ignored. It seems the cheapest and easiest option has been chosen for the stack, not the best solution for residents of Alma Road and the surrounding community.
		Concerned that there are no guarantees from the Brisbane City Council or the Queensland Government that residents around the stack won't be exposed to very high concentrations of pollution. We are extremely worried for our children's health if they have to live so close to the exhaust stack. Can Brisbane City Council and the Queensland Government guarantee that concentrated high levels of exhaust fumes will not affect residents living practically underneath the stack? Filtration should be provided to ensure that families won't be affected by these high levels of concentrated pollutants. If this cannot be done, then our family should be given the choice to move on.
		Brisbane City Council and Queensland Government have a duty of care to the residents of Alma Road. If this location, or option over cut and cover tunnel in Kalinga Park, is chosen then the Queensland Government and Brisbane City Council should show some respect and consideration to us. We are insulted that we are being treated in this way. Should take the stress off us, buy our home and sell it on for us, as we do not wish to live next to this industrial monstrosity. Why should the residents of Alma Road carry the burden of this industrial stack for the rest of the community?

Submission No.		49
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3	3.5.2	Strong objection to the placement of the proposed exhaust stack in the cul-de-sac of Alma Road, Clayfield.
14	14.4	As a result of the decision to build Airport Link, neighbours are being forcibly ejected from their homes and their houses demolished.
9 10	9.2.2 10.2.1	Will be living next to a major transport artery with huge noisy exhaust plant dominating what was once a quiet residential street.
14	14.4	Value of my property is severely affected, as is the value of all of the properties in the street. Prime residential "A" allotments which have been bought at premium prices.
14	14.4 9.3	Clayfield is now the focal point of every type of Brisbane transport. No consideration has been given to the burden which Clayfield residents have already been made to bear for the city in the name of transport. Residents are experiencing severe financial loss, ill health, worry, and the destruction of the quiet enjoyment of their homes. The final indignity of the positioning of the exhaust is unacceptable. Please ensure that the proposed exhaust stack at Alma Road is relocated.

Submission No.		50
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
2 4 5 9 11 15	2.3.4 4.2.5 5.3.5 5.6.2 9.3.4 9.5.3 11.2.1 11.3.2 15.3.4	Object to the proposed Airport Link as: ▪ Smoke stacks have no filtration and the effects this will have on public health; ▪ Prevailing winds will carry this toxic air over a greater area of Brisbane; ▪ There should be no tunnel unless it goes directly to the airport; ▪ Billions of dollars should be put into public transport infrastructure, not wasted on more tunnels; ▪ Removal of green space in Kalinga Park, including 120 year old trees; and ▪ It will destroy the habitat/ eco system of the many wildlife species in Kalinga Park.

Submission No.		51
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
14	14.3.1	The impact of Airport Link will significantly change my suburb and impact on me personally.

3 9 10 11 13 15 16	3.5.1 9.1.1 9.3.3 9.5.3 9.6.2 10.2.1 11.2.1 13.3.2 15.3.4 16.3.5	Have specific concerns relating to: ■ Ventilation complex location is too close to residential areas; ■ Destruction of Kalinga Park East; ■ Effects on public health. Fumes from stack are no good for our health; ■ Health concerns associated with the ventilation complex location/s; ■ Work site location and impacts on homes and schools (noise and dust); ■ Air quality modelling shortcomings; ■ Cultural heritage of Kalinga Park; ■ Property value impacts; ■ Impact on lifestyle and urban amenity. Prevent our ease to shops and the size of the stack building will be an eyesore; and ■ Lack of tunnel emission filtration.
3 9 16	3.5.1 9.1.1 9.3.3 16.3.5	Request that further studies are conducted and/or: ■ The North East ventilation complex is located to Centro Toombul; ■ A property value guarantee is established; ■ Baseline air quality is established for the North East connection in Kalinga Park; and ■ An independent review of air quality impacts is established to allay community concerns.

Submission No.		52
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
9		Airport Link will only add to vehicle emissions due to ongoing increases in private vehicle use.
9	9.3.4 9.5.1 9.5.3 9.6.2	Comments in relation to filtration of ventilation outlets: ■ The use of best practice filtration technology not being employed in all countries is presented as a reason not to use it here. The examples of best practice should be seen as models to be emulated; ■ Filtration technology should be employed in this project. Any increased health impact upon residents in the vicinity of the proposed ventilation stacks is unacceptable; ■ EIS implies that filtration equipment is not being installed for cost reasons; ■ Advice that there will be negligible impact upon public health is based upon reliance upon published data. Public health impacts of the project and the ventilation stacks specifically cannot be known with certainty; ■ What is the expected change in air quality within close proximity to the Federation Street ventilation outlet?; ■ Is the ability of the stack system to prevent harmful impacts on people living in proximity likely to be dependent upon weather conditions?; and ■ Health impacts is likely to effect younger and older people more significantly.
12	12.2.2	The height of development limits, in proximity to the ventilation stack, contradicts the SEQ Regional Plan targets for population growth.
14 15 16	14.3.1 15.3.1 16.3.5	Even with landscaping the visual amenity and character of the Federation Street residential area will be negatively impacted, affecting both environmental quality and property values. Is compensation for residents impacted in such a way proposed?
15	15.3.1	The EIS indicates planting to the perimeter of the Windsor ventilation site but no indication of the use or treatment within the site apart from the ventilation outlet.
10 6 15	10.3.2 6.7.3 15.3.1	Given that noise levels are proposed to be increased, it is only reasonable that the most noise-mitigating barrier options be implemented (status-quo should be pursued as a minimum rather than the lesser plan level option). The visual implications of such noise barriers are likely to be significant and thereby also negatively impact the visual amenity of the area.

4 2	4.2.6 2.2.2	The design of the Windsor stack should be given the same due consideration (as other ventilation stacks) should the project proceed.
10	10.2.4 10.3.2	Tables do not identify any modelling for Gallway Street, which was measured in its existing site at the eastern end. What is the modelled noise impact upon Gallway Street, including at the location of 24 Gallway Street?
10	10.2.4	Concerned regarding the potential impact on properties in the vicinity of Federation and Gallway Streets during construction in that area. There is extensive hard rock in the vicinity and drill and blast excavation may cause cracking to homes in the immediate vicinity of those works. What is the anticipated depth of excavation and drilling in the vicinity of Gallway street?
10 19	10.2.4 10.3.2	Noise levels are a concern as an elderly women lives at the above address. What obligations are in place to ensure that contractors adhere to the noise mitigation (and air quality) measures during construction (i.e. bonds)
15	15.3.1	Urban design measures are equally if not more important for the southern section and should be implemented in this area (Newmarket Road south to Horace Street)
12	12.2.4	Is the residential character of the Federation Street / Gallway Street area proposed to be retained? Is it proposed to retain or reduce existing controls upon demolition of pre-war houses in this street, which is dominated by pre-war houses?

Submission No.		53
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
14	14.3.1	The impact of Airport Link will significantly change my suburb and impact on me personally.
3 9 10 11 13 15 16	3.5.1 9.1.1 9.3.3 9.5.3 9.6.2 10.2.1 11.2.1 13.3.2 15.3.4 16.3.5	Have specific concerns relating to: ■ Ventilation complex location is too close to residential areas; ■ Destruction of Kalinga Park East; ■ Effects on public health. Fumes from stack are no good for our health; ■ Health concerns associated with the ventilation complex location/s; ■ Work site location and impacts on homes and schools (noise and dust); ■ Air quality modelling shortcomings; ■ Cultural heritage of Kalinga Park; ■ Property value impacts; ■ Impact on lifestyle and urban amenity. Prevent our ease to shops and the size of the stack building will be an eyesore; and ■ Lack of tunnel emission filtration.
3 9 16	3.5.1 9.1.1 9.3.3 16.3.5	Request that further studies are conducted and/or: ■ The North East ventilation complex is located to Centro Toombul; ■ A property value guarantee is established; ■ Baseline air quality is established for the North East connection in Kalinga Park; and ■ An independent review of air quality impacts is established to allay community concerns.

Submission No.		54
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
		Strong objection to the construction of the proposed Airport Link.

5	5.5.2 5.5.3 5.6.2	Airport Link will not reduce traffic congestion: ■ Will result in increased traffic congestion on Gympie, Stafford and supporting roads; ■ Traffic exiting the tunnel will add to the over burden Airport roundabout; and ■ Traffic will not move faster.
9	9.3.4	The proposed exhaust stack at Alma Road will distribute concentrated unfiltered pollution into the homes of residents in Clayfield, Ascot, Wavell Heights, Nundah and surrounding areas.
15	15.3.4	The exhaust complex will destroy the vision of a 'better Brisbane' for the residents of Alma Road and add to the already concentrated visual pollution in the Toombul area.
9	9.6.2	The proposed stack at Kedron will be a noxious environment for those children of Kedron State High School, causing many people to have respiratory problems that will affect the quality of their lives for years to come.
13	13.3.2	Construction of the tunnel will destroy the war memorial Diggers Drive in Kalinga park.
2	2.3.4	Alternatives to Airport Link: ■ Improve air train services; ■ Improve rail and bus services; and ■ Real impetus behind BCC public transport initiatives.
2	2.3.4	The proposed Airport Link does not benefit the people of Brisbane. The detrimental economic, environmental and social factors far outweigh any suggested advantages.

Submission No.		55
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
14	14.3.1	The impact of Airport Link will significantly change my suburb and impact on me personally.
3 9 10 11 13 15 16	3.5.1 9.1.1 9.3.3 9.5.3 9.6.2 10.2.1 11.2.1 13.3.2 15.3.4 16.3.5	Have specific concerns relating to: ■ Ventilation complex location is too close to residential areas; ■ Destruction of Kalinga Park East; ■ Effects on public health. Fumes from stack are no good for our health; ■ Health concerns associated with the ventilation complex location/s; ■ Work site location and impacts on homes and schools (noise and dust); ■ Air quality modelling shortcomings; ■ Cultural heritage of Kalinga Park; ■ Property value impacts; ■ Impact on lifestyle and urban amenity. Prevent our ease to shops and the size of the stack building will be an eyesore; and ■ Lack of tunnel emission filtration.
3 9 16	3.5.1 9.1.1 9.3.3 16.3.5	Request that further studies are conducted and/or: ■ The North East ventilation complex is located to Centro Toombul; ■ A property value guarantee is established; ■ Baseline air quality is established for the North East connection in Kalinga Park; and ■ An independent review of air quality impacts is established to allay community concerns.

Submission No.		56
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
14	14.4	The impact of Airport Link will significantly change my property, suburb and impact on me personally.
3 9 10 11 13 14 15 16	3.5.1 9.1.1 9.3.3 9.5.3 9.6.2 10.2.1 11.2.1 13.3.2 14.3.2 15.3.4 16.3.5	Specific concerns relating to: ■ Ventilation complex location; ■ Destruction of Kalinga Park east; ■ Effects on public health; ■ Health concerns associated with ventilation complex location/s; ■ Work site location and impacts on homes and schools; ■ Air quality modelling shortcomings; ■ Cultural heritage of Kalinga Park; ■ Property value impacts; ■ Impact on lifestyle and urban amenity; and ■ Lack of tunnel emission filtration.
5	5.6.2	What assurances do we have that local traffic will be reduced? Given the likely tolls significantly doubts the reduction in vehicles using Junction Road to get to Kedron.
4 6	4.2.3 6.1.3	The lack of detail to identify the impact on my property even after discussions from project staff, including: ■ Exact location of the tunnel under my property; ■ Understanding the exact depth of the tunnel under my property; ■ Accuracy of detailed maps contained in the EIS which do not appear to be correct (i.e. overlaying aerial photograph with property boundaries); ■ Accuracy of flood study, as contour lines appear to be a number of years old and do not represent the current situation; and ■ Does not appear to have correctly identified the underlying geography in my area because it cannot identify clearly boundary between the underlying formations. Appears to be a lack of test drilling in the gully on which my house is located.
16	16.3.5	Inability to obtain information on the effects on the property values as a result of tunnel construction.
3 6 9 16	3.5.1 6.1.3 9.1.1 9.3.3 16.3.5	Request further studies are conducted to address concerns, including: ■ Additional test drilling to resolve issues of underlying structures; ■ North East ventilation complex is located closer to the Gateway Motorway away from residential land. Current location or moving it to Centro Toombul would significantly risk the health of the community; ■ Installation of filtration on ventilation system. Has the study considered financial impacts on community's health budgets from failure to include filtration in initial construction?; ■ Publish anticipated compensation to landholders directly impacted by the tunnel; and ■ Baseline air quality is established for the North East connection in Kalinga Park and independent review of air quality impacts is established to allay community concerns.

Submission No.		57
Date Received		6 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 9	3.5.1 9.6.2	The position of the Clayfield ventilation outlet will adversely affect the entire families' health and is not in the community's best interest and seek that it be relocated to a more suitable position.
3 14	3.5.1 3.5.2 14.3.	Clayfield ventilation outlet should be relocated to a commercially zoned alternative like Toombul Shopping Town, Toombul Rail station or Ross Park, where it won't affect residential areas and recreational parkland of Kalinga Park. This would also ensure vandalism and the criminal element is minimised.
15 16	15.3.4 16.3.5	The industrial 'chimney' [at Clayfield] is an eyesore on Clayfield's historical character and will lead to property devaluation.
9	9.5.3	Filtration should be fitted, as it has proved effective in overseas tunnels. This would ensure long-term emission control, and a smaller ventilation facility.
3	3.5.1 3.5.2	There are more suitable locations that are in the community's best interest and feel that the current alternative has been chosen primarily for the cost to deliver the program.

Submission No.		58
Date Received		6 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
		Concerned about the proposed exhaust ventilation outlet for the eastern end of the Airport Link project currently earmarked at the end of Alma Road, Clayfield.
9 11	9.1.1 9.5.3 9.6.2 11.2	EIS has not used world best practices in their findings; otherwise a filtered exhaust style ventilation system would have been identified as crucial to protect the health and well-being of the surrounding families and fauna [at Clayfield]. The prevailing north-east winds will have an enormous impact on my young family and the surrounding residents' health. I am left with no doubt that there will be health implications on us all.
3	3.5.1 3.5.2	The exhaust outlet should be located down the East-West Arterial where there is already an industrial area, minimising the impact on residents in the Clayfield, Wooloowin and Eagle Junction areas.
2 4 5	2.4.2 4.2.5 5.3.4	Seems the current tunnel EIS design was driven by the cost of the project and not what was the best outcome for local residents or even the public using the tunnel. What is actually required to ease the current traffic congestion has not been addressed in the EIS design submissions.
3 4 5	3.5.2 4.2.3 5.3.5	The proposed tunnel should be extended to beyond the current Airport/ Gateway Motorway roundabout. This would resolve the requirement to have the exhaust ventilation at Alma Road or Sandgate / East-West Arterial intersection and would resolve the current ongoing issues with the Airport roundabout and East-West Arterial/ Nudgee Road intersections.
4 12	4.2.3 12.2.	The impact on green area reduction caused by the current design could be eliminated if the proposed tunnel was extended to beyond the Airport roundabout. It is of real concern that the EIS does not seem to take into account the loss of parkland.
15	15.3.4	The proposed 10 storey high exhaust ventilation system proposed [at Clayfield] is not in line with height restrictions for the area.
2	2.3.4	There does not seem to have been a true study on how to manage traffic issues relating to the Airport. The Airport should be promoting the use of the Airtrain and Brisbane City Council should be proposing multi-level car parking at train stations. Seems the EIS has been rushed through with little thought for other real less expensive options that could benefit all.

2 3 4 5 10 12	2.4.2 3.5.2 4.2.3 5.4.4 5.6.3 10.3.2 12.2.7	Agree that something is required to ease traffic in the Airport corridor but do not believe the solution is the current proposed Airport Link option. Extending the tunnel a few kilometres could resolve: ■ Better traffic flow through the Airport roundabout; ■ Exhaust ventilation system [at Clayfield] placed in more suitable location; ■ Noise reduction to residential area; ■ Minimise the green area/ playground destruction; ■ Gained community support; and ■ What cost is too much for the health and well-being of the families and other residents in this area? The extra cost could be recouped by increasing the toll slightly.
2 14 16	14.3.1 16.3.5	At the detriment to my family's health and lifestyle the Council wants to go ahead with this project at any cost. Who will benefit from this tunnel project? How is the Council intending to compensate my family for loss of enjoyment of life? Residents who live in the area will suffer and be financially disadvantaged.
5	5.6.3	The proposed concept had not taken into effect the concerns of our local community and other options need to be sought. With an additional 40,000 people working at the Airport by 2026 don't see how the current proposal will cope with the expected traffic.
14	14.3.1	Sure that council would want to minimise the risk of any future liability and the potential of litigation in respect to people's health and loss of lifestyle.

Submission No.		59
Date Received		6 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
2 4 5 9 11 15	2.3.4 4.2.5 5.3.5 5.6.2 9.3.4 9.5.3 11.2.1 11.3.2 15.3.4	Object to the proposed Airport Link as: ■ Smoke stacks have no filtration and the effects this will have on public health; ■ Prevailing winds will carry this toxic air over a greater area of Brisbane; ■ There should be no tunnel unless it goes directly to the airport; ■ Billions of dollars should be put into public transport infrastructure, not wasted on more tunnels; ■ Removal of green space in Kalinga Park, including 120 year old trees; and ■ It will destroy the habitat/ eco system of the many wildlife species in Kalinga Park.

Submission No.		60
Date Received		6 December
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
14	14.4	The impact of Airport Link will significantly change my suburb and impact on me personally.
3 9 10 11	3.5 9.3 I 9.5 9.6 10.2 11.2	Have specific concerns relating to: ■ Ventilation complex location within 50 m of my residents and I will suffer from unfiltered stack eyesore; ■ Destruction of Kalinga Park East; ■ Effects on public health. Fumes from stack are no good for our health; and ■ Health concerns associated with the ventilation complex locations.

3 9 16	3.5 9.1 9.3 l 16.3	Request that further studies are conducted and/or: ■ The North East ventilation complex is located to Centro Toombul; ■ A property value guarantee is established; ■ Baseline air quality is established for the North East connection in Kalinga Park; and ■ An independent review of air quality impacts is established to allay community concerns.

Submission No.		61
Date Received		6 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
14	14.3.1	The impact of Airport Link will significantly change my suburb and impact on me personally.
3 9 10 15 16	3.5.1 9.1.1 9.3.3 9.5.3 9.6.2 10.2.1 15.3.4 16.3.5	Have specific concerns relating to: ■ Ventilation complex location; ■ Effects on public health (guarantee that long term health problems will not increase as a result of this project); ■ Property value impacts; ■ Impact on lifestyle and urban amenity. Prevent our ease to shops and the size of the stack building will be an eyesore; and ■ Lack of tunnel emission filtration.
3	3.5.1	Request that the North East ventilation complex filtered and is located to Centro Toombul.

Submission No.		62
Date Received		6 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
10 Apndx B	10.2.4	The residents have not been consulted but rather informed about what would be happening to their neighbourhood. At no time have the concerns and opinions of the local residents been taken into account. Have requested a structural engineer to inspect home as concerned that the drilling of the tunnel will significantly compromise the structural integrity of our home.
4 16	4.2.3 16.3.5	This proposed transport corridor identified in the 1970s has kept property values down adjacent to the corridor, whilst properties further away have increased significantly. The proposed tunnels under homes [away from the transport corridor] will devalue these homes. Many residents feel very misled by the government believing the existing transport corridor was going to be used.
4 16	4.2.3 16.3.5	The plan to tunnel under the residential part of our suburb is not the only option available. They also have the option to tunnel under infrastructure (i.e. major roads, park lands, schools, railway lines). Taking a route along areas already close to heavy traffic would have less impact on residential areas and devaluation of family homes.
3 9 14 16	3.5.1 9.5.3 9.6.2 14.4.2 16.3.5	The lack of filtration to the ventilation stations will cause the homes located near the ventilation outlets to be even more devalued. Ventilation outlet will cause a higher concentration of polluted air in the immediate area and the impact on the health of local residents. The ventilation station at Kedron is located close to two schools and Kedron playing fields. The health and well being of residents and pupils seems to have been overlooked [at the Kedron ventilation outlet].

16	16.3.5	The immediate and long-term effect on property values of homes above the tunnel is believed to be significant. Property valuers have done their best to assure us that our properties would not drop in value, although they admit that it was uncertain. This left us feeling rather misled, as it seemed unlikely that we would be fairly compensated. Both our home and investment property will be affected.

Submission No.		63
Date Received		6 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
2 4 5 9 11 15	2.3.4 4.2.5 5.3.5 5.6.2 9.3.4 9.5.3 11.2.1 11.3.2 15.3.4	Object to the proposed Airport Link as: ■ Smoke stacks have no filtration and the effects this will have on public health; ■ Prevailing winds will carry this toxic air over a greater area of Brisbane; ■ There should be no tunnel unless it goes directly to the airport; ■ Billions of dollars should be put into public transport infrastructure, not wasted on more tunnels; ■ Removal of green space in Kalinga Park, including 120 year old trees; and ■ It will destroy the habitat/ eco system of the many wildlife species in Kalinga Park.

Submission No.		64
Date Received		8 December
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
		Strongly oppose the proposed Airport Link as I believe it will unreasonably impact on the use and enjoyment of the units and common property at The Mews.
9 10	9.2.2 10.2.1	In the short term, concerned about the levels of noise and dust pollution generated from construction, which will directly impact The Mews.
9 10	9.3.4 10.3.2	In the long term, concerned about impacts generated as a result of increased traffic flows past The Mews, including increased: ■ Traffic noise; ■ Air pollution; and ■ Emission of 'black' particulate matter.
15	15.3.1	Concerned with the loss of the pleasant visual aspect that The Mews currently enjoys which will be replaces with various "Los Angeles style" ramps and overpasses.
9 10 19	9.2.3 9.3.5 10.2.4 10.3.2	If Airport Link proceeds, need to address the impact of the increased traffic noise, air pollution and emissions of particulate matter by implementing noise and pollution reducing barriers.

Submission No.		65
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
9 10 14 15	9.2.2 9.3.4 10.2.4 10.3.2 14.3.2 15.3.1	I strongly oppose the proposed Airport Link given it will have serious negative impacts on The Mews, during construction and operation. I am particularly concerned about our lifestyle in terms of: ■ Construction noise; ■ Dust and dirt during construction (air quality); ■ Vibrations during construction; ■ Traffic noise; ■ Car headlights; ■ Looking out on large new roads, rather than Enoggera Creek; ■ Noise and roads near the pool and recreational areas at the Mews; and ■ Loss of community and amenity.
4 10 15	4.2.5 10.3.2 15.3.1	Airport Link will be both an eyesore and a major new source of traffic noise. Given we are already having to endure NSBT, very disappointed with the proposed Airport Link. Surely an alternative route and/or design with less impact could be formulated.

Submission No.		66
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
2	2.3.3	The impact of Airport Link will significantly change Brisbane, my suburb and impact on my personally. The Airport link will not solve the traffic problems of getting there, as it does not even connect to the Airport.
2 9 16	2.3.4 9.1.1 9.5.3	Request further studies are conducted and/or: ■ Better public transport, including more busways, light rail, more frequent services, rail service to Redcliffe; ■ EIS air quality data must be taken from Kalinga Park. The baseline for any scientific data must be from the actual location. The ventilation stacks not being filtered and located in the residential area highlights a lack of regard for the community. If Airport Link proceeds, must be filtered to world's best practice; and ■ Financial burden being placed on Brisbane ratepayers and Queensland taxpayers. Needs to be better alternatives sought and researched other than car road/ tunnel use. Obtaining more funds for alternatives such as railway to Redcliffe, more busways, etc will be harder to justify due to financial burden of tunnel.

Submission No.		67
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
2 4	2.3.2 4.2.5	More emphasis should be given to the exit at Kedron. The connection to the Airport should be secondary. Airport Link should be aimed at providing the connection to Gympie Road and Stafford Road. Gympie Road traffic from NW suburbs needs to get to the City via Hale Street or across town via the NSBT.
5	5.3.5	The roundabout at the Gateway needs a flyover from the East-West Bypass Road to Airport Drive. This roundabout is already near capacity and will become worse with more traffic and the future runway.

2	2.3.4	Greater use should be made of the rail link to get people to the Airport. Properly implemented it would be a far cheaper, more efficient, be more reliable travel time, and have environmental advantages, as it would reduce pollution.
		The Airport corporation should pay for or contribute to this link.
2	2.3.4	Fundamentally I do not think that tunnels are suitable for car and truck traffic because of ventilation and accident problems. Money spent on a good public transport system could solve many problems.

Submission No.		68
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
3 9	3.5.2 9.6.2	Airport Link will significantly change my suburb and have a personally. Health concerns are a huge issue, as I believe in a healthy lifestyle. No one would want the ventilation complex on their doorstep.
3 14 16	3.5.1 3.5.2 14.3.2 16.3.5	The proposed position of the ventilation complex [at Clayfield] being so close to our home is very much a concern, as it will devalue our home dramatically. Need to respond to these issues to achieve the best possible outcome. The area will always have a stigma underneath the stack. The proposed position of the stack will ruin our community; it is in our backyard for the children of our community.
3 9 11 13 14 16	3.5.1 9.1.1 9.3.3 9.5.3 9.6.2 11.2.1 13.3.2 14.3.2 16.3.5	Specific concerns relating to: ■ Location of the ventilation complex; ■ Public health concerns associated with ventilation complex location/s; ■ Cultural heritage of Kalinga Park and destruction of the east end; ■ Impacts on property values; and ■ Lifestyle impact on my family.
3 9 16	3.5.1 9.3.3 16.3.5	Request that further studies are conducted and consider: ■ Moving the North East Ventilation Complex to Toombul Shopping Centre; ■ Independent review of air quality is established; and ■ Property value guarantee is established.

Submission No.		69
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
3	3.5.1 3.5.2	Dissatisfied with the location of the ventilation outlet at Clayfield. Earlier newsletters did not show the location of the ventilation outlet. Residents feel that they were kept in the dark and it seems very underhanded and quite devious in its intent. It had been ascertained that the earlier site was around Ross Park.
11	11.2.1	I understand that my fine trees will be lost in the proposed construction at the end of Alma Street and its environs. The only green space to be truly effected is the small park area at the northern end of Alma Road.

3 11	3.5.1 3.5.2 11.2.1	Preferred site [for the ventilation outlet] is the pocket bordered by Sandgate Road, East-West Arterial and Toombul shopping centre. This is an area of existing shopping centre building. All the structures can be built on structural piers to the level of the Toombul Centre. If this site was selected then perhaps some of the line of mature trees could be left.
9	9.3.4 9.6.2	With the proposed single point release of very concentrated pollution, the potential for residents in Alma Street and surrounding streets to be exposed to a very high concentration of pollution levels.
4 9 15	4.2.6 9.5.3 15.3.4	Why can't we have several smaller stacks with proven highest quality filtration outlets, less impact on the visual character of the green built area of the Brook?

Submission No.		70
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
9	9.1.1	Live in close proximity to the proposed site of the ventilation exhaust stack [at Clayfield]. Why wasn't the air pollution test carried out at the proposed ventilation stack site at Kalinga Park-Alma Road? The proposed location of the ventilation outlet was not discussed in any consultation with the local community. Request independent air quality research to be conducted by Queensland University of Technology to give an accurate reading of the present levels of pollution in this area and not somewhere else.
9	9.6.2	Will be forced to sell up as couldn't possibly live in this area with all the extra pollution from the ventilation stack. Health issues are a very big concern for our family. An increase in pollution levels from the unfiltered discharge will put our immune systems under further attack.

Submission No.		71
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
14	14.3.1	Object to the reduction of available space within Kalinga Park.
5	5.3.5 5.6.2	The traffic conditions at the Airport roundabout are already chaotic and there appears to be no firm plan to ameliorate the current load and there would be an increase in volume with the implementation of the tunnel.
9 14	9.5.3 14.3.1	Strongly object to the tunnels not being filtered in any way. Prevailing winds will result in increased pollution levels being carried to the surrounding suburbs. A number of schools and childcare centres will be affected.
10 15	10.2.4 15.3.4	Residents of Alma Street will have serious disturbance for a number of years while the construction is underway and subsequently with increased noise and visual pollution from the proposed fan construction site.

Submission No.		72
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3	3.5.1 3.5.2	Strong objection to the location of a tunnel exhaust ventilation outlet at Toombul railway station or Ross Park sites. The Toombul station site is undesirable because of the close proximity to residential properties and the high volume of pedestrian traffic through the station. Ross Park site is also too close to residential properties and is an important recreational site. Would appear the Centro Toombul or East-West Arterial Road are the most appropriate choices [for the location of ventilation outlet] as they are further away from residential properties and represent a lesser disturbance to community functioning & lifestyle.
9	9.5.3	Strongly supports the use of exhaust filtration equipment. All attempts to reduce the health impacts on the local community are justifiable financially.

Submission No.		73
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
		Airport Link proposal will have a negative impact on my family, my local community and myself.
5	5.6.2	Concerned that traffic in my local area will significantly worsen. Believe the traffic at Kalinga Park tunnel entrance will create a bottleneck, thereby cancelling any benefit gained. Concentrating the traffic problem in a fewer number of areas will disadvantage the Clayfield local community.
2	2.3.4	The premise of using any benefit gained by the Airport Link proposal as justification for building the tunnel system is false. A real comparison can only be made by comparing the Airport Link outcomes with other alternative traffic improvement strategies (i.e. further development of the public transport system). The EIS does not demonstrate a thorough investigation of possible improvements in the public transport system. Recommend that the enhancement, or redevelopment, of Brisbane's public transport system be investigated as an alternative to tunnels.
9	9.5.3	The proposed ventilation stack can only have a negative impact on their surrounding areas, as the unfiltered emissions are pumped out. The decision to not employ world's best air treatment practice appears only to be supported by a cost-saving argument. Recommend that if this project proceeds, further consideration be given to methods of air treatment to minimise any impact on air quality.
3 15	3.5.2 15.3.4	The placement of the ventilation stack [at Clayfield] in a residential street does not seem to be keeping with the ideals of maintaining urban character. The placement can do nothing but destroy the character of our local community. The artist rendition of the tree-obscured view of the ventilation stack [at Clayfield] has no basis in reality; at least not for the length of time period it would take to grow the mature trees that are not currently in existence.
3 15	3.5.1 3.5.2 15.3.	The visual impact of a 30 m high building in a residential area would be severe. The visual impact cannot be discounted solely as a trade-off against the air pollution impact. Recommend that other alternatives be sought for creating a ventilation or air treatment facility that provides minimal air pollution and minimal visual impact. Recommend that alternative sites for the ventilation stack, as were originally proposed in the preliminary stages, be reconsidered.

5 9 15 16	5.6.2 9.3.4 15.3. 16.3.5	The Airport Link proposal will adversely effect me by: ■ Resulting in an increased traffic congestion in my local community; ■ Failing to provide better sustainable transport solutions; ■ Resulting in a decrease in the air quality of my local community, potentially leading to negative health impacts; ■ Providing a negative impact on the urban character of my local community by creating a visual eyesore, as well as destroying part of the eastern end of Kalinga park; and ■ Decreasing the property value of my home.

Submission No.		74
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
3 15	3.5.1 3.5.2 15.3.4	Airport Link will detrimentally change my suburb and have a significant negative impact on my family and me. The primary impact is the location of the pollution stacks at the end of Alma Road. The ventilation complex is an industrial complex and is not in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood. No degree of mitigation will be able to change this fact. Artist impressions of the ventilation complex are misleading as the diagrams are drawn from idealistic positions & mature trees will take years to grow to block the structure. These diagrams should not be taken into account when assessing the visual impact of the structure. Mitigation proposed in the EIS for the pollution stacks are not in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.
3 9	3.5.1 3.5.2 9.3.4 9.6.2	Emissions from 120k cars will be delivered to localised areas. The placement of the pollution stacks is inherently flawed. The Clayfield stack is to be placed in a valley, such that pollution will be blown into residences in Wavell and Clayfield. The pollution will be effectively trapped in the valley. The site of the pollution emission facility and stack needs to be seriously reconsidered. More pollution will be released into the local environment and this is of significant concern due to the potential adverse health affects and future medical costs to the health system.
9	9.5.3	Filtering emissions provides the possibility of eliminating harmful carcinogens and toxic chemicals and has the potential to significantly improve the general health of the population, which will reduce the burden in our overloaded hospitals. EIS does not take into account measurement of ultra fine particles, which potentially have significantly more detrimental health effects than larger particles.
9	9.3.1	The pollution goals outlined in the EIS are minimum standards. The use of the term pollution "goals" is offensive, particularly when the "goals" are higher than the current pollution levels in the area.
9 16	9.6.2 16.4.3	Particulate emissions have health risks that have not been taken into account by the EIS, hence the risk assessment in the EIS is not satisfactory. Several established technology for the removal of particulates from tunnels that result in up to 95% particulate removal. The Airport Link EIS does not take into account health benefits and cost savings to the public health system that would result in the reduction of car emissions rather than causing more pollution or maintaining the status quo. Airport Link represents significant opportunity to be able to capture vehicle pollution from tens of thousands of cars. This will have follow on cost savings in terms of community health costs, which far outweigh economic benefits to local businesses reported in the EIS.
10	10.3.1 10.3.2	The noise of cars exiting the tunnel is not considered or modelled in the EIS. Significant noise will be generated by cars exiting the tunnel (Bernoulli effect). Jet fans will cause significant noise disturbances to surrounding residents. Airport Link EIS indicates that adequate noise minimising should be instigated, but no guidelines have been established and no specific mitigation has been outlined. This is a gross oversight and these issues need to be addressed in direct consultation with the community before approvals are given.
5	5.6.2	Ease of congestion and inclusion of bus lanes on Sandgate Road and Gympie Road are incongruous. Predicted increase in traffic congestion on Sandgate Road north (by 50%) will have detrimental effects to the Clayfield area.

5	5.6.3 5.6.9	No solution has been proposed for the Gateway roundabout at Hendra, which is integral if the Airport Link is to function. If no solution between Airport Link and the Gateway is found then both projects will be a waste of time & money.
2	2.3.4	EIS has given no consideration of alternative transport approaches (i.e. integrated subway system). Requested that alternative integrated public transport options be seriously considered.
16	16.3.5	Significant concern regarding the saleability and value of our property (at Alma Road). Airport Link has prevented people making bids on other properties in the area. Project places us in limbo.
2 4 5 9 15	2.3.4 4.2.5 5.3.5 5.6.2 5.6.9 9.3.4 9.5.3 15.3.4	Recommend that: ■ Extend tunnel to the Gateway roundabout and move vent near Gateway roundabout; ■ Create overpasses & underpasses to fix traffic at Gateway roundabout; ■ Divert traffic from city bound traffic on Sandgate & Toombul Road to Gateway arterial for connection with Airport Link; ■ Preferred location of the vent is Gateway roundabout or Toombul car park; ■ Adopt the world's best practice in filtration technologies. Filtration has possibility to reduce overall pollution in the city and reduce negative health effects; ■ Mandate that corporations that manage tunnels to contribute research funding into particulate & NOX emission reduction in vehicles & tunnel ventilation systems and commission ongoing independent monitoring of tunnel emissions & air quality; ■ Perform traffic modelling with added busways and cycle paths and model increased pollution that extra congestion will cause; ■ Commission feasibility of other transport options; ■ Diagrams depicting visual impact of pollution stacks should not be used to determine visual impacts; and ■ Have independent assessors determine impact of project on property values and compensate residents appropriately.

Submission No.		75, 79, 80
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
3	3.5.1 3.5.2	Strong objection to the location of a tunnel exhaust ventilation outlet at Toombul railway station or Ross Park sites. The Toombul station site is undesirable because of the close proximity to residential properties and the high volume of pedestrian traffic through the station. Ross Park site is also too close to residential properties and is an important recreational site. Would appear the Centro Toombul or East-West Arterial Road are the most appropriate choices [for the location of ventilation outlet] as they are further away from residential properties and represent a lesser disturbance to community functioning & lifestyle.
9	9.5.3	Strongly supports the use of exhaust filtration equipment. All attempts to reduce the health impacts on the local community are justifiable financially.

Submission No.		76
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
2	2.3.3	No evidence the project is needed. Building more roads is not a sustainable strategy. The documentation "assumes" need without providing any evidence.

2	2.2.2 2.3.4	No comparison has been included to substantiate the statement that the existing road network will not sustain future travel demands even with major increases in non-motorised and public transport travel. EIS does not address the likelihood that it may be far more cost-effective to address travel demand by further investment in land use integration and public transport, walking and cycling, than in providing further capacity for unsustainable private vehicle travel. Comparable investment in better land use outcomes and enhanced public transport services would most likely result in higher walk, cycle and public transport use.
2 5	2.2.3 5.6.2	Gympie Road, Stafford Road and the East West Arterial are all key routes that will experience increased traffic congestion as a result of the project. The project is not in keeping with the project objective to "ease traffic congestion on key routes" as overall, the project will increase (not ease) congestion on these key routes.
5	5.6.4	The discussion of 'time-saving' confuses 'travel time' with 'travel speed'. The likelihood of induced longer trips encouraged by the facility and the likelihood of increased congestion beyond the portals will be likely to more than offset any theoretical time savings achieved by higher speed operation in the facility itself. Airport Link will lead to miniscule increases in vehicle speed compared with no Airport Link. Overall, Airport Link will reduce vehicle speed on the network. Project has therefore failed to achieve the objective of improving journey times. Greater travel time savings could be achieved for commercial vehicles by improving the Airtrain service, which would take a greater proportion of non-commercial vehicles off the road network.
5	5.2.3 5.6.2	EIS fails to give any evidence that the amount of traffic on lower order roads will be less than it is at present. Must include data for the current road network in Table 9-8 to demonstrate whether Airport Link will reduce or increase traffic on suburban streets. If there is an increase the project fails to meet the objective of reducing through traffic and heavy vehicles through suburban streets.
5	5.6.6	It is unclear how increasing the amount of traffic on key public transport routes (i.e. Gympie Road) will improve travel time for public transport. Any time savings for buses moving through the study corridor would be off-set by congestion outside the corridor caused by Airport Link.
9 11 14	3.5.1 9.1.1 9.3.4 11.2.1 14.3.2	The project fails to achieve the objective to improve urban amenity and community safety: ■ Open space along Kedron Brook behind Kedron State High will become a large construction zone; ■ Eastern end of Kalinga Park, which includes grove of hoop pines and eucalypts, will be bulldozed; ■ 30 m exhaust stack will be built in a residential area (Alma Road) and will release fumes over Kalinga Park; anf ■ 30 m exhaust stack will be built next to playing fields at Kedron State High and release fumes in area where children regularly exercise.
9	9.5.3	Filtering the exhaust stacks would reduce the amount of harmful substances in the fumes leaving these stacks and would improve the project's ability to meet the objective of improving local air quality along the corridor.
9	9.2.2 9.2.3	Vehicle emissions during construction have not been quantified. The cumulative effects of construction plant, delivery vehicles and spoil haulage are likely to be substantial, especially in terms of carbon dioxide and fine particulates. These impacts need to be quantified and measures for their amelioration put forward.
2		Environmental, economic and social costs of the project far outweigh the unsubstantiated benefits. The EIS must be rejected and a proposal developed that achieves the project objectives and provides greater benefits to the community.

Submission No.		77
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
11 14	11.2.1 14.3.1	The impact of Airport Link will significantly change my suburb and impact on me personally. This current project will remove most of the trees leaving us with a vision of a filthy ventilation stack and two on ramps to Sandgate Road as well as leaving this end of Kalinga Park in a relatively unusable for the period of construction. Why was this tunnel not extended to the industrial/commercial area of Nudgee Road and on to the airport?
		Appears any questions come back to cost and there is not a single concern for the current residents of the area and the costs to their health and the impacts that this project will have on their current living conditions
3 9 10 11 13 15 16	3.5.1 9.1.1 9.3.3 9.5.3 9.6.2 10.2.1 11.2.1 13.3.2 15.3.4 16.3.5	Have specific concerns relating to: ■ Ventilation complex location; ■ Destruction of Kalinga Park East; ■ Effects on public health; ■ Health concerns associated with the ventilation complex location/s; ■ Work site location and impacts on homes and schools; ■ Air quality modelling shortcomings; ■ Cultural heritage of Kalinga Park; ■ Property value impacts; ■ Impact on lifestyle and urban amenity. Prevent our ease to shops and the size of the stack building will be an eyesore; and ■ Lack of tunnel emission filtration.
3 4 9 16	3.5.1 4.2.5 9.1.1 9.3.3 16.3.5	Request that further studies are conducted and/or: ■ The North East ventilation complex is located to Centro Toombul; ■ A property value guarantee is established; ■ Baseline air quality is established for the North East connection in Kalinga Park; ■ An independent review of air quality impacts is established to allay community concerns; and ■ On ramps to Sandgate Road be re-evaluated.

Submission No.		78
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
		Airport Link will significantly change Brisbane, my suburb and impact on me personally. It will not solve the traffic problems getting to the Airport as it finishes at Toombul.
11	11.1.3 11.1.4 11.2.2	Request that another route is examined that does not take away our community space. Airport Link is removing 20% of Kalinga Park forever and 60% during construction, including 30-40 huge trees. This park is also home to over a dozen adult possums, which will not survive if moved. The white parrot nests at the [eastern] end of the park each year.
13	13.3.1 13.3.2	The Airport Link will desecrate 20% of the Digger Drive Memorial in Kalinga Park
9 10 14	9.3.4 10.2.4 14.3.2	The Airport Link will destroy our quality of living by removing the tree-lined path that allows us to walk through the wildlife habitat to the Toombul Shopping centre. The noise during the construction phase will effect our sleeping patterns and after completion the 60,000 cars that will utilise the tunnel will put more pollution in the park area than can ever be imagined.

9	9.5.3 9.6.2	The Airport Link does not have filtered ventilation stacks due to cost. The stacks should be filtered with the best technology available to ensure the community's long-term health is not affected.
2	2.3.4	To solve part of the Airport problem, the Airtrain should be placed in the control of Translink so a more regular, all night service that encourages airport workers to utilise the service through more sustainable timetables and cheaper tickets.

Submission No.		81
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
3 9	3.5.2 9.3.4 9.3.5	The vent building is to close to residential buildings, including approximately 50 m from my home. Concerned about noise levels from exhaust fans and effectiveness of the fans to disperse the fumes (particularly when wind is virtually nil). Suggest that the ventilation building be sited in Kalinga Park, just west of the railway. The land could be built up above the flood level. Recommended that results from air quality monitoring should be displayed at the top of the building to give people confidence in the system.
5	5.6.2 5.6.5	Access to and from my property has a high risk of an accident. In the past year, traffic intending to go on the arterial road [from Sandgate Road] to the Gateway has been increasing. With implementation of Airport Link, this problem will only be increased.

Submission No.		82
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
14	14.4	Airport Link will significantly change my suburb and impact on me personally. We moved to this area with a view to retirement, with little hope of recovery in the event that our investment in the area became threatened.
3 9 11 15 16	3.5.1 9.1.1 9.3.3 9.5.3 9.6.2 11.2.1 15.3.4 16.3.5	Have specific concerns relating to: ■ Ventilation complex location (at Alma Road); ■ Destruction of Kalinga Park East; ■ Property value impacts; ■ Impact on lifestyle and urban amenity; and ■ Lack of tunnel emission filtration.
3 15	3.5.1 15.3.4	Request that further studies be conducted and/or a process in keeping with the original public meetings and disclosure be followed. The original process neither adequately disclosed the Alma Street option nor has the artist given a reasonable impression of the next 10-15 years visible effect on the area.
3	3.5.1 3.5.2	Request that options covering the relocation of the ventilation system to Centro Toombul, and the full financial impact on local property values be studies and properly put before the public.

Submission No.		83
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
2	2.2.1	Don't believe that such a huge project is necessary. Smaller improvements and infrastructure to both Gympie and Lutwyche Roads and their tributaries of suburban streets would allow traffic to move much quicker. It also seems that such an investment for private vehicular travel would simply make it more viable for increased traffic over the coming years and more petrol emission problems.
9	9.5.3 9.6.2	The proposed "unfiltered" stacks would lead to more health problems and increased cost to the State and Federal government to cover health care.
15	15.3	The stacks appear to be a blight on the environment and there is no design to cover them or landscape around them. They are larger than the current landscape buildings and do not fit in with the area's character.
11	11.2.1	Concerned that the habitat & vegetation bordering the project will be negatively impacted.
5 10 14	5.7.2 10.2.4 14.3.1	Concerned that the surrounding neighbours will be severely impacted for many years due to increase in noise, re-routing of traffic, construction vehicles, etc.
2	2.2.1 2.2.2	Population growth and increased traffic can be managed in steps rather than leaping into this huge project. A project with considerable community input would be preferred and is often a better product than one done in the isolation of government offices.

Submission No.		84
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
14	14.2.4 14.3.2	Kalinga Park draws not only local residents but also those from far a field. It is regularly used by many kindergartens, schools, childcare centres, parent groups, community groups, large families and birthday party groups. Construction impacts may leave such groups "in the lurch" if planned get-togethers coincided with significant construction impacts. Recommend that notice boards be installed close to the Kalinga Park main entrance and Bertha Street car parks and possibly near Shaw park hockey fields to inform people of upcoming construction activities and proposed timelines. Advertising in local newspapers of upcoming construction activities should also occur.
20	20.6	Consideration should be given to providing mitigation works such as improved shade and access to car parking to Boyd Park (Nundah), Bennelong Park (Kedron) and the two play areas on Edinburgh Castle Road.
20	20.6	Would like to see substantial provision of shade over at least some park play areas in each area of Brisbane. This could include Downey Park/ Enoggera Creek area.
9	9.5.3	Should any tunnels be built in Brisbane from now on, they should be fitted with state of the art filtration to minimise known nasty health effects they cause.
4	4.2.3	The East West section of Airport Link, if built, should be sited under the very close nearby public land of Kedron Brook, Shaw Park and Kalinga Park rather than under private properties
4 11 13 14	4.2.5 11.2.1 13.3.2 14.3.2	The East-West section of Airport Link should continue beyond the Airport Drive/Gateway Arterial roundabout. This option would avoid the already clogged East West Arterial Road and save the peaceful, treed eastern-most Anzac Memorial section of Kalinga Park, preserve the existing pedestrian and bike access, drastically reduce the impact on the Kalinga park play areas and move the portal and emission stacks away from residential dwellings

9	9.1.1 9.3.1	What you consider to be "acceptable" levels of air pollution are not acceptable to us. At the very least an air quality monitoring unit in the vicinity of the new playground at Kalinga Park must be installed to allow baseline monitoring and legitimate comparisons.
16	16.3.5	Property owners and residents close to the proposed portals and smoke stacks deserve consideration and compensation that does not appear to be include in any of the documentation.
3	3.5.1	The eastern most emission stack should be located at any of the other three options proposed in your June 2006 newsletter, not at the end of Alma Road. We believe that the modelling of local wind patterns indicates that the Toombul shopping centre site would represent the best of the three options
10 16	10.2.4 16.3.5	Property owners directly above and those sufficiently close to the proposed underground tunnels to be effected by vibrations on an ongoing basis need to be advised in a clear manner as to what compensation (or resumption) amounts are proposed
5	5.6.2	The concept that Stafford Road is considered to be capable of withstanding the 50% increase in traffic you propose is amazingly unbelievable.
3 5	3.6.3 5.7.1	It was heartening to hear that spoil traffic from the eastern end of the proposed East West tunnels would be removed via the first built of the proposed tunnels and then via Gympie Road rather than through the residential area.
6	6.1.3	Would appreciate more information as to the likely impact of tunnelling above the shear zone beneath Park Avenue.

Submission No.		85
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
3 9	3.5.2 9.6.2	Objection to the emission stack at Clayfield. Intended to buy more property in the area but changed their mind when found out about the tunnel and exhaust outlets and resulting pollution and health threats.
16	16.3.5	Tried to re-sell our units for the last 8 months and no one will buy because of fear of all the enormous volume of polluted emissions.
9	9.5.3	Staggered to think you can plan to exhaust such contaminated and polluting material, without either filtering or washing it. Would be required by private enterprise.
9	9.6.2	A class action for damages to property from corrosive acid rains and adverse affects to our health.

Submission No.		86
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
14 Apndx B	14.3.2	Airport Link will have a profound impact on Kedron State High School. This is a matter of considerable concern to everyone in the school community. The size and complexity of the project, the wide ranging impact and huge amount of documentation is very difficult for people to absorb and respond to issues. Obligation on community to read and understand the EIS is at odds with how a community consultation process should be run. Low level of confidence that community issues are being appropriately addressed. Don't believe that the project team has met the obligation to ensure that they have appropriately addressed community concerns.
		No evidence that similar consideration [as given to the Hale Street project and impact on Brisbane State High School] has been given to the proper amelioration of the impacts on the Kedron State High School, despite it being undeniable that there will be a major impact on the school.

		Responses to date on issues raised by Kedron State High School have been manifestly inadequate. Proposed mitigation strategies seem woefully inadequate when compared to the health and safety of our children. Find response [to construction of cut and cover tunnel] to be insulting to the seriousness of the issues being raised.
5 19	5.6.7 5.6.9 5.7.6 19.7	Key issue is the safety of students and the wider school community during the development of the Airport Link, as a huge construction site will be established adjacent to the school. Subsequent operation of Airport Link and associated interchange must take into account safety of many students and community members who access the school.
5 9 10 14	5.7.2 5.7.6 9.2.2 10.2.4 14.3.2	Negative impact on the school during construction, including: ■ Large increases in noise and dust; ■ Loss of grounds; and ■ Reduced access to the school.
5 9 10 14	5.6.5 5.6.7 9.3.4 10.3.2 14.3.2	Negative impacts that occur following construction, including: ■ Significant increase in traffic noise and air pollution; and ■ Loss of access and amenity.
5 10 19	5.6.9 10.2.4 19.6	Clear minimum requirements that P&C considers mandatory: ■ A safety management plan for the school to address issues during the construction phase; ■ A design with access and safety measures appropriate to the school community; ■ An indoor sports complex to compensate for the loss of sporting facilities; ■ Air-conditioning of the school, including acoustic and air sealing treatment of the external building envelope; and ■ Safe vehicular access and improved parking arrangements for both staff and parents.

Submission No.		87
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
3 4 5 9 10	3.5.1 4.3.5 5.6.2 9.2.2 9.3.4 9.5.3 9.6.2 10.2.4	Object to the Airport Link project for the following reasons: ■ The exhaust chimneys will deliver exhaust fumes over Kedron State High School. There will be more traffic on Gympie and Stafford Road with increased fumes resulting. Children and adults exposure to fumes will increase; ■ The use of filtration in the chimney would benefit the project's capacity to meet the objective of "seeking to improve local air quality along the corridor"; ■ A large number of truckloads of spoil will be taken from the Kedron worksite over a four year period resulting in more air pollution for children at Kedron State High School and also dust and noise pollution; and ■ Airport Link will increase traffic on Brisbane's road network. Both children and adults will be affected for a project which is not in the interests of Brisbane.

Submission No.		88; 89; 90; 91; 92; 99; 113 -129
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
3 4 5 9 10 14	3.5.1 4.3.5 5.6.2 9.2.2 9.3.4 9.5.3 9.6.2 10.2.4 14.3.2	Object to the Airport Link project for the following reasons: ▪ The exhaust chimneys will deliver exhaust fumes over Kedron State High School. Increased traffic on Gympie and Stafford Roads will increase pollution. Children and adults exposure to fumes will increase; ▪ The use of filtration in the chimney would benefit the project's capacity to meet the objective of ""seeking to improve local air quality along the corridor"; ▪ A large number of truckloads of spoil will be taken from the Kedron worksite over a four year period resulting in more air pollution for children at Kedron State High School and also dust and noise pollution. Areas for sports and play will be lost due to construction; and ▪ Airport Link will increase traffic on Brisbane's road network. Both children and adults will be affected for a project that is not in the interests of Brisbane.
14	14.3.1 14.3.2 14.3.4	Concerned about the impact on local community. People will lose their homes and businesses and those who are left will have to live with the construction process. Project will compromise health and safety of children at Kedron State High School (Sub. 88)
9 14	9.2.2 14.3.1	Daughters have asthma and the dust and trucks moving around will cause pollution and inflame their condition. The construction process will be dangerous. This is a tunnel we don't want (Sub. 90)
9 14	9.2.2 14.3.1	Son attends Kedron State High School and has a medical condition (anaphylaxis). Pollutants such as dust are a major concern for his health. Impact no his well-being and attendance at the school is a real concern (Sub. 92)
2 5 9 10 14	2.3.4 5.6. 9.6.2 10.3.2 14.3.1 14.3.2	Construction and operation of Airport Link will have a negative impact on residents that live near the portals. Ability to enjoy peace and amenity of my home is likely to be significantly reduced by increased traffic, noise and air pollution. The project is unlikely to reduce congestion and will perpetuate and worsen car dependence (Sub. 99)
2 9	2.3.4 9.6.2	Object to Airport Link because of the damage to health of children attending Kedron State High School. Money would be best spent on alternate projects (i.e. public transport) (Sub. 114)
14	14.3.2	Object to Airport Link because of the disruption to the communities (Sub. 120)
5	5.7.1	Object to Airport Link because of trucks and disruption to local streets and using heaps of water to construct the tunnel (Sub.129)

Submission No.		93
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
4	4.2.5	The Mews Body Corporate strongly opposes the proposed Airport Link, particularly in its current design. Particularly opposed to the current design of the southern connection for Airport Link, which will involve major elevated roads running approximately 10 metres from units in the Mews. Recommend that the project should not proceed. If the project does proceed, strongly submit conditions be imposed which restrict the impact of the project on The Mews.

4 14 21	4.2.5 4.3.15 14.3.1 21.2.2	The Mews is currently impacted by the ICB and NSBT connections which are due to be constructed shortly. To design Airport Link such that major new road structures will run closer to The Mews than existing road structures and higher than the proposed NSBT connection is outrageous and will ruin the for the majority of residents of the complex.
		The proposed Airport Link will have significant impacts on The Mews, during both construction and operation. The EIS acknowledges some of these impacts but does not do justice to the detriment this complex will suffer if the project proceeds without significant measures to protect amenity. If the project proceeds, conditions of approval must specifically restrict the of Airport Link on The Mews.
10	10.2.4 10.3.2	Daytime noise during the construction and operation of the Airport Link is likely to disrupt the ability of hospital workers [residents] to sleep, and will disturb the quiet enjoyment of other residents of the complex. Unless properly mitigated, construction and traffic noise will force residents permanently inside their units, losing the ability to use their spacious balcony areas.
15	15.3.1	The construction of multiple elevated road structures and connections will significantly impact on the visual amenity of and views from units in The Mews. Headlights from vehicles will also shine into numerous units in the complex
9	9.2.2 9.3.2	Concerned about impact of construction and additional traffic on air quality for residents of The Mews - particularly those with respiratory problems. Also concerned about potential damage to the mechanical ventilation systems, dirt particles in the air, exhaust fumes and the 'blanketing' of the complex with dust during construction.
10	10.1.2 10.2.4	Concerned about vibration from the operation of heavy machinery and blasting during construction. Effects of vibration are particularly potent for residents with health problems who choose to live close to the RBWH.
10 21	15.1.1 21.2.2 21.3.5	The area immediately east of The Mews is becoming one of the biggest road and tunnel connections in Brisbane. The Mews is proximate to, and affected by, traffic on Bowen Bridge Road and the ICB. Noise levels in numerous units [from the ICB] are already beyond acceptable levels. To add significant traffic flows with the NSBT and the Airport Link will push noise levels in the complex to completely unacceptable levels. Residents also currently have intermittent 'peaking' noise impacts from take-off and landing of helicopters at the RBWH.
21	21.3.5	Construction of the NSBT is currently affecting The Mews and is expected to run until around 2011. With construction of the Airport Link, The Mews will be adjacent to construction sites for the next 10 years.
15	15.1.4 15.3.1	The elevated structures of Airport Link (at up to 17m) will replace those city views with the view of a major roadway. Eastern side units will close to elevated structures. Without appropriate and significant urban design measures the visual amenity for residents of the complex will suffer tremendously.
9 10 14 15 21	9.3.2 10.2.4 10.3.2 14.3.2 15.3.1 21.3.5 21.3.7	The NSBT and proposed Airport Link involve elevated structures that will run very close (20m) to the common area. This will have major impacts in terms of air quality, construction noise, operation noise, visual amenity and privacy. The amenity of these common areas will be lost completely.
4	4.2.5	One of our biggest areas of objection is the design of Airport Link and the elevated road structures running about 10 m away from The Mews. Consideration should be given to alternative routes with reduced impacts on The Mews, including possibility of an elevated structure parallel to the proposed Busway path and then connecting past Enoggera Creek.

9 10 15 19	9.2.1 9.3.3 10.2.3 10.2.4 10.3.1 10.3.2 15.3.1	Consideration should be given to appropriate conditions to minimise impacts on The Mew, including: ■ Installation of permanent noise monitoring equipment at The Mews; ■ Regular monitoring of noise levels, reporting and penalties for exceeding agreed noise levels; ■ Monitoring of air quality during construction and operation and penalties; ■ Construction and operation noise levels at The Mews not to exceed reasonable noise levels as per accepted guidelines; ■ Use of noise barriers, sound absorption material, planting and other urban design solutions to minimise the impacts at The Mews; ■ Monthly meetings between the Mews Body Corporate, BCC and the selected contractor during construction; ■ Acoustic treatment of balcony areas in all units in The Mews; ■ Use of superior road surfaces to minimise traffic noise; ■ The establishment of a committee compromising representatives from BCC, the State Government, the successful contractor for Airport Link and NSBT contractor (LBBJV) to monitor the community impact and provide a single point of consultation; and ■ Formation of a community liaison group for Bowen Hills.
		Also request noise barriers on the ICB and NSBT near The Mews.

Submission No.		94
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
21	21.2.2	The Airport Link project will impose greater impact on RNA's amenities and operations, both during construction and after completion.
21	21.2.2 21.3.5	The impact of construction activities for both the NSBT and Airport Link will necessitate changes to the implementation program of the RNA Masterplan, and impact from the completed traffic network could result in portions of the RNA Masterplan being non-viable with the need for reassessment and changes.
5 21	5.6.5 21.2.2 21.3.5 21.3.7	While the NSBT will create significant change to the existing street system in the vicinity of the RNA, the Airport Link introduces further changes. Implications for the RNA of proposed works on O'Connell Terrace included ■ Potential loss of kerbside parking along O'Connell Terrace; ■ Potential loss of access into the RNA site from O'Connell Terrace near the old alignment of Evans Street due to the presence of the off-ramp. Relocation of access further east may be required; ■ Need to use Sneyd Street and Campbell Street in order to travel northbound along Bowen Bridge Road as the right turn from O'Connell Terrace would be removed; ■ Elevated Campbell Street on-ramp may create adverse noise and visual impacts on the RNA site; and ■ Presence of the motorway on and off ramps connecting into O'Connell Terrace dramatically changes the functionality of the street. Closing O'Connell Street at Sneyd Street and relocating the RNA access may create more appropriate local road hierarchy for the area adjacent to the RNA site.
4 5	4.3.18 4.3.19 5.7.1	Impacts are expected to be significant during the construction phase, particularly of spoil haulage trucks. The Traffic Management Plan for construction will need to ensure haulage route does not impact on the annual Ekka or other events, which may require closure of Gregory Terrace.

Submission No.		95
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 9	3.5.1 9.3.5 9.6.2	Object to an unfiltered emission stack being located at the end of Alma Street. Understand the exhaust stack will be equivalent in height to a ten storey building. What is to prevent emissions from settling on nearby homes? What assurances that there will be no health risk to residents or damage to the environment from unfiltered exhaust emissions? What are the bases of these assurances?
Apndx B		Have become increasingly cynical of the information provided to residents. Whilst we do not object to the link, believe that the Government and Council have a duty to be honest in their dealings with the public.

Submission No.		96
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 9 16	3.5.1 9.6.2 16.3.5	Objects to the proposed exhaust vent at Clayfield, as it will cause pollution which we do not want our son exposed to in the future. The tenants who currently live may not wish to live there. The vent will devalue the property, which is an investment towards my retirement.

Submission No.		97
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
4 5 9	4.2.5 5.3.5 5.6.2 9.5.3	Opposed to the Airport Link for the following reasons: ■ The resulting increase in traffic on the East West link will only increase the already over taxed Gateway/ Airport Drive roundabout, resulting in further traffic delay and increase vehicle emissions; ■ The proposed ventilation stacks do not have any filtration technologies installed. The resulting concentrated emissions will have a real detrimental effect on homes; and ■ Increasing traffic on Sandgate Road north of the tunnel will increase delay and vehicle related emissions.

Submission No.		98
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
9	9.3.3	Kalinga Community Group (KCG) commissioned a report by QUT's International Laboratory for Air Quality and Health to provide an independent assessment of the EIS air quality outcomes. Request that the matters raised by the ILAQH be used to establish conditions on approval of the project. The KCG also recommend that a peer review of the air quality modelling and no-filtration option by a committee to be chaired by the Chief Scientist, and including representation of QUT's ILAQH and that the committee establish benchmarks which guarantee ambient air quality around the ventilation complexes.
9	9.3.5	The main conclusion from the review of the report is that the particle concentrations predicted by modelling appear to be unrealistically low. Predictions of the concentrations of gaseous pollutants do not raise major concerns.
9	9.3.4	The modelling predictions for gaseous compounds and particles were performed differently. Particle concentrations were only calculated in terms of the contribution of local roads to PM concentrations thus PM concentrations predicted indicate only the impact of the modelled sources to the concentrations.
9	9.3.4	The prediction of gaseous pollutant concentrations is within the same order of magnitude as the measurements. The largest difference was observed in the prediction of the annual average NO2 concentration. However the complexity of NO/NO2 conversion is well explained in the EIS and the significant difficulty in calculation of NO2 concentration is acknowledged.
9	9.3.4	The PM10 concentrations predicted due to motor vehicles using the tunnel and regional surface roads are lower than it would be expected. A comparison between annual PM10 concentrations at Woolloongabba and Rocklea shows that the Airport Link model appears to significantly underestimate the contribution of the roadways and the local sources.
9	9.3.4	It is unlikely that bushfires and dust storms would have such a dramatic impact on the annual PM10 average that its background value was not included in the assessment. It is unclear why no comparison was made between the expected total PM10 concentration with NEPM standards and WHO health guideline values. The assessment process seriously under predicts the concentrations. Such an under prediction also sheds doubts about the reliability of any PM predictions of PM10 or PM2.5 concentrations.
9	9.1.2 9.3.4	Comparing increases in PM10 concentrations to the air quality goal gives the impression that PM concentrations are of no concern. However, since PM concentrations already exceed the NEPM standard, a development that leads to increased emissions will compound an already unacceptable situation in those areas. This point has not been emphasised strongly enough in the assessment.
9	9.1.2 9.6.2	It is correct that there are no substantial difference between PM2.5 concentrations in clean and more polluted locations. However, higher PM concentrations are observed close to traffic sources. This implies that PM2.5 might not be the best metric to assess the contribution of vehicle-generated particles. Ultra fine particles, for which the report did not conduct a comprehensive assessment, is an important particulate matter metric to consider in relation to health implications.
9	9.1.2	Based on a large body of data from measurements in Brisbane in various locations in the proximity to busy traffic, the difference between urban background and busy urban locations should be much larger than the maximum of 2500 particles cm-3 as indicated in the EIS.
9	9.3.4	The lack of a signal due to the ventilation outlets indicates that the emission from the source has been underestimated. Much higher concentrations were reported in a measurement study at the Woolloongabba busway tunnel.

9	9.3.3 9.3.4	Only average emission factors at 50km/h are used for the modelling assessment and thus the effects of intersections and stop-start traffic, which can result in significantly elevated concentrations, are ignored. It is likely that this will result in an under prediction in the pollutant concentrations.
9	9.3.4	The PM10 emission factor used appears to be too low. Tunnel studies have shown that average emission factors for a similar vehicle mix is about 6 times higher than indicated. This could be partially responsible for the underestimation of PM10 concentrations in this study.
9	9.1.1 9.3.3	The modelling approach implemented in this study is appropriate for the regional impact assessment, however the approach is not adequate for assessment of the roadways on a local scale. Some other concerns in relation to the modelling approach are: ■ Since approximately 20% of the wind speeds are below 1 m/s the suitability of this model to the study could be questioned; and ■ The number of sources included in the modelling appears to be small and thus the concentrations appear likely to be underestimated.

Submission No.		100
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
2	2.3.3	Comparisons to comparable projects/ solutions must be made in order to determine if this is the best alternative, particularly: ■ Changes to public transport frequency; ■ More parking and bus and rail stations; ■ More facilities in commercial buildings for cyclists; ■ Change traffic light sequencing to improve traffic flow; ■ Reducing number of traffic lights per kilometre to improve traffic flow; ■ Airport Link does not meet the project objective to; ■ Improve transport sustainability in Brisbane's inner northern suburbs; ■ Ease traffic congestion on key routes. The project will create congestion on the key routes of Gympie, Stafford Road & the East West Arterial. The project should not proceed unless the congestion problems the project will cause are addressed & rectified; and ■ Facilitate a better balance between public transport & private vehicle use.
2 5	2.1.1 2.1.2 2.3.3 5.3.5	Airport Link does not fit within the framework of the Transport Plan for Brisbane 2002-2016. It reinforces car dependency and does not 'encourage more sustainable mode choices'. Airport Link as part of the TransApex plan does not "achieve balance between delivery of infrastructure, behavioural change programs and service improvements". Facilitate a better balance between public transport and private vehicle use. Road and associated infrastructure is being funded disproportionately more than public transport, which is contrary to what the community wants
9	9.3.4 9.5.3	Airport Link does not meet the project objective to seek to improve local air quality along the corridor. Local air quality in the areas adjacent to the proposed exhaust chimneys will deteriorate. Emissions from the Kedron outlet will cause children attending Kedron State High School to be exposed to more motor vehicle emissions. A system of filtering emissions must be included in the project scope especially as the exhaust chimney at Kedron is located close to schools.
2	2.4.2	Airport Link does not meet the project objective to deliver an affordable & cost effective solution (with appropriate toll levels). The project should not proceed unless tolls are set at no more than $2 per trip for the entire length of the Airport Link with a tolling period of no more than 35 years.

Submission No.		101
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
2	2.3.3	Comparisons to comparable projects/ solutions must be made in order to determine if this is the best alternative, particularly: ■ Improve frequency of rail and bus services; ■ More parking and bus and rail stations; ■ Provide feeder bus links and bike paths to railway stations; ■ More facilities in commercial buildings for cyclists; and ■ Improve AirTrain service.
2 5	2.3.3 5.6.2 5.6.6	Airport Link does not meet the project objective to: ■ Improve opportunities & travel times for public transport. The project must ensure unhindered continuity of public transport at tunnel portals and beyond; ■ Ease traffic congestion on key routes; and ■ Reduce through traffic and heavy vehicles through suburban streets. If people are not going to use the toll roads and the surface roads continue to be congested and rat running will continue.
9 10 11 14 15	9.2.2 10.2.4 11.2.1 14.3.2 15.3.2	Airport Link does not meet the objective to seek to improve urban amenity & community safety for the following reasons: ■ The open space along Kedron Brook behind Kedron State High will become a large construction zone bringing with it all the associated noise, disruption & dust pollution especially during the removal of spoil from the site. Existing playing fields for sport & student recreation will also be lost; ■ A grove of Hoop Pine and eucalypt trees at the eastern end of Kalinga Park will be lost; ■ The location of 30m high unfiltered exhaust chimney close to schools, parks & residential areas; and ■ Personal security issues associated with the elevated structure or bridge over the Kedron Brook at Gympie Road creating a poorly lit underpass that would be unsafe to walk or cycle through after dark."
5	5.6.2	Airport Link does not meet the object to enhance the environment on the grounds that the project promotes the use of carbon intensive transport and will lead to an increase in traffic volume during both construction and operation.
9	9.3.4 9.5.3	Airport Link does not meet the project objective to seek to improve local air quality along the corridor. Local air quality in the areas adjacent to the proposed exhaust chimneys will deteriorate. Emissions from the Kedron outlet will cause children attending Kedron State High School to be exposed to more motor vehicle emissions. A system of filtering emissions must be included in the project scope especially as the exhaust chimney at Kedron is located close to schools.

Submission No.		102
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
		Appreciate requirement for an upgrade road transport infrastructure, but consider the impact upon my and my children's lives of the proposed Airport Link is untenable

9 10 14 15 21 Apndx B	9.2.2 9.3.4 10.2.4 10.3.2 14.3.1 15.3.1 21.3.5	Consideration should be given to: ■ The traffic noise and air quality impacts on residents; ■ The dust and construction noise which is already at excessive levels due to NSBT; ■ The loss of, use and enjoyment; ■ All relevant circumstances including those of the residents at The Mews; ■ The lack of the cooperation of the LBBJV in monitoring dust/noise as requested by The Mews, which has significantly undermined the value of the 'community consultation process'; and ■ That the BCC has been negligent in its duty to disclose the proposed plans of my property.
10 21	10.2.4 21.3.5	The works to be carried out adjacent to my home will result in exposure to a cumulative total of 238 weeks of excessive noise levels. EIS also anticipates night works for a total of 28 weeks, including within 10 m of The Mews. This is in addition the already committed NSBT works.
21	21.3.5 21.3.7	The EIS fails to acknowledge or provide due recognition on the cumulative impacts on my residence. Further consideration should be given to the residents affected by the implementation of all three projects (Northern Busway, NSBT and Airport Link), which "will result in a changed and more intense urban form" "for which no effective mitigation measure is apparent
10 21	10.3.2 21.3.5	Concern with the lack of viable visual and acoustic solutions to road traffic noise from the elevated bridge's and surface roads. EIS refers to attempt to maintain 'status quo' for acceptable traffic noise rather than planning criteria. Concerned that no serious effort will be made to provide the best possible outcomes for residents who have already lost the right to quiet enjoyment of the amenities of The Mews due to NSBT.
		Disappointed with consultation undertaken by the Rivercity Project Manager. The Mews has made repeated requests for LBBJV to install the appropriate equipment to carry out dust and noise monitoring.
9 10 14 19	9.2.2 10.2.4 10.3.2 14.3.1	Request the following measures to mitigate impacts of Airport Link construction: ■ Additional cover on 50m2 of outdoor courtyard to minimise dust, construction noise and ongoing traffic noise. This area is now unusable during NSBT construction hours; ■ Acoustic treatment to one bedroom window and two sliding glass doors (to bedrooms); ■ Upgrading of individual ducted air conditioning system to compensate for the increased use and excessive dust; ■ Compensation for personal hardship; and ■ That a coordinated approach be instigated for The Mews residents for all three major infrastructure projects.

Submission No.		103
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
9	3.5.2 9.5.1 9.5.2 9.5.3	The option to exclude treatment of air emitted from ventilation stacks appears to be based entirely on the predicted values from a quantitative air quality model being below target values. The base argument of using target values is flawed as based in the concept of acceptable decline in amenity rather than taking opportunity to consider potential improvement from the proposal.
9	9.3.3	Little surprise that air quality model was unable to detect a great change due to filtration options as the model appears to be uncelebrated and there is no quantitative reporting of how well it could be validated against real data. Simple mass balance computation can demonstrate if you trap and remove pollution, the net impact on air quality will be positive. Question why the Queensland Government would prefer option that increases local air pollution, when trivial additional expense would result in an improvement to air quality.

9	9.3.3	Methods of communicating the outputs of air quality modelling are scientifically flawed and disingenuous. ■ There is no quantitative presentation of model error. Presentation of absolute air quality values without a clear quantification of the likely errors is a disingenuous and poor attempt at communicating modelled results; ■ There is no presentation of calibration or validation of results. There is no basis by which to independently assess the effectiveness of the model at predicting the current air quality; and ■ Presentation of absolute values is in error. If the model cannot predict the current air quality, it is clearly poor at predicting future scenarios. The only appropriate method of reporting is to present the relative change in air quality values under alternate scenarios.
9	9.3.3	Request reply as to why air quality modelling did not include: ■ A quantitative prediction of the likely error in the modelled results; ■ Robust and independent review of the performance of the model against known data; and ■ Presentation of relative change under alternate scenarios.
3 15	3.5.1 3.5.2 15.3.4	The ventilation outlet at Alma Road in the middle of a residential area is an entirely inappropriate location and offers no improved air quality outcomes than an alternate location within Toombul Shopping Centre. A ventilation outlet at Toombul Shopping Centre has a lower aesthetic impact on residents. The EIS does not provide a review and discussion of the alternate ventilation outlet option and does not effectively communicate why the site at Alma Road was chosen over Toombul Shopping Centre. Please advise the community the basis for selecting the preferred ventilation location and how their input was included in the decision making process. Encourage a rethink and re-evaluation of the ventilation outlet site.
5	5.2.5 5.6.7	Connection to the East-West Arterial at Toombul will present a major pedestrian obstacle for the local community, particularly children and the elderly. The proposed transition structures would create an additional major barrier and removal of pedestrian access across Kedron Brook will effectively form a barrier to pedestrian movement along Sandgate Road from Clayfield to Nundah, and under the Sandgate Road Kedron Brook Bridge to Toombul.
4	4.2.5	The preferred option is to maintain current surface conditions at Kalinga Park, West-West Arterial and Sandgate Road intersection to maintain all the inherent value of Kalinga Park and maintain pedestrian connectivity between Clayfield, Nundah and Toombul. Alternatives should be considered for these transition structures and intersection, including: ■ No entry/exit to Sandgate Road south of the intersection. Removes the need for an entry transition structure through Kalinga Park; ■ Surface level entry of southbound Sandgate Road traffic to airport link is via a bridge structure that exits at Sandgate Road north of the East-West Arterial Road and loops to join the East West arterial westbound lane east of Sandgate Road; and ■ Tunnel exit traffic heading north onto Sandgate Road would exit via a tunnel under Kedron Brook and emerge to join the northbound lane of Sandgate Road."

Submission No.		104
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
2	2.3.1	The approach is a positive step in delivering a key element for Brisbane's road network solution. BAC recognises the need for the region to have an adequate level of supporting infrastructure. Accordingly BAC has initiated a massive and unprecedented $2.2b infrastructure investment program in on-airport aviation facilities.
5	5.2.2	The New Parallel Runway project EIS and Major Development Plan recognises poor connectivity between Brisbane Airport, the CBD and western areas, and a general dropping trend in travel speed, reflecting a higher environmental cost.

5	5.2.2 5.6.2 5.6.3	BAC supports many benefits that result from Airport Link. Direct connectivity to the Gateway Arterial would improve the arterial orbital route. Since a significant proportion of freight originates or is destined for the Gateway Arterial, the link to this national highway would prove as beneficial.
5	5.2.2 5.6.1 5.6.3	The present the level of service is considered to be F at the approaches to Nudgee Road intersection. It would be difficult to see how a tolled facility such as Airport Link would attract use given the travel time benefits of the continuous link from Ipswich or Lutwyche, or Stafford Roads could be undergone at the Gateway to the coasts and ports. Even with marginal demand increases the EIS modelling suggests on this link, peak conditions will be intolerable and will severely impact patronage of that link.
4	4.2.5	BAC suggests consideration of connecting the Airport Link to the new Northern Interchange of the Gateway Upgrade Project would potentially have the benefits of: ■ Direct connection of the motorway systems; and ■ Construction delivery facilitation in largely undeveloped zones.
3 11	3.6.2 11.1.8	Viola Place is not available as a spoil disposal site and from a flora and fauna value perspective, is now completely disturbed, largely developed and in fact now 100% development committed, and has no habitat value.

Submission No.		105
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
2	2.2.2 2.3.3	The EIS is founded on the approach of comparing the 'do-nothing' approach to the Airport Link approach. Nobody expects doing nothing to result in anything but a continuation of the relative decline of transport alternatives while low occupant vehicle trips climb. The EIS claims that there will benefits from the integration with the Northern Busway and a surface traffic reduction that would improve local pedestrian and cycling environments. However, Airport Link will encourage people to drive and is therefore at cross-purposes with the busway. The project will increase the number and length of trips and therefore increase congestion and lack of safety and psychological discouragement to cyclists and pedestrians.
5	5.6.1 5.6.2 5.6.3	Real solutions are well known. Professional literature establishes strongly that trips will be generated to the expanded road space and therefore the new road networks will still become congested. The EIS admits that Gympie Road, Stafford Road and the East-West Arterial will experience increased traffic as a result of the project. However, the Greens do not believe that the increases will be limited to these roads. NSBT Change Report demonstrated blowouts in traffic on numerous roads. The same will occur with Airport Link.
5	5.6.4	EIS fraudulently refuses to bring into view citywide impacts and meaninglessly moots trip time improvements through pieces of the proposed infrastructure. The EIS claims the infrastructure will lead to increases in vehicle speed compared with a 'do nothing' option. There is very little likelihood that the tiny improvements will materialise and every likelihood that a decline will ensue as increased traffic takes hold.
5	5.4.4	The EIS evades presentation of data based on reduction of low occupant vehicle trips which can be achieved by implementing policies which achieve modal shifts
2	2.3.4	At the very minimum, an equivalent expenditure on Travel Demand Management and other elements of an alternative relevant components, should have been a comparative case. What is most glaringly obvious is how radically the Airport Link directly competes with existing, mooted and proposed public transport infrastructure and services. EIS also identifies target destinations that can and should be served by transit based solutions and should be subject to disincentives to car based entry, particularly the CBD.

16	16.8	The proposal is a gross and irresponsible waste of public resources. The money handed over in tolls is a wasted tax and should be drawn into public finances to be applied to useful projects. This is a double waste - a bad project and the lost opportunity of the provision of these resources for public transport, infrastructure and staffing, travel demand management and Translink based service improvements. Proposal is in direct competition to the Airtrain, which should be returned to public hands early so that deficiencies can be remedied

Submission No.		106
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
2	2.3.4	Would like to be convinced that encouraging a great deal more private vehicle transport is a good long-term solution for Brisbane. Other cities have chosen to prioritise spending on public infrastructure and have achieved far better & more viable results. EIS has projected demand to 2026, will more roads be required after this?
2	2.4.1	The Airport Link project is justified by an increase in liveability, which is assessed by two main indicators of accessibility & prosperity. This considers social & economic aspects, however there is no consideration of the environment. The solution to Brisbane's transport woes needs to take environmental concerns more seriously as improved accessibility will be worthless & prosperity will be in jeopardy if the environment is degraded
5	5.6.7	Concerned as to how pedestrian and cyclist connections will be maintained or improved through the massive infrastructure proposed at the portals.
15 16	15.3.4 16.3.5	The area has already experienced the beginnings of the economic "fall out" of being near the portal and ventilation station through property sales stalling and values stagnating. Would like to know more about mitigation measures around the portals for residents.
3 15	3.5.2 15.3.4	Severely question whether a 10-storey tower structure with a large block attached into an almost historic double storey residential neighbourhood at Clayfield achieves the goal of "integrating the infrastructure…into local neighbourhoods to retain the sense of place". Believes it is socially destructive and would be more suited at the Toombul shopping complex or nearer the Airport railway.
15	15.3.4	Supports the requirement for the ventilation stations to be of multiple use if at all possible as unoccupied infrastructure invites vandalism and general disrespect
11	11.3.2	The proposed mitigation measures for impacts on flora are reasonable but do not go far enough. The project is a rare chance to bring back some balance.

Submission No.		107
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
8 11 20	8.2.2 11.3.1 20.3.4	A Number of issues have been adequately addressed in the EIS while further information on a number of matters concerning urban design, flora and fauna and open space is required. Pleased to see commitments in the EIS which reflect KBCN concerns on Kedron Brook, particularly at the Sandgate Road portal. Other areas we consider have been sympathetically addressed in the EIS include: ■ Community involvement in re-vegetation and regeneration along Kedron Brook; ■ A commitment to rehabilitation and re-vegetation of key sites in riparian areas along the Brook; and ■ The proposed Schulz canal wetlands restoration.

2 5	2.2.2 5.4.4	Challenge the contention that massive investment into private vehicle transport is going to provide a long-term sustainable solution to balance economic, environmental and social goals. Improving road infrastructure will lead to a substantial increase in road traffic. The Airport Link project is benchmarking against unrealistic travel time expectations. Recommend modelling for travel demand be re-examined taking into consideration the relative benefits that would accrue from a similar level of investment in infrastructure for other forms of transport. This analysis should take into account the comparative advantage of time, cost, convenience, safety etc for road travel to be examined for roads as well as other transport modalities.
2	2.1.4	The document does not provide adequate detail on the 'liveability indicators'. Would appreciate further information on each liveability indicator, as it is possible that the Airport Link does not provide a net gain in this area against indicators such as a green space and air quality.
9	9.3.4 9.3.5	There is considerable community anxiety regarding air quality and it is unclear whether this analysis will be sufficient to settle the issue. Recommend a commitment to ongoing consultation with an expert panel so that any concerns regarding air quality can be adequately addressed.
11	11.3.1	There will be substantially increased deleterious effects on natural ecosystem from noise, light, pollution and generally increased activity near the portals. Recommends an examination of additional mitigation measures for the natural environment.
16	16.4.3 16.4.4	Economic analysis for the project appears to have been done in isolation. When compared with other potential infrastructure projects would the Airport Link still provide value for money? Recommend that a similar economic analysis be undertaken for other transport options.
4 15	4.2.2 15.3.2 15.3.4	Structures adjacent to the brook or its floodway designed to keep out a 1 in 10,000 year flood need to be both individually and collectively environmentally friendly. A more physical indication is required of how structures to the Brook might look and work.
3 15	3.5.2	The proposals for buildings and stacks should fit within local character. Current designs put much larger structures than currently exist at the planned stack locations, negatively impacting on the existing environments. Re-examined location of stacks from all aspects, not only operational efficiency.
11 20	11.3.1	It is not clear what comprehensive landscaping aims to achieve and whether or not this will be fauna friendly. Landscaping needs to be designed to improve the habitat value for native fauna. The landscape and re-vegetation plan proposed [for Kedron Brook] lacks vigour and does not provide any definitive proposal for improved quality of vegetation and the creation of suitable habitat for native wildlife. A detailed landscape and re-vegetation plan needs to be included in a final proposal to achieve the following: ■ Improved value of the waterway as an acknowledged wildlife corridor; ■ Detailed re-vegetation plan; ■ Link between re-vegetation plan and improved habitat available for native animals; ■ Plan for continued water quality; and ■ No net reduction in green space.
11	11.1.1 11.1.6	Challenge the assertion that habitat condition at Sandgate Road is poor noting that the area is tidal and at times hosts native flora and fauna. The criteria used for rating the aquatic habitat condition and conservation value needs to be further explained with clear parameters and the comparative rating system justified.

Submission No.		108
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
2 9	2.2 9.7.3 9.7.4	The Queensland Conservation Council believes that the EIS contains unsubstantiated assertions and analyses that are underpinned by dubious assumptions. It believes that the EIS fails to adequately address: ■ Greenhouse gas emissions and climate change; ■ Issues related to toxic vehicle emissions in-tunnel and around smoke stacks; and ■ Alternative scenarios and reliability test information, particularly within context of rationale for development.
9	9.7.3 9.7.4	The estimate of greenhouse gas emissions is probably an underestimate. Figures given for the consumption for the Australian car fleet refer to a document that doesn't appear in the reference list and appear to overstate the fuel efficiency of the Australian car fleet by at least 10%. It is not expected that there will be any improvements in the efficiency of the national car fleet in the near future. The EIS has no examples of how high-energy intensity building materials will be substituted for materials that have lower energy intensity. The EIS fails to correctly conceptualise the seriousness of the environmental impact of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change, and trivialises these emissions by stating that they are only a small proportion of Queensland's total emissions.
9	9.3.3 9.6.2	Despite the Airport Link project being a direct contributor to vehicle emissions that would not otherwise be released, the EIS downplays these emissions. The discussion of regional health impacts disregards people closest to the smoke stacks who will suffer the impacts of 'concentrated' vehicle emissions. Introducing smoke stacks will effectively create three "point-sources" of pollution. The overall levels of pollution will also rise with Airport Link above those levels without Airport Link.
1 5	1.4.1 5.4.4	The EIS makes assumptions regarding the use and expected increased volumes of traffic on Brisbane's roads. The EIS does not adequately address the underlying assumptions that are made to support the case for this development. This statement is unsubstantiated conjecture, and made in the absence of any attempt to comparatively model alternate travel options to and from the Airport (i.e. no attempt has been made to compare the impact of the Airport Link against the effects of improving the currently sub-standard Airtrain service). Testing the effectiveness of Airport Link against the impact of adequately improving services on existing infrastructure would bring the EIS more in line with its requirement to conceptualise the plan within the IRTP. Predictions of private vehicle use and increased air transport use ignore impacts of factors such as peak oil, carbon trading, fuel subsidy redeployment, or Kyoto protocol obligations. All of these factors that impact upon the viability and relative environmental impact of Airport Link have been ignored in the EIS.
		View of the QCC that the Airport Link project should not proceed.

Submission No.		109
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
14	14.3.1	The impact of Airport Link will significantly change my suburb and impact on us personally.

3 9 10 11 13 15 16	3.5.1 9.1.1 9.3.3 9.5.3 9.6.2 10.2.1 11.2.1 13.3.2 15.3.4 16.3.5	Have specific concerns relating to: ■ Ventilation complex location; ■ Destruction of Kalinga Park East; ■ Effects on public health; ■ Health concerns associated with the ventilation complex location/s; ■ Work site location and impacts on homes and schools (noise and dust); ■ Air quality modelling shortcomings; ■ Cultural heritage of Kalinga Park; ■ Property value impacts; ■ Impact on lifestyle and urban amenity; and ■ Lack of tunnel emission filtration.
14 16	14.3.1 16.3.5	We believe the current tunnel plan will lead to a very significant lowering of our quality of living not to mention a substantial lowering of the value of our property.
3 14 16 15	3.5.2 14.3.1 16.3.5 15.3.4	Apart from the effects on Kalinga Park and disruption for years during construction, the biggest issue is the proposed location of the ventilation complex. Placing such a large complex in the middle of residential homes will have a devastating impact on everyone near it both financially and lifestyle. Our home will be fundamentally worthless and this complex will destroy the suburb's amenity and our enjoyment of our home and the street. We request much more detailed consideration is given to a more appropriate location for the ventilation complex [at Clayfield].

Submission No.		110
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**

Submission No.		111
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
14	14.3.1	The Airport Link EIS minimises the impact the project will have on those who live in the vicinity of the proposed Sandgate Road portal.
3 15 16	3.5.1 3.5.2 15.3.4 16.3.5	Dispute that sites for the ventilation towers were indicated before the EIS. While there was some discussion of ventilation stations, the sitting of these stations was not indicated. The [Clayfield] ventilation site is in a residential area.

3 4 9 10 14 15 16 3	3.5.1 3.5.2 4.4.1 4.4.2 9.1.2 9.3.4 10.3.2 14.3.2 15.3.4 16.3.5	Issues with the ventilation station at Sandgate Road: ■ The site proposed is to close to residential properties. Other options are sited away from residential sites. The EIS does not comment on the impact of this sitting but the impact on the residential area and aesthetics and home values will be considerably impacted; ■ The effectiveness of the ventilation station is not addressed with regard to the localised impact on the air quality; ■ The maintenance of the ventilation stations is not discussed. No indication given in the EIS of the regularity or optimum required maintenance to ensure safe and effective operation of the stations; ■ The noise impact on the local area or amelioration is not discussed. This matter should be further examined from point of view of those living close to these stations. ■ The ongoing security of the ventilation stations is not addressed. Should be required to indicate how the building is to be maintained and ensure the locality is not diminished by the presence of graffiti; and ■ The quality of emissions from the ventilation stations is not addressed for those living close to the emission points.
9	9.1.2 9.3.4	It appears that no testing has been undertaken at this site and the impact of the ventilation station cannot be measured against the current pollution levels at this site as there are no local measures to compare.
4 10	4.3.10 4.3.19 10.2.4	Issues relating to construction at Sandgate Road: ■ 24hour construction impacting negatively on residential areas. Impact would be reduced in work program allowed for quiet at night; ■ Spoil removal routes are not finalised or mandated. EIS should designate route for spoil removal that would minimise impact on residential areas.; and ■ Spoilage removal through the residential areas should not be permitted.
16	16.3.5	Impact on property value is already being felt in the area. The value of homes owned in the area close to the Sandgate Road portal and ventilation station will be negatively impacted on should the project proceed. Concerns in relation to effects on property values include no consideration of: ■ The impact of the proposal on the economic impact for local homeowners during construction and operation; and ■ The impact on the elderly homeowners who need to sell their property to access aged care.
15	15.3.4	The construction of the portal and the ventilation station at the Sandgate Road site will impact on the local, visual environment to its detriment. Before any approval is given the visual impact of the ventilation station needs consideration and a detailed response provided regarding the approach to the retention of residential values of the adjacent area. Key concerns in relation to the visual environment include: ■ The juxtaposition of an industrial building with a residential environment will significantly alter the visual environment and is not satisfactorily addressed; ■ The proposal to camouflage the ventilation station is unrealistic; and ■ Other sites away from the residential precinct neat to the Sandgate Road portal needs to be considered.
14	14.3.1 14.3.2	The EIS fails to address the social impact of the change in the environment caused if this proposal proceeds. The impact can be measures and the involvement of the local community in an assessment of these impacts would give some description for consideration of the impact. The cumulative psychological impact of the project and this process has not been acknowledged. We believe that an EIS should make some effort to address this impact and the proponent should be required to address these issues through ongoing support to the individuals who identify that they have been affected.

Submission No.		112
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 9 15	3.5.1 9.6.2 15.3.4	Directly impacted by the Airport Link, particular the position of the smokestack in Alma Road. Concerned about the visual and health impact of having the tunnel in a high-density residential area.
16	16.3.5	Concerned about the detrimental effect the position of the smokestack will have on property prices in this area.
3	3.5.1	Aware the smokestack could be positioned in the carpark at Toombul Shopping Centre, and believe this would be the best solution.

Submission No.		130
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
14 16	14.3.1 16.3.5	Nothing was ever mentioned in conveyancing searches about Airport Link or the Northern Busway. Had we been given information about these projects, would have reconsidered purchasing house. Concerned and worried that Airport Link and the Northern Busway are going to cause considerable amount of loss and inconvenience, particularly that the projects are going to devalue our property. Projects will have a major impact on lifestyle and well-being whilst project is under construction.
14 19	14.3.1	The leaflets and literature received do not explain the direct impact the projects are going to have on my family and me nor do they address the fundamental issues that affect the immediate residents who have to live within the work zones during the construction period and beyond. We are unsure what the project will do for our health and for the health of our children. What compensation is available? Will homes be washed down twice a year from all of the dust and soot from construction? What happens if house is damaged as a result of construction works?
2	2.3.3	Should charge a toll for people who drive into the City. We are being put out and homes and lives destroyed so people who drive to work can be accommodated. Should upgrade public transport (i.e. extra services for people in outer suburbs).
9	9.6.2	Concern with North West Ventilation Station at Kedron. Deck will overlook this ventilation stack and we are worried about the quality of air and breathing in the concentrated exhaust fumes. Placing a ventilation outlet site within 500 m of a school is outrageous. Can't get any reassurance or guarantee at community consultations about health or quality of air.

Submission No.		131
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
2	2.3.3	Rational explanation for the Airport Link project is severely lacking. Consideration and comparison of other options to meet future demands have not been made. No consideration has been given to impacts of the well-established future increases in fuel costs and the subsequent decrease in private vehicle travel. Investigation of more cost-effective and sustainable travel options is severely lacking. Investment should be made into wide range of cost-effective, sustainable, positive strategies that would effectively achieve project objectives (i.e. public transport improvements).

9	9.5.3 9.6.2	Concerned about the proposal to utilise chimney stacks that do not incorporate the ability to filter exhaust fumes from the tunnel. Ventilation systems that ensure the minimisation of carbon dioxide and fine particulates are a priority to maintain the health of the local community. Living in a community with increased exposure to harmful exhaust fumes significantly jeopardises the health of residents, decreases the appeal of the suburb as well as the value of properties within it.
11 15	11.2.1 15.3.3	Construction of Airport Link does not meet the objective to improve urban amenity and community safety. Specifically, construction of Airport Link and associated stacks: ■ Eradicates parkland for public use along Kedron Brook, behind Kedron State High School; ■ Removes eucalypts and hoop pines; ■ Will severely disrupt the natural habitat of fauna; and ■ Will physically and visually pollute the environment.
5	5.3.5 5.6.2	Traffic congestion will increase on key roads, including Gympie Road, Stafford Road and East-West Arterial and Nudgee Road. These routes are heavily congested and the project will make it even more difficult and frustrating for people to access the Airport and Gateway.
2	2.4.1	Significant environmental, economic and social costs of the project outweigh the nominal benefits. Substantial negative impacts on local residents affected by the project and the broader community have been largely minimised or ignored by the project proponents. Request EIS is rejected and proposal developed that is more consistent with and more effectively achieves project objectives.

Submission No.		132
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
2	2.4.1	Justification for the tunnel to reduce environmental costs due to congestion cannot be upheld without analysis of environmental costs caused by construction of the tunnel (i.e. damage to environmental commons due to bulk quarrying, processing and transport of materials and the carbon based, greenhouse-affecting energy use). This constitutes serious negligence and misrepresents the tunnels benefits. Reducing environmental costs of congestion by displacing and dispersing them in environmental commons indicates failure to comprehend systemic nature of environmental risk.
16	16.4.2 16.4.3	Economic analysis is deficient and requires further work. Number of critical externality factors have been ignored, including monetary costs as a result of mining of materials for concrete (i.e. quantities of concrete required will possibly exhaust quarries requiring materials to be sourced beyond SEQ, forcing up building prices and reducing housing affordability) and energy used in construction (i.e. consumption of fossil fuel in quarrying, processing and transport).

Submission No.		133
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
14 15	14.3.1 15.3.1	Concerned that the Airport Link will have a detrimental affect on my property located at The Mews apartments from the perspective of renters still wanting to rent and lifestyle for owner-occupiers would no longer be the same. The access ramps to the tunnel will result in a wall being built alongside The Mews and that some of the properties will only see this from their window.
10	10.2.4	The amount of noise that Airport Link along with the NSBT is a considerable impact. Noise studies undertaken for the EIS based on data obtained in 2002 during the construction of The Mews.

21	21.3.4 21.3.5	Between NSBT, Northern Busway and Airport Link, construction may finish in 2011. This is a considerable period of time to expect residents of The Mews to put up with constant noise, detours and construction vehicles, night moving of materials and waste by trucks.
		Commencement of NSBT has resulted in balconies being covered in a layer of dirt to point where residents no longer using balconies as they are fed up with having to clean the furniture daily.
9 10 15 21	9.2.3 10.2.4 15.2.1 21.3.4 21.3.5 21.3.7	Recommend the following requirements to manage impacts for The Mews: ■ Noise barriers need to be installed to ensure that residents of The Mews are able to within such close proximity to a project that will excessively exceed 63 DBA; ■ Cleaning of the complex on a regular basis should be provided by the contractor; ■ Pollution monitoring should be put in place as well as noise monitoring; ■ Design of noise barriers for Airport Link need to be of the same aesthetic look as those for NSBT to blend in with the surrounding environment; ■ Continued meetings between the contractor and The Mews Body Corporate Committee to be maintained on a regular basis; and ■ Consideration to be given to identify other designs that would enable Airport Link to not be built alongside The Mews or that the road does not have to be positioned above the NSBT road and therefore eliminating the creation of an obstruction 17-20 metres high alongside units.

Submission No.		134
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
9	9.5.1 9.6.2	I wish to object to the placement of any exhaust stacks that do not contain the most advanced state of the art technology for filtration and treatment of the exhaust toxins. The health and well being of people is paramount.
14	14.4.1	The destruction of much of the KSHS oval for a period of 4 years will have an adverse affect on the students, who will be unable to use the space for school based recreation or lunch time activity.
5 10	5.5.2 10.3.2	The high truck traffic, expected to be one truck per 10 minutes for 6 days per week according to information published in the Northside Chronicle would produce unacceptable noise levels.
14	14.4.1 14.5.2	A suitable level of mitigation must be provided if the Link is to proceed. It is essential that KSHS receive fair compensation for the very high social and educational and health costs that they are expected to pay.
14	14.3.2 14.5.2	Both Kalinga Park and Ross Park are well utilized and valuable assets to the community which need to be replaced to at least equal standard if they need to be reclaimed for the tunnel
4 5	4.2.3 5.3.5	The East-West Arterial is already extremely congested and it would appear foolish to dump traffic at this point to increase the problem that already exists here.
2	2.2	Money would be better off directed towards cycle ways, good public transport including busways to make buses more reliable and faster, and ring road transport.
11	11.2.1	I object to the destruction of the Hoop Pines along the creek at the eastern end of Kalinga Park and Melrose Park. This does not meet with the EIS Flora and fauna objectives.
2	2.2	The city should not be required to fund the short sighted decisions of people who seek individual rights of driving their cars whenever and wherever they wish without considering the rights of the community as a whole.

Submission No.		135
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
5 9	5.3.1 5.6.2 9.6.2	A general concern has been expressed about the tunnel's impact on air quality in the vicinity of the proposed North-Eastern ventilation station at Toombul. Strong concerns have been expressed about the traffic impacts that will occur at both the Nudgee Road/East-West Arterial and Gateway Motorway Intersections. The Nudgee Road/East-West Arterial Intersection draw particular attention as it is already heavily impacts at peak times. It is my belief that this problem area will intensify upon the completion of the Airport Link tunnel.

Submission No.		136
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
2	2.3.4	No justifiable reason why Airport Link is required. More feasible way to spend project funds would be the implementation of an international standard public transport system. Public transport reduces congestion and air pollution.
4 9 10 14	4.2.5 9.3.4 10.2.4 14.3.2	Oppose to Airport Link because of: ■ Traffic pollution being transferred into Kedron State High School grounds by creating a main road at the back of the school; ■ Effect of construction on the school's normal day to day operations including loss of school oval and possible reductions in enrolments; ■ Increase in air and noise pollution poses a threat to students; and ■ Large ventilation stacks concentrating pollution in the school following construction.
8	8.2.1 8.2.2	Flooding investigation does not clearly state if ultimate flows have been modelled and studies mentioned are outdated due to change in upstream land use. Further information on how local flooding will be mitigated needs to be addressed. The report does not include information regarding the Gympie Road crossing over Kedron Brook. The Surface Water Technical Report #2 did not show real evidence of how the Airport Link will impact on the current water quality and how the proposed mitigation may reduce the impact of existing levels.
5	5.6.7	Construction will reduce access for pedestrians, which is not acceptable as it is required for school children to safely commute to school. A super structure is going to divide the community by increasing difficulty in cross Gympie Road
2	2.2.1	The government should pay for the tunnel, as Brisbane requires the infrastructure due to increase in population. Project will only reduce traffic by low percentages. Does not make sense to build a huge and expensive infrastructure if supposed advantages are quite low.

Submission No.		137
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 13 14	3.5.1 13.3.2 14.3.1	Object to the construction of an emission building and stack at the end of Alma Road, Clayfield. It would be criminal to desecrate Digger's Drive in Kalinga Park and residents do not wish to have access to the park denied for up to four years. Son has asthma, which will worsen with the proposed plans. Don't want the lovely balance of life that we have upset by the crude placing of this ugly stack at the end of our street.

2	2.3.4	Improved transport facilities are the way of the future, not more roads for cars to travel on. There would not be any need for the on-ramp, tunnel and emission stack if we keep driving home the public transport campaign to educate everyone.

Submission No.		138
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
4 5 9	4.2.5 5.6.2 9.6.	Against the Airport Link tunnel because of: ■ Emissions from the tunnel at the end of Stuckey Road; ■ The tunnel doesn't continue to the airport and will create more congestion at Sandgate Road and Toombul; ■ Need more trains serving then airport; and ■ No smoke stacks and no taking our parks and homes away.

Submission No.		139
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
3 9	3.5.1 9.6.2	The Toombul Centro site for the east/west stack should be pursued because it is not directly adjacent to homes. BCC's own data suggests no significant difference in air quality outcomes and there will be less visual impacts as it is already an industrial area. Would have to question if it is just an issue of cost rather than thinking of the cost of the public's health.
9	9.5.3 9.6.2	Concerned with the lack of tunnel emission filtration and effects on public health. Why would other countries invest money into filtration if filtering is ineffective? There are a lot of young families living in the area and the effect of pollution on younger generation is greater than the effect on adults.
9 10	9.2.2 10.2.4	Concerned with the work site location and its impact on homes and schools. Plans for reducing dust and noise were not successful at Campbell Street since work started on the NSBT.
9	9.3.3 9.3.5	Air quality modelling is based on existing and estimated traffic volumes over the next ten years and does not take into account the effect of the new Gateway Motorway extension, the parallel runway & the East West Arterial road upgrade. There is no confirmation that air monitoring around the stack will happen and for how long.
15	15.3	Concerned with the visual pollution of the stack. A ten storey stack in an area that has nothing above three storeys is definitely going to stick out. If the stack was included in Centro Toombul then this would not be an issue.
16	16.3.5	Concerned with property value impacts. Stack will undoubtedly have an effect on house prices. Anything that puts doubt in the mind of a purchaser as to health effects will reduce values. Appreciate that infrastructure planning is needed, but when there is an alternative such as Centro Toombul, why affect the health of local residents and also value of local housing.
3 9	3.5.1 9.5.1	Request that the North East ventilation complex is filtered and located to Centro Toombul.

Submission No.		140
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
4 5	4.2.5 5.6.2	Airport Link will have significant impact on the commercial property at 122 Gympie Road Kedron due to: ■ Elevated structure constructed on Gympie immediately in front of the property; ■ Changes in the existing traffic movement along Gympie Road and Stafford Road; ■ Northern Busway cut & cover tunnel constructed on Gympie Road immediately in front of the property; and ■ A busway transition structure constructed on Gympie Road a few hundred metres north of the property.
16	16.3.5	Airport Link and Northern Busway will adversely affect the ability to lease the premises and property value. Since notification of the Airport Link & Northern Busway, current leasee has advised they are not prepared to commit to our usual lease arrangements due to the significant disruption likely to be caused by the projects. It is unlikely that we will be able to readily secure a new tenant, which will affect the rental return & value of the property.
16	16.3.5	Essential for the protection of local businesses that some immediate and proactive thought and action is given by Airport Link and the Northern Busway on a broader range of practical ways to minimise adverse affects and to practically support local business. In cases where it can be shown that land owners and businesses have been financially disadvantaged, it is fair and reasonable that some form of compensation or offset is provided by the Project or its proponents to try and restore as far as possible, the business to the state it would have been in had it not been subject to project effects. Methodology could be developed to ensure compensatory measures are fair and that a claims process is simple, cost effective and not protracted. Businesses should not suffer a financial detriment from the Project.
4 10 15 16	4.3.17 10.2.4 15.3.2 15.4.2 16.3.5	Changed traffic movement, safety fencing and barriers and structural sides of the final elevated structure will dramatically decrease visibility of the property from Gympie Road. Will have major adverse impact on sales and lease ability and value of land. End design of elevated structure and urban design and landscaping should consider the open-air display/sales nature of the property and maintain visibility from Gympie Road. The landowner & lessee of the property should be consulted on these matters.
5 15 16	5.6.5 15.3.2 16.3.5	Construction machinery, fencing, noise protection & barriers located in the vicinity of the property will take away from the professional presentation of the property, or may give the appearance that the property is closed for business. It should be ensured that the property remains highly visible, easily accessible, clearly appears open for business & professional at all times during the project.
5	5.6.5	Safety fencing, re-routing traffic during construction and permanent changes to traffic movement will have adverse impact on access to property. If potential purchasers can't see how they can easily access the site, the will go elsewhere to make their purchase. A long-term concern is that sales lost during the construction period will convert to a permanent erosion of the client base and will affect lease ability and value of property. Project should guarantee that there will be a well-signed & ready access to the property.
9	9.2.2	Increased dust will result in the need for more frequent & detailed cleaning of the premises & car stock, increasing operating expenses. Dust levels must be kept at a safe level for staff & others on the property.
10	10.2.4 10.3.2	Increased noise will adversely affect the conduct of business. Noise levels must be kept at a safe level for staff & others on the property
10	10.2.4	Advice is sought on how the project team will respond to any movement of buildings on private property.
12	12.2.6	Advice is sought on whether the proposed elevated structure will preclude or adversely affect any future development of the property.

19	19.6	Recommendations include: ■ The Airport Link & Northern Busway projects establish a local business liaison officer to disseminate information of interest, address concerns & facilitate local business operations during the course of the projects; ■ In cases where is can be reasonably shown that the business has been financially disadvantaged by the project a fair form of compensation should be provided (i.e. land tax & rates reductions, compensation for loss of income, increased operating expenses, inconvenience & disruption during construction & reduced property value); ■ Practical measures are employed to support local business operations particularly during construction (i.e. council relaxations of advertising, street parking & operating hours; funding of additional business advertising & bulk purchase of advertising space to achieved improved cost of advertising & marketing benefits); and ■ Consideration given to minimise the effects of construction on local businesses (i.e. clear & easy access to properties, ensuring safety & noise barriers don't impede property visibility).

Submission No.		141
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
2 4	2.1.1 4.3.15	The Airport Link cannot be considered in isolation as it represents a motorway-standard extension of the NSBT and connects with other components of the Brisbane road network.
5	5.3.4 5.6.3	Airport Link plays a vital role in enhancing the NSBT's viability as a cross-city bypass, providing a new link to the airport and establishing an arterial orbital segment connecting the East-West Arterial Road and Stafford Road. However, it appears that Airport Link in itself generates its own set of congestion issues, primarily where it connects with the surface roads.
5	5.4.4 5.4.6	RACQ strongly objects to tolling of new road capacity because tolls: ■ Are an additional cost imposed on the motorists; and ■ Interfere with attainment of the optimal benefits of such infrastructure.
16	16.4.4	The economic sensitivity analysis should have included higher and lower discount rates than the base rate of 6.8%. A higher rate (i.e. 8%) would have resulted in a negative net present value and a benefit/cost ratio below one. A case could be argued for a higher rate because it would be closer to the social opportunity cost of capital.
16	16.4.4	The economics of the project has been severely handicapped by the intention to toll it. To the extent that the toll is cut, aggregate travel time savings, vehicle operating cost savings and air pollution benefits would rise. The result would be a higher net present value and benefit cost ratio.
16	16.4.1 16.4.3	There are ways of financing the project that would have positive effects on economic efficiency, including: ■ Taxing the NB and reallocating the proceeds to AL to cut tolls would substantially increase the Airport Link's benefits and benefit/cost ratio; ■ Proceeds of sale of the government's electricity and gas distribution business could be transferred to urban road projects like AL; and ■ Network-wide congestion pricing regime could be implemented in Brisbane to reduce congestion costs directly.
2 5 14	2.1.4 5.4.6 14.3.4	The proposal to toll the Airport Link to pay for its provisions undermines the purpose of the road to alleviate congestions, as the toll will encourage drivers to stay on existing unpriced, congested roads. The higher the toll, the greater the social loss. Any toll should not be based solely on the cost of providing the road.

16	16.4.3	Airport Link will make available a premium service as an alternative to competing congested roads on the unpriced network, while covering full economic costs. A fundamental flaw in this approach to road provision and pricing is that it won't even get close to optimal congestion alleviation. For tolled roads or lanes to be attractive to potential users a significant speed difference must be maintained between priced and free submissions. Cutting congestion on existing free lanes would eliminate the incentive to pay to use the priced roads/ lanes.
16	16.4.3	The shortcomings of toll roads are greater when they are privately owned and operated. The causes are inappropriate allocation of risk bearing, and conflict between the congestion-alleviation goal of governments and the profit maximising objective of private operators.
5	5.3.4 5.6.3	Forecast reductions relative to the 'do nothing' case need to be viewed in context. With Airport Link and Northern Busway in place, traffic is still forecast to increase substantially on Sandgate Road, which is already heavily congested at peak times. With Airport Link and Northern Busway in place, congestion will worsen on Sandgate Road. The alternative of an 'add-a-lane' facility should be subject to rigorous traffic analysis and benefit/cost analysis including comparisons with alternative options such as an additional general-purpose lane.
5	5.6.3	Reductions in traffic on Lutwyche Road in vicinity of Albion Road will be more than offset by a reduction in road capacity of one third through confiscation of general traffic lanes for bus lanes. So congestion would worsen after the provision of Airport Link and the interim busway
5	5.6.2 5.6.3	Suggestions that the Airport Link and Northern Busway would free up sufficient road space to allow confiscation of general traffic lanes for bus lanes on Lutwyche Road are at best dubious and most probably false. Such action would worsen congestion on a road already operating above capacity.
5	5.6.3 5.6.9	A number of intersections will suffer from increased congestions due to Airport Link. Declining level of service travel times for a number of roads in the impacted area raises concerns about Airport Link, as it: ■ Disadvantages both the many dispersed local and intra-regional surface trips; and ■ Merely gives priority to long distance trips for those users prepared to pay a toll. Queensland Government and Brisbane City Council should take responsibility for adverse effects of Airport Link on the road network both inside and outside the project area. Roads that have significantly increased traffic demands placed on them as a direct result of the project should be upgraded as part of its scope (i.e. Stafford Road/ Webster Road intersection, Airport Drive/East-West Arterial Road roundabout)"
5	5.3.5 5.6.3 5.6.9	Stafford Road / Webster Road intersection is already operating at low level of service and there is only going to be a very minor decrease. The substantial increase in traffic on Stafford Road would not be adequately offset with a slight decrease in traffic volumes on Webster Road. Stafford Road from Gympie Road to Appleby Road/Shand Street in general is of concern. It is forecast that Stafford Road will have traffic volumes of 45 vpd in 2026. While this might be within capacity at mid-block locations, it is not acceptable to dismiss increasing traffic capacity problems. Many improvements would be necessary than proposed it the EIS (i.e. consideration of grade separation straight ahead traffic lanes of Stafford Road under Webster Road in both directions).
5	5.6.9	The Airport Link / East-West Arterial Roundabout and Nudgee Road intersection need to be upgraded by further grade separation. This proposed upgrade should be publicly funded in preference to higher tolls for either of the tolled projects.
5	5.6.3	Concerned that the Gympie Road/Stafford Road lane drops from three to one lane overall within approximately 200m will cause significant congestion issues during peak times.
5	5.6.9	RACQ believes that large volumes of outbound traffic will already be on Gympie Road when it merges with Airport Link tunnel exit due to: ■ The wide variety of origins and destinations of trips; ■ Limited access to the tunnel for travellers intending to head northbound; ■ The tolling-off effect; and ■ Therefore it is important to widen the road corridor to accommodate four lanes outbound north to at least Broughton Road."
5	5.6.3 5.6.9	Intersections and road sections operating at poor level of service should be prioritised for capacity improvements to adequately manage the expected increased traffic demand.

5	5.5.3	No reduction in general purpose lane space should be considered as part of Airport Link, even with a predicted lowering of traffic volumes on certain roads. Traffic growth and the vast expansion of the road freight task over the next few decades must be accommodated efficiently.
4 5 19	4.3.19 5.7.3	TMP's should investigate spoil haulage impacts at key intersections and road sections and make necessary changes to frequency of haulage trips if advised impacts are predicted. TMP's should also include monitoring of adverse impacts associated with spoil haulage throughout the construction period, taking into consideration NSBT.
4 5 19	4.3.19 5.7.3	Careful consideration should be given to the number of haulage trips scheduled for peak traffic periods. RACQ recommends that there be very limited spoil haulage trips undertaken during AM and PM peak periods. The Schneider Road extension across the Pinkenba rail line should be the designated spoil haulage route to the spoil disposal site
5	5.7.1	TMP's should ensure that the safety of workers on-site and motorists travelling through road works is not compromised
5	5.7.1 5.7.2	Lane closures should be kept to a minimum and preferably in off-peak or night operations. Road works, diversions and speed restrictions should be clearly signed and be regularly monitored.
5	5.7.1	Delivery to all worksites should be managed under specific site Traffic Management Plans.

Submission No.		142
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
9	9.3.4 9.6.2	Concerned about the health of daughter because she will reside and play directly beside the ventilation outlet. No guarantee of air quality in the immediate area or that the ventilation stack will not have long term adverse affects on health.
9 10	9.2.2 10.2.4	The increased noise levels and dust particulates from heavy construction machinery will seriously impact residents. We should retain the right to reside in an area with minimal levels of noise and pollution.
9	9.1.2	Would like guarantee that fair and reasonable air quality data has been taken to compare the current air quality with the air quality after the completion of Airport Link. Air quality measures should be taken at end of Alma Road and in Kalinga Park
15	15.3.4	Proposed design of the ventilation stack does not reflect heritage of existing dwellings in the immediate area. Consideration should be given to ensure that the heritage of the area is maintained. Aesthetics of the ventilation stack seriously detract people from what is a very peaceful and tree lined suburb. Thought of hiding the stack by sketching masses of trees in the street is unrealistic and misleading.
16 Apndx B	16.3.5	Prudent to compensate residents whose property values are directly impacted by Airport Link. Loss in property value has meant that if decide to relocate, would be seriously disadvantaged financially. Delay and misleading consultations has lead us to spending thousands of dollars and many months of redesign and re-planning our home. Feel very mislead and disappointed about the consultation process.
3 9 16	3.5.1 9.6.2 16.3.5	Request further studies are conducted to address health, property value concerns and alternatives to placing the ventilation stack away from a residential area.

Submission No.		143
Date Received		12 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3	3.5.1 3.5.2	Community objects to the proposed smoke stack in Clayfield. Smoke stack filtration and a different location are required as a solution to this. It is disappointing to know that the government would take such detrimental action against people's health and lifestyles, all to save costs. Smoke stack needs to be completely away from any residential area. Better solution to build this out towards the airport where it is a non-residential area.

Submission No.		144
Date Received		12 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
		Support Airport Link and believe if implemented properly it will provide benefits to both greater Brisbane and local residents. In implementing Airport Link, impact on local residents must be addressed and minimised
9	9.1.2 9.2.2 9.3.4 9.3.5	Currently there is no requirement for air quality monitoring at the eastern end of Kalinga Park. Before construction begins a baseline air quality study should be undertaken to establish current air quality. Ongoing monitoring of both in-tunnel and ambient air quality during operation with real-time internet access should be mandated. Benchmarks for air quality should be established and mandated in the operator's contract and EMP (operational). Strategies to stop exceedance of the benchmark need to be implemented (i.e. implementation of filtration systems).
3 15 16	3.5.1 3.5.2 16.3.5	Concerned that out of the four sites options offered to the community, none of them were selected. The location "A" shown in previous consultation does not accurately reflect the location of the preferred outlet. The ventilation outlet should be located in Centro Toombul precinct and should not be in a residential street as planned. Concerns with the ventilation outlet at Alma Road relate to detrimental effect on the community's and property values near the stack being adversely affected. Locating the outlet at Centro Toombul would ensure it is distant from residential properties and would help to 'camouflage' the building and outlet. Would also allow emissions to disperse over wider area.
9	9.5.1 9.5.2	The State Government must investigate all aspects of filtration and if the technology delivers improvements in local air quality then the ventilation outlets should be equipped with that equipment.
5	5.3.5 5.6.2 5.6.3	East/West Arterial - Nudgee Road and Airport Roundabout often operate at or beyond their capacity and it is imperative that the State Government improves them to ensure traffic flows freely. These intersections must be upgraded to ensure that traffic flows smoothly along the East-West Arterial.
4 5 19	4.3.19 5.7.3 19.6	Kingsford Smith Drive should be used as the last available option for spoil removal. Will add another 2-3 years of heavy truck movement along Kingsford Smith Drive when combined with NSBT. Alternative means of transporting spoil that does not increase the load on Kingsford Smith Drive should be investigated. If it must be used then the trucks must utilise the most modern and environmentally friendly options, all loads must be covered and no increase in truck traffic noise should occur between 10.00pm and 7.00am
5 10	5.7.1 10.2.4	All construction access should be done to minimise disturbance to local residents and residents along Kingsford Smith Drive. Vehicle access to the work site must avoid residential streets. Workers should not park in local roads and hours of operation must be arranged to not disturb normal residential amenity. Appropriate noise attenuation measures must be implemented to minimise noise movement across Kalinga Park.

5 14	5.7.2 14.3.2	Construction must be undertaken to minimise the impact to Wooloowin State School and Kedron State High School, including minimising the risk of environmental or physical harm to students and staff. Opportunities should be investigated for providing better vehicular access to Wooloowin State School, as access is currently limited. It is also necessary to investigate the appropriateness of providing air conditioning to the schools to enable them to combat the excessive noise from the construction sites.
16	16.3.5	Support the introduction of a Property Value Guarantee to protect residents if they experience a drop in the market value of their property.

Submission No.		145
Date Received		12 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
14	14.3.1	The impact of Airport Link will significantly change my suburb and impact on me personally. Have serious health concerns with regards to the ventilation complex locations. The current location at Alma Road and the lack of tunnel emission filtration will significantly reduce air quality and have major health impacts for people in the area.
3 9 10 11 15 16	3.5.1 9.1.1 9.3.3 9.5.3 9.6.2 10.2.1 11.2.1 15.3.4 16.3.5	Have specific concerns relating to: ■ Ventilation complex location; ■ Lack of tunnel emission filtration; ■ Air quality modelling shortcomings; ■ Effects on public health; ■ Health concerns associated with the ventilation complex location/s; ■ Destruction of Kalinga Park East; ■ Work site location and impacts on homes and schools; ■ Property value impacts; and ■ Impact on lifestyle and urban amenity. Prevent our ease to shops and the size of the stack building will be an eyesore.
3 9 16	3.5.1 9.1.1 9.3.3 16.3.5	Request that further studies are conducted and/or: ■ Baseline air quality is established for the North East connection in Kalinga Park; ■ An independent review of air quality impacts is established to allay community concerns; ■ The North East ventilation complex is located to Centro Toombul; and ■ A property value guarantee is established.

Submission No.		146
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
		Environmental, economic and social costs of the project far outweigh the unsubstantiated benefits. The EIS must be rejected and a proposal developed that achieves the project objectives and provides greater benefits to the community.
2	2.3.3	No evidence the project is needed. Building more roads is not a sustainable strategy. The documentation "assumes" need without providing any evidence.
2	2.2.2 2.3.4	No comparison has been included to substantiate the statement that the existing road network will not sustain future travel demands even with major increases in non-motorised and public transport travel. EIS does not address the likelihood that it may be far more cost-effective to address travel demand by further investment in land use integration and public transport, walking and cycling, than in providing further capacity for unsustainable private vehicle travel. Comparable investment in better land use outcomes and enhanced public transport services would most likely result in higher walk, cycle and public transport use.

2 5	2.2.3 5.6.2	Gympie Road, Stafford Road and the East West Arterial are all key routes that will experience increased traffic congestion as a result of the project. The project is not in keeping with the project objective to "ease traffic congestion on key routes" as overall, the project will increase (not ease) congestion on these key routes.
5	5.6.4	The discussion of 'time-saving' confuses 'travel time' with 'travel speed'. The likelihood of induced longer trips encouraged by the facility and the likelihood of increased congestion beyond the portals will be likely to more than offset any theoretical time savings achieved by higher speed operation in the facility itself. Airport Link will lead to miniscule increases in vehicle speed compared with no Airport Link. Overall, Airport Link will reduce vehicle speed on the network. Project has therefore failed to achieve the objective of improving journey times. Greater travel time savings could be achieved for commercial vehicles by improving the Airtrain service, which would take a greater proportion of non-commercial vehicles off the road network.
5	5.2.3 5.6.2	EIS fails to give any evidence that the amount of traffic on lower order roads will be less than it is at present. Must include data for the current road network in Table 9-8 to demonstrate whether Airport Link will reduce or increase traffic on suburban streets. If there is an increase the project fails to meet the objective of reducing through traffic and heavy vehicles through suburban streets.
5	5.6.6	It is unclear how increasing the amount of traffic on key public transport routes (i.e. Gympie Road) will improve travel time for public transport. Any time savings for buses moving through the study corridor would be off-set by congestion outside the corridor caused by Airport Link.
9 11 14	9.1.1 9.3.4 11.2.1 14.3.2	The project fails to achieve the objective to improve urban amenity and community safety: ■ Open space along Kedron Brook behind Kedron State High will become a large construction zone; ■ Eastern end of Kalinga Park, which includes grove of hoop pines and eucalypts, will be bulldozed; ■ 30 m exhaust stack will be built in a residential area (Alma Road) and will release fumes over Kalinga Park; and ■ 30 m exhaust stack will be built next to playing fields at Kedron State High and release fumes in area where children regularly exercise.
9	9.5.3	Filtering the exhaust stacks would reduce the amount of harmful substances in the fumes leaving these stacks and would improve the project's ability to meet the objective of improving local air quality along the corridor.
9	9.2.2 9.2.3	Vehicle emissions during construction have not been quantified. The cumulative effects of construction plant, delivery vehicles and spoil haulage are likely to be substantial, especially in terms of carbon dioxide and fine particulates. These impacts need to be quantified and measures for their amelioration put forward.

Submission No.		147
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
5	5.6.7	Pedestrian lights are needed for the proposed crossing on the new section of Sandgate Road entering the tunnel from Clayfield.
3 9 16	3.5.1 9.6.2 16.3	The ventilation stack planned for Alma Road is too close to local residents. The health and well-being has not been considered and will greatly decrease property values within the region.
5	5.6.5	It will become difficult to access my home if the division strip on Sandgate Road was extended
5	5.7.2	Four years construction work building the tunnel would bring about chaos in the area. The Gateway Bridge and other proposed developments should be constructed first to alleviate traffic congestion.
2	2.3.4	People should be encouraged to utilise public transport more. Train and bus services need to be improved and fares reduced.

Submission No.		148
Date Received		22 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
		Recommended that as a result of the significant impacts within a heavily populated urban area, and the compromised role of The Coordinator General in representing the proponent, The Coordinator General appoint a panel of technical experts to assist in considering the EIS and submissions, pursuant to Section 16 of the SDPWO Act.
2	2.1.1 2.1.3	Reject the premise of the SEQ Infrastructure Plan without a rigorous and apolitical planning process being applied. As such, the justification that the proposal is part of the SEQ Infrastructure Plan is fundamentally irrelevant. Claims that Airport Link is part of the Brisbane Council Transport Plan, which does not stand up to peer scrutiny, bear little weight.
2	2.1.3	SEQ Regional Plan indicates a preference for a more liveable and sustainable urban conurbation. Development of urban freeways is counter to its objective, including increased mode share for public and active transport. No evidence in the EIS to refute this long standing planning principle.
		EIS is silent on the matter of compliance with the IRTP which is an admission that the proposal is not able to meet the objectives of the IRTP
2	2.1.2 2.3.4	The alternate objective of TransApex and Airport Link in particular is to cater for peak hour travel and are derived out of a predict and provide mentality which the IRTP vehemently opposes. Development of TransApex may entrench and encourage a level of car dependence, which will have the effect of sustaining and fast tracking congestion. It is recommended that The Coordinator-General acknowledge that the proposed Airport Link and TransApex is not compliant with the IRTP and therefore is counter to good regional planning and transport infrastructure principles.
9	9.3.4	Argued that TransApex will contribute an additional 500,000 vehicle trips into the current Brisbane traffic system. TransApex itself is a linear emission source that is difficult to understand and control. Whilst it is acknowledged that some emission efficiencies are occurring with petrol and diesel engines, must also be acknowledged that individual engine efficiencies are easily offset by a dramatic increase in the number of engines contributing.
1 2	1.4.1 2.1.2	If Airport Link is considered in the absence of the NSBT, the Northern Link and other elements of the TransApex network, it would not stack up. Where an application is for a part or component of a whole, it is considered at Case Law to be a piecemeal application. The intent is to ensure the full effect of a proposal is evaluated and that projects are not advanced which are knowingly incomplete. It is apparent that the proposed Airport Link is not a project that may be evaluated in isolation. Its impacts, and those contributing to it by other proposed elements of TransApex, cannot be understood without a full EIS across all elements of TransApex. It is recommended that The Coordinator General refer the proposal back to the proponents until a more complete EIS is prepared for TransApex and other associated road infrastructure.
1	1.4.2	A study by the European Environment Agency [in relation to the precautionary principle] sets out 12 principles to adhere to ensure a transparent and accurate regulatory role such as that of The Coordinator-General. It is clear that the proposal has many uncertainties, risks and indeed, ignorance of potential impacts, such as air quality health for many local residence near the stacks.

1	1.4.2	Ecological Sustainable Development is an overriding consideration to be adhered to by The Coordinator-General in considering the proposal. The proposal does not provide a balance that protects ecological processes nor does it maintain cultural, economic, physical and social well-being. Recent precedent in this matter is consideration of the Anvil Hill Coal Mine, which found that the assessment by the Director General (NSW) was flawed in that it did not take into account the precautionary principle. It is argued that it is incumbent on The Coordinator-General to adhere to the precautionary approach and ESD principles. The proposal's contribution to local, regional and broader air pollution both as a stand alone project and as a component of TransApex and the more general transport network that must be considered fully
2 5	2.3 5.4.4	Not a valid argument that traffic will increase in a do nothing option. The existing road network would serve to temper increased car usage through maintaining a level of congestion generally undesirable to the average commuter. Several options which have previously been canvassed include: ■ Removal of regional road network tolls for freight and commercial vehicles; ■ Establishment of a competitive public transport system; and ■ Integration of land uses, particularly at nodes of transport to encourage less car reliant exchanges.
9	9.3.3 9.7.4	The significant local, regional and broader air pollution contributions, including greenhouse gas emissions, as well as the contribution to increase car use in Brisbane, requires a higher order of consideration not achieved in the current EIS documentation.
1	1.4.2	It is recommended that The Coordinator-General account for ESD and precautionary principle in his consideration and requires a more holistic EIS across the entire TransApex proposal to fully ascertain the air pollution and land use impacts.
5	5.1.2	The proponents have gone to extreme lengths to justify the use of the BSTM. ICB was developed with traffic modelling akin to the BSTM. Less than 10 years after it was completed, it is choked with traffic and existing roads were not relieved as claimed. Sustainable Brisbane has previously highlighted major incongruities between the Gateway Upgrade Project and the NSBT, both using the same model. Apparent that whilst QT has provided advice pertaining to the applicability of the BSTM to urban freeway proposals, it has not confirmed the BSTM's accuracy, particularly when one considers the range of measures proposed in the IRTP and the inability to effectively model these. It is recommended that The Coordinator-General reject the current traffic modelling results.
	9.2.2	The Traffic and Transport Technical Paper has revealed that the representation of information often has the outcome of distorting consideration. In Table 9.6, a total of about 20,000 additional vehicle movements in a southbound (CBD) direction are anticipated as a result of the proposal. In a 'with tunnel' scenario in 2012, results in an increase of about 10,000 vehicles through the upper Valley/ Bowen Hills/ Spring Hill area. The EIS is silent on mitigation measures to accommodate this change. Information in Table 9.6 is better demonstrated spatially to give the reader a clear indication of traffic flows and volumes, which in turn will inform the impacts on existing road capacity.
5	5.5.1	Executive Summary of the Traffic and Transport Report notes that only (<0.2%) increase in overall vkt in the network is forecast, which conflicts with the main body of the report which reports overall (Metropolitan) induced demand of 0.6 to 0.7% with PM peaks in the range of 1.0 - 1.3%. The evidence used for these figures was based on algorithms "consistent with the NSBT EIS" rather than on real-time measurable performance of the effects of increased capacity such as the ICB and M1. The proponent has also consistently denied the phenomenon of induced traffic, citing the need for the project is to accommodate growth in traffic due to population growth. Proponents have agreed to clauses in the NSBT Project Deed, which ensures induced traffic benefiting the NSBT is not a compassable payment to RCM. Reference to generated or attracted traffic is a clear reference to induced traffic as a result of a transport network enhancement.
5	5.5.1 5.6.5	The report notes that "The Central City has a forecast increase of over 55% in vehicle demand. As the Central City does not have the capacity to accommodate this increase, the need is to curb that demand by facilitating model shift and more localised access to goods and services.
5	5.6.3	The traffic demand through the East West Arterial intersection with Nudgee Road and the Gateway Arterial should be within the scope of the EIS, and a proportion of remedial works should be costed into the project.

5	5.6.6	The integration of the Northern Busway with Gympie Road is compromised by the traffic increases in Gympie Road north of Kedron due to Airport Link. The traffic demand will not allow for road space to be allocated to the busways merging with the surface or the dedicated busway continuing on to Chermside. The additional traffic frustrates rather than supports the public transport outcomes.
5	5.1.2	It is recommended that The Coordinator-General reject the traffic modelling results and refuses the proposal.
3 4 9	3.5.2 4.2.6 9.3.4	The Ausplume Training Manual and other plume modelling guides are quite explicit in indicating the height of stacks to give adequate plume dispersion characteristics. Buildings and other structures near a relatively short stack can have a substantial effect on plume transport and dispersion, and on the resulting ground level concentrations that are observed. The three stacks must be at least 70 m from ground level and at least 50 m above a 20 m building otherwise building wakes create a downwash effect.
4 9	4.2.6 9.3.4 9.6.2	It is recommended that The Coordinator-General dismiss the air quality modelling and subsequent health assessment results and require the proponent through project conditioning to ensure stacks are of a height that is 2.5 x building height and the distance to the next equivalent building is at least 3 or 5 x building height, and that the proponent undertake new air quality modelling based on new stack heights and building set backs.
9	9.1.1	Data from Rocklea and Eagle Farm EPA monitoring stations has been used rather than monitoring and using data from local areas. Onsite measurements should be used to help model atmospheric transport and dispersion and may also aid in model selection. It is recommended that The Coordinator-General dismiss the air quality and health assessment reports and requires local wind flows to be monitored for at least one year before resubmitting modelled air quality parameters.
9	9.4	The air quality modelling appears to have not considered road dust as a particulate contributor and it is recommended that The Coordinator-General require the modelling to consider road dust as a significant contributor to particulate matter in an urban road tunnel environment.
9	9.1.1 9.6.2	The air quality modelling appears to have not considered portal emissions as a secondary point source emission. This has the effect of contributing to a wider tunnel pollutant effects, particularly for residents near to the portals. Ultimately, this issue will lead to the prospect of class action lawsuits based on deleterious health consequences as well as injurious affection on property values. The Coordinator-General has ignored previous submissions to the NSBT seeking to ban portal emissions. As such, there is no guarantee that any operator will not deliberately effect portal emissions. It is recommended that The Coordinator-General impose a condition banning portal emissions with the installation of air quality and air flow monitoring equipment and daily public reporting of results by internet, with heavy fines for any noticeable portal emissions.
9	9.5.3	Filtration is available and is in use in many tunnels and other industrial uses around the world. A combination of electrostatic precipitators placed at every one kilometre interval as well as at the emission points, as well as denitrifying units, would have the beneficial economic effect of negotiating the need for the stacks and exhaust fans. Independent castings have revealed ESPs and denitrifies offset the costs to the point that it is as cost effective to install filtration. It is a clear imperative that filtration must be a requirement of all urban tunnel freeways.
3 9	3.5.2 9.5.1	The location of two smoke stacks within hundreds of metres of each other at Bowen Hills is not only reckless, it will have acute and chronic effects on the residential population, health workers and hospitalised people. These two stacks must be filtered to ensure the health and well being of the surrounding population. Recommended that The Coordinator-General condition the development with the requirement for ESP and denitrification filtration to world's best practice standards.
		The project deed for the NSBT project indicates a serious problem with elected officials negotiating large projects with private companies. It is recommended that The Coordinator-General condition the proposal to ensure compassable payments are not committed to in regards or potential transport network enhancements.

Submission No.		1
Date Received		29 October 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
10	10.2.4.	EIS needs to identify and assess future noise impacts on KSHS. Para on pg 10-11 (Noise chapter) does not indicate the level or extent of noise impacts on KSHS in construction stage. Level, extent and nature of noise impacts on school's activities, and any disruption to the operation of the school and the students' learning environment should be identified and assessed.
9	9.1.3. 9.2.2.	AQ and health impacts on students in KSHS should be specifically identified and assessed.

Submission No.		2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17,18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 127, 128, 129, 136, 137, 138
Date Received		30 October 2006 – 29 November 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
21		Construction and operation of Airport Link and the Northern Busway will have a profound impact on KSHS.
5		Concern over safety of students and wider school community during construction and operation.
10 9 5 14	9.2.3 9.3.5 10.2.4 10.3.2 14.4.1	Concern over negative impacts on KSHS during construction, particularly in relation to large increases in noise and dust, loss of grounds and reduced access to school.
10 9 5 14	5.7 9.2.3 9.3.5 10.2.4 10.3.2 14.4.1	Concern over impacts on schools after construction from works, inc traffic noise, air pollution, and loss of access and loss of amenity.
19 21	19.4 19.6 21.2.1	Suggested mitigation measures: ■ Safety management plan for construction phase; ■ Incorporate access and safety measures in design of Airport Link and Northern Busway; ■ Provision of indoor sports complex to compensate loss of school sporting facilities; ■ Air-conditioning of school, acoustic and air sealing treatment of external building envelope (i.e. double glazing, replacement of louver style windows); and ■ Safe vehicular access and improved parking arrangements for staff and parents, considering changes being considered in DES complex.
19	19.4.	Not acceptable that well-being and educational environment of students and staff are adversely impacted for several years without sufficient mitigations being put in place.

14 21	14.3.2 14.4.2 21.4	Construction and operation of Airport Link and the Northern Busway will have a profound impact on the nature of public space and infrastructure for Brisbane's inner north. There are numerous shortcomings in relation to the dislocation and devaluing of public spaces (Submission 50).
19	19.6 19.7	Suggested Mitigation Measures (Submission 50): ■ Public acknowledgement of specific problems facing KSHS and publication of documents on how issues will be addressed within the management of project; ■ Safety management plan for construction phase; ■ Incorporate access and safety measures in the design of Airport Link and the Northern Busway; ■ Provision of indoor sports complex to compensate loss of school sporting facilities. The procurement and liability for this must be identified in the Project Cost Plan; ■ Air-conditioning of school, acoustic and air sealing treatment of external building envelope (i.e. double glazing, replacement of louver style windows). The procurement and liability for this must be identified in the Project Cost Plan; and ■ Safe vehicular access and improved parking arrangements for staff and parents, considering changes being considered in DES complex. The procurement and liability for this must be identified in the Project Cost Plan.
14	14.3.2	Concerned about the impact on the local community and environment. Classic Brisbane home in Colton Avenue will be bulldozed to make way for concrete overpass and that unique corner of Brisbane will be lost forever (Submission 114).
14 16 21	14.3.1 14.3.2 14.3.4	Airport Link and the North-South Bypass Tunnel project are ripping the heart out of the Bowen Bridge Road and Lutwyche Road/ Gympie Road community. Businesses, residents and schools are all adversely affected. Appropriate compensation for the people who will be affected needs to be addressed. Community is making sacrifices so the rest of Brisbane's population can have faster access to and from the city (Submission 114).
14	14.3.2	Experience of residence and businesses resumed for the North-South Bypass Tunnel show that financial compensation is inadequate to purchase a similar home and they are forced to move away. Many people are tenants who will receive no financial compensation for forced relocation and historically low rates and rent (Submission 114).
2 14	14.3.2	Appreciate the urgency to improve Lutwyche and Gympie Roads in regard to access and safety. Improving that corner is essential but the impact of the construction on our community is being undervalued and our concerns need to be addressed (Submission 114).
9 10 14	9.2.2 10.2.1 14.3.2	Experience from construction of Nundah Bypass tunnel, was that the dust and noise and close proximity to large vehicles can cause disruption to our business on a daily basis. It is essential that the requests of the high school be met to ensure students are not disadvantaged by the construction and that good education outcome and best practice health and safety are achieved (Submission 114).
11 14	11.2.1 14.3.1	Concerned about the ability of residence and students to traverse the construction zone. What measures are you implementing to ensure the safety and access of the local community during construction? Our experience is that construction workers do whatever they like and damn the locals. Will Kedron Brook and Kalinga Park be safe and rehabilitated if required? How will local wildlife be protected or rescued when threatened? (Submission 114).
20	20.4.2	The promised rehabilitation of Nundah Memorial Park following construction of the Nundah tunnel was cheap and unsuccessful and the locals lost a valuable asset. Community needs assurances this will not happen with Airport Link.
9	9.6.2	The pollution coming from the air filtration stacks impacting on our health for years to come (Submission 114).
14 20	14.3.1 20.4.2	It should be possible to work with the community to provide infrastructure required to ensure our health and safety during construction, retain goodwill and protect and restore our natural environment (Submission 114).

Submission No.		16
Date Received		30 October 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
5 19		Concern that increase in traffic on Stafford Rd will further increase already significant traffic on her street, Waroon St, Stafford. Would like traffic calming measures on Waroon St (i.e. Traffic light, island)

Submission No.		116
Date Received		13 November 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3	3.5.1. 3.5.2.	Strongly object to the placement of a 10 storey emission stack amongst houses.
9	9.3.2.	We will constantly be affected by the emissions, because the prevailing wind from the stack is directly over our houses. Clear negative effects on our health, house paint and garden will result.
3	3.5.2.	You have clear usable alternatives for the location of the ventilation outlet: ■ Over the railway on line unused oval; ■ Across the creek on ground near the road, opposite the shopping centre; and ■ The shopping centres lower car park.

Submission No.		117
Date Received		13 November 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
9	9.5.3.	Has concern for an unfiltered exhaust stack located somewhere in the vicinity of Toombul shopping centre. Agree that a well-planned and implemented Road/Rail/Airport infrastructure in required, but opposed to a decision to implement non-filtered exhaust stacks.
9	9.6.2	As a parent the physical, emotional and psychological well-being of my family is of paramount importance. Decisions are not based on what's best for the health of the community.
9	9.6.2.	I shudder to think how 'untreated' exhaust gases will affect air quality in the local area. The short and long term implications of this on my young family are concerning.

Submission No.		118
Date Received		13 November 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
4 5	4.2.5 5.3.5	Concerned the Airport Link will stop at the East West Arterial Road. This will just create another bottleneck at the Nudgee Road. The intersection of Nudgee Road and the East West Arterial is a nightmare right now.
5	5.6.9	We need a fly over Nudgee Road leading to a Clover leaf intersection at the Gateway Arterial (Roundabout)

Submission No.		119
Date Received		22 November 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 9 15	3.5.1 3.5.2 9.6.2 15.3.4	Protest vehemently against the site of proposed emission stack at Clayfield. Please can it be moved away from residential areas to vacant/industrial/park land? Devastating from a visual and health point of view.
16	16.3.5	Properties in the immediate vicinity will devalue greatly.
9	9.5.3	I cannot believe that filters are not even being considered. If people get sick down the track, then filters will be installed.

Submission No.		120
Date Received		27 November 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
5	5.6.5	Presently can leave our driveway and legally drive across the two inbound lanes at the northern end of Truro St. Concerned that alterations to traffic flow and barriers will render this impossible.
5	5.6.5	If the planned service road along Truro Street were a two-directional road for buses and residence only, locals would not need to drive a block coming from the city.
5	5.6.9	There are not enough safe places for cross-roads through Lutwyche Road. The cutting road behind Pop's Fig, should be a cross-roads into Stoneleigh Street, to reduce rat running.
5	5.3.2	The issue of being able to get West-east roads crossing Lutwyche Road running smoothly is important.

Submission No.		121
Date Received		27 November 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
9	9.3.4	Object to the construction of Airport Link. The proposed 30-metre exhaust stack will distribute concentrated pollution into the homes of residents in Clayfield, Ascot, Wavell Heights and Nundah.
15	15.1.4	This huge exhaust stack [Clayfield] will destroy the vision of a "better Brisbane" for residents and the environment and add to the already concentrated visual pollution of the Toombul area.
13	13.3.2	Construction of the tunnel will destroy the war memorial Diggers Drive in Kalinga Park
5	5.4.4	Efficient public transport is the international method for reducing traffic congestion. The BCC is duplicitous in his half hearted attempt to promote public transport.
5	5.3.5 5.6.3	No strategy has been proposed to deal with the anticipated high volume of traffic when cars exit the tunnel. The roundabout isn't capable of handling present loads.

		Cost projections no longer bear any relevance to those originally put forward. BCC capability to manage their finances is increasingly in doubt.

Submission No.		122
Date Received		9 November 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
9	9.3.	Alma road is now a marked site for a hideous 10-storey block housing a 30m tower that will emit unfiltered toxins.
15	15.1.4 15.3.4	Feel cheated and betrayed by government to allow Alma Road to be the dumping ground for this hideous eyesore. Bougainvillea will not disguise the monstrosity and will offer no comfort local residents.
9 15	9.6.2 15.3.4	Alma Rd cul-de-sac will become unsightly cul-de-stack, compromising health of community and changing liveability. Residents have followed council regulations for renovations but government is able to manipulate rules and whitewash criteria to suit own agenda.
3	3.5.2	Questioned what are other alternative locations [for the ventilation outlet] and why were these sites dismissed. Also when Alma Road entered into the equation as a location for the stack.
9	9.5.3	Wants explanation as to why non-filtered city traffic and heavy vehicles exhaust toxins are allowed.
14 16	14.3.1 16.3.5	Residents of Alma Road will be severely impacted. Value of property will plummet, health will be compromised and lifestyles eroded.

Submission No.		123
Date Received		14 November 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
9		Strong objection to 30m exhaust stack at Alma Road and request its relocation.
14	14.3.2	Neighbours being forcibly ejected from homes and houses demolished. Will be living next to a major transport artery with huge noisy exhaust plant dominating quiet residential street.
16	16.3.5	Value of properties in the street is already severely affected ("prime residential "A" allotments)
14	14.3.2	Clayfield the focal point of every type of Brisbane transport- road, tunnel, bus, train and airport. No consideration given to residents, who are experiencing ill health, severe financial loss, worry, destruction of quiet enjoyment of their homes due to "industrial intrusion". The final indignity of the positioning of the exhaust is unacceptable.

Submission No.		124
Date Received		2 November 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
14 15	14.3.2 15.1.3	Alma Road is a mix of character homes, Queenslanders, low set apartments that fit with surroundings. Alma Road also runs down to Kalinga Park, where exhaust stack will rise approx 10 storeys. Magnitude is heart-breaking, as home will be diagonally opposite.
3	3.5.2	Saddens me that this monstrosity will overshadow children wherever they go. Cannot accept that this is the only suitable location for the stack. Community is not being seen as real people. There are alternatives that are better and fit in with this community. BCC would prefer to see small communities suffer for potential grand traffic and engineering solutions.
1 3	3.5.2	The location of stack at Alma Road was never an option for community consultation. New location released with the EIS and has only been given eight weeks to comment. Community is not being given a fair go.
9	9.5.3 9.6.2	Not opposed to progress or tunnel, just on the location of the industrial stack. Concerned with health issues and effect on children's health. Queensland should lead the way by installing filters.

Submission No.		125
Date Received		2 November 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3 9	3.5.2 9.6.2	Horrified that the ventilation stack is going at the end of Alma Road. Don't even try and tell me that the extra pollution levels from this proposed stack will not affect our health and those around us.
9	9.1.2 9.3.4	Calling for air quality tests to be done at Kalinga Park. Also asking for air quality research to be carried out by the Qld University of Technology International Laboratory for Air Quality and Health. An independent body would be giving an objective and accurate answer to allay our fears.

Submission No.		126
Date Received		3 November 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
14	14.3.2	Concern over safety of students and wider school community from construction and operation, including large construction site adjacent to school for several years, and need for road and busway interchange to take into account safety of students and members of the community to access the school.
5 9 10 14	5.7.2 9.2.3 10.2.4 14.3.2	Concern over negative impact on KSHS during construction from noise and dust, loss of grounds and reduced access to school

5 9 10 14	5.6.5 9.3.5 10.3.2 14.3.2	Concern over impact on KSHS following construction, particularly increase in traffic noise and air pollution, and loss of access and amenity.
19	19.6 19.7	Suggested Mitigation Measures: ■ Safety management plan for construction phase; ■ Incorporate access and safety measures in design of Airport Link and Northern Busway; ■ Provision of indoor sports complex to compensate loss of school sporting facilities (designed against noise, dust); ■ Air-conditioning of school, acoustic and air sealing treatment of external building envelope (i.e. double glazing, replacement of louver style windows); and ■ Safe vehicular access and improved parking arrangements for staff and parents, considering changes being considered in DES complex.

Submission No.		130
Date Received		6 December 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
9 11 14	9.6.2 11.2.1 14.3.2	Object to the plans because: ■ Use of parkland denied and probably destroyed forever; ■ Loss of wildlife & natural habitat in parklands and surrounding areas; and ■ Construction of emission stack with no filtration of fumes etc.

Submission No.		131
Date Received		4 December 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
1	1.4.2	Underlying unstated assumption in Airport Link EIS that oil supplies and price of fuel will continue to be relatively cheap, enabling population to use motor vehicles in current manner. Neglecting to analyse impacts of "Peak Oil", the findings of the EIS are inaccurate, EIS does not meet elements of the EIS, and does not provide accurate information on which to decide whether to proceed, modify or reject the proposal.
2	2.4.1	Airport Link will be constructed at a period in time where there is a high probability that peak oil productions will be reached. Cause for concern in relation to construction costs (increasing financial burden on the Queensland Government and BCC), and patronage as travel behaviours change in terms of modes of transport, willingness to pay tolls, and number of trips taken.
1	1.4.2	As EIS has not been conducted without considering impacts of peak oil and resultant higher fuel prices, its findings do not provide accurate basis on which to judge the proposed Airport Link project.
2	2.4.1	Recommend that: ■ Alternative options for Airport Link be developed and considered in light of peak oil (i.e. increase public transport); ■ Impact of peak oil on travel behaviour be examined in detail and included in the EIS; and ■ Deficiencies of EIS (as detailed) be rectified.

5	5.4.1	Whilst Airport Link Model Sensitivity Testing briefly mentions that increased vehicle operating costs of increased fuel prices were considered, there is no detail on what prices were modelled or the actual impact in terms of the number of trips taken, or how modes would change as a result of increased oil prices. The impact of substantially higher fuel prices has been paid lip service to in the EIS. Given this, the validity of the transport model must be questioned.
5	5.4.4	TOR requires explanation of alternative future scenarios considered. Section 6.2 (Technical Paper 1) only considers future road network improvements, public transport & toll values as alternative future scenarios. Peak oil should be considered in detail in the EIS, as it will affect the number of trips, mode of transport & the cost of the project itself. Without examining the impact of Peak Oil, the Coordinator General cannot make an accurate judgement on the pros & cons of the project.
5	5.4.6	No data has been provided detailing how increased fuel prices will affect traffic volumes, modes of travel, willingness to pay toll, or travel behaviour trends. Without considering rising fuel costs, the model does not reflect changes in key parameters or assumptions & is deficient in meeting the terms of the TOR. The travel choice survey did not ask participants the effect of petrol prices on their choices of transport modes or willingness to pay tolls. Without these questions, surveys do not provide data which to model how rising fuel costs will affect travel choices.
5	5.4.3	The paragraph describing the sustainability of travel (Technical Paper 1) does not consider rising fuel costs. Without considering the affects of oil price on the sustainability of household travel behaviour, the element of the TOR has not been met by the EIS.
5	5.4.6	Recommendations: ■ Airport Link model sensitivity testing model be reviewed and consider impact of significantly increased fuel prices; ■ Future with peak oil to be included as high possibility and very significant alternative future scenario; ■ Further research into sensitivity of model outputs with regards to peak oil be considered; and ■ Future research into analysis of trends in household travel behaviour is completed with peak oil as major consideration.
16	16.4.2	Analysis of the current & future economic situation has not considered peak oil and therefore is of limited relevance to the future. No reference in any of the assumption for the Cost Benefit Analysis to fuel prices remaining affordable. Without considering the impact of increased fuel prices, neither the costs nor benefits of the project can be accurately predicted.
16	16.4.2	Recommendations: ■ EIS consider impact of peak oil on future economic situation in Queensland, relevant to Airport Link; ■ EIS includes an assumption on future price of fuels through life of project and impact of fuel prices on construction costs, patronage and willingness to pay toll; and ■ Impact of significantly increased fuel prices, as result of peak oil, be considered in cost benefit analysis and compared to business as usual analysis.
17	17.3.1	Peak Oil whilst not physically hazardous, is an economic & social hazard. By not considering Peak Oil, there is no opportunity to mitigate the risk associated with this issue.
17	17.3.1	Recommended that peak oil be considered as a risk to the project and appropriate mitigation measures developed, including cost of these measures.
22	22.1.1 22.1.3 22.1.4	If read with a detailed knowledge of the likelihood & impacts of the Peak Oil phenomenon, the conclusion & recommendations appear to be divorced from reality. As a result the conclusion & recommendations are not balanced & do not provide the Coordinator General with an accurate portrayal of the costs & benefits of the project
22		Recommend that the conclusion & recommendations of the EIS be reviewed after a detailed analysis of the impact of Peak Oil on the Airport Link project has been completed

Submission No.		132
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
1	1.4.2	The project should receive community support but should be fairly analysed before any further project work be undertaken.
3 8 9	3.5.1 8.2.1 9.3.4	The location of the Sandgate Road exhaust stack and service building appears involves the removal of significant multi family dwellings (units/ townhouses). This may be avoided by looking at another alternative (between Northern rail line and Airtrain), which: ■ Does not involve the removal of any dwellings; ■ Utilises land already marginalised by existing rail works; ■ Is further from existing residential dwellings (reduces exhaust overflow); and ■ Will improve comprised hydraulic efficiency of existing railway structures.
3	3.5.1	The removal of existing dwellings is quite unnecessary, as the ventilation construction is not bound by any alignment constraints of the tunnel. Some degree of lateral or innovative thinking may see it located in a less obtrusive and destructive location.
3 15	3.5.1 15.3.4	The current Airport Link and Northern rail line are quite obtrusive and would have made a large amount of the parkland unusable. Using the triangle of land at the rail line confluence, may ultimately improve the outlook of the current affected land.
9	9.3.4	By locating the stack [at Sandgate Road] directly north to north east of existing residential properties the risk of causing environmental pollution is exacerbated. Using the alternative location (triangle of land at the rail line) provides a significant relief in having the outflow dissipate over the existing railway easement.
8	8.2.1	The current floodplain is highly comprised and hydraulically inefficient. The proposed site may be adequately designed to place it above the 100year or SPF as well as to increase the flow rate velocity. It would not take too much design innovation to improve the open channel hydraulics of this location.
4	4.2.5	There is some confusion regarding the tunnel's meeting of Sandgate Road. An alternative should be analysed (provides a picture detailing tunnel alignment joint with existing road). This alignment should allow traffic to the airport and allow ease of access from Sandgate Road.
3	3.3	The tunnel is not just an engineering solution and should look at a range of viable alternatives that may challenge the traditional engineering views but will see the tunnel obtain better community support.

Submission No.		133
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
5	5.6.3	Support Airport Link but does not agree with tunnel terminating at E-W Arterial, which already suffers from heavy congestion. In its current form it is a Gateway Motorway Link Tunnel. Tunnel should exit on Airport Drive after roundabout, but would still be good to have an exit on the E-W Arterial to allow motorist to get onto the Gateway Motorway. Making all traffic to come out at the roundabout would grind everything to a standstill.

Submission No.		134
Date Received		6 December 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
		Object to the construction of Airport Link.
2	2.4.1	Airport Link will encourage more people to drive cars adding to global warming.
9	9.5.3 9.6.2	Ventilation stacks pumping out of unfiltered fumes from thousands of cars into the community is unacceptable.
11	11.2.1	Only endangered species are considered, what about rest of flora and fauna?
2	2.4	Project will drain money from more sustainable projects (e.g. Better public transport, bike, walking paths), and put ratepayers and taxpayers into debt for 45 years.
5	5.6.3	Tunnel will not solve traffic problems only increase traffic. The tunnel will come south at the airport roundabout, which is not in the Airport Link. Where is the sense?
14	14.3.1	Unjust and inequitable to expect residents living near construction site to put up with noise and dust 24 hours a day 7 days a week (construction, haulage, cut and cover) and loss of open space and lowered property values.
14	14.3.1 14.3.2	Residents are expected to put up with impacts with no compensation. Don't have traffic problem in the area and its unfair that there is not benefit to their community. Is a light sleeper and will have to move for the unnecessary, unjust project. How will she be compensated for having to leave her home for 10 years?

Submission No.		135
Date Received		4 December 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
9	9.5.3 9.6.2	Object strongly to a 10-storey emissions stack at Alma Road. No filtration to be put in the stacks, which has been proven in other countries that is not the way to go. BCC backward in recognising the way to go. Health of residents living in the area for 40 years worth nothing to BCC. Stack is an eyesore, few trees to hide it. Drawing in newspaper is a completely false representation. Who in their right mind would walk, ride or exercise in Ross Park/ Kalinga Park with nitrogen dioxide pumped into air causing death, also impacting Ozone Layer.
5	5.6.3	APL goes nowhere near airport, only just pass Sandgate Road, and thus still have to struggle though traffic and traffic lights.
16	16.3.5	BCC should reduce their rates and compensate owners of property in Alma Rd whose property values have now plummeted.
8	8.2.1	When it floods hopefully there are no deaths (it has previously moved whole houses off its foundations) where portals are.
		Visited office in city and was told that only the white units and a little house were the only things that would go and a protective wall was the only thing to be constructed. They lied to my face. I asked if a stack was to be put anywhere like in Sydney and they told me that they would not make the same mistake in QLD and lied to me again.
9	9.6.2	I feel the stack is a danger to my mother's health and mine. I will be sending the doctors bills to BCC for approving stacks with no filtration.

Submission No.		139
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
3	3.5.2.	Protest against site of ventilation outlet in quiet suburban street with no filtration
15	15.3.4.	Artist impressions are ridiculous and despicable- showing beautiful flowering vines growing over the huge stack and huge trees disguising the lower monstrosities. Most of the residents of Alma Road will be dead and buried before such miracles happen.
5	5.3.5	Present intersection where the East-West Arterial meets the other roads and it is a nightmare.
2	2.4.	Cost of fixing all the difficulties will be horrendous. A fraction of the expenditure could be used to subsidize the Air Link Rail Line so as to access the Airport safer and faster.
3	3.5.2.	Experiences in Sydney should have sent out warning signals. The Stack should have been situated at Toombul Shopping Town, but commercial interests there seem to have more influence.

Submission No.		140
Date Received		11 December 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
21	21.4	Overall approach of the EIS in naming negative impacts and dis-benefits and often stating that the overall effects are marginal appears to fail to acknowledge the cumulative effects of these impacts. Specifically, lacking seems to be recognition of very real "tipping points" that threaten the viability of the parish after the cumulative effects of these incremental changes accrue.
14	14.3.2	Generally, the level of concern for Airport Link is significantly higher than that for the Northern Busway, notably for its lack of integration into the local community area and the resultant community impacts.
14 15	14.3.2 15.1.4	The visual values of the church and front grounds, including the Lyche Gate and boundary wall, directly and heavily support the quality of the ministry and ritual of the parish. The financial situation of the parish is finely balanced and includes crucial income from weddings and funerals. A demonstrable decline in wedding and funeral activity is easily measurable and would directly impact upon the financial viability of the parish, undercutting the liveability of the local communities and takes from the ability of Airport Link to deliver positive local community outcomes. Thereby failing to deliver on the Airport Link objective to "enhance liveability of our communities".
5	5.6.5	A closed parish, or one with significantly impaired access, will increase commuting distances to other service centres and undermine Airport Link sub-objective to "improve urban amenity".
14	14.3.2	Airport Link appears to offer no mechanism for recovery against any economic loss suffered by this parish. Consider this a major shortcoming of the plan that requires redress. Loss of the parish's benefice status is considered a key measure of the financial viability and sustainability of the parish. Loss of this status in the eyes of the church would be considered a deeply impacting event.

10 19	10.2.4	The proposal to undertake construction works 24 hours, 6 days a week appears to conflict with the genuine requirements of this site to undertake Saturday weddings, funerals on most days and special events of state significance using the front yard. In coordination with the Northern Busway, Airport Link will need to evaluate in detail the operational requirements of St Andrews and come up with a strategy and management plan to design out noise and construction disruptions for both the construction and operational phases of the project. Otherwise, objective of "enhance the environment" through delivery upon noise and air quality sub-objectives will not be achieved during the construction phase.
10	10.2.4	Recent works at St Andrews revealed presence of uncontrolled filling. The extent of this is unclear and it appears necessary for the project to undertake comprehensive geotechnical investigation and reporting on the entire St Andrews site to determine the nature, extent and implications of this filling for the transmission of vibration that would lead to cracking of structures and facilities. Appears necessary to investigate and set appropriate vibration and noise standards and limits and make necessary adjustments to the construction plan. As minimum, expect vibration standards to at least that of a "school and hospital".
10	10.2.4	Existing crack will need to be monitored beforehand to establish baseline condition and during construction to establish contribution of either the Northern Busway or Airport Link projects on any possible widening of this crack. Any crack growth will be considered reasonably contributable to these projects. Necessary to establish a protocol for the allocation of responsibility for cracking and crack growth between these two projects.
10	10.2.4	Reasonable expectation that specific investigations and recommendations are made for the limits of vibration that the boundary wall and Lyche Gate can be subject to. Additional protective works and measures may be necessary to reduce to zero any harm to these important assets.
10	10.2.4	The rectory is located at the rear of the church building and it is not clear that the proximity of this building to the proposed works has been allowed for noise planning. Expectation that the Rectory be afforded the same level of noise protection as other similarly situated residences.
4 15	4.2.5 15.3.2	The proposed tunnel portal location needs to be moved down the hill, away from the parish to minimise the negative impacts at the front of the church. These negative impacts are visual, noise, air quality and the presence of at speed traffic that will decrease urban amenity for this important community facility.
4 15	4.3.3 4.3.5 15.3.2	Physical alteration of the front yard would alter the shape of the liturgy of the local church and intrusive activities (i.e. noise and vibration) would intrude upon the liturgy and ritual of the church and faith community. Request that the location of the construction tunnel portal, spoil shed and construction worksite at the front of the church be moved downhill to the front of the hotel car park. Crucially important that visual appearance of construction works do not adversely impact upon bookings for weddings. Sensitive urban design is necessary in both the construction and operational phases to ensure no loss of visual amenity and the visual values of the site and surroundings.
15	15.3.2	Requested that the final construction of the green space proposed above the tunnel and in the middle of the road outside of St Andrews and over the remaining metres of the tunnel is: ■ Sympathetic to visual symbol of the church; ■ Capable of some noise attenuation; and ■ Supportive of a road user speed environment matching the land uses in the vicinity.
9	9.6	The long-term health effect of ultra fine particles is a major air quality issue. The cumulative effect of the operation of the Northern Busway and Airport Link northwest ventilation station is of clear concern for the on-going viability of attracting and retaining present and future rectors to staff the parish.
4 12	4.2.6 12.2.2	Sense project's apparent aversion to tall chimneys to ventilation stations will limit effective dispersion. If chimney heights are limited to about 30 m then having church on nearby rise is to effectively decrease height of the structure in relative terms about AHD. Appears to be little if any coordination of the chimney height with maximum building heights in the area, under the town plans, projecting forward into the mid-term future. Given the EIS preliminary assessment that the project would "facilitate potential TODs" appears to make the present project development look incomplete.

4	4.6.3	Submission calls upon the tunnel operator to seek a Development Application from the EPA to handle and discharge combustion emissions to the environment. Given community concern over air quality, long-term licensing of the environmental discharge is considered to be the only reasonable option. Monitoring of ventilation station emissions should also be linked to tunnel portal emissions to ensure uphill diesel emissions are contained and treated.
9	9.3.1	The lack of well-published Queensland state standards around PM0.1 emissions need to be addressed. Given current level of public controversy about air quality standards, call for an independent expert to review whole area of concern and to submit publicly displayed report.
12	12.3.2	Impression that the project has no vision of an improved urban space along Lutwyche Road. Effectively the project seeks to "double-decker" a six-lane road, with no traffic calming measures that would result in enhanced urban amenity. Call for review of BCC's local neighbourhood plans for the length of the Airport Link corridor on the understanding that a calmer surface road space along Lutwyche Road would allow for greatly enhanced urban amenity.
5	5.6.9	Serious consideration should be given to lowered speed limits for segments of Lutwyche Road at locations of urban enhancement. This would help to achieve project objective of enhanced liveability of the local community through improved community safety and encouraging urban regeneration along the Lutwyche Road kerbside. Also support achievement of project objective of enhanced environment through reduced traffic noise along the corridor.
5	5.6.9	Walking and cycling need to be considered in this project, especially with lack of bike lanes across to Lutwyche Road from Kedron Park Road. Call for local integrated transport plan, incorporating Local Area Traffic Management scheme to address: ■ Safe turn movements into kerbside properties at the Church, hotel and Wooloowin State School; ■ Walking and pedestrian access; and ■ Cycling and interconnection of the fragmented cycle network. The local integrated transport plan will support EIS's interest in promoting "public transport use, walking and cycling".
5	5.6.9	Call for the kerb-side lane to be converted to a high occupancy vehicle lane (i.e. bus or T3) into which left-turning vehicles are permitted to enter. Rationale being to reduce likelihood of rear-end accidents. A HOV lane is supported by strategic objective 4 of Council's Transport Plan.
4	4.5.1	Care should be exercised to preserve the gravitational flow of the sewer in the area of Lutwyche and Kedron Park Roads so as to avoid the installation of a sewer pumping station and overflow structure.

Submission No.		141
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
3 9	3.5.2 9.6.2	Think the North East Ventilation Outlet is best located at Centro Toombul. This would greatly reduce the effects on public health, also on homes and schools.

Submission No.		142
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
		Project fails to achieve a number of objectives outlined in Section 2 of the EIS when compared to the "without Airport Link" option. Hope that The Coordinator-General will undertake a critical, independent analysis of the EIS taking into account public concerns.
2	2.3.4	No comparison has been included to substantiate the statement that "even with major increases in non-motorised and public transport travel, the existing road network will not sustain future travel demands". Does not address likelihood that it may be far more cost-effective to address travel demand by further investment in land use integration, travel demand management, public transport, walking and cycling.
5	5.4.4	Comparable investment in better land use and enhanced public transport services would most likely result in higher walking, cycling and public transport mode-share over and above the ""base-case"". Suggest a combination of the following strategies would be a far better alternative to the Airport Link: ■ Improve the Airtrain service; ■ Improve the frequency of rail and major bus services; ■ Provide more car and bicycle parking at rail and busway stations; ■ Provide feeder bus links and bike paths; ■ Develop a network of on-call community mini-bus services; ■ Fund the State's Smart Travel Choices for SEQ policy; ■ Develop ring networks of public transport around the city; and ■ Focus future population growth in Brisbane within 5km of rail networks. Until this comparison, The Coordinator-General can't decide whether Airport Link is the best method of achieving project objectives.
2	2.3.3 2.3.4	Documentation "assumes" need without providing evidenced-based rationale or justification. Observation that the project forms "part of a wider, balanced solution…" does not establish what role it plays in that wider solution nor how it responds or contributes to "local imperatives for integrated transport". EIS suggests that Transport Plan for Brisbane, TransApex, and SEQIPP identify need for a system of motorway-standard orbital roads to address high levels of congestion in Brisbane. No evidence presented in these documents to indicate that a system of motorway-standard orbital roads will achieve any such outcome.
5	5.4.3	Proponent failed to detail specific objectives and justification for the Project within the context of the Transport Plan for Brisbane as required by the ToR. Failed to acknowledge the specific mode share targets/ objectives set out by the Transport Plan for Brisbane. Traffic and Transport Technical Paper show increases in public transport mode share with and without improved public transport. Mode-share predictions for public transport are same with and without improved public transport. By 2026, mode-share will be 11.1%, which is below the 2016 target set in the Transport Plan for Brisbane.
5	5.4.4	Despite claiming (without evidence) that government has made a concerted effort to increase public transport, Table 8-2 (Traffic and Transport Technical Paper) shows proponent is not currently planning to meet its own targets for increased public transport usage.
2	2.3.2	Unclear why planning based on traffic forecasts, rather than planning to meet desired goals. Setting goals and targets is key principle of IRTP which proponent has failed to address. While IRTP has been overtaken by SEQRP, principles of the IRTP are still valid and need to be considered when justifying Airport Link.
5	5.4.4	Unless BCC can achieve mode share set out in the Transport Plan, then they will not achieve benefits set out in the plan. Proponents do not understand that the best way to ease traffic congestion is to reduce number of cars on road. Failing to achieve 14% mode share for public transport will mean far more traffic and congestion.
1	1.4.3	Section 2.2 of the EIS does not address the Brisbane City Plan as required by the ToR.

2	2.4.1	Research shows that cities with higher vehicle speeds burn more fuel than cities with lower vehicle speeds. Car dependent cities have far greater environmental impacts than cities where a significant proportion of travel (>30%) is via public transport, walking and cycling. Therefore, proponent's desire to create free-flowing traffic for car dependent society is environmentally destructive.
9	9.3.12	Section 2.4 of the EIS [stating Airport Link will reduce total VKT] is directly contradicted by Table 9-8 (Traffic and Transport Technical Paper), which shows Airport Link will increase VKT.
5	5.3.1	Description of existing transport network failed to address amount of single-occupant cars using the road network, which is the main reason for congestion.
5	5.3.1	Description of existing transport network failed to address that inner-north traffic congestion is issue between 6am - 8.30am weekday mornings and 3pm - 6pm weekday afternoons. Strategies which can make more efficient use of existing roads during peak hours and reducing congestion include tidal flow systems, car pooling, flexible working hours, changes to route of travel. Airport Link runs counter to demand management programs by planning for transport system dominated by single occupant vehicles in peak hours.
5	5.6.2	Increasing traffic on Gympie Road, Stafford Road and East-West Arterial will increase (not ease) congestion.
5	5.6.2	Table 9-10 (Traffic and Transport Technical Report) shows general decrease in traffic on roads in inner-north when compared to "without Airport Link". However, simply decreasing traffic increases created by NSBT, and not to level that it would be without NSBT.
5	5.6.2	Misleading to suggest that traffic and congestion will be reduced as a result of Airport Link. Only roads that will clearly benefit are three district roads (Figure 10). Traffic reduction benefits for Lutwyche Road would pale into comparison to traffic reduction benefits of investing Airport Link money into public transport improvements.
5	5.6.4	"Time saving" erroneously confuses "travel time" with "travel speed". Likelihood of induced trips encouraged by Airport Link and of increased congestion beyond portals will be likely to be more than offset any theoretical time savings achieved by higher speed operation in facility itself. Airport Link will lead to miniscule increases in vehicle speed (compared to no Airport Link option) and will lead to reduction in vehicle speeds over next 20 years. Project fails to achieve objective of improving journey times due to reduced speed.
5	5.6.4	Table 9-9 (Traffic and Transport Technical Report) shows travel time savings created for commercial vehicles as a result of the project are miniscule. Greater travel time savings could be achieved for commercial vehicles by improving the Airtrain service to reduce the number of non-commercial vehicles on the road network. Certainty of travel times for commercial vehicles can also be assisted by measures including focus on addressing arterial pinch points, continuation and expansion of bus priority program, funding and transfer of intelligent transport systems, transfer of real time information technologies to road network. Airport Link fails to address any of these measures.
5	5.6.2	Section 9.2.4 (Traffic and Transport Technical Report) claims project reduces amount of travel on lower order roads, yet fails to give any evidence that amount of traffic on lower order roads will be less than present. Data must be included for current road network (Table 9-8) to demonstrate whether Airport Link will reduce or increase traffic on suburban streets. Table 9-10 of the Traffic and Transport Technical Report shows that traffic on suburban roads will increase significantly above 2004 levels as result of Airport Link, therefore failing to achieve objective of reducing traffic through suburban streets.
5	5.6.6	Proponent has not justified statement that "increased road capacity is critical and priority action to improve attractiveness of public transport because bus transport will continue to rely on surface road network". No evidence that increase road capacity is critical and priority action for improving public transport. Given providing additional road capacity will increase congestion, can expect Airport Link will exacerbate this issue.
2 5	5.6.4	For objective to improve opportunities and travel times for public transport, without Airport Link option is superior to with Airport Link option because not building Airport Link frees up hundreds of millions of dollars for direct improvements to public transport system. Not building Airport Link will increase journey times for car commuters, combined with improved travel times for public transport commuters will make public transport more competitive with the car, increasing modal shift to public transport.

5 9 11 15	5.6.2 9.3.2 11.2.1 15.3.1 15.3.2 15.3.4	Project fails to achieve objective to improve urban amenity and community safety for following: ■ Open space along Kedron Brook will be large construction zone. Significant eucalypt and fig trees are under threat; ■ Eastern end of Kalinga Park (including hoop pines) will be bulldozed; ■ 30 m exhaust stack will be built in residential street (Alma Road); ■ Exhaust stack will be built next to playing fields of KSHS and project will increase children's exposure to automotive exhaust; ■ Houses in well-established urban areas will be resumed and demolished; ■ Visual amenity outcomes at Bowen Hills, Kedron and Toombul are hideous; and ■ Will be more traffic on suburban streets. Without Airport Link option is far superior than with Airport Link option as without option doesn't require destruction and concrete monstrosities.
11	11.2.1	Fact that project is in highly urbanised area with little native vegetation remaining should be good reason to retain all native vegetation possible. In 2 of the 3 ground disturbance sites, proponent has made no effort to achieve objective to protect significant flora and fauna.
11	11.2.1 11.3.2	The North-Western construction site will impact on significant vegetation such as the stand of remnant Forest Red Gums, fig trees and other local tree species. Proponent has made no indication that these trees will be protected. Where it is possible to retain trees, they should be relocated.
11	11.1.3	EIS erroneously refers to eastern side of Sandgate Road when statement should read western side. Table 11.5 omits entirely the presence of highly significant and unique tree situated in Kalinga Park on western side of Sandgate Road. Tree is only example of pink-flowered E. tereticornis occurring in the eastern section of Kalinga Park. It would be totally destroyed if Airport Link proceeds.
11	11.2.1	Forest Red Gum provides food source for many nectar-feeding birds. Loss of this tree to the local residents and urban environment would be very significant due to its age, value as habitat tree and asset to local and wider community.
11	11.1.1	Limited flora and fauna survey period is clearly inadequate in terms of length. It cannot be considered to be a proper and professional field investigation so as to permit an expert assessment of the scope of species present and number of individual species occurring or impacted. No surveys in the late afternoon and nocturnal surveys completed in 15 mins on two occasions. Aquatic vegetation survey completed in one day field inspection which covered five sites and was ostensibly to cover four separate characteristics for assessment. Submit that length and scope of survey was insufficient to be able to draw any substantive conclusions as to likely species to be impacted.
11	11.1.1 11.1.3	Statement that no remnant vegetation was found within the study corridor is totally false and misleading. Of the opinion that several areas of remnant vegetation in the study corridor. Table 11.4 states that Kalinga Park has scattered remnant trees. Report compiled as matter of urgency and no credible assessment of the results obtained.
11	11.1.4 11.2.1	The fauna survey did not record any grey-headed flying foxes despite apparently conducting a nocturnal survey, as it would be obvious grey headed flying foxes were present due to their noise. The loss of the fig tree would have a significant impact on the habitat of the flying foxes. Even if tree not removed, construction activities would likely adversely restrict access by mammals to the tree, which could have lasting effect on feeding habits of species that are listed as vulnerable.
11	11.1.4 11.3.2	Hollows in dead trees are used by mammals, bats and birds. The removal of any mature tree in the eastern section of Kalinga Park must inevitably have a significant impact on the wildlife in that environment. Nonsense to state that any mature trees in the eastern section of Kalinga Park can be replaced as part of a revegetation plan. Proposed planting of mature Hoop Pines will not achieve objective of restoring natural environment of area to condition it is now in. Any statement to the contrary cannot be supported by fact. EIS acknowledges that Kedron Brook corridor of which Kalinga Park is part is an "important ecological corridor".

11	11.1.6	Table 11.9 rates the Kedron Brook tributary habitat values as 3 or 4 out of 10. We dispute the basis of this assessment. To place a massive road and tunnel structure through such as delicately balanced environment can only be classified as State-sponsored vandalism. EIS fails to indicate that there is a strong occurrence of the native species of Mangrove fern in the Kedron Brook tributary (Melrose Creek). The fern is not common in Brisbane and any removal would have negative impact on habitat values and health of the Creek.
11	11.3.2	Assert that any proposed landscaping will not in any way mitigate the impacts of loss of wildlife, urban amenity and natural community assets. To equate the impact of construction activity to current traffic noise and light is totally ludicrous. Revegetation and recovery work undertaken as part of the Airtrain was never satisfactorily performed. Can only expect to see this scenario repeated on bigger scale if Airport Link proceeds.
11	11.2	Dispute assertion that long term impacts on terrestrial flora and fauna at Kalinga and Ross Parks is not expected to be significant. It is clear that there will be long term and catastrophic impacts on the habitat, the environment and on all of the local community.
11	11.3.2	Mitigation measures relating to flora and fauna proposed for construction are grossly inadequate and commitments are unenforceable. Assert that EMPs cannot be adequately designed to allow remedial work to ensure that environment is properly safeguarded.
5 9	5.6.4 9.3.4	Suggestion that Airport Link will improve local air quality is extremely misleading. The exhaust chimneys will spout unfiltered fumes from 90,000 vpd over schools, hospitals and parklands, coupled with significant traffic increases along most roads inside and outside of the study area. Claim that Airport Link will create free moving traffic, which produce less emissions than congested traffic, is incorrect as Tables 9-8 and 9-9 (Traffic and Transport Technical Report) show vehicle speeds will decline over next 20 years as a result of Airport Link.
9	9.3.3	The impacts of Airport Link are variable, and there is no consistent reduction in pollution at the different sites for the different pollutants measured. The Coordinator-General should note that this modelling is based on a range of unfound assumptions that do not correlate with statistics from other sections of the report (i.e. vehicle speeds listed in the Air Quality Technical Report are not consistent with predicted vehicle speeds in Table 9-8 and 9-9 of the Traffic and Transport Technical Report).
9	9.3.4 9.5.3	The majority of air toxins will increase by between 17 and 48% as a result of Airport Link. Filtration of exhaust stack would improve the projects ability to meet the air quality objective. Cannot avoid the fact that filtering the exhaust stacks would reduce the amount of harmful substances in the fumes leaving the stacks, regardless of whether it makes an overall difference to "ambient air quality". Irrelevant that emissions from ventilation outlets are less than emissions near busy surface roads because there will still be significant amount of pollution coming from the exhaust stacks.
9	9.3.4	Statement in Air Quality Technical Report that ventilation outlets are often seen as a new pollution source, whereas in most cases the surrounding areas achieve a benefit in local air quality due to the reduction of vehicles on the surface roads is incorrect as there will be a significant increase of vehicles on surface roads because of the project.
9		The level of academic rigour of the Air Quality Technical Report is worrying. For example the author refers to his/her own previous studies to justify his/her current position.
9	9.5.3	Airport Link does nothing to address this "most beneficial option" of treating emissions. Firstly because it leads to increase in VKT whether comparing with current or future levels without Airport Link. Secondly, because there is no proposal to tighten BCC or State Government regulations that control emission standards for individual vehicles.
2	2.5	Analysis uncovered factual and methodological errors with EIS that need correction before decision can be made. Suggest that a number of cases that the project fails to achieve objectives when compared to the "without Airport Link" option. In cases where Airport Link does appear to be superior to the "without Airport Link" option, the benefits are minimal. On the whole, believe that the project's impacts outweigh its benefits.

Submission No.		143
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
13	13.3.2	W&DHS has neutral approach to project. Recognise the need to deal with increasing traffic congestion and the devastation of an above ground solution within historic precinct. Main effort is to work towards understanding value of heritage elements of built environment
1	1.5.1	Process of public consultation to be fairly and appropriately conducted. Concerns have been listened to and considered. Information on project has been transmitted to community and real effort has been made to transmit technical information in an understandable way.
13	13.3.2	Concerns over loss of Windsor Police Station (Lutwyche Road), which is a significant heritage structure. The building is a fine example of smaller scale Edwardian public architecture in QLD and presently forms part of a precinct including Wooloowin State School and St Andrews Anglican Church. The Society does not agree with dismissive conclusion of technical report that this building does not have sufficient integrity to be of heritage value, wishes to record the shallow approach of the technical report in many areas and its lack of rigour in uncritically accepting unsupported and fallacious oral 'history'. Is concerned that retaining this building, while technically possible, not economically practical and mourns its almost certain loss. Recommends that a complete record of the site be assembled and preserved.
15.	15.3.2	Concerned over aesthetic issues of emission stack. These are massive structure in environment of relatively small-scale buildings. Importance of appropriate design cannot overstress. Recommends special attention be paid to the design of exhaust stacks.
13 19	13.3.2	Summary of recommendations to Windsor Police Station: ■ Strenuous efforts be made to preserve it; ■ If building cannot be saved, a full survey be undertaken on site, with photographs, measured drawings, relevant historical material (including planning permits, drainage plans and the like), and that this material be assembled in an accessible format; ■ Recorded material be deposited in suitable archives, and one copy deposited with the society for access at the Old Council Chambers; and ■ A plaque recording the police station be incorporated in a public area within the precinct and within.

Submission No.		144
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	EIS Section Reference	Summary of Issues
		Understand APL will proceed regardless of community feedback but appeal for better mitigation of impacts on surrounding communities.
9	9.5.3 9.6.2	Concerns in APL EIS for air quality: ■ AQ will worsen APL in Stafford, Gordon Park and Kedron by increasing traffic on major roads; ■ North-west vent outlet has highest estimated emissions, yet is closes to schools and community recreation areas; and ■ Does not understand how filtration will not reduce pollutants from the vent outlet. International studies show filtration has 80-95% removal efficiency for total suspended particulates, and 60% removal efficiency for total oxides of nitrogen. Even if filtration only slightly improves quality of emissions, project team should opt for best practice and include filtration. Believes filtration not included, as it is an expensive precedent for other TransApex tunnels.

9	9.5.3	Strongly support the filtration of the ventilation outlets to mitigate negative impacts of Airport Link on adjacent residents' air quality.
1	1.5.1	Consultation process was flawed and not in line with Queensland Government's guidelines for community engagement. Important information (i.e. height and AQ impacts of vent outlets, height of ramps at Kedron, noise impacts) was omitted from the project newsletter. Only people who read the EIS would discover the height of vent outlets and air quality in Kedron would worsen.

Submission No.		145
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
		The GPT Group are registered owners of 214 Lutwyche Road, Windsor. With input from McCormic Rankin Cagney (traffic engineers) and UrbisJHD the following submission provides both an analysis of the potential impacts to our property during and post construction, and a critical review of the broader scope of reference for the EIS.
16	16.3.2	The obvious question to arise from the proposed relationship between the Airport Link tunnel and our property is the impact upon the development rights to the area of private property directly above the tunnel path. Other issues that are of importance are the impact both during and post construction upon site access and the levels of passing traffic to be affected by the introduction of the tunnel.
3 5	3.4.1 5.3.1 5.3.4 5.5.1 5.5.2	In terms of the operational performance at the ends the Airport Link where the infrastructure connects to the existing road network, the following observations are made: Southern Connection ■ The Newmarket Road/Lutwyche Road intersection is expected to continue to operate unsatisfactorily during the AM peak and the PM peak; ■ The Bowen Bridge Road/O'Connell Street intersection is expected to continue to operate poorly during the AM peak period; ■ The Bowen Bridge Road/Herston Road intersection is expected to operate slightly worse during the AM and PM periods; ■ No change is expected to the poorly operating Brooks Street/St Paul's Terrace intersection during the AM and PM periods; ■ No change is expected to the poorly operating Bowen Bridge Road/Gregory Terrace/Brunswick Street intersection during the AM and PM peak periods; and ■ The Campbell Street/Mayne Street/Hamilton Place intersection is expected to operate slightly worse during the AM and PM peak periods.
3 5	3.4.2 3.4.3 5.3.1 5.3.4 5.5.1 5.5.2	North Western Connection ■ This is expected to increase in traffic along Gympie Road. Intersections along Gympie Road within the vicinity of the motorway are expected to continue to operate poorly; ■ Intersections along Stafford Road are expected to operate slightly worse; ■ North Eastern Connection; ■ With the addition of the Airport Link the East West Arterial/Nudgee Road intersection performance will decline further; and ■ This intersection has been effectively ignored.
5	5.3.1 5.3.4 5.5.1 5.5.2	The continued poor operation of the Lutwyche Road/Newmarket Road intersection is a reflection of the existing over-saturated conditions. Even with the daily reduction in volumes the intersection is still expected to operate poorly. Further, at grade kerb side bus lanes will be installed along Lutwyche road at the frontage of the subject site.
12		This encroachment is of particular concern given the potential restrictions to development of their site. The State may consider resuming land. This issue with this option is that the entire frontage of the site would need to be set back. This would be costly and reduce the available site space and existing on-site parking.

5 21	5.7.2 21.4	We also wish to raise concerns regarding the impact on the existing retail activities as a result of construction activities. The impact of the predicted road closures and heavy vehicle movements has not been appropriately addressed.
5 21	5.6 21.2	There are contradictory statements provided in the EIS as to the nature and extent of impact upon vehicle movements along Lutwyche Road as a result of the opening Airport Link.

Submission No.		146
Date Received		11 December 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
		Letter to Premier Peter Beattie.
5 21	5.6 21.2	Object strongly to APL. Name gives wrong impression as it does not link to Airport, but to heavily congested E-W Arterial. Not the solution to inner city traffic problems but would add to chaos, construction interruption to local and through traffic should be obvious. Computer modelling should have highlighted EW arterial as one of major concern.
2	2.4.1	Inner city congestion caused by need to travel to work and lack of public transport, as is shown from recent closure of Riverside Expressway and increase in public transport usage. Traffic flows to the city can be addressed by improving public transport, example that comes to mind is the long put off and delayed extension of rail to Redcliffe and the fast growing surrounding area.
9 14 5 10 16 11	9.3.4 9.5.3 9.6.2 14.3.1 14.3.2 5.6.5 10.2.4 16.3.5 11.2.1	We live close to tunnel and will be adversely affected by: ■ Health problems from unfiltered exhaust of approx 100,000 vehicles per day from a 30m chimney within 70m of our residence; ■ Our area will become a construction site for 4 years. Noise, traffic increases 24/7 will make it unbearable to live here. It is near impossible to get onto Junction Road now what will it be like during construction?; ■ Loss of public parkland and destruction of trees and waterways; and ■ Decrease in property values and lifestyle that we purchased to live in.
2	2.4.1	Project is ill conceived, does not address growth area in Hamilton and real traffic congestion to the Airport roundabout and future growth at airport.
		It is imperative that all levels of government address these issues as a condition of this project approval.

Submission No.		147
Date Received		18 December 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
		Firstly, I would like to establish that I am not against the proposal, however, if several points must be agreed to, otherwise the project will not go ahead.
3 4 5	3.4.1 4.2.5 4.3.18 5.6.5	The existing traffic island on Sandgate Road will not be extended any further than its present alignment. No noise barriers will be constructed and there will be no permanent road closures or access restrictions to side streets.

3 4 5	3.4.1 4.2.5 5.6.5	Junction Road, Rose St ad Kedron Park Road will not be modified in any way to restrict the flow of traffic. There will be no traffic calming, no boulevard, no tree planting on the existing roadway and no bikeway. The only improvement is the widening of the railway overpass on Junction Road.
4 5	4.2.5 5.6.5	A footpath and crossing will be provided on the western side of Sandgate Road at the junction of the Airport Link entrance/exit.
3	3.5.1 3.6.2	The Alma Road ventilation tower will not be built in its current proposed location. It will be relocated to either the northern side of Shultz Canal or to a more favourable location in Kalinga Park. It was mentioned earlier that these locations were not suitable as they were on flood plains. Tunnels produce large amounts of dirt and some of that can be used to elevate the ventilation tower.
4	4.2.5	I would urge all parties concerned to explore the possibility of constructing the Kedron to Toombul section of the link as an elevated roadway. This would be more user friendly, will cost a lot less, has minimal impact on the environment, does not require a ventilation tower and has the added bonus of providing shade for a bikeway and walkway underneath.

Submission No.		148
Date Received		18 December 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
3 14	3.5.2 14.3.1	This letter is my official objection to the proposed site of the ventilation system at Clayfield. The basis of my objection includes that this particular site will have a negative impact on general public health, visual and noise pollution and a personal impact to all individuals in the community.
14	14.3.1	Should the air ventilation system go ahead, I would have a direct view of it from my front door and balcony, therefore creating unwanted disturbance and stress.
9 14	9.6.2 14.3.1	My concern also extends to the amount of noise that will be generated on a 24-hour basis and the amount of air pollution that will occur from the non-filtered ventilation systems and how that will impact my health.
16	16.3.5	There will also be an impact financially to me, as my property will decrease in value due to the increase in noise, air and visual pollution.
3	3.5.1 3.5.2	My understanding is that there are alternative sites for this development that may be slightly more costly, but have a reduced impact on the direct surrounding community. Maybe these need to be explored further.

Submission No.		149
Date Received		13 December 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
		We are a long term resident of Bowen Hills and have been developing plans to refurbish our property that will be greatly affected by the proposed Airport Link.
21	21.3.7 21.4	We have had land resumed for both the NSBT and the ICB projects and are now concerned about the affect that the Airport Link will place on our property and business.
4 15	4.2.5 15.3.1	It is highly undesirable for a business to have the frontage of its corporate headquarters disfigured by a major piece of infrastructure. The proposed structure will not only resume significant prime land at the front of our building, but will exceed the height of the building itself.

5	5.6.5	The current proposal will mean completely re-configuring the car parking and traffic flow on our site. Visitors will be forced to enter via a service road under a suspended roadway.
10	10.3.2	It is understood that noise levels will triple after the completion of the project. This will be a significant increase in noise and disturbance levels for over 800 employees.
16	16.3.5	The proposed refurbishment of the property may now be difficult to proceed with if the result is that the refurbished building fronts onto a four lane suspended roadway. Alternative redevelopment plans are needed now and the expected budget has increased from $13 million to an estimated $30 million to $35 million.
14	14.3.4 14.3.5	In a highly competitive sector like the media, it is crucial to attract and retain the best possible staff. Having sought broad consultation from staff on the refurbishment of the building, it is now a major concern to put the project on hold while uncertainties are resolved. Everyday that a decision is delayed on our future accommodation needs, further damages are done to staff retention and stability.

Submission No.		150
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		No
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
		Writing on behalf of joint owners of 80 Alma Rd.
3 16	3.5.1 16.3.5	In the initial stages four ventilation sites were offered and none of them were Alma Road. After investing a large amount of money into a property at 80 Alma Road, we have been informed that the ventilation stack is to be located at the end of this street and will greatly affect the value and the future possibility of selling this property.
3	3.5.1	We are not against the tunnel itself, but just the current proposed location of the ventilation stack at Alma Road. If the location cannot be changed, we are wondering what our options are to mitigate loss of capital in the project.

Government Agency Submission Summary

Submission No.		N/A State Government Department
Department		Department of Natural Resources and Water
Address		PO Box 864, Ipswich QLD 4305
Date Received		24 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
6	6.2.3	Strong recommendation is made for detailed investigations and management plans for ASS be undertaken as early as possible in the planning, design and approval stages, consistent with section 4.4 and 4.5 of State Planning Policy (SPP) 2/02.
6	6.2.3	ASS investigations are requested in areas where there is the potential for disturbing ASS during construction and groundwater drawdown.
6	6.2.3	Management strategies should be provided in the EMP detailing site specific prevention, minimisation, mitigation and monitoring strategies, consistent with Appendix 4 of the SPP 2/02 Guideline.
6	6.2.3	If drawdown extends to alluvial areas containing ASS, ongoing monitoring and treatment may be required for the life of the project.

Submission No.		N/A State Government Department
Department		Queensland Health
Address		147 Charlotte Street, GPO Box 48, Brisbane QLD 4001
Date Received		24 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
9	9.2.3	Important that mitigation strategies in relation to odour management are implemented. One critical element is a good complaint process, clearly defining responsibilities for investigating and responding to complaints.
9	9.3.3	The assumption that the exposures predicted in the community through modelling are valid is a critical assumption for Queensland Health as it is this predicted exposure on which health assessment is based and basis for which Queensland Health is satisfied that the construction and ongoing use of Airport Link will not result in an unacceptable health risk. Queensland Health is not in a position to comment on accuracy or precision of air quality predictions made.
9	9.6.2	Methodology and assumptions used for assessing health risk would need to be scrutinised more carefully in circumstances where exposures or predicted ambient levels are large and predicted exposures are approaching standards.
9	9.6.2	There is inherent uncertainty in the determination of health risk for any air quality and health assessment. This uncertainty is important to acknowledge and becomes critical when predictions made are so small and hence potentially within the bounds of the uncertainty associated with the method.
9	9.6.2	Based on the EIS, Queensland Health is of the view that the construction and ongoing use of Airport Link will not result in an unacceptable increase in health risk to the community from the expected small increase in air pollution levels.
11	New	EIS should address how mosquito breeding sites will be managed (refer Guidelines to minimise mosquito and biting midge problems in new development areas, Queensland Health, March 2002).

10	10.2.4	Preferable for the proponent to consult all affected health care facilities [in addition to Rosemount Hospital] prior to finalisation of the management plan for the mitigation of vibration impacts from the construction activities.
9 19	9.3.5	PM2.5 particles should be monitored in addition to PM10 particles.

Submission No.		N/A State Government Department
Department		Environmental Protection Agency
Address		160 Ann Street, PO Box 15155 City East, QLD 4002
Date Received		24 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
General	Overall scope	Conclude that Airport Link is unlikely to impact significantly on matters of State interest.
9	9.3.3	Methodology used for analysing potential impact of Airport Link on ambient air quality is appropriate and reflects contemporary practice. The results produced appear to be reasonable. Input data used and assumptions made in setting up model appear reasonable and appropriate.
9	9.3.5	Proposal to manage in-tunnel air quality by using automatic links between continuous air quality monitors and ventilation fans is supported.
9 19	9.2.3	Various measures proposed to manage nuisance dust generation during construction are supported.
9 19	9.2.3	Current comment in relation to monitoring of TSP, PM10 and dust deposition levels is too general and non-committal. A clear commitment to monitoring [nuisance dust] at specified locations, with the proposed frequency, timing and duration of monitoring clearly articulated, would significantly improve proposed mitigation measures. Commitment to making data publicly available via the internet is desirable.
9 19	9.3.5	Current comment about ambient air quality monitoring sites is too general and non-committal. Specifying the location of the monitoring sites, the parameters being monitored, who will be responsible for monitoring, and how long monitoring will continue, would significantly improve the proposed mitigation measures. A commitment to making the data publicly available via the internet is desirable.
9 19	9.3.5	Comment about establishing three monitoring locations is too general and non-committal. A definite commitment to confirming the modelling predictions by conducting ambient air quality monitoring, at specified locations and for specified parameters, would significantly improve the proposed mitigation measures. A commitment to making the data publicly available via the internet is desirable.
9 19	9.3.5	Comment about in-tunnel air quality mitigation that advises motorists to close their vehicle windows does not provide a reasonable level of protection of the health and well-being of all tunnel users and workers, including motorcyclists and drivers of some sports cars. A much more universal plan is needed to provide a reasonable level of protection of all tunnel users who might be forced to stay in the tunnels for prolonged periods. This is also relevant to emergency and maintenance crews.
9	9.3.5	Beneficial to include a discussion on the proposed measures for mitigating against the impact of failure of a ventilation fan, or monitoring/controlling equipment, on performance of tunnel ventilation system.
General 11.	11.2	Methodology used for analysing the potential impact of the Airport Link is appropriate and appears to result in a through assessment. The assessment of biodiversity values appears to have been thorough.
13 19	13.3.5	Recommend that the EPA is provided with a realistic opportunity to assess any cultural heritage management plans that are developed and be consulted should any impact be anticipated.

19.	19.6 19.7	Recommend that the EPA is provided with a realistic opportunity to assess any EMP that is developed for Airport Link and be consulted should any impact be anticipated.

Submission No.		N/A State Government Department
Department		Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries
Address		13 Beach Road, PO Box 76, Deception Bay QLD 4508
Date Received		27 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
General		DPI&F considers that the EIS has identified and satisfactorily addressed most issues relevant to DPI&F.
4	4.6.2	DPI&F have identified two forms of approvals that may be required: ■ Approval for marine plant disturbance at Enoggera Creek; and ■ Approval for construction of a waterway barrier on a Kedron Brook tributary.
11	11.2.2 11.3.1 11.3.2	Any disturbance of marine plants should be minimised and where disturbance is unavoidable, appropriate mitigation should be considered.
11	11.3.1 11.3.2	Mitigation of impacts to marine plants, tidal lands and other fisheries resources to offset any loss of and/or disturbance to fish habitat is appropriate and would be a condition of any approval issues by DPI&F.
4	4.6.2	DPI&F request that conditions attached to submission be applied to any approvals. With these conditions upon the development, impacts to fisheries interests will be justified and adequately managed.

Submission No.		N/A State Government Department
Department		Office of Urban Management
Address		Office of the Coordinator-General
Date Received		27 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
12		A range of land-use planning processes are underway, have been recently completed or are proposed in the EIS area, which comprises a location of key strategic importance to the City of Brisbane and SEQ region. It is critical Airport Link does not compromise potential future land-use outcomes.
12		Bowen Hills through to Lutwyche are likely to be identified as major areas for renewal. Bowen Hills particularly, comprises one of SEQ's most significant transit oriented development opportunities. It is essential the future functionality of the Bowen Hills precinct, particularly relating to amenity, along with pedestrian and traffic movements, is not compromised.
12		The Inner Northern Regeneration Precinct (INRP) Masterplan included the development of land-use principles, prepared at the request of MIPO, to inform Airport Link route alignment, infrastructure design and impact mitigation. These principles, provided previously to MIPO, should inform the final design.

12		In relation to Bowen Hills: ■ EIS does not adequately [assess] the legibility of, and access to Bowen Hills station; ■ Airport Link should ensure infrastructure does not compromise opportunities for improved Station access and surrounding land use planning opportunities, integrated open space system and access to pedestrian and cycle paths; and ■ Impact of Airport Link on possible traffic configurations should be further detailed, specifically for Campbell Street, intersection of O'Connell Terrace / Brookes Street/ Hamilton Place, and intersection of Abbotsford Road/ Markwell Street/ Montpelier Road.
12		Proposed timing for the provision of public spaces and key connections [at Bowen Hills] should be provided as part of the EIS.
12		RBH identified as a Specialist Activity Centre in SEQRP, which requires transit oriented development principles to be applied in the detailed planning.
12		In relation to RBH: ■ EIS does not include adequate detail analysis of potential pedestrian and cycle impacts, or mitigation measures to support future commercial and/or retail development along the northern edge of O'Connell Terrace; ■ Further investigations should be undertaken as part of the EIS to provide active frontages to O'Connell Terrace; and ■ Impacts of major events at Royal Brisbane Showgrounds are not discussed and need to be addressed.
5	5.6.7	In relation to pedestrian and cycle connections: ■ Airport Link should not compromise key connections between centres; ■ Identifiable, accessible, attractive, safe and significant key pedestrian and cycle connections need to be provided at all portals, all stations and between RBH, RNA, Bowen Hills and Lutwyche; ■ Airport Link should not compromise pedestrian, cycle and local traffic connections and links between destinations; and ■ Where Airport Link impacts upon key connections, amenity and traffic intersections, the cost of mitigation works should be borne by the project.
5	5.6.7	EIS contains inadequate analysis of the pedestrian and cycle impacts and opportunities for the Airport Link project on the surrounding area. Planning for, and capital works of these key connections should be included in the budget for the Airport Link project, including: ■ Cycle and recreational connectivity to adjacent green spaces and BCC's broader green network and parks; and ■ Opportunities for active frontages along the length of all main pedestrian connections.
5	5.6.7 s	Further pedestrian and cycle network analysis is required to ensure Airport Link aims "to improve the travel environment of pedestrians and cyclists on the surface network and provide flexibility for travel as well as significant health and environmental benefits, by reducing traffic demands on the local road system, particularly through activity centres and near public transport stations" are achieved.
12.		Proposed route alignment and project impacts need to further consider land use and transport integration principles, specifically location, land use, design, transport, and social, particularly at the RBH and where there are proposed surface connections to: ■ ICB, NSBT, and City at Bowen Hills; ■ Gympie Road and Stafford Road at Kedron; and ■ East-West Arterial and Sandgate Road at Clayfield/Toombul.
15		EIS does not investigate impacts of the ventilation stacks on the urban environment. Further work should be undertaken to investigate opportunities to design the ventilation stacks as part of the urban fabric, and as engaging sculptural landmarks within new parkland.

Submission No.		N/A State Government Department
Department		Queensland Transport and Department of Main Roads – Integrated Transport Planning, Transapex Team
Address		Floor 14, 200 Mary Street, GPO Box 213, Brisbane, QLD 4001
Date Received		27 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
In Brief	1.3.1	The Queensland EPA appears to be an omission from the list of state agencies consulted, particularly for such a significant project
In Brief	2.2.4	Airport Link must be interoperable with other Queensland toll roads.
In Brief	2.3.2	Toll way project approval should be added to Table 2.1
In Brief	2.3.2	Up to date public transport patronage data should be used in Table 3.2. TransLink patronage increased by 11% from 2004-05 to 2005-06.
In Brief	3.2.3	Explain the negative figures for motorways on Table 3.4 for clarity.
In Brief	3.2.4	Clarification would be beneficial regarding road traffic noise being improved by easing congestion as with reduced congestion, and increased average vehicle speeds, traffic noise increases.
In Brief	3.2.4	Review of the EIS could not find analysis to substantiate the estimated environmental benefit in the order of $11M referred in the In Brief.
In Brief	5.1.1	A statement to clarify the origin of the residents in the user preference survey would be useful.
In Brief	5.5	Consideration should be given to the cumulative impacts from haulage transport on the road network for the transport of construction spoil, waste and contaminated material as well as construction haulage traffic from other major projects (i.e. NSBT). Construction traffic management plans should provide mitigation strategies to address the cumulative impacts of all road construction and major development projects (i.e. Northern Busway, NSBT, Gateway Upgrade/Deviation Project, Hamilton Northshore urban renewal project, planned development for Brisbane Airport (including the parallel runway) and surrounding land (including matters addressed in Chapter 21 - Cumulative Impacts).
In Brief	6.4	It seems to be accepted that current water quality data collected by BCC and EPA will be sufficient for use as baseline data to monitor any impacts from the projects construction and operation. This may not be adequate, and further targeted monitoring by the proponent prior to construction may be necessary in order to get more useful baseline data.
In Brief	6.6.1	On one hand, ambient air quality is 'considered to be good' and it then goes on to say that 'levels in the immediate vicinity (within a few metres) of busy roads may be close to or exceed relevant ambient guidelines'. Note: air quality monitoring undertaken by Main Roads and the EPA adjacent to the Riverside Expressway indicates that ambient air quality is well within EPA guidelines for carbon monoxide, nitrous oxides and PM10.
In Brief	6.6.4	There appears to be limited discussion during community consultation of air quality. Exploring negligible impacts of the project on human health as part of community consultation may be an effective strategy rather than weighting the focus towards physical mitigation treatments.
In Brief	6.6.5	The discussion of various air quality parameters does not include reference to particulate matter size of 1 micron. Although there are no current EPA standards for this parameter they may come into place in the next 12-24 months and provision should be made to explore this further.
In Brief	6.7.3	The EIS refers to the use of Open Graded Asphalt as a possible surface treatments and reduction in speed as potential mitigation strategies for traffic noise impacts. These would only be acceptable where other strategies (e.g. noise barriers) are not appropriate, or not required. Main Roads Road Traffic Noise Management Code of Practice sets the standards as to what level of treatment is required.

In Brief	6.8	The emphasis placed on maintaining existing parks and open spaces and riparian areas for their vegetative significance and importance to fauna communities is supported. The suggested wetland area around the north-eastern end as flood mitigation is supported in principle, subject to further exploration in terms of feasibility and practicality.
In Brief	6.10.2	The implications of the Airport Link being a tolled road need to be considered as part of the social impacts. Community severance should be included as a potential social impact of the project. Reduced street connectivity [through creation of cul-de-sacs] combined with noise mitigation structures and other elevated structures proposed may increase community severance and social isolation in the vicinity of portals if not appropriately managed.
In Brief	6.13.3	Adopting an intense screen planting program (Bougainvillea), particularly for noise barriers and exterior canopies and overarching elements adjacent to road pavement may be problematic in terms of maintenance, access and watering issues.
4	4.4.1	It is recommended that the organisation responsible for Airport Link traffic operations be physically located in the Brisbane Metropolitan Traffic Management Centre to promote effectiveness in the management of traffic operations. It is proposed that the operator locate their traffic management and tunnel management systems off site and remotely access these systems from the BMTMC. To make the shift to network level operations, systems will need to be integrated to the STREAMS ITS platform as determined by the Portfolio ITS Strategy and centres should be co-located.
5	5.1.2	Figure 5-2 would benefit by showing the rail lines
5	5.2.4	Bus Network on page 5-22, should include PT as a proportion of total traffic in %.
5	5.2.5	There is little as to any proposed future plans and/or policies of BCC/QT and DMR as to ped/cycle paths or shared lanes particularly for Gympie and Stafford Roads. The provision or otherwise of ped/cycle paths or shared lanes should be better related to any such future plans and/or polices.
5	5.2.5	The Transport Portfolio agrees that Airport Link presents opportunities for bus priority, cycle, pedestrian and inner city urban design improvements. It is suggested that these opportunities be considered as part of the EIS and implemented in concert with the Airport Link project. Experience shows that these opportunities fade once traffic fills available space.
5	5.2.5	There are currently no plans to integrate cycling into Lutwyche Road which is the main corridor above Airport Link. Lutwyche Road is one of the primary corridors for north side residents travelling to the Royal Brisbane Hospital, Fortitude Valley and Brisbane CBD. Cyclists, not only motorists, seek to use this route for the directness it provides.
5	5.2.5	Details of the strategies to ensure existing bicycle routes remain open during construction are required. The EIS states that all current routes will remain open with the exception of a section of the Kedron Brook bikeway. A solution needs to be stated to any closure along the Kedron Brook bikeway as it provides a major corridor for recreational activity as well as east-west utility cycling movement.
5	5.2.5	Parallel cycle paths should be provided at any point the construction works compromise an existing path. These realigned paths should then become the 'new alignment' unless deviation is significant. The quality of temporary diversions must be all weather capable.
5	5.2.5	The pedestrian environment will fall below the standard of the status quo based on Airport Link designs. Pedestrians will be at a particular disadvantage near areas surrounding the tunnel portals.
5	5.2.5	The convoluted nature of portals as a mix of tunnels, lanes, refuge islands and elevated structures either denies passage to pedestrians, will cause them significant delays or raise security concerns. Although specific details are not provided in the EIS, it can be safely assumed that pedestrians will be forced to wait for two to three (perhaps four) sets of signals to cross: 1) Stafford, Lutwyche and Gympie Roads at the north-western connection; and 2) The East-West Arterial and Sandgate Roads at the North eastern connection.

5	5.2.5	All pedestrian crossing facilities should be shortest route possible to limit shortcutting of the road facilities and introducing a high degree of risk. The phasing of signals should also allow pedestrians to cross in 'one go'. If pedestrians and cyclists have to wait through a full phase of each leg of the crossing or part thereof (if refuges are used) there will be either risky attempts to cross 'out of phase' with the walk signals or a significant loss of opportunity to promote active travel within the immediate community. Where possible, crossings should be via bridge or road tunnel – under road bridges and so on, with regard to CPTED principles.
5	5.3.5	In the second paragraph under Table 5-10 advise the numerical values of degree of saturation.
5	5.6.3	An update should be provided of the MR investigations underway on the East-West Arterial and Nudgee Road intersections, the ATC transport study and Stafford Road and Gympie Road.
6	6.1	It should be noted that soil types indicated in The Soil Landscapes of Brisbane and South-eastern Environs Queensland 1:100,000 map (Figure 6-2) represent the dominant soils and the surveyed data is interpretive only. The Terms of Reference (TOR) require a description of the soil profiles likely to be affected by the surface works – only the impacted soil types are included in this section.
6	6.2	To adequately mitigate erosion risks, all areas where soil is to be disturbed and/or placed should be assessed for erosion risk, not just the major excavation areas. The reference to Logan and Clayfield soil types [at the north-eastern worksite] as being moderate to highly dispersive is considered too general and possibly a misinterpretation of the soil type characteristics. Mechanical versus chemical dispersion characteristics should be qualified.
7	7.4.2	Has the existing stormwater systems been checked for adequate capacity to accommodate flows from the untanked tunnels.
9		In 2003, the South Eastern Sydney Public Health Unit and NSW Department of Health published "M5 EAST TUNNELS AIR QUALITY MONITORING PROJECT REPORT JULY 2003". The report made a number of recommendations of precautions to be taken by tunnel users, identified groups of the community that may be at greater risk and indicated the need for more rigorous handling of certain pollutants. Based on the report, NSW Health has recommended that warning signs be erected and brochures distributed to ensure tunnel users are aware of health risks associated with usage of the tunnel. Has this been considered?
9	9.1.2	Goals in Table 9.1 should be referenced to which standard they are using - other than just saying criteria set by the Queensland Government and the NEPC. 1) 1 hour maximum NO2 as 246µg/m3 - where does this figure come from as the EPP (Air) notes the NO2 1 hour as 320 µg/m3 and the NEPM notes the NO2 1 hour as 0.12 ppm. 2) NO2 annual average as 62 µg/m3 - where does this figure come from as the EPP (Air) does not have an annual average and the NEPM annual average for NO2 is 0.03 ppm. 3) PM10 average as 30 µg/m3 - where does this figure come from as the EPP (Air) has an annual average of 50 µg/m3 and the NEPM does not have an annual average for PM 10. 4) SO2 - 24 hour maximum as 225 µg/m3 - where does this figure come from as the EPP (Air) does not have a 24 hour maximum standard and the NEPM has a 24 hour standard as 0.08 ppm
9	9.2.3	Measures for avoiding nuisance dust and odour impacts - lists activities which must be addressed to avoid nuisance from construction activities but does not detail how the activity will be implemented, as this information is to be included as part of a Construction Dust and Odour Environmental Management Plan. Comments assessing measures on avoiding nuisance dust and odour impacts are to be contained in the Construction Dust and Odour Environmental Management Plan. The plan is also to include requirements for monitoring of particulate levels within areas adjacent to the main worksites. As the particulate levels have not been defined - suggest the particulate levels to be monitored include PM10 and PM2.5 as a minimum.

9	9.2.3	Management measures for diesel exhaust emissions - (A) the section notes measures which can minimise the effects of diesel exhaust emissions but does not detail how the measures will be implemented. (B) - It may be relevant to mention the NEPC is currently reviewing the Diesel Vehicle Emissions NEPM.
9	9.2.3	The ToR requested a description of existing sources of odours influencing air quality within the study area. No comments on this were provided and very little consideration is given to odour other than management measures for odorous spoil. No consideration is given to the potential for odour from vehicle exhausts and ventilation ducts. Covering odorous material with a tarpaulin may not be efficacious. However, odour is not considered likely to be a significant issue and the approach of management via a Construction Dust and Odour Environmental Management Plan is supported.
9	Table 9-2	Measures of spoil truck loads (one way) is satisfactory if spoil haulage transport route is circuitous. Should a contractor adopt an "in-out" route then truck movements could double.
9		The adoption of the NEPM goals for particulates creates some minor potential perception issues, given the exceedance of the goals by existing background sources at times. It is stated in the EIS that the NEPM is designed to consider regional population exposure only and it might have been beneficial to compare to both EPP and NEPM guidelines throughout the text to emphasise this point.
9	9.3.1	Table 9.3 notes 1) (1) NEPM CO 8 hour maximum as 9 ppm or 11 mg/m3 - the NEPM notes in the schedule the CO 8 hour maximum as 9 ppm - this may be confusing as to where the 11 mg/m3 comes from (is this due to conversion and rounding?). 2) (2) NO2 NEPM values as both ppm and ug/m3 - the NEPM notes in the schedule NO2 values as ppm only - again, this may be confusing as to where the ug/m3 values come from. 3) (3) NEPM SO2 - 24 hour maximum as both ppm and ug/m3 - the NEPM notes in the schedule SO2 as ppm only. 4) (4) O3 - EPP 4 hour maximum as 0.08 ppm - the EPP schedule notes the O3 standard as 0.079 ppm - the standard has been rounded up. Table 9.3 also notes the NEPM as both ppm and ug/m3 - the NEPM schedule only notes O3 as ppm. 5) (5) NEPM toluene as ppm and mg/m3 - the NEPM schedule notes toluene as ppm only.
9	9.3.4	Page 9-24 notes "In addition, methodologies for measuring ultrafine particles are still being developed and there is no widely agreed technique for measuring both ultrafine particle mass and number." This is not to say that it cannot be done efficiently - QT has been monitoring ultrafine particles now for a number of years using techniques with the QUT.
9	9.3.5	Validation of [air quality] modelling results is critical - this can then confirm the modelling results and identify if any mitigation measures are needed.
9	9.6.1	The EIS suggests that traffic management programs will be required to be implemented to ensure that prolonged exposure (>15 minutes) to nitrogen dioxide is not experienced by any motorist. No reference is given to where this traffic management program would be located or what it may contain.
9	9.7.1	Mention should be made (p9-41) of 3.3 MW of electrical power generation at Rochedale landfill that has been operated by LMS as of 20/9/06.
9	9.7.5	The contention that the Project would result in an improved energy efficiency compared to the NO Project case needs some quantitative estimate, based on the number of vehicles experiencing lower congestion.
10	10.2.1	No analysis of noise impacts have been done using the LA10(15min) parameter.
10	10.2.4	External noise criteria seem to be set based on an ‘acceptable’ internal figure extrapolated to the outside via an adopted 10 or 20 dB(A) façade noise reduction.
10.	10.2.4	Why is there a difference in sound power level for front-end loaders with identical power and mass rating tunnelling during the day and then at night?
10	10.2.4	Are the maximum internal noise goals and external noise goals reported correctly in Table 10-14.

10	10.2.4	Are the noise goals in Table 10-15 (Kalinga Street residences) correct? Should 'residence immediately south' have a night-time noise goal? No measured average lA90, 15min levels are incorporated in the Table 10-15, which would allow determination of the ventilation external criterion. Previously stated steady state ventilation noise not to exceed background LA90 15min when determined as Lamax adj 15min, now Laeq= LA90 +3. Which is correct? Compare Page 10-25 Table 10-23. Where preference is given to the first criterion but in terms of the component noise level. Note that Lamax.adj is not defined or used in the latest version of AS1055.1.
10	10.2.4	Are the external noise goals in Tables 10-16 and 10-17 correct?
10	10.2.4	Adjustments (Table 10-18) need to be made for external noise goals and external sleep disturbance goals.
10	10.3.2	Barrier heights of 7 to 8m at Lutwyche Road, north-western connections would not be acceptable. Alternative noise mitigation measures would be required.
15		TOR Section 5.8.2 requires that design measures be included to mitigate light impacts (particularly through construction phase) – this has not been addressed in Chapter 15.
15	15.2	The successful transplanting and translocation of existing mature tree specimens impacted by Project Works [at Kedron Brook and Kalinga Park] should be prioritised where possible over replacement. Community consultation identified cycle and pedestrian paths as urban design and amenity issues however the response seems to focus on reinstatement of exiting facilities (see Objectives: 3rd dot point) rather than encourage enhancements. The provision or otherwise of ped/cycle paths or shared lanes should be better related to future plans for such facilities and/or polices of BCC/QT/DMR.
15	15.2	Areas of significant cultural, heritage and architectural value should also be included as elements for consideration under Landscape Values as opposed to only natural areas.
15	15.2	While the stated design objectives are appropriate, several key MR objectives for road landscape and urban design should also be addressed by the EIS, including: ▪ Provide a safe road environment for all road users (not only pedestrians and cyclists only); and ▪ Provide sustainable landscape and urban design treatment that minimises ongoing maintenance requirements.
15	15.2 Figure 15.13	The red structure in the median is unidentified – unable to comment on urban design intent. Proposed tree plantings do not comply with MR clear zone requirements. Boulevard treatments may need to be revised to ensure compliance. Little detailing on proposed roadside landscape planting is provided at this stage. However there seems to be intent within the EIS landscape and urban design to provide highly structured subtropical landscapes. Much care will be required at design development to ensure the success of this approach under current water restriction conditions and to ensure that self sustaining vegetation and maintenance minimisation objectives are met.
15	Figure 15.14	The Bougainvillea vegetation screens are not considered feasible and an alternative treatment for comment is requested. The EIS does not adequately explain how this treatment may be achieved (i.e. planter boxes are not evident), nor is it evident how they would be integrated within the structures. Irrigation would be required, contrary to the EIS stated objective of water wise design. Maintenance access could only be achieved through outside lane closures or external raised platforms. Maintenance costs alone would discount the proposed treatment as a feasible option. The strong visual effect created by a brightly flowering vegetation will highlight the structures, rather than integrate them. This treatment seems not to satisfy sustainability, maintenance, cost or aesthetic objectives. The visual mitigation for these structures (bridges, tunnel portals and so on) could be better achieved through a high level of architectural and structural detailing and cosmetic finishing.
15	Figure 15.14	Transparent noise barriers may not adequately mitigate headlight glare from raised structures into adjacent residential areas. Panelling may be more prone to vandal attack and increased replacement/maintenance costs. Road pollution may quickly diminish visual impact mitigation benefits provided by transparent panelling and regular cleaning of panels may be required. Maintenance to both sides will be difficult and ultimately costly due to elevation, requirements to close outside lanes and impediment created by proposed bougainvillea planting.

15	Figure 15.53	The rear of the tunnel portals indicated in this image appears to be devoid of any urban design treatment. Given the visual prominence of these features in the road environment, it is considered that these elements require more detailed design resolution for inclusion within the overall EIS landscape and urban design.
15	Figure 15.57a	Similar concerns as given for Figure 15.12 regards planting over structures. This section indicates vine planting is proposed to planters along wall alignments. As per comments regarding the Bougainvillea treatment, irrigation will be required to sustain this vegetation which is incompatible with the EIS objective of providing water wise design. Maintenance access to planters would appear to require the complete closure of a lane to permit vehicle access.
16	Table 16-12	What is the rationale behind the use of a social discount rate of 5.5% in Table 16-12?
16	Table 16-18	A note as to the implications of the negative figures for motorways in Table 16-18 would improve clarity.
17	17.3.2	The changes made to the ITS about lane control signals appear to bring it in line with the Queensland Road Rules.
19	Table 2	Performance criteria in the “Traffic and Transport – Construction” are not measurable criteria. Performance criteria for managing traffic during the construction period could include: ▪ Volume of vehicles able to pass through the construction site (measurable using pavement detectors); ▪ Travel time of vehicles passing through the roads effected by construction (measurable using travel time surveys); ▪ Safety of vehicles travelling through the construction site (measurable using accident records); and ▪ Level of public satisfaction (measurable through complaint records, surveys). It is suggested that surveys be undertaken before, during and after construction so that the traffic disruption can be managed in the best way possible (this would be very difficult to do without data). During construction on a fortnightly or monthly basis, this data can be analysed to find out new ways to improve performance of the affected network. DMR MRS 11.02 is currently under revision in this regard.
19		Many of the "performance criteria" are actually more like 'actions'. The performance criteria are better located in "monitoring" where the actual values to be achieved are listed (for some but not for all).
20		Framework for urban regeneration not in the EIS TOR as compared with the requirement for urban design (section 15). Section 20.6 recommends that works be included but they have not been costed.
22	22.1.5	Four construction work sites are identified but there is no further discussion of the Clayfield site.
22	22.3.2	Coordinating committee for urban regeneration for coordinated delivery of programs indicates that urban regeneration is separate to the project yet Chapter 20 recommends that urban regeneration be undertaken as a part of the project. It seems that better delineation between what is urban design and what is urban regeneration needs to be made so the scope of works is made very clear as what is in a potential contract and what is not.
Volume 2	TX-001, TX-002, TX-003, TX-004, TX-005	While there are typical cross sections for tunnels and transition structures, a typical road cross section is not apparent. A typical cross section drawing should be provided for Gympie Road and Stafford Road to depict accommodation of predicted traffic volumes to 2026 and pedestrian/cycle facilities (where provided) rather than rely on the Urban Design treatments.
Volume 2	EIS-SO-007, 008,013	An allowance for on road cyclists is to be made within the Gympie Road, Stafford Road and Sandgate Road corridors. It is not clear if these provisions have been made. The works must allow for bicycle movements through all intersections and high quality connectivity between existing and future bicycle facilities.
Volume 2	EIS-SO-013, 008	Pedestrian movements at Sandgate Road and Airport Link (East-West Arterial) have not been fully detailed. It is unclear if the phasing and green times of traffic signals at Gympie and Stafford roads would provide appropriate provisions for pedestrian movements. The works must allow for pedestrian movements through all intersections and provide connections to the existing footpaths.

Volume 2		Access to private properties and businesses need to be maintained. Loss of directional access needs to be identified along with alternative routes.
Volume 2	EIS-SO-007	The EIS needs to address the potential for an undesirable weave from the outbound traffic from Airport Link attempting to cross Gympie Road lanes to Broughton Road. Broughton Road has been identified in the traffic modelling as having a high rat-running potential impacting on three local school precincts.
Volume 2	EIS-SO-008	The diverge point onto Airport Link (East-West) from Gympie Road is close to the intersection with Stafford Road. The EIS needs to address the potential for late weaves entering into the Airport Link (EW) access due to its close proximity to the intersection.
Volume 2	EIS-SO-007	The current proposal to lane drop the right lane on Stafford Road heading west bound against an overpass wall with no option for run out is not acceptable. Also two lanes west bound are needed between Swan Street and Rose Lane to match the ultimate five lane configuration on Stafford Road.
Volume 2	EIS-SO-007, 008,013	Left turn slots at intersections need to be provided and should be of a length to be clear of the 95 percentile of back of queue for the through movements.
Volume 2	EIS-LS-035	The vertical crest curve on NSBTE1 at CH 306 hides the common tangent point for the reverse curves heading towards Mayne Road. In addition, the change requirements for super elevation cross over between reverse curves over the crest will require the super to be rolling out as traffic is midway through the tight horizontal and vertical curves. The EIS needs to address this road geometry.
Volume 2	EIS-LS-036	The speed environment on the straight alignment of control NSBTF1 between CH 150 and CH 450 is inconsistent with the speed capacity of the curve commencing at CH 450. The vertical alignment accentuates the potential for accidents in this location. The EIS needs to address this road geometry.
Volume 2	EIS-SO-001, 002,003, 007, 008,013	Sight distances to diverge points need to be checked for compliance with standards.
Volume 2	EIS-LS-023 GR9BK1	Horizontal and vertical curve combination fails to meet Road Planning and Design Manual standards (Chapter 11 Horizontal Alignment). The EIS needs to address this road geometry.
Volume 2	EIS-SO-001, 002,003, 007, 008,013	Operational legibility and safety at interchanges with short distances between merges and diverges will rely heavily on comprehensive signage. No information is available in the EIS to demonstrate how this can be achieved through a signing program. The EIS needs to address legibility of decision points and signage to assist the legibility.
Volume 2	EIS-LS-010	The EIS layouts indicate that the clearance for traffic would be reduced to between 3.8m to 4.0m.The existing bridge underpass clearance for Melton Road under East West Arterial should be maintained.
Volume 2	EIS-SO-008	There will be a strong east to west pedestrian movement across Gympie Road to access the Kedron Brook Busway Station. The pedestrian facilities at the interchange are circuitous and poorly accommodated with five crossing point to access the station. The EIS needs to provide a separate pedestrian facility or greatly improve the at-grade crossing.
Volume 2	EIS-SO-007	It would appear that the existing signalised pedestrian crossing on Gympie Road at the bowling alley opposite Somerset Road (and proposed new outbound bus stop) had been removed. A pedestrian facility in this vicinity needs to be reinstated or alternative access for pedestrians detailed.
Volume 2	EIS-SO-008	It is unclear how the signal phasing and geometric layouts accommodate for bus movements from the Busway to Kedron Park Road and Airport Link. If the movement is intended then the EIS needs to address this in the intersection layouts.
Volume 2	EIS-SO-007	An additional lane outbound in Gympie Road (between Stafford Road and Sadlier Road) needs to be provided to accommodate the two-lane flow outbound from Lutwyche Road. Currently this two lane flow is reduced to a single lane near Broughton Road.

Volume 2		There are a number of design elements that at preliminary design have not been fully resolved, as is usual, and these have been documented in the Reference Design Report for future detailed design development and resolution. The Reference Design Report has not been included in the EIS to provide an explanation of the issue and a proposed resolution methodology. Justification needs to be given to a number of aspects, for example Gympie Road reduced to one lane after Homebush Road until merging with the two lane from AL. The traffic numbers that support this provision need to be related to the response.
Volume 3	Report 01	Insufficient detail on the traffic model outputs makes it difficult to determine if operational requirements can be met and/or maintained at current levels within the Gympie Road and Stafford Road corridors. More detail needs to be provided. In addition it is not clear if the operation of the Airport Link will result in additional delays or queuing on Gympie Road and Stafford Road. (Especially where 3 northbound lanes drop to one prior to Broughton Road).
Volume 3	Report 01	Existing turn lane vehicle storage capacities are to be maintained or increased at all intersections
Volume 3	Report 01	The increase in through volumes predicted in Gympie and Stafford Roads would indicate that right turn movements would need to be restricted at some intersections on Gympie Road north of Stafford Road. These restrictions, redirections and or U turn requirements and their impacts on the adjoining road networks need to be identified.
Volume 3	Report 01	There is doubt that the right turn traffic movement from Stafford Road/Gympie Road east bound towards Lutwyche can be satisfactorily accommodated without grade separation due to the number of movements be catered for at the intersection and its close proximity to diverges onto the Airport Link. The EIS needs to demonstrate the expected delays to the intersection in combination with the adjacent network with a microsimulation traffic model. Should the model demonstrate unacceptable delays then grade separation of additional movements must be considered.
Volume 3 s	Report 01	It is unclear if the traffic modelling has provided spare capacity for the growth of Public Transport volumes in the AM and PM peaks. This needs to be clearly explained. It is expected that additional volumes of buses will be generated in Gympie Road and Stafford Road to feed onto the Northern Busway. Final treatments need to be further investigated and are likely to be more extensive than 'indented bus bays'.
Volume 3	Report 01	Whilst the EIS concludes that the Gympie Road impacts reduce to 6-7% by Chermside, a closer inspection of the '2012 PM2 + Airport Link' plots reveals significant 'rat-running' on local streets compared with the '2012 PM2 Do Min' (Street: 2012PM2 Do Min/2012PM2 + Airport Link): ■ Clarence Road: 320/630; ■ Broughton Road: 110/1020; ■ Turner Road: 140/1030; and ■ Moree Street: 140/890. The EIS needs to clearly explain what measures will be applied to manage this rat-running including this diverted traffic on Gympie Road that is likely to extend the impacts beyond Chermside. The management of potential rat-running needs to be detailed as does the process for managing traffic redirected (resulting from the management of rat-running) into the Gympie Road corridor.
Volume 3 s	Report 01	Model plots Stafford Road-Webster Road '2012 PM2 Do Min' - the low west bound count on Stafford Road west of Webster Road (2210) and the high north bound count on Webster Road north of Stafford Road (4530) seem inconsistent and need to be explained.
Volume 3	Report 01	Model plots Stafford Road-Gympie Road '2012 AM2 Do Min' - The low south bound count on Gympie Road north of Stafford Road (6300)t needs explanation .
Volume 3	Report 01	The EIS canvases a number of treatments to investigate for Stafford Road, between Gympie Road and Webster Road (p 9-135). However, the EIS does not state whether land is required. The EIS needs to identify options to manage the future demand on Stafford Road.

Volume 3	Report 01	The EIS forecasts significant increases in contra-peak demands on Gympie Road (north of Stafford Road): ■ AM - northbound - from 2953 (2004) to 4460 (2012 DoMin) to 5610 (2012+AL); and ■ PM - southbound - from 3286 (2004) to 4900 (2012 DoMin) to 5910 (2012+AL). Although there is a natural increase in the amount of contra-peak demand to 2012, the Airport Link Project results in a significant increases in contra-peak demand: 2012+AL/2012 DoMin: ■ AM NB +26% 5610/4460; ■ PM SB +21% 5910/4900. These increases are likely to lead to: ■ Reduced peak-direction capacity (as green time is allocated to the contra-peak direction turning movements); ■ Construction of raised medians in segments where turn movements are currently prevented by a double centre-line; ■ Increased pressure on signalised side street demands; and ■ Difficulty in maintaining pedestrian and cyclist amenity.
Volume 3	Report 01 3.3.2	Only part of KSD is a B-double route, not all of it.
Volume 3	Report 01 Figure 9-6 and Table 9-7	Need to explain in the EIS why the traffic volume on Sandgate Road north of East West Arterial is unloaded in 2026.
Volume 3	Report 05	The fifth dot point on the first page of the Executive Summary should be qualified to state that concentrations would be expected to decrease if congestion does not worsen significantly (by measures such as the proposed tunnel). It would be useful to also present a long-term wind rose to help justify that the 2004 wind rose data are representative. The omission of data from Rocklea (as requested in the ToR) is not considered to be significant, as the nearby sites would be expected to be more representative. It would be useful to quantify and discuss how much lower predictions based on the SEQ inventory data would be compared to the PIARC emissions data.
Volume 3	Report 05	The Section on Emission Estimates on p23 notes that future emissions are likely to be lower as a result of new design rules. It would be useful to quantify the magnitude of potential improvement based on adoption of proposed design rules. The peak hour periods are nominated on p23 as hours ending 7, 8, 9, 16, 17, 18 and 19 consistent with congested hours for the Cross City Tunnel EIS in Sydney. It is recommended that hourly traffic and speed estimates be considered further – examination of Traffic Census data for several major Brisbane roads suggests that traffic flow for the hour ending 10 may be higher than for the hour ending 7 and that traffic flow for the hour ending 15 may be higher than for the hour ending 19. This may be of some significance, given the lower dispersion conditions expected in the early morning. It would be useful to have some indication of the sensitivity of emissions to a more realistic vehicle speed distribution, rather than the simple free-flowing/congested 80 kph/20 kph assumption.
Volume 3	Report 05	It would be worthwhile to assess the likely impact of the occurrence of 'flagging' (due to winds above 5 m/s) and proposed control measures (Table 8). Figures 41 to 45 compare the existing situation with the future (2012) with and without the tunnel, presented as a percentage change. It may be beneficial to present a comparison of the percentage change for 2012 for the situation with the tunnel compared to that without. Do the emission factors in Table 21 include the likely increases in congestion of the existing network without the tunnel? The headings of Tables C3 and C4 in Appendix C are confusing.

Volume 3	Report 05	Section 5.4.1 of the ToR states that the scope includes consistency with the South East Queensland Regional Air Quality Strategy (SEQRAQS). That document is apparently not mentioned in the EIS. Check references. Section 5.4.4 of the ToR states that reference should be made to the Brisbane Air Quality Strategy (2004). That document is apparently not mentioned in the EIS. Check references. Section 5.4.2 of the ToR states that the findings of modelling for the construction phase of the Project should be presented. This was apparently not done.
Volume 3	Report 06	The report notes that worst case increases in pollutant levels were used for assessing health impact and that improvements in predicted air quality were not used as offsets. It would be beneficial to present some basic worked calculations to demonstrate how such offsets might work (i.e. estimated number of persons exposed to increased concentration and average increase compared to estimated number of persons exposed to decreased concentration and average decrease for the situation 'with tunnel' compared to 'without'). Some further qualification of the summarised health impacts may be required so that findings are not taken out of context i.e. p10 states that 'Epidemiological models of the acute health impacts of ambient NO2 predict that on the days where the maximum increase in NO2 occurs, there will be an increase in hospital admissions for cardiovascular, respiratory diseases in people aged 65 and over and asthma. An impact on mortality is also forecast'. This might need to be softened, qualified or made more general for example, 'maximum' replaced by 'any', or an explanation added that such events might be expected to occur at a rate of less than one event per year if such an increase occurred every day (rather than once per year as predicted). 'Worst case' may need to be inserted in the first sentence of the section headed PM10 (p10) in line with the findings for CO, formaldehyde and NO2.
Volume 3	Report 09	The EIS should address whether there will be Brisbane City Council neighbourhood planning for example Lutwyche Corridor and Albion Neighbourhood Plans

Submission No.		N/A State Government Department
Department		Department of Housing
Address		Level 13, 61 Mary Street GPO Box 690, Brisbane QLD 4001
Date Received		29 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
14	14.3.4 14.4.4	Proposed resumption of a number of private sector boarding houses located in Earle Street and Colton Avenue and 20 units and six houses of affordable private rental accommodation, is likely to have a significant impact on the supply of low cost housing in the area.
14	14.3.4 14.4.4	Any loss of affordable housing within the study area would run counter to the SEQRP principles and would affect the department's ability to respond to high need clients who require affordable housing located near high end use facilities.
14 20	14.5.2 20.5.3	Loss of any affordable housing is of great concern. The department expects that innovative solutions will be implemented to ensure that there is no nett loss of affordable housing as a result of the project. Departmental officers will continue to work collaboratively with the project team to identify strategies to ensure there is no net loss of affordable housing.
14 20	14.5.2 20.5.3	Some mitigation measures include: ■ Opportunities for building long-term social housing on land not used as the project nears completion; and ■ Opportunities to construct affordable housing through community organisations on land along the busway route.

14t	14.3.4 14.4.4	While loss of existing residential services is acknowledged as inevitable, the department has lead responsibility for coordinating implementation of the Residential Services Closure Response: Queensland Government Interagency Protocol. The protocol sets out roles and responsibilities to respond to residents affected by the closure of private residential services and assist in finding alternative housing/ support options. Department expects continued consultation with the project team regarding the resumption of these properties so timely response can be implemented for residents.

Submission No.		N/A State Government Department
Department		Department of Public Works
Address		Level 4, 80 George Street GPO Box 2906 Brisbane QLD 4001
Date Received		30 November 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
22	Property	Airport Link does not directly affect properties owned or managed by the Department of Public Works.
4	4.2.6 4.3.13	Requested that the Department of Public Works is informed and consulted in conjunction with the Department of Emergency Services of any developments that may be located on the site to ensure longer term master planning aspects are considered in regard to both the proposed air handling unit [ventilation outlet and station] and other potential future developments at the Department of Emergency Services Kedron campus.
5	5.3.5 5.6.3	The increased traffic flows en-route to the Brisbane Airport will need to address the existing and already highly congested 'at grade' intersections of Nudgee Road and the Gateway Motorway roundabout and the future 'at grade' intersection at Sandgate Road after project completion. It is imperative to ensure these three 'at grade' intersections are addressed as an integral part of the Airport Link Project to ensure successful traffic flow outcomes for the community.

Submission No.		N/A State Government Department
Department		Department of Communities
Address		Level 2, 230 Lutwyche Road PO Box 2186 Windsor QLD 4030
Date Received		5 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
22		The Department considers that the EIS addresses social impact assessment and community consultation components of the Terms of Reference well
14	14.3.2	EIS should more fully address the social impacts of a considerable increase in traffic on Stafford Road. Such a large increase in traffic volume is likely to result in significant negative social impacts including: ■ Community severance and loss of community cohesion; ■ Creation of local access and connectivity issues; ■ Loss of amenity and suburb character; and ■ Health issues associated with increased vehicle emissions and incidence of accidents.
14	14.3.2	Stafford has a high proportion of older residents. Older residents typically have great difficulty negotiating major roads and predicted increases in the volume of traffic on Stafford Road is likely to create an acute access barrier for many of these residents. A possible mitigating strategy is the inclusion of Stafford in the Urban Regeneration Framework.

21	21.4	Chapter devoted to cumulative impacts is very much orientated towards cumulative economic impacts which are wholly positive. To provide greater balance to the cumulative impacts section, it would be appropriate to also include statements relating to the potential negative social impacts of Airport Link, including Airport Link could contribute towards social exclusion by accelerating loss of affordable housing, displacing existing residents, and negative impacts on community cohesion and social infrastructure over time.

Submission No.		N/A State Government Department
Department		Department of Emergency Services
Address		Cnr Kedron Park Road and Park Road, GPO Box 1425 Brisbane QLD 4001
Date Received		6 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
4	4.4.3	In regard to the complete failure of power supply, will the Uninterruptible Power Supply run the deluge system?
4	4.4.3	It is recommended that essential services include "location markers" [in the context of those to be maintained by a UPS].
4		As one of the proposed worksites is situated on land owned by DES, further consultation with regard to property matters is necessary.
4	4.3.18 4.3.20	The EIS does not mention delivery arrangements for precast components that may have the potential for significant impact on the Kedron worksite as they will need to be stored and managed. It is recommended that the delivery and management of the precast components be addressed in the EIS.
5	5.6.5x	Park Road is noted as having secondary access to the DES complex but it is next to Kedron State High School and increased usage may present risk to school children. During school terms Park Road is very busy. Moreover, emergency vehicles (ambulances) use Kedron Park Road access to quickly exit the complex. These issues need to be adequately addressed in the detailed project design.
12	12.2.6 s	Access to the site of the Emergency Services Complex under the Kedron Brook Bridge is a concern as the road would be below the designated flood level.
19	Hazard and Risk -- Operation	It is recommended that Incident Management Plans be developed for the full range of potential emergencies.
17	17.3.2	To help ensure that the fire and life safety design of AL will allow the Queensland Fire and Rescue Service to meet its statutory obligations to protect life, property and the environment from fire and hazardous materials emergencies it is recommended that:- Early and ongoing consultation with DES/QFRS on the planning and design development process for the fire and life safety design of the structure. This would be expected to include, but not be limited to, the establishment of a 'Fire and Life Safety Committee' to facilitate the input of key stakeholders (including QFRS) to the development of the infrastructure fire and life safety design.
17	17.3.2	To help ensure that the fire and life safety design of AL will allow the Queensland Fire and Rescue Service to meet its statutory obligations to protect life, property and the environment from fire and hazardous materials emergencies it is recommended that:- Consultation with QFRS on the particular processes to be implemented to ensure that an independent suitably qualified and experienced, rigorous technical review of the fire and life safety design proposals and supporting analysis is undertaken.
17	17.3.2	To help ensure that the fire and life safety design of AL will allow the Queensland Fire and Rescue Service to meet its statutory obligations to protect life, property and the environment from fire and hazardous materials emergencies it is recommended that:- DES/QFRS endorsement of the fire and life safety design of the infrastructure including appropriate testing of key elements is achieved prior to operation of the tunnel

4	Volume 2	It is noted that the schematic drawings of the Airport Link Feasibility Study have limited detail. As such, the full implications upon QAS will remain unknown until full and accurate plans are able to be viewed and commented upon.
5 21	5.6.5 x	There appear to be potential limitations of access/egress for emergency vehicles when looking at the project, including the Northern Busway, as a whole
5	5.6.5	Access/egress to/from the proposed infrastructure should take into account the need for the delivery of all emergency services in view of the proposal that ten trucks per hour are expected to traverse the Kedron Project site..
5	5.6.5	Proposed periods of construction may have considerable impact on QAS service delivery. In particular, access/egress for the QAS Intensive Care Station in the Emergency Services complex on Kedron Park Road.
5	5.6.5	There is potential for impacts on pedestrian and vehicular movements to/from/around/across QAS Intensive Care Paramedic Station within the DES complex Kedron. Warning signs, restrictive crossing areas, barriers will need to be considered to prevent accidents between vehicles, pedestrians and emergency vehicles.
5	5.6.5	Ambulance access and egress is required to a standard that is supportive of QAS Units weight and size as well as all patient care equipment to all areas (or close proximity to), and areas of public access should have provision of :--ramps (not steps), lift access etc (where applicable)
5	5.6.5	Heights of all new structures should not be restrictive to QAS (or other emergency vehicles) access/egress to incidents within the precinct of the project and associated areas during or after construction.
4	4.2	Bikeways, ramps etc. will need to be underpinned wherever emergency vehicles are required to cross into public areas thereby limiting potential for infrastructure and QAS vehicle and equipment to be damaged.
4	4.2	Any underpass or tunnel structure (pedestrian, bike, buses or vehicle) should provide for ease of access for QAS equipment and/or vehicles, and should be adequately illuminated at all hours.
4	4.2	Emergency vehicle access and egress to all areas of the infrastructure is a specific requirement, including the potential recovery of patients from the public access areas and the Busway terminals.
4	4.2	Any review of these parcels of land should consider the potential requirement for Emergency Management Queensland to land a helicopter in emergency situations.
4	4.3.16	Any plantings or review of vegetation should be based on an appropriate risk assessment of that vegetation in regard to the possible consequence of ingestion/allergic reaction by pedestrians/commuters and surrounding road/busway networks. The possibility must also be highlighted that leaf litter may constitute may constitute a slip/trip hazard on roads, busways and pedestrian ways.
4	4.2	A risk assessment needs to be undertaken of all structural links as potential high risk environments (I.e. accident scenes and potential suicides).
4	4.2	Infrastructure should be named and signposted with any signage to include the physical location of that piece of infrastructure, including the street address of that location. This will provide a caller for emergency help with the ability to accurately describe the location of an emergency and allow emergency services to more quickly find the site so described.
9	9.6	Location of the Ventilation Station and outlet is of concern. The potentially hazardous pollutants being exhausted within the Emergency Services Complex where approximately 800 staff are accommodated are of concern to DES. A third party assessment in regard to these emissions and there potential effects on DES staff is requested.
4	4.2	An assessment of the impact of other concurrent infrastructure projects needs to be conducted, specifically addressing the risk to emergency services mobility. (i.e. To what extent will multiple projects impede the capacity of emergency vehicles to travel freely from incident sites to health facilities. We need to understand whether response profiles will be affected).

3	3.4	State Planning Policy 1/03 Outcome 3 requires "Wherever possible, community infrastructure to which this SPP applies is located and designed to function effectively during and immediately after natural hazard events commensurate with a specified level of risk." Community infrastructure to which the SPP applies is specified in Appendix 9 of the SPP 1/03 Guideline. Where the community infrastructure is located below the recommended flood level specified for that infrastructure it is required to be designed to be resilient to flooding and to be operable as soon as possible after flooding. It is required that the design of AL effectively addresses the risk of flooding, particularly given the location of Gympie Road and Sandgate Road interchanges in the Kedron Brook floodplain.
14		The proposed alignment of the tunnels at the North-western Connection has a severe impact on the Emergency Services Complex, particularly the Gympie Road access, staff car parking and the Kedron Brook Building. Any proposals to address the impact that the structure will have on the property will further seriously affect the amenity of the current site and will impact the regard with which it is currently held as a sought-after workplace.
4	4.2	A major impact of the tunnel alignment is the network of roads at the intersection of Gympie and Kedron Brook Roads and the links to surface roads from the tunnel. Three levels of road are proposed for the intersection -- the tunnel, the surface and the elevated overpass.
4	4.2	An off-ramp from the tunnel inbound will surface in close proximity to the DES pool complex and there is an outbound ramp linking Gympie Road to the tunnel at the point where the KBB now stands. It is estimated 30,000 cars per day will use this link road.
4	4.2	The proposed alignment of the tunnel bisects the DES Complex decimating the potential for growth on the Kedron site. Loss of approximately 40% of the site, height of on and off ramps and the link road from Gympie Road to the outbound tunnel ramp will significantly affect the DES's master plan for development and future growth of the site.
4	4.2	Because the Gympie Road entry is the principal entry point to the complex for staff and commercial vehicles its loss to road construction will be a major detriment to the Complex's operation. Heavy vehicles, in particular, will have difficulties with the alternatives in terms of safety and turning circles.
5	5.6.5	Provision of access and egress for staff needs to be identified, with the development of alternative arrangements almost certainly having negative impact on the visual and workplace amenity.
4	4.2	The Kedron Brook Building will need to be demolished with the functional technical units it now contains needing to be relocated. Alternative accommodation at other DES sites is not available. Moreover, the 2000 m2 of functional office space from the Kedron Brook Building cannot be absorbed into the main complex building. DES has submitted a compensation claim to the Airport Link Project Team for the loss of property that will result from the construction process and for the redevelopment necessary to continue the services here mentioned.
4	4.2	DES gave assurances to staff in developing the business case for the Kedron Complex that ample car parking would be provided for staff at the complex. All car parking adjacent to the Kedron Brook Building is lost to the project. Development options for car parking are included in the business case and compensation claim submitted to the Airport Link Project Team.
10		It is envisaged that there will be an increase in noise levels at the DES Kedron Complex during construction and operation of the project. Construction works, increased passing traffic from Gympie and Stafford Roads and the operation of the ventilation outlet station are seen as major potential contributors to increased noise levels. It is vital that acoustic design data and actual readings from similar tunnel projects are pursued to provide sound information on which to base future decision making.
4	4.3.2	The storage, movement, treatment and disposal of tunnel spoil, contaminated soils, Acid Sulphate Soils and hazardous materials on site poses risks which must be addressed. It is noted that the EIS recognises the importance of these issues and indicates measures to be taken to reduce negative impacts.
15	15.3.2	The visual amenity afforded by the green space including the sports oval and other green belts between the main building and the Kedron Brook Building will be severely curtailed by the tunnel construction.

15	15.3.2	The ventilation outlet station and stack will also severely impact the visual amenity of the DES Complex as a large solid block with base of more than 120m2 and height up to 30 metres of visual pollution to DES staff.
9	9.6	The ventilation shaft will pump out more than 2700 cubic metres of heated, exhaust-polluted air every minute and despite the height of the stack, there will be an impact on the surrounding area that will vary depending on the direction and strength of any wind.
9	9.6	The exhaust discharges of the large number of heavy vehicles and the generation of dust on site will further degrade the air quality around the DES Complex. The preferred position of DES is to request a third party analysis and evaluation of this potential impact and its possible health effects.
14	14.3.1 14.3.1	A number of DES staff cycle to work and others access the Complex on foot. Students at Kedron State High School use the green spaces behind their school for access to and from to avoid the heavy traffic load on Gympie Road and Kedron Park Road. The safety of these groups of users will need to be considered in developing alternative accessways during construction.

Submission No.		N/A State Government Department
Department		Department of Local Government, Planning, Sport and Recreation
Address		Level 18, 41 George Street, PO Box 15031 City East QLD 4002
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
19	19.5.3 19.5.4 19.5.5 s	The Dept's main interest is the development approval process under the Integrated Planning Act 1997 and the Brisbane City Plan 2000 (City Plan).
4	4.6.1	Some aspects of the project, during the construction phase and urban mitigation works phase, are likely to constitute assessable development which may require assessment under City Plan.
		The Department acknowledges the significant role of the proposed Airport Link for easing traffic congestion in the northern suburbs and linking the Brisbane Airport to the southern and south-western suburbs.
		The Department also supports the urban regeneration initiatives proposed for the transport corridor.

Submission No.		N/A State Government Department
Department		BCC Transport & Traffic Branch, City Policy & Strategy Division
Address		GPO Box 1434 Brisbane QLD 4001
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
		The Airport Link generally provides for pedestrians and in the case that an existing pathway is affected by the project, a new or improved link will be provided in its place.
2	2.3.4	Noting the provision for pedestrians there appears to be no little or no provision for cyclists. There is no mention of where cyclists will travel after departing the ICB, and no mention of a parallel corridor along the Airport Link alignment.
2	2.3.4 g	There is no real evidence to show that Airport Link is improving the pedestrian/cycle environment along the Airport Link corridor.

5	Tech Report No. 1, section 9.6	Impact of Airport Link construction and ultimate infrastructure on walking and cycling mobility, through portal arrangements, during construction staging and not improving accessibility across Lutwyche Road.
5	Tech Report No. 1, section 3.7	No off-road north/south connection for cyclists or pedestrians between Kedron Brook shared pathway and CBD. Arterial roads are direct but without dedicated facilities. Safer back street routes are gradient constrained and indirect. Sandgate Road bicycle lanes cease at Nundah (inbound). Poor quality pedestrian and cycle connection between major shared pathways and key destinations such as Centro Toombul, Centro Lutwyche and Lutwyche Road bus services. Centro Toombul severs the Kedron Brook shared pathway.
5	Tech Report No. 1, section 6.1.6	The trip generation model has incorporated trips by all modes, including walking and cycling. Results of these average daily weekday modes are not shown in mode splits. The model apparently shows changes from "other modes" to private vehicle as a result of Airport Link (Tech Report No. 1, page 6-81, section 6.1.6). A request is made for data from the modelling relevant to walking and cycling,
5	Tech Report No. 1, section 9.6.1	No cyclist facilities are mentioned in relation to the Southern Connection, especially in terms of addressing the existing corridor along Lutwyche Road, or connection to existing networks along ICB and INB
5	Tech Report No. 1, section 3.7	Lutwyche Road and Sandgate Road are recognised as commuter routes. However, Lutwyche Road lacks on-road cycle lanes, lane widths are too narrow to facilitate lane sharing with motor vehicles and the short sections of inbound transit lanes are heavily used by buses. Generally the route is disregarded as a formal one for cyclists.
5	Tech Report No. 1, section 9.2.2	Stafford Road is recognised as a preliminary bikeway in the Bicycle Brisbane Plan so the citing of "Facilities for pedestrians and cyclists" as examples of arterial traffic measures that should be investigated for implementation along Stafford Road are supported. Dedicated cycle lanes and improved footpaths are requested.
5	Tech Report No. 1, section 9.6.2	Addition of a new path provided east of existing KB ped/cycle bridge (near Fifth Avenue) to connect the Kedron Brook pathway with the Kedron State High School ovals across a cut and cover section of Airport Link. Accessibility between school and pathway is supported.
5	Tech Report No. 1, section 9.6.3	The Airport Link Project proposes modifications and realignment of some sections of the Schulz Canal pathway with the section between Jackson Street and Melton Road relocated to the northern bank. This is suitable post-construction but it is imperative that during construction access is provided to and along this corridor, from both ends of the construction worksite, and specifically from existing facilities at Jackson St, Melton Rd, Parklands St, Stuckey Rd, Alma Rd and Sandgate Road. It is important also that access is maintained between the Schulz Canal pathway and Toombul Railway Station, and that access is provided across/under the rail line which is a significant barrier to accessibility in the area.
5	Tech Report No. 1, section 9.5.3	The Airport Link Project is to affect 4 existing bus stops once operational and a further three bus stops during construction. Pedestrian and cycle access to temporary and new bus stops must be maintained during construction and afterwards in conjunction with northern Busway. In particular the proposed bus stop between Lasseter Street and Park Terrace along Gympie Road should be constructed with improved footpath facilities.
5	19.6	For all construction staging, a traffic management plan that shows cycle detours and pedestrian accessibility must be shown to Active Transport
		Access to existing railway stations, such as Toombul, must be maintained at all times.

Submission No.		N/A State Government Department
Department		BCC City Planning, Urban Management Division
Address		Level 16, 69 Ann Street, GPO Box 1434 Brisbane QLD 4001
Date Received		8 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
12		Lutwyche Road Corridor Neighbourhood Plan (in preparation)--There is continual reference in EIS to integration of land use and transport infrastructure planning. However, Council's ability to integrate land use planning outcomes with the Airport Link structures is limited given the advanced stage of design of the project. It is not within the scope of the Lutwyche Road Corridor Neighbourhood Plan to mitigate impacts of Airport Link. All mitigation actions are to be carried out by or on behalf of the Proponent and be clearly identified and costed in tender documents as the proponent's responsibility (to carry out and fund).
12 15		Bowen Hills--SEQ Regional Plan identifies Bowen Hills as an opportunity for transit oriented development. Urban Renewal Brisbane is reviewing the Bowen Hills Local Area Plan to ensure (1) the EIS addresses legibility and access to Bowen Hills Station; (2) AL does not compromise station access improvements, surrounding land uses planning opportunities integrated open space system and access to pedestrian and cycle paths; (3) AL does not prejudice creation of a rail/bus interchange.
5t		The impacts of AL on possible transport configurations should be further detailed specifically for:- Campbell St; intersection of O'Connell Terrace, Brookes St, Hamilton Place; and intersection of Abbotsford Rd, Markwell St and Montpelier Rd. In addition, proposed timing for provision of public spaces and key connections should be provided as part of the EIS
14		Social and Community-- Though the EIS raises a number of social values and key impacts, the mitigation measures proposed are extremely limited, are not costed over the life of the impact and have not been resourced through any social infrastructure arrangement.
15		Mitigation options regarding the loss of several community facilities (e.g. former Police Station/ PCYC Headquarters) have not been explicitly detailed or process explained. Open space is critical to the well-being of communities and innovative, creative opportunities to provide new spaces have not been demonstrated.
15		Bowen Hills is to be impacted by several major transport projects including AL. AL may be an opportunity to redress some resulting issues:- (1) Pedestrian connectivity between key public facilities (RBH and Bowen Hills train station) needs to be identifiable, safe and accessible; (2) Cycle connectivity is needed to green space networks and the RNA grounds; (3) Need for active frontages to all main pedestrian connections; (4) Need for infrastructure to support provision of commercial retail development along the northern edge of O'Connell Terrace; (5) Design the ventilation stack as an engaging sculptural vertical landmark within the new parkland; (6) timing of the provision of the public spaces/connections.
15		What is the scope of work beyond the transport infrastructure to mitigate identified impacts?
12		What are the proposed land use patterns for remaining land and what bits are "left over" and will require additional work to integrate them into a cohesive urban fabric?
15		What are the expectations of additional BCC works to further enhance connectivity, so that they may be considered in future budget allocations?
15		Mitigation works in Bowen Hills should:--(1) provide a high quality urban design outcome by promoting connectivity, legibility and safety; (2) Design overbridges, public art, noise barriers and transport infrastructure as visual contributions to the public realm; (3) Be have strong commitment to sustainability and tropical design.

15		Landscaping requirements should include: ■ Large trees at key points (preferably *Ficus*), to reinforce Brisbane's subtropical character and provide a foil to the size of the transport infrastructure; ■ Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) and on-site stormwater retention; ■ Widened footpaths and building setbacks; ■ Clumped informal street tree plantings consistent with a subtropical boulevard; and ■ Inviting, no glare hardstand areas.
15		O'Connell Terrace will become a major pedestrian thoroughfare so: 1) Setbacks to create wider pedestrian spaces should be considered, particularly near entrances to the RNA Showgrounds; 2) Awning cover should be provided where possible to allow for shaded all-weather connection between key public facilities; and 3) Finishes should be of a high quality commensurate with its inner urban location.
15		Pedestrian and cycle connectivity require: 1) Signage and wayfinding elements consistent with wider city signage; 2) Design and lighting in line with CPTED principles reviewed by Council and QLD Police Safety audits; and 3) Limited driveway cross-overs to reduce pedestrian/cycle and vehicle conflicts along O'Connell Terrace.
15		A lighting plan is required that is consistent for the entire precinct.

Submission No.		N/A State Government Department
Department		Department of Education, Training and the Arts
Address		30 Mary Street, PO Box 15033 City East QLD 4002
Date Received		13 December 2006
Properly Made		Yes
EIS Chapter	**EIS Section Reference**	**Summary of Issues**
9		It is important to note that the air quality standards or goals established as part of the NEPM are designed to be measured to give an 'average' representation of air quality. That is the NEPM monitoring protocol was not designed to apply to monitoring peak concentrations from major emission sources.
9		The health risk assessment concludes that there will be no appreciable change in community health as a consequence of AL. This assumption will require testing over time as little is currently known about the impact of ultra fine particulate matter on humans, and in particular, in their formative years.
9		Location of significant work sites for AL and the Northern Busway in close proximity to both Wooloowin State School and Kedron State High School with attendant operation of heavy diesel-powered machinery, excavation and storage of rock materials, extraction of air from underground tunnels and impediments to traffic flows to accommodate vehicles entering or leaving the worksites are of concern in relation to student and staff health as is the location of the portal near the Kedron State High School oval.
9		Whilst there is no issue with the stated goals for ambient air quality the forecast change in air quality as a result of AL is an issue e.g. in respect of the predicted increase in annual average NO2 level at Wooloowin State School of 3.69 ug/m3 (1.8parts per billion).
9		Discussion of the long term effects of ambient exposure to air pollution in the EIS (Volume 3, Technical Report 5b) have raised community concerns in respect of: 1) Location of a ventilation outlet in the vicinity of Wooloowin State School and Kedron State High School (This Department has indicated that ventilation towers should be no closer than 300 metres to a school site.); 2) Location of ventilation outlet in relation to sensitive land uses including schools, child care, aged care, residential areas, open spaces and recreational areas; 3) Need for filtration of ventilation outlets employing world's best practice and at any cost;

		4) Need for online real time monitoring and reporting of air quality during construction and operation; and 5) Validation and certification of air quality models.
10		With respect to the note in Technical Report on Noise and Vibration to the effect that further examination of Kedron State High School should be undertaken to see whether the windows are normally open (as assumed) or whether they are air-conditioned and the windows kept shut the Department takes the position of the EPA's Noise Measurement Manual 3rd ed. 1 March 2000 which states "Measurements should be made in habitable rooms with doors and windows open or closed to represent typical 'worst case' conditions".
14		Given schools operate five days per week for 40 weeks a year, the duration of the construction and the increased traffic post-construction is a significant issue for the Department. Long term mitigation as opposed to temporary mitigation during construction is deemed appropriate to ensure student learning is not impacted.
10		The Department supports noise mitigation measures immediately adjacent to the Kedron and other construction sites due to the use of rock breakers (that can exceed the standard by up to 30dBA) and other construction activities.
10		The assessment that prevailing levels of traffic noise will mask construction noise is unacceptable as any increase in noise has the potential to impact upon the learning environment.
10		The fan noise at the tunnel portal near schools raises concerns along with the disposal of pollutants.
4 5		The expectation that the Department of Emergency Services relocate its access road to it car park along a road on the Kedron State High School boundary has serious implications for the high school. In excess of 500 vehicles will utilise this road daily, mainly between 7.45am and 8.45am when students are accessing the footpath along Kedron Park Road. As the school's music block, hall, general learning areas and canteen facilities are located immediately adjacent to this proposed road the issue of increased traffic noise, air quality concerns and implications for student safety will be paramount concerns to staff, students and parents.
4 5		The EIS acknowledges the complexity of the Gympie Road, Lutwyche Road, Kedron Park Road intersection. The requirement to maintain safe pedestrian movements is crucial for the safety of students attending both Wooloowin State School and Kedron State High School. These concerns are held not only by current students and their parents but also by prospective parents that may consider alternative schools should student safety be compromised.
4 5		Of the 950 students at Kedron State High School a recent survey showed 29% travel by motor vehicle, 27% travel by bus, 19% catch a train, 17% walk, 7% cycle and 1% catch taxis. A large number of the 70% who do not use motor vehicle will be subjected to the impact of construction and the resultant alternative bicycle and pedestrian routes that will need to be put in place during and after the construction phase. Similar concerns are held for students of Wooloowin State School.
4 5		Proximity of the work site to Wooloowin State School and Kedron State High School presents significant access issues, especially for those students who have to negotiate re-configured bikeways and footpaths as a result of the construction. Drop-off and pick-up zones for students transported by car also have the potential to be significantly impacted by AL construction.
4		Denial of access to the Kedron State High School oval during construction of the cut and cover tunnel section and re-instatement of the oval presents significant issues for the effective delivery of the school's Sport and Physical Education curriculum.
10		Impacts of tunnel construction, namely vibration and subsidence, are of concern with respect to the DES swimming pool and the Wooloowin State School swimming pool to the continuation of the Sport and Physical Education curriculum.
4 5		There is a need to maintain safe pedestrian and cycle access (including for students with a disability) near construction worksites and surface works, particularly:
11		Construction needs to be managed to ensure that: ▪ Species are able to be maintained during construction, such as the provision of vegetation areas prior to construction commencing;

		▪ Impact of construction on species in Kedron Brook; and ▪ A limitation of access to Kedron Brook would impact significantly on the capacity of Kedron State High School to continue scientific studies.