

***REPORT TO THE  
RESOURCE PLANNING AND  
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION***

***IN RELATION TO  
FORESTRY TASMANIA'S PROPOSED  
SOUTHWOOD RESOURCES – HUON'  
INTEGRATED WOOD PROCESSING SITE***

**PREPARED BY THE BOARD OF ENVIRONMENTAL  
MANAGEMENT AND POLLUTION CONTROL**

**FEBRUARY 2002**

## **Table of Contents**

Abbreviations and definitions

Introduction

Part A: Summary table of environmental issues raised in representations

Part B: Discussion of issues of particular relevance

Part C: Specific comments in relation to environmental issues

## **Abbreviations and Definitions**

Board:	the Board of Environmental Management and Pollution Control established under Section 12 of the EMPCA.
CG:	Coordinating Group for Wastewater Reuse, as defined in the Guidelines for Wastewater Reuse in Tasmania (DELM, 1994).
Director	the Director of Environmental Management
DPEMP	Development Proposal and Environmental Management Plan for the Wood Centre, prepared by SEMF, dated August 2001
Draft Air EPP:	Draft Environment Protection Policy (Air Quality) and Regulatory Impact Statement, September 2001
EAR:	Environment Assessment Report for Southwood Resources – Huon, prepared by the Environment Division of the Department of Primary Industries, Water and Environment dated November 2001 and approved by the Board on 3 December 2001
ED:	the Environment Division of DPIWE
EMP:	Environmental Management Plan
EMPCA	Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act 1994
EPN:	Environment Protection Notice
Environmental conditions:	those conditions stipulated by the Board, as shown in Schedule 2 of the Planning Permit
FT	Forestry Tasmania
Level 2 activity:	an activity as defined in Schedule 2 of the EMPCA
LUPAA:	Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993
Planning Permit:	the planning permit with respect to an Integrated Timber Processing Site at Weld Road Lonnvale, approved by the Huon Valley Council on 12 December 2001
Planning Authority:	the Huon Valley Council
RMPS:	Tasmania's Resource Management and Planning System
Wood Centre:	'Southwood Resources – Huon' - proposed Integrated Wood Processing Site

**PART A: SUMMARY TABLE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES RAISED IN REPRESENTATIONS**

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
1	Hughes, J D PO Box 107, Cygnet	Forest management and timber supply issues.  Forestry-related impacts on water quality.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W7 of this report.	No
2	Chin, R 181 Guys Road, Cygnet	General concerns about potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre.	Potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre have been assessed by the Board. An evaluation report has been prepared in the form of an EAR.	No
3	Wright, J 137 East Derwent Highway, Lindisfarne	Wood-fired power station is old technology which would not be acceptable in other countries as it is not sustainable.	This issue is discussed in S. 8.12.5.1.3 of the EAR.	No
4	Parkinson, K 22 Sturt Close, Kingston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
5	Roberts, H 24 Albury Road, Huonville	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
6	L & S Doyle Pty Ltd PO Box 131, Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
7	Riley, R Duke Street, Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
8	Bennett, P Kent Street, Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
9	Willis, J School Road, Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
10	Wilcox, G & K Palmer's Road, Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
11	Watson, R 3000 Glen Huon Rd, Glen Huon	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
12	Sullivan, L 77 Helen Street, Ranelagh	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
13	Horvat, P & G 91 Four Foot Road, Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
14	Drake, B 1 John Street, Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
15	Doyle, J E Main Road, Franklin	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
16	Ashlin, R & G Arve Road, Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
17	Wallis B R	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
	19 Melrose Street, Huonville			
18	Huon Citizens for Southwood (Alan Duggan) 8420 Channel Highway, Cradoc	In favour of the proposed development	Noted.	No
19	Burgess, B F PO Box 11 Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
20	Burgess, P PO Box 11 Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
21	Russell, H & J Fords Road, Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
22	Thomas, M J Deep Bay Road, Cygnet	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
23	Woolley, J c/- Post Office, Glen Huon	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
24	Collin, B 66 Wentworth Street, South Hobart	More consideration should have been given to alternative transport arrangements, especially alternative port options	Refer to Part B, Section T5 of this report.  Note that the Planning Authority has concerns with the establishment of a new port in the Huon estuary, particularly in relation to potential, social and environmental impacts and effects on other industries such as the aquaculture industry	No
25	Curry, S 18 Mary St, North Hobart	Requirements for further information.	Refer to Part B, Sections IN1 or IN2 of this report.	No
25		Assessment of water quantity issues not satisfactory. Greenhouse effect should be considered in the context of water quantity.  General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.  Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users.  Assessment of water quality issues not satisfactory.	Refer to Part B, Section W1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
25		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
25		Concerns in relation to the practicality of regulating the large number of environmental conditions (166 conditions stipulated by the Board), especially considering that several substantial management plans and models are yet to be submitted which will require assessment.	The Board notes that the administration and enforcement of environmental conditions for 'Level 2' premises falls within the core business functions of DPIWE's Environment Division. The regulation of five level 2 activities will require significant resources, especially during the development phase.	No
26	Adkins, J 30 Watsons Rd, Kettering	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
27	Burgess, J H PO Box 55, Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
28	Shiel, M 54 Mount Pleasant Rd, Kingston	General concerns about potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre.  Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users.	Potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre have been assessed by the Board. An evaluation report has been prepared in the form of an EAR.  Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	No
29	Evans, L 18 Arthur Street, Port Huon	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
30	Bayne, D Mitre 10. Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
31	Geeves, R 1100 Kent Street Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
32	Burgess, A F 341 Arve Road, Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
33	Russell, M J 10 Cemetery Road, Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
34	Russell, M A 10 Cemetery Road, Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
35	Ruzicka, P Rogers Road, Nichols Rivulet	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
36	Ried, S 5528 Huon Highway, Waterloo	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
37	Hickey, B L 1748 Cygnet Coast Rd, Glaziers Bay	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
38	Woodward, K & W Lonnvale Road, Judbury	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
39	Pritchard, S & B Four Foot Road, Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
40	Wilson, L 66 Mountain River Rd, Grove	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
41	Needham, P R c/- Post Office, Franklin	General concerns about potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre.	Potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre have been assessed by the Board. An evaluation report has been prepared in the form of an EAR.	No
42	Manton, R 6775 Channel Highway, Cygnet	Assessment of water quantity issues not satisfactory. Greenhouse effect should be considered in the context of water quantity.  General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.  Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users.  Assessment of water quality issues not satisfactory.  General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section W1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
43	Manton, A	Assessment of water quantity issues not satisfactory.	Refer to Part B, Section W1 of this report.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
	6775 Channel Highway, Cygnet	Greenhouse effect should be considered in the context of water quantity.		
43		General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.	No
43		Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users.	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	No
43		Assessment of water quality issues not satisfactory.	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	No
43		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report	No
44	Shearman, S 12 Stubbins Street, Coningham	Limitations Statement	Refer to Part B, Section LS1 of this report.	No
44		Requirements for further information.	Refer to Part B, Sections IN1 or IN2 of this report.	No
44		Assessment of water quantity issues not satisfactory. Greenhouse effect should be considered in the context of water quantity.	Refer to Part B, Section W1 of this report.	No
		Status of Water Licence needs to be confirmed.	Refer to Part B, Section W4 of this report.	
44		Situating the proposed Wood Centre in the immediate vicinity of the Huon River does not comply with the principles of "sustainable development" as defined in the LUPAA and does not constitute good environmental planning.  General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	The Board has considered the project in terms of the sustainable development objectives of the RMPS. The issue raised is considered to be a planning issue, to be considered by the Planning Authority.  Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
45	Lough J Jacksons Road, Franklin	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
45		Requirements for further information.	Refer to Part B, Sections IN1 or IN2 of this report.	No
45		Assessment of water quantity issues not satisfactory.	Refer to Part B, Section W1 of this report.	No
		General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.	

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
		Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users.	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	
45		Situating the proposed Wood Centre in the immediate vicinity of the Huon River does not comply with the principles of "sustainable development" as defined in the LUPAA and does not constitute good environmental planning.	The Board has considered the project in terms of the sustainable development objectives of the RMPS. The issue raised is considered to be a planning issue, to be considered by the Planning Authority.	No
45		General concerns about an increase in greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the Wood Centre development.	This issue is discussed in S. 8.12 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) of the EAR.	No
45		Wood-fired power station is old technology which would not be acceptable in other countries as it is not sustainable.	This issue is discussed in S. 8.12.5.1.3 of the EAR.	No
46	Wallis, M 19 Melrose Street, Huonville	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
47	Whitehouse, D J 69 Elizabeth Street, Ranelagh	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
48	Iles, J 49 Four Foot Road, Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
49	Wilson, J C 24 Arthur Street, Port Huon	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
50	Wilson, M J 24 Arthur Street, Port Huon	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
51	Hayes, T Cannel Road, Huonville	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
52	James, W G 4034 Huon Highway, Castle Forbes Bay	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
53	Bell, C Huonville	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
54	Vandervalk, S 62-64 Ranelagh St, Ranelagh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No



No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
55	Bennett, N 260 Glen Huon Road, Glen Huon	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
56	Truchanas, M J 37 Gourlay St, Blackmans Bay	Situating the proposed Wood Centre in the immediate vicinity of the Huon River does not comply with the principles of "sustainable development" as defined in the LUPAA and does not constitute good environmental planning.	The Board has considered the project in terms of the sustainable development objectives of the RMPS. The issue raised is considered to be a planning issue, to be considered by the Planning Authority.	No
56		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
57	O'Doherty, M PO Box 161, Cygnet	Requirements for further information.	Refer to Part B, Sections IN1 or IN2 of this report.	No
57		Greenhouse effect should be considered in the context of water quantity.	Refer to Part B, Section W1 of this report.	No
		Concerned about more stringent water restrictions.	Refer to Part B, Section W3 of this report.	
		Status of Water Licence needs to be confirmed.	Refer to Part B, Section W4 of this report.	
		Specific issues in relation to wastewater management.	Refer to Part B, Section W6 of this report.	
		Forestry-related impacts on water quality.	Refer to Part B, Section W7 of this report.	
57		Situating the proposed Wood Centre in the immediate vicinity of the Huon River does not comply with the principles of "sustainable development" as defined in the LUPAA and does not constitute good environmental planning.	The Board has considered the project in terms of the sustainable development objectives of the RMPS. The issue raised is considered to be a planning issue, to be considered by the Planning Authority.	No
57		Wood-fired power station is old technology which would not be acceptable in other countries as it is not sustainable.	This issue is discussed in S. 8.12.5.1.3 of the EAR.	No
57		Taking issue with the claim made in the DPEMP that greenhouse gas emissions in Australia will be reduced as a result of the Wood Centre development.	The evaluation of Greenhouse Gas issues in S. 8.12.5 of the EAR concludes that "without taking into account carbon sink issues, it is likely that the operation of wood-fired boilers	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
			will result in a slight net decrease of greenhouse gas emissions when compared to the current situation [where forest residue is burnt after harvesting]." (page 154 of EAR).	
57		Taking issue with the claim made in the DPEMP that regenerating forests sequester more CO <sub>2</sub> than mature forests, especially when considering the amount of carbon contained in understorey species and organic matter on the forest floor.	The environmental assessment acknowledges this issue, see S. 8.12.5.1.1, 1 <sup>st</sup> dot point (page 152) of EAR. As a result, Forestry Tasmania's argument that forestry operations are greenhouse-neutral activities, is not supported in the EAR. Nevertheless, the EAR concludes that when considering current practices of residue burning after harvesting, the net result of the Wood Centre development is likely to be a slight net decrease in greenhouse gas emissions. It is understood that in March/April 2002, the AGO will release detailed information relating to the National Carbon Accounting System which is likely to provide more background information on this matter.	No
58	Williams, R 1239 Midlands Hwy, Mangalore	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
59	Molloy, S RSD 156, Triabunna	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
59 59 59  59		Forest management and timber supply issues. Assessment of water quality issues not satisfactory. General concerns about increased air pollution resulting from the Wood Centre (Power Station in particular), especially considering the frequency of fogs experienced in the Huon River Valley.  General concerns about an increase in greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the Wood Centre development.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report. Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report. Air quality issues are addressed in S. 8.6 of the EAR; refer in particular to Sections 8.6.9 (Evaluation) and 8.6.10 (Recommendations). Environmental conditions relevant to air quality issues are specified in Schedule 2, Part A / A1-A8, Part B / A1 – A3, Part C / A1 – A7, Part D / A1 - A5, Part E / A1 – A 4 and Part F /A1 – A6. This issue is discussed in S. 8.12 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) of the EAR.	No No No  No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
59		<p>No independent studies have been carried out to show that using wood chips as a fuel source for the power station is sustainable.</p> <p>Concerned that noise from the Wood Centre site will impinge on neighbours.</p>	<p>Refer to S. 8.12 of the EAR which contains an evaluation of these issues.</p> <p>Note: it is proposed that the feed stock for the power station will mainly be forest residue collected from the forest floor, supplemented by by-products from the wood centre operations rather than wood chips (see p. 378/ 379 of the DPEMP).</p> <p>Cumulative noise impacts from the Wood Centre are described in S. 8.7.7 of the EAR and evaluated in S. 8.7.9.</p> <p>Environmental conditions in Part A / N1 – N6, Part B / N1- N2, Part C / N1 – N2, Part D / N1 – N2, Part E / N1 – N2 and Part F / N1 – N4 are designed to prevent noise impacts on sensitive uses adjacent to the Wood Centre.</p> <p>Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.</p>	No
59		<p>General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury) and particular concern about proposed 24-hour truck movements.</p> <p>Potential impacts on segments of the transport route outside of the Huon Valley, including the Tasman Highway.</p> <p>Concerns in relation to the practicality of regulating the large number of environmental conditions (166 conditions stipulated by the Board), especially considering that several substantial management plans and models are yet to be submitted which will require assessment.</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Section T3 of this report.</p> <p>The Board notes that the administration and enforcement of environmental conditions for 'Level 2' premises falls within the core business functions of DPIWE's Environment Division. The regulation of five level 2 activities will require significant resources, especially during the development phase.</p>	No
60	Oates, B Abbeyfield House, Wilmot	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
	Road, Huonville			
61	Bekkema, W 324 Scotts Road, Cairns Bay	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
61		Assessment of water quality issues not satisfactory.	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	No
		Specific issues in relation to wastewater management.	Refer to Part B, Section W6 of this report.	
62	Bekkema, M 324 Scotts Road, Cairns Bay	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
62		Specific issues in relation to wastewater management.	Refer to Part B, Section W6 of this report.	No
63	Burgess, S U3/183 Main Road, Huonville	General concerns about potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre.	Environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre have been assessed by the Board. An evaluation report has been prepared in the form of an EAR.	No
64	Hughes, J (2 <sup>nd</sup> Submission) PO Box 107, Cygnet	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
64		Forestry-related impacts on water quality.	Refer to Part B, Section W7 of this report.	No
65	Seabourne, P & S Harvey Road, Dover	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
66	Duggan, L 56 Thorpe Street, Cygnet	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
67	Duggan, R Graces Road, Glaziers Bay	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
68	Duggan, P 19 Armstrongs Rd, Cradoc	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
69	Duggan, S 1790 Cygnet Coast Rd, Cradoc	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
70	Duggan, D 52 Reids Road, Cradoc	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
71	Flach, W M 6 Ormond St, Bellerive	A wood-fired power station should not be supported as a matter of principle, as there are "cleaner" alternatives, such as hydro power.	This issue is discussed in S. 8.12.5.1.3 of the EAR.	No
72	Traill, C E & J C PO Box 273, Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
73	Wiseneek, C 78 Davies Road, Lower Snug	Assessment of water quantity issues not satisfactory. Greenhouse effect should be considered in the context of water quantity.	Refer to Part B, Section W1 of this report.	No
73		General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.  Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users.  Assessment of water quality issues not satisfactory. General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic on townships.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report. Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	
74	Greener, S Clarks Road, Lower Longley	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
75	Gurrin, R 78 Davies Road, Lower Snug	Assessment of water quantity issues not satisfactory. Greenhouse effect should be considered in the context of water quantity.	Refer to Part B, Section W1 of this report.	No
75		General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.  Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users.  Assessment of water quality issues not satisfactory. General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic on townships, including Margate.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report. Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report. Note that the proposed transport route does not go through Margate (refer to Figure 6 of EAR).	
76	Christian, C 456 Pass Road, Cambridge	Impacts on downstream water users should be considered.	Refer to Part B, Section W3 of this report.	No
76		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
76		Potential for structural damage on buildings in Macquarie and Davey St. Concerns in relation to the practicality of regulating the	Refer to Part B, Section T4 of this report.  The Board notes that the administration and	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
		large number of environmental conditions (166 conditions stipulated by the Board), especially considering that several substantial management plans and models are yet to be submitted which will require assessment.	enforcement of environmental conditions for 'Level 2' premises falls within the core business functions of DPIWE's Environment Division. The regulation of five level 2 activities will require significant resources, especially during the development phase.	
77	Stratton, D (Hobart Hardcrome) 54 Browns Road, Kingston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
78	Schuecker, R G 198 Seventh Day Road, Glen Huon	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
79	Wilson, C 635 Sandfly Road, Sandfly	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
80	Lovell, J & Flach, J (Save Australia) PO Box 461, Rosny Park	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
81	Evans, R 18 Arthur Street, Port Huon	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
82	Benson, J 47-26 Windsor St, Glenorchy	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
83	Hicks, P 1123 Pelverata Road, Pelverata	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.  Requirements for further information.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.  Refer to Part B, Sections IN1 or IN2 of this report.	No
83		Assessment of water quantity issues not satisfactory. General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section W1 of this report. Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
83		The large number and far-reaching nature of conditions attached to the Planning Permit indicates that the permit is inadequate and should be rejected.	The Board does not agree with this view. The large number of permit conditions is a reflection of the complex nature of the proposed development. It is noted that five Level 2	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
			activities are proposed as part of the Wood Centre development.	
84	Southern Forests Community Group ( I Weist & J Hughes) PO Box 176, Cygnet	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
84		Mechanism required to reduce water usage if environmental flows are low.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.	No
		Water Licence should specify maximum amount of water to be abstracted.	Refer to Part B, Section W4 of this report.	
84		Need for a proper geological survey to assess seepage issues.	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	
84		Specific issues in relation to wastewater management. The DPEMP lacks a commitment to compensate the community in the event of environmental damage. Concern that the community may have to bear the cost in the event of environmental damage.	Refer to Part B, Section W6 of this report. The activity will be regulated by the Environment Division to ensure compliance with the environmental conditions specified by the Board. Compliance with these conditions is expected to minimise the risk of environmental harm being caused by the activities undertaken at the Wood Centre.	No
84		Limits need to be set for the maximum permissible fugitive ash emissions from the Wood Centre.	In addition, the EMPCA contains a range of instruments to deal with environmental harm, including the capacity to require those who cause environmental harm to "make good". Stack emission limits specified in environmental condition A5 [Part A] & Attachment 5 include limits for particulate matter, smoke and soot. This will effectively also regulate ash emissions from the boiler stacks.  Condition A14 [Part A] requires the elimination of fugitive atmospheric emissions (incl. ash)	No





No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
88	Shields, G Stoney Point Trail, Crabtree	<p>Emission levels specified in the DPEMP for dioxins are not equal to or better than Australian or World's Best Practice.</p> <p>Representor claims that at present, there are no national standards for dioxin emissions. On this basis, the air emission control measures specified in the DPEMP are considered unacceptable.</p>	<p>Dioxin emissions are discussed in S. 8.6.7 of the EAR, refer in particular to Table 15 (Predicted effects of Wood Centre stack emissions).</p> <p>Table 15 shows the results of air quality modelling carried out on behalf of Forestry Tasmania (documented in Appendix U of the DPEMP and summarised in S. 10.2.2 of the DPEMP).</p> <p>Dioxin emissions and ground level concentrations (GLC) associated with the Wood Centre development have been estimated. The estimated GLC was compared against a guideline set by the Victorian EPA. The maximum GLC predicted is appr. 20% of the guideline set by EPA Victoria for dioxin. Based on current knowledge, dioxin emissions from the proposed facility are not considered to significantly affect background levels of dioxins in the region.</p>	No
88		<p>According to the DPEMP, FT made a commitment to installing a weather monitoring station by December 2001. The representor notes that when making inquiries in relation to this issue in January 2002, it was obvious that FT had not progressed this issue.</p>	<p>Environmental condition [Part A] A2 (f) specifies that a meteorological monitoring station must be installed by 1<sup>st</sup> March 2002. DPIWE was advised in January 2002 that FT is in the process of determining a suitable location for the monitoring station.</p>	No
89	Wright, W PO Box 204, Huonville	<p>Situating the proposed Wood Centre in the immediate vicinity of the Huon River does not comply with the principles of "sustainable development" as defined in the LUPAA and does not constitute good environmental planning.</p>	<p>The Board has considered the project in terms of the sustainable development objectives of the RMPS. The issue raised is considered to be a planning issue, to be considered by the Planning Authority.</p>	No
89		<p>Concerns that the community may have to bear the costs for the regulation of large number of environmental conditions (including monitoring requirements).</p>	<p>The cost of monitoring will be borne by the proponent. Regulations under EMPCA specify annual permit fees for level 2 activities. These are paid to the State Government and are intended to cover the cost of regulation.</p>	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
89		With the Tasmanian Air Quality Policy still in the development stage, how can the developer know that it will meet the future standard?	FT was advised that the standards outlined in the September 2001 of the Draft Air EPP will apply. Environmental conditions in relation to atmospheric emissions have been set in accordance with that document.	No
89		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
90	Henley, B Lenah Valley	General concerns about potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre.	Environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre have been assessed by the Board. An evaluation report has been prepared in the form of an EAR.	No
91	Weld, J Adventure Bay Village, Bruny Island	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
92	Dimmick, P (Southwood Community Advisory Group) PO Box 168, Huonville	Refer to No. 164		No
93	Jumppanen, P & Allen, K PO Box 94, Kingston	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
93		Impacts on downstream water users should be considered.	Refer to Part B, Section W3 of this report.	No
		Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users.	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	
94	Sheridan G 54 Auburn Road, Kingston	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM 1 of this report.	No
94		The project would have fulfilled the criteria for a project of State Significance under the State Policies and Projects Act 1933. Why was it not dealt with in accordance with that Act?	The decision to take a project out of the normal assessment process and deal with it as a Project of State Significance is made by the Premier (as the Minister responsible for the State Policies and Projects Act) and would normally involve consultation with the proponent. The Board plays no part in the decision-making process.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
94		<p>The Environmental Assessment carried out by the Board should be broader and should, for example, consider social, economic and landscape aspects.</p> <p>General concerns about an increase in greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the Wood Centre development.</p> <p>In the view of the representor, the statement on page 153 of the EAR that "the Wood Centre would be in line with current developments world-wide" is not a responsible argument, as it does not acknowledge the targets set in the Kyoto protocol.</p> <p>The representor cites Australian research which highlights the particular implications of global warming on the Australian environment and argues that greenhouse gas issues are not adequately addressed in the DPMP or the EAR.</p>	<p>The scope of the Board's environmental assessment is defined by the EMPCA. The issues assessed by the Board in relation to the Wood Centre development are outlined in Section 8 of the EAR. Socio-economic impacts are considered to be planning issues to be addressed by the Planning Authority.</p> <p>This issue is discussed in S. 8.12 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) of the EAR.</p> <p>The Kyoto Protocol is not yet in force and recent statements by the Commonwealth suggest that Australia will not ratify the Protocol.</p> <p>The evaluation of greenhouse gas emission issues in the EAR (section 8.12) is based on the currently existing regulatory framework.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>
95	<p>Middleton, J 560 Cygnet Coast Rd, Petchey's Bay</p>	<p>Forest management and timber supply issues.</p> <p>General concerns about an increase in greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the Wood Centre development.</p> <p>Wood-fired power station is old technology which would not be acceptable in other countries as it is not sustainable.</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.</p> <p>This issue is discussed in S. 8.12 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) of the EAR.</p> <p>This issue is discussed in S. 8.12.5.1.3 of the EAR.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>
96	<p>Lewin, S W 235 Cross Road, Lucaston</p>	<p>General concerns about an increase in greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the Wood Centre development.</p>	<p>This issue is discussed in S. 8.12 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) of the EAR.</p>	<p>No</p>
97	<p>Griffiths, A &amp; B PO Box 126, Huonville</p>	<p>Forest management and timber supply issues.</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.</p>	<p>No</p>

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
97		Assessment of water quality issues not satisfactory.	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	No
97		Specific issues in relation to wastewater management. Situating the proposed Wood Centre in the immediate vicinity of the Huon River does not comply with the principles of "sustainable development" as defined in the LUPAA and does not constitute good environmental planning.	Refer to Part B, Section W6 of this report. The Board has considered the project in terms of the sustainable development objectives of the RMPS. The issue raised is considered to be a planning issue, to be considered by the Planning Authority.	No
97		The arrangements for solid waste management should be clarified.	The arrangements for solid waste management are discussed in Section 8.8 of the EAR (in particular, S. 8.8.9 - Potential Impact, 8.8.11 – Evaluation and S. 8.8.12 – Recommendations).	No
97		Why have steam emissions (from the cooling tower) not been assessed and why are there no environmental conditions in this respect ?	The Board has specified several environmental conditions with regard to solid waste management: S1 – S5 [Part A], S1 [Part B], S1 [Part C], S1 & S2 [Part D], S1 [Part E] and S1 [Part F]. Steam emissions from the power station are discussed in S. 8.6.5.1 and 8.6.5.2 of the EAR. The EAR clarifies that water vapour emissions are not considered to be a pollutant as they are not likely to cause environmental harm. Therefore, environmental conditions to limit or control the emission of water vapour have not been specified by the Board. However, the EAR recognises that there is the potential for visual impacts in relation to steam emissions (see page 173, S. 8.15.6 of EAR). Visual impacts are regarded as a planning issue to be addressed by the Planning Authority.	No
97		Concerns that DPIWE may not be adequately resourced to ensure compliance with the permit conditions.	The availability of resources within DPIWE to regulate the development will be monitored. If necessary a submission for additional resources can be made.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
97		Specific comments in relation to environmental conditions.	Refer to Part C of this report.	Refer to Part C of this report.
98	Duggan, C 95 Sandhill Road, Cradoc	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
99	Lucas, S & H 80 Bonds Road, Judbury	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
99		Limitations Statement	Refer to Part B, Section LS1 of this report.	No
99		Requirements for further information	Refer to Part B, Sections IN1 or IN2 of this report.	No
99		Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
99		Minimum environmental flow should be determined before granting of a Water Licence.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.	No
99		Concerns that the community may have to bear the costs for the regulation of large number of environmental conditions (including monitoring requirements).	The cost of monitoring will be borne by the proponent. Regulations under EMPCA specify annual permit fees for level 2 activities. These are paid to the State Government and are intended to cover the cost of regulation.	No
99		The Tasmanian DRAFT Environment Protection Policy (Air Quality) should not be used to establish air quality / emission benchmarks, as it does not reflect local conditions in the Huon Valley.	The draft Tasmanian EPP (Air Quality) is designed to apply to the entire State. Local conditions are addressed in the EPP by reference to Schedule 2 which states that "the atmospheric dispersion calculation should consider local terrain and meteorology, the effect of background concentrations, the contribution of adjacent sources and the need to preserve the capacity of the local environment to receive future emissions." The requirements of the Draft Policy are reflected in the EAR. In particular, the need for local meteorological data to be utilised for any future air dispersion modelling is highlighted in S. 8.6.9 and 8.6.10 of the EAR. The recommendations contained in the EAR are in turn reflected in the Board's environmental conditions with regard to atmospheric	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
99		Lack of specific information in relation to the Power Station, e.g. capacity, local meteorological data, documentation regarding permitted plant emissions, identification of plant operator.	<p>emissions, in particular [Part A] A2, A3, A10 and A11.</p> <p>While detailed technical specifications were not available at the time of the assessment, preliminary air dispersion modelling was conducted based on predicted stack emissions. This is documented in Appendix U of the DPMP and summarised in S. 10.2.2 of the DPMP.</p> <p>The lack of detailed technical information and local meteorological data was highlighted in the EAR (S. 8.6.9 Atmospheric Emissions – Evaluation). As a result, the environmental conditions [Part A] include requirements to:</p> <p>A2: install a monitoring station to collect local met. data for input into air dispersion modelling;</p> <p>A3: establish an air quality monitoring station at the nearest population centre for ongoing monitoring of key air quality parameters (e.g. particulates);</p> <p>A10: repeat the air quality dispersion modelling program prior to the commissioning of the power station, <u>on the basis of detailed technical specifications;</u></p> <p>A11: demonstrate to the Director that specified GLCs for critical air quality parameters can be met prior to commissioning of the Power Station.</p>	No
99		Lack of discussion in relation of impacts of Power Station emissions on adjacent communities such as Judbury and Lonnvale.	<p>Modelling results are discussed in terms of the worst affected areas and nearest communities. The air-impact on other localities, are by inference, predicted to be less significant. Modelling results however, are available for the entire modelling domain, and could easily include results for other localities of interest</p>	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
99		<p>Estimated CO emission of 66.67 g/s (Appendix U, page 3) would equate to 55 l/s or 1,745 million litres or 2102 tonnes per year (annual figures based on the assumption of continuous operation).</p> <p>The representor makes the observation that this emission rate is higher than maximum emission rates permitted in similar wood fired stations in other countries like the US and provides the following references:</p> <p><a href="http://www.anr.state.vt.us/dec/air/Page/permits.htm">http://www.anr.state.vt.us/dec/air/Page/permits.htm</a>  <a href="http://arbis.arb.ca.gov/fcaa/tv/tvinfo/permits/sha/sha.htm">http://arbis.arb.ca.gov/fcaa/tv/tvinfo/permits/sha/sha.htm</a></p>	<p>(when further modelling is conducted).</p> <p>There are no formal limits on emission rates in Tasmania. However, regulations are in place with respect to in-stack concentrations and ground level concentrations of pollutants, including carbon monoxide.</p> <p>The proposed Wood Centre facility complies with best-practice requirements (as defined under EMPCA) for in-stack carbon monoxide concentrations and easily meets ground level concentration criteria.</p> <p>In the USA, some regions fail to comply with ambient air standards on carbon monoxide and ozone. For this reason, more stringent requirements tend to be placed on sources of carbon monoxide, a pollutant that also promotes photochemical ozone production. In Tasmania, compliance with ambient carbon monoxide and ozone standards is considered to be easily achieved.</p>	No
99		<p>Concerns in relation to the practicality of regulating the large number of environmental conditions (166 conditions stipulated by the Board), especially considering that several substantial management plans and models are yet to be submitted which will require assessment.</p>	<p>The Board notes that the administration and enforcement of environmental conditions for 'Level 2' premises falls within the core business functions of DPIWE's Environment Division. The regulation of five level 2 activities will require significant resources, especially during the development phase.</p>	No
99		<p>Specific comments in relation to environmental conditions.</p>	<p>Refer to Part C of this report.</p>	Refer to Part C of this report.
100	Duthoit, D 17 Esplanade Nth, Snug	<p>General concerns about potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre.</p>	<p>Potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre have been assessed by the Board. An evaluation report has been prepared in the form of an EAR.</p>	No
101	Timber Communities Australia (Southern Branch) – Alan Ashbarry	<p>In favour of the proposed development.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
	C/- PO Box 82, Richmond			
102	Timber Communities Australia (State Office) – Barry Chipman PO Box 172, Campania	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
103	Bayesian Investments Ltd (N J Edwards) 944 Cygnet Coast Rd, Petcheys Bay	General concerns about potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre.	Potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre have been assessed by the Board. An evaluation report has been prepared in the form of an EAR.	No
104	Paizs, A PO Box 362, Huonville	Assessment of water quality issues not satisfactory.	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	No
104		Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
104		General concerns about increased air pollution resulting from the Wood Centre (Power Station in particular), especially considering the frequency of fogs experienced in the Huon River Valley.	Air quality issues are addressed in S. 8.6 of the EAR; refer in particular to Sections 8.6.9 (Evaluation) and 8.6.10 (Recommendations). Environmental conditions relevant to air quality issues are specified in Part A / A1-A8, Part B / A1 – A3, Part C / A1 – A7, Part D / A1 - A5, Part E / A1 – A 4 and Part F /A1 – A6.	No
		Concerns in relation to specific air quality parameters (e.g. NO <sub>2</sub> , NO <sub>x</sub> , CO, oxides of sulphur, formaldehyde, acrolein, acetaldehyde, acetic acid, formic acid).	NO <sub>x</sub> (including NO <sub>2</sub> ) and CO emissions are addressed in the EAR (Section 8.6, especially 8.6.7; 8.6.9 and 8.6.10).  Oxides of sulfur, formaldehyde, acrolein, acetaldehyde, acetic acid, and formic acid are not expected to be emitted in significant quantities.	
104		General concerns about an increase in greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the Wood Centre development.	This issue is discussed in S. 8.12 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) of the EAR.	No
105	Bennett R & P A 98 Nairn Street, Ranelagh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
106	Hannah, A 55 Old Farm Road, Sth	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No



No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
106	Hobart	Assessment of water quantity issues not satisfactory.	Refer to Part B, Section W1 of this report.	No
106		Potential for dust emissions from the Wood Centre site.	Dust emissions from Wood Centre operations are covered in S.8.6 of EAR, especially in Evaluation Section 8.6.9 ('Dust and Wood Fibre Particles' on p. 110).  Note that environmental condition A14 [Part A] requires the responsible person to eliminate the escape of visible dust, wood waste, wood fibres, wood chips or ash from the Wood Centre site.	No
107	McDonald, L Jacksons Rd, Franklin	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
108	Duthoit, M 17 Esplanade Nth, Snug	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.  Assessment of water quantity issues not satisfactory.  General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.  Impacts on downstream water users should be considered.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W3 of this report.	No
109	Hopper, S & T 59 Agnes, Street, Ranelagh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
110	Burgess, S (2 <sup>nd</sup> Submission) Unit 3, 183 Main Rd, Huonville	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
110		Impacts on downstream water users should be considered.	Refer to Part B, Section W3 of this report.	No
110		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury). incl. vibrations.	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
111	Fullard, D (2 <sup>nd</sup> Submission) 363 Van Morey Rd, Margate	General concerns about potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre.	Potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre have been assessed by the	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
111		Implications of Wood Centre development on potential to develop adjacent land for eco-tourism.	Board. An evaluation report has been prepared in the form of an EAR. Essentially a planning matter, to be considered by the Planning Authority.	No
112	Anders, S 42 North Huon Road, Ranelagh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
113	Spry, M PO Box 297, Huonville	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
114	Edward, H 11 Marguerite Street, Ranelagh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
115	Greener, G Clarks Road, Lower Longley	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
115		Assessment of water quantity issues not satisfactory.	Refer to Part B, Section W1 of this report.	No
		Impacts on downstream water users should be considered.	Refer to Part B, Section W3 of this report.	
		Will Forestry Tasmania be charged for water usage?	Refer to Part B, Section W3 of this report.	
		Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users.	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	
		Specific issues in relation to wastewater management.	Refer to Part B, Section W6 of this report.	
115		Forestry-related impacts on water quality. General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B Section W7 of this report. Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
116	McGrath, D A PO Box 443, Franklin	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
117	Howard, R 151 Glen Huon Rd,	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
	Huonville	Judbury).		
118	Bastick, P PO Box 134, Woodbridge	General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.	No
118		Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users. General concerns about increased air pollution resulting from the Wood Centre (Power Station in particular), especially considering the frequency of fogs experienced in the Huon River Valley.	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.  Air quality issues are addressed in S. 8.6 of the EAR; refer in particular to Sections 8.6.9 (Evaluation) and 8.6.10 (Recommendations). Environmental conditions relevant to air quality issues are specified in Schedule 2, Part A / A1-A8, Part B / A1 – A3, Part C / A1 – A7, Part D / A1 - A5, Part E / A1 – A 4 and Part F /A1 – A6.	No
119	Evans, N 351 Four Foot Road, Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
120	Dean, G 601 Huon Road, South Hobart	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
121	Tamayo, A 95 Marlyn Road, South Hobart	General concerns about potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre.	Potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre have been assessed by the Board. An evaluation report has been prepared in the form of an EAR.	No
122	Boyle, M & K 77 Banksia Road, Mt River	General concerns about an increase in greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the Wood Centre development.	This issue is discussed in S. 8.12 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) of the EAR.	No
123	Southern Sustainable Forest Group ( Ian Johnston) 245 Howden Road, Howden	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
124	Reeva, P 77 Banksia Road, Mtn River	General concerns about potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre.	Potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre have been assessed by the Board. An evaluation report has been prepared in the form of an EAR.	No
125	Thomson, A & C M PO Box 213, Geeveston	General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.  Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
125		<p>General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).</p> <p>The potential impacts on segments of the transport route outside of the Huon Valley, including Tasman Highway, is also raised.</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.</p> <p>Refer to Part B, Section T3 of this report.</p>	No
126	Boyle, S 77 Banksia Road, Mt River	Requirements for further information	Refer to Part B, Sections IN1 or IN2 of this report.	No
126		General concerns about an increase in greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the Wood Centre development.	This issue is discussed in S. 8.12 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) of the EAR.	No
126		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
127	Higgins, M PO Box 168, Huonville	Limitations Statement	Refer to Part B, Section LS1 of this report.	No
127		The representor suggests that standard mechanisms in relation to permit breaches are not appropriate in respect to the Southwood development. It is suggested that if any portion of the (Wood Centre) operation breaches permit conditions on more than 2 occasions, the activity should be decommissioned and the site rehabilitated.	It is unclear why normal compliance and enforcement policies should not be applied to this development.	No
127		Specific comments in relation to environmental conditions.	Refer to Part C of this report.	Refer to Part C of this report.
128	Hindle L P & J A 15 Stone Cres, Darlington WA	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
129	Oates, L 260 Lollara Road, Ranelagh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
130	Deverson, C PO Box 146, Huonville	Concerned about more stringent water restrictions.	Refer to Part B, Section W3 of this report.	No
130		<p>Specific issues in relation to wastewater management.</p> <p>General concerns about increased air pollution resulting</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Section W6 of this report.</p> <p>Air quality issues are addressed in S. 8.6 of the</p>	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
130		<p>from the Wood Centre (Power Station in particular), especially considering the frequency of fogs experienced in the Huon River Valley.</p> <p>Concern about traffic-related air pollution (vehicle emissions) in general.</p>	<p>EAR; refer in particular to Sections 8.6.9 (Evaluation) and 8.6.10 (Recommendations). Environmental conditions relevant to air quality issues are specified in Schedule 2, Part A / A1- A8, Part B / A1 – A3, Part C / A1 – A7, Part D / A1 - A5, Part E / A1 – A 4 and Part F /A1 – A6.</p> <p>Air pollution from increased traffic as a result of the development may lead to some small increases near road-side in low lying areas, but is expected to be of little significance on a regional scale.</p>	No
131	(Can't decipher name) no address	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
132	Partridge W Lt 3 Helen Street, Ranelagh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
133 133	Cronin, D c/- Post Office, Huonville	<p>Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users.</p> <p>General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.</p> <p>Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.</p>	No No
134	Van Der Heyden, C 318 Bakers Creek Road, Lucaston	General concerns about potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre.	Potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre have been assessed by the Board. An evaluation report has been prepared in the form of an EAR.	No
135 135	Spencer, J 111 St Leonards Rd, Forres, Scotland	<p>Forest management and timber supply issues.</p> <p>Concerns in relation to the practicality of regulating the large number of environmental conditions (166 conditions stipulated by the Board), especially considering that several substantial management plans and models are yet to be submitted which will require</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.</p> <p>The Board notes that the administration and enforcement of environmental conditions for 'Level 2' premises falls within the core business functions of DPIWE's Environment Division. The regulation of five level 2 activities will</p>	No No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
		assessment.	require significant resources, especially during the development phase.	
136	Van Ry, H 60 Channel Highway, Kingston	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
137	Short, E, F & J 78 Kayoota Road, Rose Bay	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
138	Frankcomb, S 90 Glen Road, Ranelagh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury), including impacts on buildings due to vibrations.	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section T4 of this report	No
139	Watkins, D S 40 Millhouse Road, Longley	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
139		General concerns about increased air pollution resulting from the Wood Centre (Power Station in particular), especially considering the frequency of fogs experienced in the Huon River Valley.	Air quality issues are addressed in S. 8.6 of the EAR; refer in particular to Sections 8.6.9 (Evaluation) and 8.6.10 (Recommendations). Environmental conditions relevant to air quality issues are specified in Schedule 2, Part A / A1-A8, Part B / A1 – A3, Part C / A1 – A7, Part D / A1 - A5, Part E / A1 – A 4 and Part F /A1 – A6.	No
140	Allen, M & Towle N U2/5 Stevens Place, Burnie	Legal responsibility over operations of the Wood Centre.	Refer to Part B, Section LEG1 of this report.	No
141	Dudley, Sarah 953 North Huon Road, Judbury	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
141		Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
141		Legal responsibility over operations of the Wood Centre.	Refer to Part B, Section LEG1 of this report.	No
141		General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.	No
141		Assessment of water quality issues not satisfactory. Concerns in relation to specific air quality parameters (e.g. NO <sub>2</sub> , NO <sub>x</sub> , CO, oxides of sulphur, formaldehyde, acrolein, acetaldehyde, acetic acid, formic acid).	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report. NO <sub>x</sub> (including NO <sub>2</sub> ) and CO emissions are addressed in the EAR (Section 8.6, especially 8.6.7; 8.6.9 and 8.6.10).	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
141		<p>Potential for acid rain due to air emissions from power station.</p> <p>Lack of specific information in relation to the Power Station, e.g. capacity, local meteorological data, documentation regarding permitted plant emissions, identification of plant operator.</p> <p>Concerns in relation to the practicality of regulating the large number of environmental conditions (166 conditions stipulated by the Board), especially considering that several substantial management plans and models are yet to be submitted which will require assessment.</p>	<p>Oxides of sulfur, formaldehyde, acrolein, acetaldehyde, acetic acid, and formic acid are not expected to be emitted in significant quantities.</p> <p>The precursors of acid rain are oxides of sulfur and nitrogen, respectively. Sulfur in wood is present at low levels and for this reason corresponding oxides will also be emitted in low quantities. Oxides on nitrogen will be emitted in more substantive quantities, but still at relatively low levels by comparison with international cases where significant acidification has occurred.</p> <p>While detailed technical specifications were not available at the time of the assessment, preliminary air dispersion modelling was conducted based on predicted stack emissions. This is documented in Appendix U of the DPEMP and summarised in S. 10.2.2 of the DPEMP.</p> <p>The lack of detailed technical information and local meteorological data was highlighted in the EAR (S. 8.6.9 Atmospheric Emissions – Evaluation). As a result, the environmental conditions [Part A] include requirements for further modelling (for details, refer to representation 99 above).</p> <p>The Board notes that the administration and enforcement of environmental conditions for 'Level 2' premises falls within the core business functions of DPIWE's Environment Division. The regulation of five level 2 activities will require significant resources, especially during the development phase.</p>	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
142	Ward, J PO Box 213, Huonville	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
142		Legal responsibility over operations of the Wood Centre.	Refer to Part B, Section LEG1 of this report.	No
142		General concerns about air pollution resulting from the Wood Centre (Power Station in particular), especially considering the frequency of fogs experienced in the Huon River Valley.	Air quality issues are addressed in S. 8.6 of the EAR; refer in particular to Sections 8.6.9 (Evaluation) and 8.6.10 (Recommendations). Environmental conditions relevant to air quality issues are specified in Schedule 2, Part A / A1-A8, Part B / A1 – A3, Part C / A1 – A7, Part D / A1 - A5, Part E / A1 – A 4 and Part F /A1 – A6.	No
143	Wheatley, P 32 Turnip Fields Rd, South Hobart	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
143		Requirements for further information.	Refer to Part B, Sections IN1 or IN2 of this report.	No
143		Assessment of water quantity issues not satisfactory. Greenhouse effect should be considered in the context of water quantity.	Refer to Part B, Section W1 of this report.	No
143		Legal responsibility over operations of the Wood Centre.	Refer to Part B, Section LEG1 of this report.	No
143		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
144	Whitten, G 134 Maudleys Rd, Allen Rivulet	General concerns about increased air pollution resulting from the Wood Centre (Power Station in particular), especially considering the frequency of fogs experienced in the Huon River Valley	Air quality issues are addressed in S. 8.6 of the EAR; refer in particular to Sections 8.6.9 (Evaluation) and 8.6.10 (Recommendations). Environmental conditions relevant to air quality issues are specified in conditions [Part A] A1-A8, [Part B] A1 – A3, [Part C] A1 – A7, [Part D] A1 - A5, [Part E] A1 – A 4 and [Part F] A1 – A6.	No
144		Increased fog frequency would have detrimental impact on agriculture and horticulture activities in the region.	Water vapour is not considered to be a pollutant and therefore not addressed in EAR. With regards to socio-economic impacts, the issue is to be considered by the Planning Authority.	No



No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
145	Donaghey, R & C 80 Sawards Road, Myalla	General concerns about potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre.	Refer to Part B, Section LEG1 of this report.	No
145		Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
145		General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.	No
146	Thomas, P 82 Randalls Bay Road, Cygnet	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
146		General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River. Greenhouse effect should be considered in the context of water quantity.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.	No
146		The arrangements for solid waste management should be clarified.	The arrangements for solid waste management are discussed in Section 8.8 of the EAR (in particular, S. 8.8.9 - Potential Impact, 8.8.11 – Evaluation and S. 8.8.12 – Recommendations).  The Board has specified several environmental conditions with regard to solid waste management: S1 – S5 [Part A], S1 [Part B], S1 [Part C], S1 & S2 [Part D], S1 [Part E] and S1 [Part F].	No
146		The representor suggests that standard mechanisms in relation to permit breaches are not appropriate in respect to the Southwood development. It is suggested that if any portion of the (Wood Centre) operation breaches permit conditions on more than 2 occasions, the activity should be decommissioned and the site rehabilitated.	It is unclear why normal compliance and enforcement policies should not be applied to this development.	No
146		The Planning Permit should include an explicit statement that the issue of the permit does not imply that future amendments will be granted.	This is a matter of law, and it is not necessary to include it in the permit.	No
146		Specific comments in relation to environmental conditions.	Refer to Part C of this report.	Refer to Part C of this report.
147	Smith, E 7 Charlton Street, Cygnet	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
147		Impacts of water abstraction on downstream water users should be considered.	Refer to Part B, Section W3 of this report.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
147		Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
148	Cremasco, N 243 Judds Creek Rd, Judbury	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
148		Legal responsibility over operations of the Wood Centre.	Refer to Part B, Section LEG1 of this report.	No
148		Assessment of water quantity issues not satisfactory.	Refer to Part B, Section W1 of this report.	No
		General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.	
148		Assessment of water quality issues not satisfactory. The wastewater reuse site should be assessed.	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report. The EAR recognises that the information provided in the DPEMP with regard to the Wastewater Reuse site is not sufficiently detailed to fully assess its feasibility. Section 8.3.6.1.1 (1 <sup>st</sup> dot point on page 84) of the EAR specifies that a Site Management Plan is to be submitted prior to site development. The plan requires approval from the Director who will consider it in consultation with the CG. The requirement is reflected in the environmental conditions [Schedule 2, Part A, conditions WR 1-4]. Environmental condition WR3 prohibits construction of works associated with the proposed wastewater re-use unless a Wastewater Reuse Plan has been approved.	No
148		The arrangements for solid waste management should be clarified.	The arrangements for solid waste management are discussed in Section 8.8 of the EAR (in particular, S. 8.8.9 - Potential Impact, 8.8.11 – Evaluation and S. 8.8.12 – Recommendations).  The Board has specified several environmental conditions with regard to solid waste management: S1 – S5 [Part A], S1 [Part B], S1 [Part C], S1 & S2 [Part D], S1 [Part E] and S1 [Part F].	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
148		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
148		The large number and far-reaching nature of conditions attached to the Planning Permit indicates that the permit is inadequate and should be rejected.	The Board does not agree with this view. The large number of permit conditions is a reflection of the complex nature of the proposed development. It is noted that five Level 2 activities are proposed as part of the Wood Centre development.	No
149	Brettingham-Moore, E 120 Lookout Rd, Geeveston	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
149		Requirements for further information	Refer to Part B, Sections IN1 or IN2 of this report.	No
149		The wastewater reuse site should be assessed.	The EAR recognises that the information provided in the DPMP with regard to the Wastewater Reuse site is not sufficiently detailed to fully assess its feasibility. Section 8.3.6.1.1 (1 <sup>st</sup> dot point on page 84) of the EAR specifies that a Site Management Plan is to be submitted prior to site development. The plan requires approval from the Director who will consider it in consultation with the CG. The requirement is reflected in the environmental conditions [Schedule 2, Part A, conditions WR 1-4]. Environmental condition WR3 prohibits construction of works associated with the proposed wastewater re-use unless a Wastewater Reuse Plan has been approved.	No
149		The arrangements for solid waste management should be clarified.	The arrangements for solid waste management are discussed in Section 8.8 of the EAR (in particular, S. 8.8.9 - Potential Impact, 8.8.11 – Evaluation and S. 8.8.12 – Recommendations).  The Board has specified several environmental conditions with regard to solid waste management: S1 – S5 [Part A], S1 [Part B], S1	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
149		The DPEMP lacks a commitment to compensate the community in the event of environmental damage. Concern that the community may have to bear the cost in the event of environmental damage.	[Part C], S1 & S2 [Part D], S1 [Part E] and S1 [Part F]. The activity will be regulated by the Environment Division to ensure compliance with the environmental conditions specified by the Board. Compliance with these conditions is expected to minimise the risk of environmental harm being caused by the activities undertaken at the Wood Centre.	No
149		The large number and far-reaching nature of conditions attached to the Planning Permit indicates that the permit is inadequate and should be rejected.	In addition, the EMPCA contains a range of instruments to deal with environmental harm, including the capacity to require those who cause environmental harm to "make good". The Board does not agree with this view. The large number of permit conditions is a reflection of the complex nature of the proposed development. It is noted that five Level 2 activities are proposed to occur at Wood Centre complex.	No
149		Concerns that the taxpayer may be liable for any costs associated with clean-up of spills, remediation etc.	The EMPCA provides for the cost of cleaning up spills, and remediation to be borne by the person that caused the environmental damage. If necessary, the costs of clean up can be recovered (see s. 44 – 47 of EMPCA).	No
149		Concerns that the community may have to bear the costs for the regulation of large number of environmental conditions (including monitoring requirements).	The cost of monitoring will be borne by the proponent. Regulations under EMPCA specify annual permit fees for level 2 activities. These are paid to the State Government and are intended to cover the cost of regulation.	No
150	Borrie, I F PO Box 135, Dover	Specific issues in relation to wastewater management.	Refer to Part B, Section W6 of this report.	No
150		The wastewater reuse site should be assessed.	The EAR recognises that the information provided in the DPEMP with regard to the Wastewater Reuse site is not sufficiently detailed to fully assess its feasibility. Section	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
150		The representor is concerned that the DPEMP (Table 23, p.99) and EAR (Table 10, p. 55). give the impression that a by-pass of Geeveston already exists.	8.3.6.1.1 (1 <sup>st</sup> dot point on page 84) of the EAR specifies that a Site Management Plan is to be submitted prior to site development. The plan requires approval from the Director who will consider it in consultation with the CG. The requirement is reflected in the environmental conditions [Schedule 2, Part A, conditions WR 1-4]. Environmental condition WR3 prohibits construction of works associated with the proposed wastewater re-use unless a Wastewater Reuse Plan has been approved. Refer to Part B, Section T2 of this report.	No
150		Concerns in relation to the practicality of regulating the large number of environmental conditions (166 conditions stipulated by the Board), especially considering that several substantial management plans and models are yet to be submitted which will require assessment.	The Board notes that the administration and enforcement of environmental conditions for 'Level 2' premises falls within the core business functions of DPIWE's Environment Division. The regulation of five level 2 activities will require significant resources, especially during the development phase.	No
150		The representor notes that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The results of additional surveys, studies and monitoring programs are unknown; and</li> <li>- It may not be possible to eliminate or mitigate successfully any adverse environmental impacts identified by those surveys, studies and monitoring programs.</li> </ul> <p>The representor argues that in view of the uncertain outcome in regard to the review of further information, the Board's conclusion that the development is capable of being managed in an environmentally acceptable manner (as outlined in S. 9 of the EAR) is not justified.</p> <p>Specific comments in relation to environmental</p>	The Board is satisfied that the DPEMP contains sufficient detail, and sufficient is known of the environmental effects of the types of activities that are proposed (from experience elsewhere), to be satisfied that the development is capable of being managed in an environmentally acceptable manner. The further studies and surveys may rule out some options for the proponent. This is a risk to the proponent, as if some options are not available, options involving greater cost may eventuate, as the environmental requirements set by the Act and by the Board will not be compromised.	No
150		Specific comments in relation to environmental	Refer to Part C of this report.	Refer to Part C of this

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
		conditions.		report.
151	Fraser, W 239 Cockle Creek Rd, Lune River	Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users.	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	No
152	Southern Branch Tasmanian Beekeepers Association (Simon Pigot) PO Box 481, Sandy Bay	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
153	Cahill, P and Tyler, K 17 Marguerite St, Ranelagh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
154	Shields, L Stoney Point Trail, Crabtree	Emission levels specified in the DPEMP for dioxins are not equal to or better than Australian or World's Best Practice.  Representor claims that at present, there are no national standards for dioxin emissions. On this basis, the air emission control measures specified in the DPEMP are considered unacceptable.	Dioxin emissions are discussed in S. 8.6.7 of the EAR; refer in particular to Table 15 (Predicted effects of Wood Centre stack emissions).  Table 15 shows the results of air quality modelling carried out on behalf of Forestry Tasmania (documented in Appendix U of the DPEMP and summarised in S. 10.2.2 of the DPEMP). Dioxin emissions and ground level concentrations (GLC) associated with the Wood Centre development have been estimated. The estimated GLC was compared against a guideline set by the Victorian EPA. The maximum GLC predicted is appr. 20% of the guideline set by EPA Victoria for dioxin.  Based on current knowledge, dioxin emissions from the proposed facility are not considered to significantly affect background levels of dioxins in the region.	No  No
155	Ranelagh Community Group C/- 100 Agnes Street, Ranelagh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
155		Specific concerns that the DPEMP overestimates the numbers of heavy vehicles currently travelling along the North Huon Rd.	Refer to Part B, Section T6 of this report.	No
155		It is argued that a workforce of 200 is likely to result in more than 50 vehicles travelling to and from the site on work days and that due to the road improvements, North Huon Road is likely to become more heavily used by tourists, other local users and trucks from private forests. General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).  Traffic-related impacts occurring outside of the Huon Valley Council area have not been considered in sufficient detail.	The findings of the EAR would not be affected, as only the impact arising from log truck traffic was modelled.  Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section T3 of this report.	No
156	Young, J 3568 Main Road, Franklin	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
157	Timber Communities Australia Huon Valley Branch (Jenny Woolley) PO Box 172, Campania	In favour of the proposed development	Noted.	No
158	Wojtowicz, A 87 Agnes Street, Ranelagh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
158		More consideration should have been given to alternative transport arrangements. Specific comments in relation to environmental conditions.	Refer to Part B, Section T5 of this report.  Refer to Part C of this report.	Refer to Part C of this report.
159	Lawatsch, B 36 Brismead Road, Mt Nelson	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
159		General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
159		<p>Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users. Concerned that noise from the Wood Centre site will impinge on surrounding areas, including WHA.</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.</p> <p>Cumulative noise impacts from the Wood Centre are described in S. 8.7.7 of the EAR and evaluated in S. 8.7.9. Environmental conditions in Schedule 2, Part A, N1 – N6, Part B / N1- N2, Part C / N1 – N2, Part D / N1 – N2, Part E / N1 – N2 and Part F / N1 – N4 are designed to prevent noise impacts on sensitive uses adjacent to the Wood Centre. This issue is discussed in S. 8.12.5.1.3 of the EAR.</p>	No
159		<p>Wood-fired power station is old technology which would not be acceptable in other countries as it is not sustainable.</p>		No
159		<p>General concerns about increased air pollution resulting from the Wood Centre (Power Station in particular), especially considering the frequency of fogs experienced in the Huon River Valley.</p>	<p>Air quality issues are addressed in S. 8.6 of the EAR; refer in particular to Sections 8.6.9 (Evaluation) and 8.6.10 (Recommendations). Environmental conditions relevant to air quality issues are specified in Schedule 2, Part A / A1- A8, Part B / A1 – A3, Part C / A1 – A7, Part D / A1 - A5, Part E / A1 – A 4 and Part F /A1 – A6.</p>	No
159		<p>General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic on townships, including those between Kingston and Ranelagh</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.</p>	No
160	Donohoe, S	<p>Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.</p>	No
160	958 North Huon Rd, Judbury	<p>Legal responsibility over operations of the Wood Centre.</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Section LEG1 of this report.</p>	No
160		<p>Forest management and timber supply issues.</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.</p>	No
160		<p>General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.</p>	No
160		<p>Assessment of water quality issues not satisfactory. Lack of specific information in relation to the Power Station, e.g. capacity, local meteorological data, documentation regarding permitted plant emissions, identification of plant operator.</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report. While detailed technical specifications were not available at the time of the assessment, preliminary air dispersion modelling was conducted based on predicted stack emissions.</p>	No



No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
160		<p>Concerns in relation to specific air quality parameters (e.g. NO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, oxides of sulphur, formaldehyde, acrolein, acetaldehyde, acetic acid, formic acid).</p> <p>Potential for acid rain due to air emissions from power station.</p>	<p>This is documented in Appendix U of the DPEMP and summarised in S. 10.2.2 of the DPEMP.</p> <p>The lack of detailed technical information and local meteorological data was highlighted in the EAR (S. 8.6.9 Atmospheric Emissions – Evaluation). As a result, the environmental conditions [Part A] include requirements for further modelling (for details, refer to representation 99 above).</p> <p>NO<sub>x</sub> (including NO<sub>2</sub>) and CO emissions are addressed in the EAR (Section 8.6, especially 8.6.7; 8.6.9 and 8.6.10).</p> <p>Oxides of sulfur, formaldehyde, acrolein, acetaldehyde, acetic acid, and formic acid are not expected to be emitted in significant quantities.</p> <p>The precursors of acid rain are oxides of sulfur and nitrogen, respectively. Sulfur in wood is present at low levels and for this reason corresponding oxides will also be emitted in low quantities. Oxides on nitrogen will be emitted in more substantive quantities, but still at relatively low levels by comparison with international cases where significant acidification has occurred.</p>	No
160		<p>General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.</p>	No
160		<p>Concerns in relation to the practicality of regulating the large number of environmental conditions (166 conditions stipulated by the Board), especially considering that several substantial management plans</p>	<p>The Board notes that the administration and enforcement of environmental conditions for 'Level 2' premises falls within the core business functions of DPIWE's Environment Division.</p>	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
		and models are yet to be submitted which will require assessment.	The regulation of five level 2 activities will require significant resources, especially during the development phase.	
161	Ayers, J C/- Post Office, Grove	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
161		Specific issues in relation to wastewater management.	Refer to Part B, Section W6 of this report.	No
162	Huon Protection Group 760 Cygnet Coast Rd, Petcheys Bay	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
162		Specific issues in relation to wastewater management.	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	No
162		Insufficient information on daily flows in the Huon River at times of low flow.	The Board does not agree with this statement, as the DPEMP (S. 3.3.2) documents that 30 years of records for Frying Pan Creek were used, including a number of low flow years.	
162		Forestry-related impacts on water quality. Taking issue with the claim made in the DPEMP that greenhouse gas emissions will be reduced as a result of the Wood Centre development.	Refer to Part B, Section W7 of this report. An evaluation of this issue is contained in S. 8.12.5 of the EAR, which concludes that "without taking into account carbon sink issues, it is likely that the operation of wood-fired boilers will result in a slight net decrease of greenhouse gas emissions when compared to the current situation [where forest residue is burnt after harvesting]." (page 154 of EAR).	No
163	Direen, J & B 18 North Huon Rd, Ranelagh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
163		Particularly concerned about potential for damage to a building located at a distance of less than 2 m distance from the existing road as a result of vibrations.	Refer to Part B, Section T4 of this report.	No
164	Southwood Community Advisory Group (Tim Tierney) 3 Wilmot Road, Huonville	Neutral.	Noted.	No
165	Velnaar, C	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
165	237 Graces Road, Glaziers Bay	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
165		Current practice of burning forest residue should be discontinued as unsustainable. General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Not within the scope of the Board's assessment (refer to Section 8 of EAR). Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
166	Velnaar, G 237 Graces, Road, Glaziers Bay	Forest management and timber supply issues.  The failure of regulatory bodies to effectively pursue breaches of legislative requirements such as permit conditions, is of concern with regard to the future regulation of the Wood Centre activities.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.  Both LUPAA and EMCA have provisions for civil enforcement should a person not be satisfied with the actions of a regulatory authority.	No
166		Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users.	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	No
166		Assessment of water quality issues not satisfactory. Specific comments in relation to environmental conditions.	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report. Refer to Part C of this report.	Refer to Part C of this report.
167	Rebikov, A & T 351 Judds Creek Road, Judbury	General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.	No
167		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury), particular concern about proposed 24-hour truck movements.	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
168	Harrison, R 619 Rollingbrook Dr, Baytown, Texas	General concerns about potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre.	Potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre have been assessed by the Board. An evaluation report has been prepared in the form of an EAR.	No
169	Summer Kitchen Organic Bakery 1 Marguerite Street,	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
169	Ranelagh	Concern that vibrations generated by heavy trucks may cause damage to buildings. Specific comments in relation to environmental conditions relating to traffic.	Refer to Part B, Section T4 of this report.  Refer to Part C of this report.	Refer to Part C of this report.
170	Donohoe, K E 958 North Huon Road, Judbury	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
170		Requirements for further information.	Refer to Part B, Sections IN1 or IN2 of this report.	No
170		Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
170		Minimum environmental flow should be determined before granting of a Water Licence.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.	No
170		As a matter of principle, a DRAFT policy ( <i>i.e.</i> the Tasmanian Draft Environment Protection Policy (Air Quality)) should not be used to establish air quality / emission benchmarks.  The Tasmanian DRAFT Environment Protection Policy (Air Quality) should not be used to establish air quality / emission benchmarks, as it does not reflect local conditions in the Huon Valley.	The assessment of impacts on air quality must be undertaken in accordance with the objectives of EMPCA. The assessment framework set out in the Draft EPP (Air Quality) is designed to support EMPCA and is consistent with it.  The draft EPP (Air Quality) is designed to apply to the entire State. Local conditions are addressed in the EPP by reference to Schedule 2 which states that "the atmospheric dispersion calculation should consider local terrain and meteorology, the effect of background concentrations, the contribution of adjacent sources and the need to preserve the capacity of the local environment to receive future emissions." The requirements of the Draft Policy are reflected in the EAR. In particular, the need for local meteorological data to be utilised for any future air dispersion modelling is highlighted in S. 8.6.9 and 8.6.10 of the EAR. The recommendations contained in the EAR are in	No.

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
			turn reflected in the Board's environmental conditions with regard to atmospheric emissions, in particular [Part A] A2, A3, A10 and A11.	
170		Local meteorological data should have been used when considering impact on air quality.	Note that the issue is addressed in EAR (S. 8.6.9 'Atmospheric Emissions – Evaluation'). While the lack of met. data was recognised as a concern, the information provided in Appendix U of the DPEMP (air dispersion modelling report) was considered suitable for the purposes of a screening exercise. It was also noted that the model used ('Ausplume') tends to over predict pollution levels. The collection of local met. data and the conduct of further air dispersion modelling is required in accordance with the environmental conditions [ Part A], A2 and A10.	No
170		Lack of discussion in relation of impacts of Power Station emissions on adjacent communities such as Judbury and Lonnvale.	Modelling results are discussed in terms of the worst affected areas and nearest communities. The air-impact on other localities, are by inference, predicted to be less significant. Modelling results however, are available for the entire modelling domain, and could easily include results for other localities of interest (when further modelling is conducted).	No
171	Donohoe, A J 958 North Huon Road, Judbury	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
171		Legal responsibility over Wood Centre operations.	Refer to Part B, Section LEG1 of this report.	No
171		Assessment of water quantity issues not satisfactory. Greenhouse effect should be considered in the context of water quantity.	Refer to Part B, Section W1 of this report.	No
		General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.	
171		The wastewater reuse site should be assessed.	The EAR recognises that the information	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
			provided in the DPEMP with regard to the Wastewater Reuse site is not sufficiently detailed to fully assess its feasibility. Section 8.3.6.1.1 (1 <sup>st</sup> dot point on page 84) of the EAR specifies that a Site Management Plan is to be submitted prior to site development. The plan requires approval from the Director who will consider it in consultation with the CG. The requirement is reflected in the environmental conditions [Schedule 2, Part A, conditions WR 1-4]. Environmental condition WR3 prohibits construction of works associated with the proposed wastewater re-use unless a Wastewater Reuse Plan has been approved.	
171		The arrangements for solid waste management should be clarified.	The arrangements for solid waste management are discussed in Section 8.8 of the EAR (in particular, S. 8.8.9 - Potential Impact, 8.8.11 – Evaluation and S. 8.8.12 – Recommendations).  The Board has specified several environmental conditions with regard to solid waste management: S1 – S5 [Part A], S1 [Part B], S1 [Part C], S1 & S2 [Part D], S1 [Part E] and S1 [Part F].	No
171		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
171		The large number and far-reaching nature of conditions attached to the Planning Permit indicates that the permit is inadequate and should be rejected.	The Board does not agree with this view. The large number of permit conditions is a reflection of the complex nature of the proposed development. It is noted that five Level 2 activities are proposed as part of the Wood Centre development.	No
172	Dimmick, P PO Box 168	The representor suggests that standard mechanisms in relation to permit breaches are not appropriate in respect to the Southwood development. It is suggested	It is unclear why normal compliance and enforcement policies should not be applied to this development.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
		that if any portion of the (Wood Centre) operation breaches permit conditions on more than 2 occasions, the activity should be decommissioned and the site rehabilitated.		
172		Specific comments in relation to environmental conditions.	Refer to Part C of this report.	Refer to Part C of this report.
173	Mitchell, Y 80-90 Helen Street, Ranelagh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
174	Wohlgemuth M Bayview Road, Dover	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury), incl. damage to historic buildings as a result of vibrations.	Refer to Sections T1 and T4 of this report.	No
174		Concerns in relation to the practicality of regulating the large number of environmental conditions (166 conditions stipulated by the Board), especially considering that several substantial management plans and models are yet to be submitted which will require assessment.	The Board notes that the administration and enforcement of environmental conditions for 'Level 2' premises falls within the core business functions of DPIWE's Environment Division. The regulation of five level 2 activities will require significant resources, especially during the development phase.	No
175	Davis, S Main Road, Geeveston	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
176	Sears, L & A 231 Albion Heights Drive, Kingston	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
176		General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.  Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users.  Assessment of water quality issues not satisfactory.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	No
176		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
176		General concerns about increased air pollution resulting	Air quality issues are addressed in S. 8.6 of the	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
		from the Wood Centre (Power Station in particular), especially considering the frequency of fogs experienced in the Huon River Valley.	EAR; refer in particular to Sections 8.6.9 (Evaluation) and 8.6.10 (Recommendations). Environmental conditions relevant to air quality issues are specified in Schedule 2, Part A / A1- A8, Part B / A1 – A3, Part C / A1 – A7, Part D / A1 - A5, Part E / A1 – A 4 and Part F /A1 – A6.	
176		Concern about traffic-related air pollution (vehicle emissions) in general.	Air pollution from increased traffic as a result of the development may lead to some small increases near road-side in low lying areas, but is expected to be of little significance on a regional scale.	No
177	Jupe, D 39 Talone Road, Blackmans Bay	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
178	Tasmanian Conservation Trust 102 Bathurst Street, Hobart	General concerns about potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre.	Potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre have been assessed by the Board. An evaluation report has been prepared in the form of an EAR.	No
178		Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
178		Concerned about problems with the processing of application for Water Licence.	Refer to Part B, Section W4 of this report.	No
178		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).  More consideration should have been given to alternative transport routes / mechanisms. Conditions should be set to enforce the use of the Plenty Road to New Norfolk.	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section T5 of this report.	No
179	Hayden, K 2883 Huon Highway, Huonville	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).  Concern that vibrations generated by heavy trucks may cause damage to buildings.	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section T4 of this report.	No



No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
180	Tyson, Kim c/- Post Office, Grove	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).  Concern that vibrations generated by heavy trucks may cause damage to buildings.	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section T4 of this report.	No
181	Tyson, S C/- Post Office, Grove	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).  Concern that vibrations generated by heavy trucks may cause damage to buildings.	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section T4 of this report.	No
182	Tyson, Kris 110 Wattle Hill Road, Mt River	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).  Concern that vibrations generated by heavy trucks may cause damage to buildings.	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section T4 of this report.	No
183	Gatenby, J C/- Post Office, Grove	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).  Concern that vibrations generated by heavy trucks may cause damage to buildings.	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section T4 of this report.	No
184	Scriber, J C/- Post Office, Grove	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).  Concern that vibrations generated by heavy trucks may cause damage to buildings.	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section T4 of this report.	No
185	Conway, R 482 Bakers Creek Road, Lucaston	Impacts of water abstraction on downstream water users should be considered.	Refer to Part B, Section W3 of this report.	No
186	Butt, J & L R 88 Agnes Street, Ranelagh	General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
		Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users.	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	
186		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).  More consideration should have been given to alternative transport routes / mechanisms.	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section T5 of this report.	No
187	Woolley, Matthew 124 North Huon Road, Ranelagh	Concerned that noise from the Wood Centre site will impinge on neighbours.	Cumulative noise impacts from the Wood Centre are described in S. 8.7.7 of the EAR and evaluated in S. 8.7.9. Environmental conditions in Schedule 2, Part A, N1 – N6, Part B / N1- N2, Part C / N1 – N2, Part D / N1 – N2, Part E / N1 – N2 and Part F / N1 – N4 are designed to prevent noise impacts on sensitive uses adjacent to the Wood Centre.	No
187		General concerns about air pollution resulting from the Wood Centre (Power Station in particular), especially considering the frequency of fogs experienced in the Huon River Valley.	Air quality issues are addressed in S. 8.6 of the EAR; refer in particular to Sections 8.6.9 (Evaluation) and 8.6.10 (Recommendations). Environmental conditions relevant to air quality issues are specified in Schedule 2, Part A / A1- A8, Part B / A1 – A3, Part C / A1 – A7, Part D / A1 - A5, Part E / A1 – A 4 and Part F /A1 – A6.	No
188	Woolley, Rob and Merle 124 North Huon Road, Ranelagh	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
188		General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.  Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	No
188		General concerns about increased air pollution resulting from the Wood Centre (Power Station in particular), especially considering the frequency of fogs experienced in the Huon River Valley.	Air quality issues are addressed in S. 8.6 of the EAR; refer in particular to Sections 8.6.9 (Evaluation) and 8.6.10 (Recommendations). Environmental conditions relevant to air quality	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
			issues are specified in Schedule 2, Part A / A1-A8, Part B / A1 – A3, Part C / A1 – A7, Part D / A1 - A5, Part E / A1 – A 4 and Part F /A1 – A6.	
188		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
189	Vanduren, G & P 509 New Road, Franklin	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
189		Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users.	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	No
189		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
190	Quarrier, S 635 Mountain River Rd, Mountain River	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).  Concern that vibrations generated by heavy trucks may cause damage to buildings.	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section T4 of this report.	No
191	Van Ravels, F & S 65-69 Agnes Street, Ranelagh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).  Concern that vibrations generated by heavy trucks may cause damage to buildings.	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section T4 of this report.	No
192	Broadby, L Post Office, Grove	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
193	Brown, D PO Box 392, St Helens	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
193		General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.  Assessment of water quality issues not satisfactory.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	No
193		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
		heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).		
193		Concerns in relation to the practicality of regulating the large number of environmental conditions (166 conditions stipulated by the Board), especially considering that several substantial management plans and models are yet to be submitted which will require assessment.	The Board notes that the administration and enforcement of environmental conditions for 'Level 2' premises falls within the core business functions of DPIWE's Environment Division. The regulation of five level 2 activities will require significant resources, especially during the development phase.	No
194	Crowe, J 68 Ranelagh Street, Ranelagh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
195	Perrin, W & R 100 Agnes Street, Ranelagh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
196	Vandervalk, E R 62 Ranelagh Street, Ranealgh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
197	James, T W Huon Highway, Castle Forbes Bay	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
198	Bining, J Franklins Road, Crabtree	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
199	Vanderdonk, L Lucaston	General concerns about potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre.	Potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre have been assessed by the Board. An evaluation report has been prepared in the form of an EAR.	No
200	Thompson, E W 668 Glen Huon Road, Huonville	General concerns about potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre.	Potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre have been assessed by the Board. An evaluation report has been prepared in the form of an EAR.	No
201	Roberts, P M 24 Albury Road, Huonville	In favour of the proposed development.	Noted.	No
202	Klimek, C PO Box 63, Lune River	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
		Judbury).		
202		Specific comments in relation to environmental conditions.	Refer to Part C of this report.	Refer to Part C of this report.
203	Zeven, D 2 Marguerite St, Ranelagh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).  More consideration should have been given to alternative transport routes, e.g. the Plenty Link Road.	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section T5 of this report.	No
204	Komzak, L Liddells Road, Crabtree	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
204		General concerns about increased air pollution resulting from the Wood Centre (Power Station in particular), especially considering the frequency of fogs experienced in the Huon River Valley.	Air quality issues are addressed in S. 8.6 of the EAR; refer in particular to Sections 8.6.9 (Evaluation) and 8.6.10 (Recommendations). Environmental conditions relevant to air quality issues are specified in Schedule 2, Part A / A1-A8, Part B / A1 – A3, Part C / A1 – A7, Part D / A1 - A5, Part E / A1 – A 4 and Part F /A1 – A6.	No
205	Simon, M R 1701 Huon Road, Longley	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
205		Forest management and timber supply issues.  Current practice of burning forest residue should be discontinued as unsustainable.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.  Not within the scope of the Board's assessment (refer to Section 8 of EAR).	No
205		Situating the proposed Wood Centre in the immediate vicinity of the Huon River does not comply with the principles of "sustainable development" as defined in the LUPAA and does not constitute good environmental planning.	The Board considers this to be a planning issue, to be considered by the Planning Authority.	No
205		General concerns about increased air pollution resulting from the Wood Centre (Power Station in particular), especially considering the frequency of fogs experienced in the Huon River Valley.	Air quality issues are addressed in S. 8.6 of the EAR; refer in particular to Sections 8.6.9 (Evaluation) and 8.6.10 (Recommendations). Environmental conditions relevant to air quality issues are specified in Schedule 2, Part A / A1-A8, Part B / A1 – A3, Part C / A1 – A7, Part D /	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
		Potential for dust emissions from the Wood Centre site.	<p>A1 - A5, Part E / A1 – A 4 and Part F /A1 – A6.</p> <p>Dust emissions from Wood Centre operations are covered in S. 8.6 of EAR, especially in Evaluation Section 8.6.9 ('Dust and Wood Fibre Particles' on p. 110).</p> <p>Note that environmental condition Part A / A14 requires the responsible person to eliminate the escape of visible dust, wood waste, wood fibres, wood chips or ash from the Wood Centre site.</p>	
205		Why have steam emissions (from the cooling tower) not been assessed and why are there no environmental conditions in this respect ?	<p>Steam emissions from the power station are discussed in S. 8.6.5.1 and 8.6.5.2 of the EAR. The EAR clarifies that water vapour emissions are not considered to be a pollutant as they are not likely to cause environmental harm. Therefore, environmental conditions to limit or control the emission of water vapour have not been stipulated by the Board.</p> <p>However, the EAR recognises that there is the potential for visual impacts in relation to steam emissions (see page 173, S. 8.15.6 of EAR). Visual impacts are regarded as a planning issue to be addressed by the Planning Authority.</p>	No
205		The DPEMP uses varying figures in relation to the capacity of the power station (p.51 – 20-40MW, elsewhere 30- 50 MW).	While the main body of the DPEMP uses varying figures in relation to the power generation capacity, the air emission modelling report (Appendix U) as well as the EAR (see S. 8.6.5, p. 99) are based on the worst-case scenario of 50 MW.	No
205		Atmospheric emissions (dioxins, greenhouse gases) from heat plants need to be specified in addition to power station output.	<p>Atmospheric emissions from various sources at the Wood Centre (including heat plants) are specified in Table 1 of the DPEMP supplement as well as Table 16 of EAR for a range of parameters including greenhouse gases.</p> <p>Dioxin emissions from the power station and</p>	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
			heat plants have been considered in the Air dispersion modelling exercise, as documented in Appendix U to DPEMP and as described in S. 8.6.7.1 of the EAR.	
205		The Tasmanian Draft Air EPP disallows back yard burning. It is therefore not logical to allow the operation of a wood-fired power station.	The draft Air EPP does not formally exclude back-yard burning. For example, such burning is allowed when conducted in accordance with a fire permit or as allowed by a council by-law. Moreover, the draft EPP does not propose the banning of wood in domestic woodheaters, which would represent a more reasonable analogy. It should also be noted that the wood-fired power station has been assessed against the guidelines/standards outlined in the Draft Policy (see S. 8.6.9 and 8.6.10 of the EAR). Moreover, the Power Station will require installation of pollution control equipment to reduce emissions and operated in a manner that maximises efficiency and energy generation.	No
205		General concerns about an increase in greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the Wood Centre development.  The greenhouse gas emission argument put forward by FT does not take into account the fact that some plantation timber will be used. Representor suggests that this impacts on the emission output, especially CO <sub>2</sub> . In addition, energy used in bringing fuel to the site should be accounted for.	This issue is discussed in S. 8.12 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) of the EAR.  The DPEMP states that the main fuel source for the power station will be forest residue. However, page 378 contains a statement "...the green wood by-products from the Wood Centre will be supplemented as needed, or as available, by processed wood by-products from other local sources, including other sawmills, and discarded wood residues."  The DPEMP specifies that up to 37,000 dry tonnes per year of by-product from other processing areas at the Wood Centre may be used as fuel source for the Power Station (Table	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
			<p>77). However, there is no estimate of the amount of fuelwood from external sources which may be used as fuel source for the power station.</p> <p>It is recommended that clarification from FT be sought in relation to this issue.</p>	
206	Lee, B 69 Dillons Hill Road, Glaziers Bay	Concern that exhaust emissions or dust have the potential to affect local enterprises, e.g. beekeeping industry and honey production. [Representation refers to an article in APIS – Apicultural Information and Issues, Florida Extension Newsletter Vol. 12, No. 5, May 1994. Honey Bees and Environmental Contamination].	<p>Air pollution from increased traffic as a result of the development may lead to some small increases near road-side in low lying areas, but is expected to be of little significance on a regional scale.</p> <p>The potential for nuisance dust may be significant near unsealed or poorly maintained roads. The potential impact on the bee/honey production industry from increased vehicle-related emissions is unclear.</p>	No
206		<p>General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).</p> <p>Representation highlights traffic noise problems currently experienced by residents living close to the Southern Outlet, mainly due to truck noise.</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.</p> <p>Refer to Part B, Section T3 of this report.</p>	No
207	Riddle and Van Velzen 48 Old Road, Franklin	<p>General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.</p> <p>Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users, specifically in relation to the drinking water supply.</p> <p>The arrangements for solid waste management should be clarified.</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.</p> <p>Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.</p> <p>The arrangements for solid waste management are discussed in Section 8.8 of the EAR (in particular, S. 8.8.9 - Potential Impact, 8.8.11 – Evaluation and S. 8.8.12 – Recommendations).</p> <p>The Board has specified several environmental</p>	No



No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
			conditions with regard to solid waste management: S1 – S5 [Part A], S1 [Part B], S1 [Part C], S1 & S2 [Part D], S1 [Part E] and S1 [Part F].	
207		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
207		The DPEMP lacks a commitment to compensate the community in the event of environmental damage. Concern that the community may have to bear the cost in the event of environmental damage.	The activity will be regulated by the Environment Division to ensure compliance with the environmental conditions specified by the Board. Compliance with these conditions is expected to minimise the risk of environmental harm being caused by the activities undertaken at the Wood Centre.  In addition, the EMPCA contains a range of instruments to deal with environmental harm, including the capacity to require those who cause environmental harm to "make good".	No
207		Concerns in relation to the practicality of regulating the large number of environmental conditions (166 conditions stipulated by the Board), especially considering that several substantial management plans and models are yet to be submitted which will require assessment.	The Board notes that the administration and enforcement of environmental conditions for 'Level 2' premises falls within the core business functions of DPIWE's Environment Division. The regulation of five level 2 activities will require significant resources, especially during the development phase.	No
207		Concerns that the community may have to bear the costs for the regulation of large number of environmental conditions (including monitoring requirements).	The cost of monitoring will be borne by the proponent. Regulations under EMPCA specify annual permit fees for level 2 activities. These are paid to the State Government and are intended to cover the cost of regulation.	No
208	Handrickan, A & V 81 Benders Road, Huonville	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
208		General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.	Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
		Concerned about more stringent water restrictions.	Refer to Part B, Section W3 of this report.	
208		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury) and particular concern about 24-hour truck movements.	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
209	Nibling, C 14 Park Briar Cir, Baytown Texas	General concerns about potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre.	Potential environmental impacts associated with the Wood Centre have been assessed by the Board. An evaluation report has been prepared in the form of an EAR.	No
210	Jones, L & and Hurst J PO Box 82, Huonville	Need for <u>independent</u> assessment.	Refer to Part B, Section IA of this report.	No
210		Potential for impacts on water quality in the Huon River and on water users, specifically as a result of increased salinity.	Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	No
210		DPEMP gives the impression that noise levels from the operation of the Wood Centre will be comparable to rural noise levels.	The DPEMP argues that the current noise levels are typical of those found in a rural / semi-rural area and investigates the predicted increase in noise levels on the basis of modelling. S. 12.2.5.4 of the DPEMP provides a summary of the noise sources at the Wood Centre along with an evaluation of noise impacts on adjacent sensitive uses.  Further evaluation of noise impacts is contained in S. 8.7 of the EAR.	No
211	Glanville, C PO Box 42, Cygnet	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).  More consideration should have been given to alternative transport mechanisms, especially alternative port options.	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section T5 of this report.  Note that the Planning Authority has concerns with the establishment of a new port in the Huon estuary, particularly in relation to	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
			potential, social and environmental impacts and effects on other industries such as the aquaculture industry	
212	Ragg, S 1 Adventure Place, Margate	Concerned about more stringent water restrictions.  Role of Forestry Tasmania in the water catchment?	Refer to Part B, Section W3 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W3 of this report.	No
212		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).  The concentration of heavy trucks at the Wood Centre opening time (7 am) is of concern, as this is already a busy time on North Huon Road.	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.  Note that with regards to noise, environmental condition T6 requires that traffic noise modelling is repeated prior to commencement of the Wood Centre operations. Such modelling is to consider the likely times of truck "clustering".	No
213	Laugher, B & Others 9 Wynnstay Court, Blackmans Bay	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
213		General concerns about increased air pollution resulting from the Wood Centre (Power Station in particular), especially considering the frequency of fogs experienced in the Huon River Valley.	Air quality issues are addressed in S. 8.6 of the EAR; refer in particular to Sections 8.6.9 (Evaluation) and 8.6.10 (Recommendations). Environmental conditions relevant to air quality issues are specified in Schedule 2, Part A / A1-A8, Part B / A1 – A3, Part C / A1 – A7, Part D / A1 - A5, Part E / A1 – A 4 and Part F /A1 – A6.	No
214	Direen, D W & R J 77 Agnes Street, Ranelagh	General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).  Concern that vibrations generated by heavy trucks may cause damage to buildings.	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section T4 of this report.	No
215	Bilokur, N 69 Thomas Street, Howard QLD	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
215		Assessment of water quantity issues not satisfactory.  General impacts of water abstraction from Huon River.  Assessment of water quality issues not satisfactory.	Refer to Part B, Section W1 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W2 of this report.  Refer to Part B, Section W5 of this report.	No
215		General concerns about an increase in greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the Wood Centre development.	This issue is discussed in S. 8.12 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) of the EAR.	No
215		Approval for the development should be delayed until sufficient local meteorological data has been collected to show that there will be no air pollution problems.	The lack of specific technical information and local meteorological information in relation to the air dispersion modelling provided as part of the DPEMP (Appendix U) is also highlighted in S. 8.6.9 of the EAR.  The EAR therefore requests further modelling, as outlined in the Recommendations Section S. 8.6.10 (3 <sup>rd</sup> dot point). These recommendations are reflected in the environmental conditions [Part A] A2, A3, A10 and A11.	No
215		General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).	Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.	No
216	Maddock, J PO Box 101, Kingston	Forest management and timber supply issues.	Refer to Part B, Section FM1 of this report.	No
216		No information was provided for river flows at point of abstraction.	The Board disagrees with this statement, as the DPEMP (Table 14, page 68) contains a river flow estimate at the proposed site of water abstraction.	No
216		General concerns about increased air pollution resulting from the Wood Centre (Power Station in particular), especially considering the frequency of fogs experienced in the Huon River Valley.	Air quality issues are addressed in S. 8.6 of the EAR; refer in particular to Sections 8.6.9 (Evaluation) and 8.6.10 (Recommendations).  Environmental conditions relevant to air quality issues are specified in Schedule 2, Part A / A1-A8, Part B / A1 – A3, Part C / A1 – A7, Part D / A1 - A5, Part E / A1 – A 4 and Part F /A1 – A6.	No
216		Concerned that noise from the Wood Centre site will impinge on neighbours.	Cumulative noise impacts from the Wood Centre are described in S. 8.7.7 of the EAR and	No

No.	NAME AND ADDRESS	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	COMMENTS	CHANGE TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED?
			<p>evaluated in S. 8.7.9.  Environmental conditions in Schedule 2, Part A, N1 – N6, Part B / N1- N2, Part C / N1 – N2, Part D / N1 – N2, Part E / N1 – N2 and Part F / N1 – N4 are designed to prevent noise impacts on sensitive uses adjacent to the Wood Centre.</p>	
216		<p>General concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury).</p>	<p>Refer to Part B, Section T1 of this report.</p>	<p>No</p>



## **PART B: DISCUSSION OF ISSUES OF PARTICULAR RELEVANCE**

### **Independent Assessment**

#### **Issue IA:**

*Numerous representations [e.g. 36, 45, 58, 62, 74, 83, 85, 93, 99, 106, 107, 108, 110, 115, 120, 127, 141, 143, 146, 147, 148, 149, 160, 161, 165, 170, 171, 176, 198, 204, 205, 208, 210] called for an independent assessment of potential environmental, social and economic impacts of the development.*

*In addition, several representors argue that neither the Board nor any State Government Department can be considered to be an independent decision-making agency.*

#### **Board's response:**

In response to these arguments, the Board notes that it has undertaken a comprehensive and independent assessment of potential environmental impacts in relation to the proposed development, as documented in the EAR. In addition, the Board refers to the discussion contained in Section 3.1.9 of the Planning Authority's report to the RPDC which comprehensively deals with this issue. Relevant sections of the Planning Authority's report are reiterated underneath:

*"The planning system within Tasmania (and elsewhere) is based on the developer providing all the necessary information to justify a development proposal. In the case of Southwood, this was mainly dictated by the Guidelines for the DP&EMP that were issued by the EMPC Board. It is appropriate that this work be done at the developer's expense. It is not appropriate that another independent body prepare the necessary documents for the developer. This is certainly not the practice elsewhere.*

*The Council and the relevant government agencies provide the independent scrutiny and assessment of the studies that are done. In the case of Southwood this was primarily the job of the Council and the EMPC Board, and in the next stage, the Commission.*

*Further to this, the planning system enables the public to comment and provide further "independent" scrutiny. The planning system is designed to have sufficient checks and balances incorporated within it to encourage an independent scrutiny of any future development proposal. If anyone believes this is not the case, then that is something that should be taken up with the State's legislators.*

*It is worth noting (bearing in mind the comments of some submissions) that the EMPC Board is independent of government in the majority. It has two government representatives and three non-government representatives. It makes the decisions on the proposed environmental permit conditions (or refuses the application on environmental grounds), not the Department of Primary Industries, Water and Environment.*

*In the case of Southwood and any other Level 2 Activity, the Board will legally set the environmental conditions that Council must include in any future permit. If Council or any other body conducted its own independent assessment, it would have no bearing on those conditions – it would effectively be a waste of time as Council would have no power to amend the Board's conditions or to include environmental conditions of its own.*

*The need for an independent study raises a number of questions. Who is entirely independent? What consultant would you use? Would you need to call tenders because of the scale of the study involved (due to Local Government Act 1993 requirements)? What precedent does this set for other development applications? Who commissions the study and does that compromise its "independence"? The applicant has already partially paid for the current assessments (EMPCA Board and Council), so who pays for any additional assessments?*

*The obvious conclusion is that the existing legislated assessment system must be applied and that there is no realistic opportunity to call for further assessments beyond those required as a condition on any approved permit."*

#### **Board's recommendation:**

No change to environmental conditions required.

## **Requirements for further information**

### **Issue IN1:**

*Several representors [e.g. 44, 45, 83, 97, 99, 126, 141, 143, 146, 149, 158, 160, 170] highlighted the fact that the Board's environmental conditions require a significant amount of further information, including management plans in relation to several key issues. A number of representors felt that the permit should not be approved until such information has been submitted and favourable results have been obtained.*

### **Board's response:**

DPIWE's Environment Division is the agency responsible for enforcing environmental conditions in relation to Level 2 activities. The information required under the Board's environmental conditions will be subject to review and assessment by the DPIWE's Environment Division, prior to being considered for approval by the Director.

### **Issue IN2:**

*Two representors [146, 158] highlighted the need for key information, such as the various management plans required in accordance with the Board's environmental conditions, to be made available to the public prior to the project's approval.*

### **Board's response:**

The Management Plans will provide the necessary detail in relation to technical specifications and management practices to demonstrate that compliance will be achieved and that the project will be conducted within the specifications outlined in the DPEMP. If this information reveals that the project development is likely to be significantly different to the initial outline and if significant environmental implications were likely to arise from this, a new planning permit may be required. This will be subject to public representations. If the Planning Authority does not require a new planning permit but the Management Plans propose significant changes, the Director of Environmental Management also has the discretion to "call in" any environmentally relevant activity for assessment in accordance with S. 27(2) of the EMPCA. These processes will ensure that adequate public consultation occurs.

### **Board's recommendation:**

No change to environmental conditions required.

## **Limitations Statement**

### **Issue LS1:**

*Several representors [e.g. 44, 85, 99, 108, 127, 142, 148, 149, 165, 170 and 216] felt that the Limitations Statement in the DPEMP, which states, in part, that "...the passage of time, manifestation of latent conditions or impacts of future events may result in the actual project and its impact differing from that described in this report", compromises the value of the assessment, as the statement appears to signal that the actual project once developed may differ significantly from what has been approved.*

### **Board's response:**

The Board refers to the discussion contained in Section 3.1.9 of the Planning Authority's report to the RPDC which deals with this issue. Relevant sections of the Planning Authority's report are reiterated underneath:

*"These concerns relate to the possibility of the proponents being able to do whatever they want once they get initial approval and that they will not be bound by the descriptions in the document that they are asking Council to approve.*

*The Limitations Statement within the DP&EMP basically says that the proponent has used all the information that is relevant to this proposal, but that as time goes by, it is likely that such information will lose its currency and the reader should take this into account.*

*Regardless of this, any permit issued by Council (or the Commission in this case) will dictate quite precisely what development can take place. If the Southwood development is approved, then such a permit will be essentially*



based on the DP&EMP as lodged. The permit will also include many conditions that will need to be complied with and which will stipulate where changes to the DP&EMP have been accommodated.

The developer cannot undertake a development that is contrary to the permit. If substantial changes are necessary in the future, then a new application will need to be lodged. The Limitations Statement in the DP&EMP does not provide any means of avoiding the existing or future legal requirements to obtain a new planning permit or to amend an existing one."

**Board's recommendation:**

No change to environmental conditions required.

### **Forest management and timber supply issues.**

**Issue FM 1:**

The issue of timber supply and forest management practices in general (including concerns about the logging of old-growth forests, the use of 1080 poison, the adequacy of the RFA and the Forest Practices Code) emerged as an issue of significant interest to the community with a large number of representations [1, 59, 61, 64, 84, 86, 91, 94, 95, 97, 99, 104, 123, 135, 139, 141, 142, 145, 147, 152, 156, 159, 160, 162, 165, 166, 170, 177, 178, 188, 189, 193, 205, 213, 215, 216] expressing concerns in this regard.

**Board's response:**

Section 8 of the EAR outlines the scope of the Board's assessment as well as the rationale for not considering resource supply issues. No further discussion of this issue is considered necessary within the context of this report.

**Board's recommendation:**

No change to environmental conditions required.

### **Legal responsibility for operation of the Wood Centre**

**Issue LEG1:**

Several representors [44, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 148, 160, 166, 171] expressed their concerns that Forestry Tasmania may not have direct involvement or control of the activities at the Wood Centre site due to the anticipated leasing and sub-leasing arrangements. In this regard, it is felt that there should be a clear requirement for each party who intends to sublease and operate a component of the proposed development to undergo a separate permit and approval process in order to have consistent compliance with the LUPAA.

**Board's response:**

The Board refers to the discussion contained in Section 3.1.2 of the Planning Authority's report to the RPDC which deals with this issue. Relevant sections of the Planning Authority's report are reiterated underneath:

"A few submissions ... were concerned about an apparent conflict between Forestry Tasmania being the proponent of Southwood, but not necessarily the operator of the Wood Centre once constructed. From a planning perspective, this is not an issue as the planning permit runs with the land and not with the applicant, developer or operator. What is being assessed is the development and not the relative merits of the applicant. If the land is transferred or a new manager is appointed, then the same permit would apply regardless. Any operator of the development approved under a planning permit is subject to the conditions of that permit regardless of whether they were the original applicant or not."

With regard to the environmental conditions specified by the Board, the person responsible for the activity is defined as "any person who is or was responsible for the activity for which the permit is issued and includes any officer, employee, agent and assign of that person".

Forestry Tasmania is considered to be the responsible person and will be liable for any breaches of the environmental conditions, until such time as formal advice is received that the responsibilities for certain

activities has been taken over by another party. In this event, the other party would be issued with an Environment Protection Notice containing the environmental conditions, in accordance with Section 44 of the EMPCA. This would ensure that the new operator (lessee, sub-lessee) is aware of the environmental conditions. If a new operator wishes to make significant changes to the operation, this would be subject to assessment.

**Board's recommendation:**

No change to environmental conditions required.

## **Traffic Issues**

**Issue T1:**

*A large number of representors [25, 42, 43, 44, 54, 56, 59, 73, 75, 76, 83, 89, 109, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 125, 126, 128, 129, 131, 132, 133, 136, 138, 143, 148, 155, 158, 160, 163, 165, 167, 169, 171, 173, 174, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 186, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 202, 203, 206, 207, 208, 211, 214, 215 and 216] expressed general concerns in relation to the impacts of increased heavy traffic (particularly through Ranelagh and Judbury). Some of these [59, 167, 208] were particularly concerned about proposed 24-hour truck movements. Several also referred to impacts on the townships of Margate [73, 75] and Kingston [159].*

**Board's response:**

The Board's assessment in relation to traffic is restricted to environmental issues (noise, dust, vibration, roadkill) and is contained in S. 8.13 of the EAR. Other traffic-related impacts, e.g. road safety issues, are to be addressed by the Planning Authority.

Note that after passing through Ranelagh, the proposed transport route follows the Huon Highway, then the Southern Outlet towards Hobart (refer to Figure 6 in the EAR), therefore Margate or the Channel area in general will not be impacted.

With regard to Forestry Tasmania's proposal for 24-hour truck traffic, the Board notes that environmental conditions T4 and T5 impose restrictions in relation to the hours of truck movements to and from the Wood Centre. This restriction was determined necessary as a result of the predicted noise impacts during the early morning and at night-time.

**Issue T2:**

*One representor [150] notes that the assumption of an existing Geeveston by-pass, as reflected in the DPMP (Table 23, p.99) and EAR (Table 10, p. 55), is incorrect. While there is an indication of intention in the DPMP to construct the Geeveston by-pass within 2 years of the completion of construction of the Wood Centre (EAR p. 53), there is no firm commitment to do so.*

*The representor argues that therefore, residents of Geeveston along the 5 kms of Arve Road will suffer impacts from log traffic and suggests that a condition should be added which requires a by-pass of Geeveston to be constructed prior to the commencement of any activities on the land.*

**Board's response:**

The EAR in Section 5.1 (Current situation) states that trucks following the Arve Road towards the Huon Hwy currently travel through Geeveston. This is based on information in the DPMP which states on page 91 that "from the forest blocks located around Geeveston, most of the timber moves along the Arve Road to the Huon Hwy at Geeveston." According to Table 21 of the DPMP, the number of log truck movements along this route is currently 34 per day.

While Table 10 of the EAR assumes that the by-pass of Geeveston is completed, an assessment of the situation without the by-pass is also provided in Section 5.3.2.2.3 of the EAR (p. 53). This assessment concludes that even without the by-pass, the number of truck movements will decrease from 34 to 22 once the Wood Centre is operational. This is due to logs being transported to the Wood Centre via Forestry Roads rather than through the

sealed section of Arve Road through Geeveston (as shown in Figure 14, page 101 of the DPMP and clarified on page 51 of the DPMP supplement).

As it is expected that traffic-related impacts on this road section will be reduced once the Wood Centre becomes operational, a further assessment of traffic-related impacts on Geeveston or the incorporation of a condition requiring a by-pass to be constructed prior to commencement of operations at the Wood Centre were not considered necessary.

**Issue T3:**

*Some representors [59, 125, 155] also highlighted the potential impacts on segments of the transport route outside of the Huon Valley, including the Tasman Highway and Sorell Council area. According to two representors [155 and 206], there is an indication that noise problems currently exist in relation to the Southern Outlet.*

**Board's response:**

According to the traffic estimates provided in the DPMP, the amount of heavy vehicle traffic travelling along the Huon Highway and through Hobart is not expected to increase significantly as a result of the Wood Centre operations. Depending on the type of vehicles to be used (28t vs. 44 t payload), the best-case scenario would be a reduction by 3% whereas as a worst-case scenario, there may be an increase of 28% along this road segment.

With regard to heavy vehicle movements to Triabunna via Sorell, the DPMP (Table 37, page 124, Fig. 14, p. 101 and Fig. 11, p. 93) indicates that there will either be a slight decrease (from 84 movements/day to 78) or an increase by appr. 30% (from 84 movements/day to 98), depending on the type of trucks used for the transport of wood fibre (e.g. HPVs with 44t payload vs. standard trucks).

However, as environmental condition T3 requires that transport of wood fibre is carried out in HPVs, it is ensured that the resulting number of trucks travelling through Hobart and further on to Triabunna (via Sorell) will decrease slightly.

**Issue T4:**

*Some representors [76, 138, 163, 169, 174, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 190, 191, 214] were concerned that heavy vehicle movements may cause structural damage to buildings as a result of vibrations.*

**Board's response:**

Section 8.13.1.4 of the EAR concludes that traffic-related damage to buildings as a result of increased truck movements associated with the Wood Centre development is unlikely. However, this is based on the assumption that there is a minimal distance of 10 metres between buildings and the trucks, as this is the scenario presented in the DPMP. Once the exact location of the traffic route is confirmed, the impact on buildings at a distance of less than 10 metres to the road should be reviewed.

The Board recommends that a condition should be added which requires that at least 3 months prior to the commencement of road upgrading works associated with the operations on the land, the responsible person must provide the Director with confirmation of the exact transport route. This notification must consist of a map on an appropriate scale which clearly identifies the location of those buildings which will be at a distance of 10 metres or less from any new or upgraded sections of road following completion of road upgrading works.

**Issue T5:**

*Several representors [86, 158, 178, 186, 203] felt that more consideration should have been given to alternative transport mechanism and / or alternative road transport routes. In particular, the Plenty (Link) Road was mentioned as an option deserving more in-depth consideration [86, 178, 203].*

**Board's response:**

In the Board's view, the use of the proposed transport route is unlikely to generate environmental harm, provided that: (a) the specified environmental conditions are complied with; and (b) mitigation measures are reviewed by the Director following the submission of the noise modelling program (to be conducted in accordance with environmental condition T6) to ensure that noise impacts on residents will be within acceptable levels.

Further consideration of alternative transport routes is therefore not considered necessary.

**Issue T6:**

*The Ranelagh Community Group (RCG) [155] expressed specific concerns that the DPEMP overestimates the numbers of heavy vehicles currently travelling along the North Huon Rd. This resulted in DIER conducting further traffic counts at key points along the proposed route and close to Ranelagh. The RCG also undertook its own surveys of truck numbers.*

*The most recent DIER survey results showed the average heavy vehicle count through Ranelagh and along Lollara Rd to be lower than specified in the DPEMP. On the other hand, the number of other vehicles travelling along North Huon Rd. appears to have been underestimated in the DPEMP.*

**Board's response:**

As the EAR did not rely on estimates of current traffic volumes, the changed baseline data in relation to traffic counts (particularly heavy vehicles) along key segments of the proposed transport route does not impact on the findings of the EAR.

The EAR estimates the potential for traffic-related impacts by comparing predicted future heavy traffic movements for two future scenarios, with and without the Wood Centre. These estimates use anticipated timber harvesting and production volumes provided by FT along with the estimated increase of heavy vehicle traffic resulting from the Wood Centre (as shown in Table 10 of the EAR).

For example, the baseline figure for the North Huon Road segment is specified as "0", as there is currently a load limit on North Huon Road which prevents FT trucks from travelling along this route.

With specific reference to noise impacts, a background noise survey was conducted over a 10-day period in August/September 2001. This survey can be expected to reflect the present traffic noise impacts fairly accurately and will be used as the baseline to assess future traffic noise levels against.

Although the discrepancy between the information provided in the DPEMP and the updated traffic survey is of general concern (in terms of the reliability of the information provided in the DPEMP), it does not alter the findings of the environmental assessment of traffic issues.

**Board's summary recommendations in relation to traffic:**

A new condition should be added in relation to the review of vibration-related impacts. The required modifications are reflected in Part C of this report.

## **Water Quantity Issues**

**Issue W1: Assessment of Water Quantity Issues**

*Representors [25, 42, 43, 44, 73, 75, 83, 106, 108, 115, 143, 148, 171, 215] argued that an independent comprehensive assessment of impact of the proposed Wood Centre on water flow is required.*

**Board's response:**

An independent review of the impact of the proposal on available water resources is not considered necessary in light of the minimum flows in the river at the extraction point (estimated to be 497 ML/day) in comparison with the proposed extraction (5 ML/day). The minimum flow figure is based on the Huon River at Frying Pan Creek Gauging Station (records from 1970-2000), located 4 kilometres downstream, adjusted for the catchment area difference. The quality of data at this station is considered to be good as it is biased towards low flows due to the occurrences of predominantly drier than average seasons. In addition, the short distance between the proposed off-take point for the development and the gauging station together with the quality of flow data means the estimated minimum flow is a reliable estimate.

*Representors [25, 42, 43, 57, 73, 75, 143, 146, 171] suggested that climatic changes due to the greenhouse effect should be taken into account in the context of water flow / rainfall predictions.*

**Board's response:**

Correcting stream flows in relation to future climate change cannot be undertaken on a catchment basis with any degree of accuracy. However, climate change is unlikely to have a significant effect on the impact of the extraction as the proposed extraction is only 1.5% of minimum flows, 0.7% of average flows and only 0.003% of maximum flows.

**Issue W2: General Impacts**

*Numerous representors expressed general concerns that the Wood Centre water abstraction regime has the potential to detrimentally impact on the Huon River and associated water uses [25, 42, 43, 45, 73, 75, 86, 108, 118, 125, 141, 145, 146, 148, 159, 160, 167, 171, 176, 186, 188, 193, 207, 208, and 215]. Several representors had particular concerns that the river flow rate may be affected during dry spells. A number of these representations drew attention to potential impacts on in-stream ecosystems and species (including fish populations) and riparian vegetation.*

**Board's response:**

According to available flow estimates, the proposed water extraction only amounts to 1.5% of minimum estimated flows. Due to this very small percentage, the general impact of the extraction is expected to be negligible. As a guide to the impact on available habitat during minimum flow conditions, the level of water at the Frying Pan Creek gauging station would drop by less than 5 millimetres.

The issue is considered in some detail in Section 8.3 of the EAR, in particular in Section 8.3.2.2 (Potential Impacts), Section 8.3.3.2 (Mitigation Measures), 8.3.5.2 (Evaluation) and 8.3.6.2 (Recommendations). Note also that environmental conditions WA1, WA2 and WA 3 [Part A] have been stipulated to ensure that the recommendations contained in the EAR are implemented.

*Two representors [99, 170] requested that the minimum environmental flow level for the Huon River should be determined to ensure that the proposed water abstraction practices are sustainable. Representor [84] expressed the view that a condition should be imposed to enforce a reduction of water abstraction if environmental impacts are likely.*

**Board's response:**

An environmental flow study has not been undertaken for the Huon River because water extractions to date, including the amount earmarked for use at the Wood Centre, are a very small part of the overall flow and the health of the river is not considered to be impacted by such extractions. Notwithstanding this, in accordance with the *Water Management Act 1999*, the environment would take precedent over the needs of the Wood Centre. If and when such a minimum environmental flow is determined, the volume of water allocated for the Wood Centre would be restricted if the river flows dropped to minimum environmental flow levels.

**Issue W3: Impacts on other Water Users**

*Concerns were raised that under low-flow conditions, water abstraction may lead to a slight increase in water temperature [178] and pollutant concentration [210] with associated impacts on down-stream users.*

**Board's response:**

As reductions in river flows would only be negligible, temperature and concentration variations are unlikely to occur as a consequence of the proposed Wood Centre water extraction regime.

*Representors [76, 93, 108, 110 and 115] stated that potential impact of the proposed development should be assessed in the context of other water uses; cumulative impacts should be considered.*

**Board's response:**

As the proposed water extraction is very small in comparison to the minimum estimated flows, the extraction is unlikely to adversely impact on existing water users.

*Representors [57, 130, 208 and 212] expressed concerns that water abstraction for the Wood Centre may lead to more stringent water restrictions downstream, as Council currently imposes water restrictions during summer.*

**Board's response:**

It was clarified with the Huon Valley Council that water restrictions in the municipality are currently imposed are the result of limited water reservoir capacity, not water supply shortages. Huon Council extracts water supplies at Ranelagh, which is estimated to be less than 10 ML/day. In addition, existing water allocations (not including towns) amount to only 7.3 ML/day. This is only a small proportion of the minimum stream flow available. If the proposed Wood Centre water allocation is added to existing water allocations, only 4.5 % of the minimum historical flow would be used. Huon Valley Council has confirmed that water restrictions on down-stream users are not expected to become more stringent as a result of the Wood Centre development.

*Representor [212] questioned whether Forestry Tasmania will become defacto water catchment managers by controlling water abstraction upstream and whether Forestry Tasmania be able to sell their water rights (or parts thereof) to downstream users? Representor 115 questioned whether Forestry Tasmania will be charged for the volume of water abstracted from the Huon River.*

**Board's response:**

Under current arrangements, Forestry Tasmania will be able to sell water that it does not use in the same way as all current water licence holders. However, it is unlikely that there will be a market for water in the Huon River as there is still ample water resource yet to be allocated without adversely impacting on the environment.

Forestry Tasmania will merely have a licence to extract water from the river and will have no role in water catchment management which is the role of the water regulator, *i.e.* DPIWE.

In relation to charging a fee for water, the Board notes that the Government has no plans and currently does not charge any water user for water taken.

**Issue W4: Water Licence**

*Representor [57] expressed concerns that a Water Licence has not yet been issued, while representor [178] highlighted problems with the advertising of the licence application.*

**Board's response:**

The Board notes that a Water Licence for the Wood Centre was issued on 31<sup>st</sup> January 2002. The licence specifies a maximum annual usage rate of 1750 ML/annum and an average daily rate of 5 ML/day. The licence contains several conditions, requiring the licence holder to comply with the following:

- (a) Water metering devices are to be installed to record daily extraction quantities;
- (b) A daily record of water quantities extracted must be maintained and forwarded to the Water Management Branch of DPIWE on a quarterly basis; and
- (c) The daily record must be available for inspection by an authorised officer at any time.

*Representor [84] expressed the opinion that the Water Licence should specify the maximum permissible abstraction volume, with no options for future increases. However, the proponent is be entitled to make further applications for additional water extraction rights in the future which would then be assessed on its merits in accordance with the provisions of the Water Management Act.*

**Board's response:**

The water licence specifies the maximum permissible volume to be extracted and includes no options for future increase.

**Board's summary recommendation in relation to water quantity issues:**

No change to environmental conditions required.

## **Water Quality Issues**

### **Issue W5: Assessment of water quality impacts**

Several representors [45, 73, 75, 118, 125, 133, 151, 159, 166, 176, 186, 188, 189, 207, 210] expressed their general concerns in relation to the potential for detrimental impacts on the Huon River and associated water users. One representor notes specific concern in relation impacts on the drinking water supply for the valley [207] and another raised the possibility of increased salinity [210].

In addition, numerous representors [61, 97, 141, 148, 160, 176] highlighted the need for an assessment of the impacts of the Wood Centre development on water quality and several others [25, 42, 43, 59, 73, 75, 166, 193, 215] stressed that this assessment needed to be carried out by an independent authority. A number of representors [25, 42, 43, 93, 115, 125] pointed out that the potential impact of the proposed development should be assessed in the context of other water uses and that cumulative impacts should be considered. One representor [104] advocated the use of the precautionary principle in the assessment of the water quality impacts.

### **Board's response:**

An evaluation of water quality impacts has been undertaken by the Environment Division as part of the EAR (Section 8.3), which was approved by the Board. The EAR contains an outline of the proposed arrangements for wastewater collection, treatment and disposal in Section 3.4.6.4, as well as a description of Potential Impacts (Section 8.3.2.1), Mitigation Measures (Section 8.3.3.1), Public Submissions (Section 8.3.4), Evaluation (Section 8.3.5.1) and Recommendations (Section 8.3.6.1) in relation to water quality issues.

With regards to the question of independence, the Board refers back to the discussion of this issue under the heading 'Issue IA' above.

Representor [84] argues that a proper geological survey needs to be undertaken to assess the risk of contamination of the Huon River as a result of seepage.

Environmental condition GEO1 [Part A] requires a hydrogeological survey to be carried out. In addition, condition GW2 requires a groundwater impact risk assessment and management plan to be prepared and submitted for the Director's approval.

### **Issue W6: Specific issues in relation to wastewater management**

A number of specific concerns were raised in relation to the proposed wastewater management and disposal practices. These are summarised and responded to below:

- *A description of water consumption / wastewater management practices is required and the size and location of wastewater holding ponds needs to be described [61, 97].*

A description of water usage is provided in S. 3.4.6.3.1 of the EAR, while S. 3.4.6.4 contains a description of the site-wide wastewater management system. Figure 3 of the EAR shows the wastewater holding ponds as "storage pond 1, 2 & 3".

- *Insufficient information on the risks of unplanned discharge of toxic materials and chemicals held on site and associated risk of spillage (for example in relation to stormwater / wastewater retention ponds) [57, 86, 115, 130, 161, 162].*

The EAR deals with accidental discharges of materials handled on site in S. 8.3.3.1.2 (Mitigation Measures) and S. 8.3.5.1 (Evaluation, page 80).

Environmental conditions G13, E1 and E4 are of relevance in this regard.

Issues related to the overflow of effluent from the communal storage ponds are described in S. 8.3.3.1.1 (Mitigation Measures) and S. 8.3.5.1 (Evaluation, page 79/80) of the EAR.

Environmental conditions E1, E8, E9, E10, E13, E14 and E15 are of relevance in this regard.

- *Will wastewater be transported away from the site? If so, has the increase in traffic been considered? [62]*

No, it is not intended to transport wastewater away from the site. According to the DPEMP, some wastewater will be pumped to an irrigation area in the vicinity of the Wood Centre site ('Type 1' wastewater, including treated sewage), while another wastewater stream ('Type 2' wastewater, including wash water, roof water and stormwater run-off) will be internally recycled and collected in communal storage ponds which are designed to overflow only in a specified wet weather event. Refer to S. 3.4.6.4 (esp. Fig. 4 & 5) of the EAR for a description of the wastewater collection and treatment system.

- *If substantial amounts of water are to be evaporated in the cooling process, the concentration of tannins in the remaining bleedstream will be elevated. Have the impacts of increased tannin levels on the receiving environment and the boiler been considered [97]?*

No. However, in accordance with the environmental conditions of the permit, the responsible person is required to submit a detailed wastewater management plan, which must detail the quality and quantity of each wastewater stream [Part A, E4(a)]. The Board considers this to be a suitable mechanism for addressing this issue. Note also that the cooling tower bleed stream is destined to go to the wastewater irrigation scheme (compare Figure 5 of EAR), not be discharged to the Huon River.

- *Chemicals used to treat cooling tower water and management practices for resulting wastewater stream: the chemicals should be identified [84].*

The DPEMP states that cooling tower water will be treated with a biocide. Further detail with regard to the type and concentration of the chemical used will be required as part of the detailed wastewater management plan, required in accordance with environmental condition E4(a) [Part A]. Note also that, according to the DPEMP, a detoxification unit will be installed prior to discharging the cooling tower bleed stream to the wastewater irrigation area. Refer to S. 3.4.6.4 (esp. Fig. 4 & 5) of the EAR for a description of the wastewater collection and treatment system.

- *Capacity of the wastewater irrigation area to cater for 20 year's wastewater loading should be demonstrated [84].*

The EAR recognises that the information provided in the DPEMP with regard to the Wastewater Reuse site is not sufficiently detailed to fully assess its feasibility. Section 8.3.6.1.1 (1<sup>st</sup> dot point on page 84) of the EAR specifies that a Site Management Plan should be submitted prior to site development. The plan requires approval from the Director who will consider it in consultation with the CG. The requirement is reflected in the environmental conditions WR 1-4 [Part A]. Environmental condition WR3 prohibits construction of works associated with the proposed wastewater re-use unless a Wastewater Reuse Plan has been approved.

- *Discharge limits and monitoring programs need to be established in relation to discharges into the Huon River [84].*

In accordance with environmental condition E10 [Part A], discharge of effluent from the communal storage ponds at the Wood Centre site is only permitted in the case a 1 in 10 year, 72-hour rainfall event. Condition E4 [Part A] requires the development of a wastewater management plan. Once a detailed wastewater management plan has been received by the Director, discharge limits for those permitted overflow events will be specified by the Director. These will take into account the Protected Environmental Values at the designated point of discharge (refer to S. 8.3.6.1.1 of the EAR for further information).

The environmental conditions currently also contain numerous requirements for the monitoring of wastewater and receiving water quality. These requirements are summarised in Table 2 and Table 3 / Attachment 7 of the environmental conditions.



- *One representor [150] notes that in the case of the Power Station not proceeding, wastewater management practices may differ from those described in the development proposal (e.g. discharge of contaminated effluent may be more frequent) and adds that no guarantees have been provided that the required Wastewater Management Plan can adequately resolve the possible risk of water contamination.*

Section 8.2.5.1 (page 80) of the EAR explores the consequences of the Power Station not proceeding and concludes that if such a scenario (i.e. more frequent discharge) was to eventuate, the issue would need to be re-evaluated in the light of the proposed arrangements. The report further states that "It is the Environment Division's view that it would be appropriate for such an assessment to incorporate a public consultation phase."

Environmental condition E6 requires that the Wastewater Management Plan is submitted to the Director for approval. The Board is satisfied that this process constitutes an adequate safeguard to ensure that risk of water contamination is adequately addressed.

***Issue W7: Forestry-related impacts on water quality***

*Several representors [1, 57, 64, 86, 115, 162] commented that current forest management practices contribute to water quality problems in the Huon River, due to sedimentation and release of chemicals.*

***Board's response:***

Impacts related to forest management practices are considered to be outside of the scope of the Board's assessment in relation to the Wood Centre proposal. Section 8 of the EAR outlines the scope of the Board's assessment.

***Board's summary recommendation in relation to water quality:***

No change to environmental conditions required.

### Part C: Specific comments in relation to environmental conditions

Several representors suggested specific changes to the Board's environmental conditions. The following table provides a response to the significant (ie non trivial) suggestions.

CONDITION	ISSUE	BOARD'S RESPONSE	CHANGE TO CONDITION REQUIRED?
Schedule 1	Representor [150] suggests that the current wording of 'Definitions of land' indicates that the definitions do not apply to Schedule 2 (Environmental Conditions).	The Board agrees with this suggestion and recommends that the wording is changed as follows:  <i>"In Schedule 1 <u>and</u> Schedule 2, unless the contrary appears:..."</i>  AND  under "Note" at the end of the "Definition of Terms" section (2 <sup>nd</sup> dotpoint):  <i>"Unless the contrary appears, words and expressions used in <u>Schedule 1 and Schedule 2</u> have the same meaning as they have in the EMPCA."</i>	YES
Schedule 1	Representor [150] suggests that after the definition of "communal storage ponds", a further definition is inserted, namely:  <i>"construction activity" or "construction works" means any activity or works for the preparation of the land for the uses or development approved by this permit, or for the construction of production facilities or other facilities so approved."</i>	The Board agrees with this suggestion and recommends that the following definition is included:  <i>""construction activity" or "construction works" means -</i>  <i>any activity or works for the preparation of the land for a use or development to which this permit relates; and</i>  <i>any activity or works for the construction of a production facility or other facility which may be constructed on the land in connection with the activity".</i>	YES
Schedule 1	Representor [150] suggests to add the following words under "Note":  <i>"Where a telephone or fax number is referred to, it means that number, or if it has been changed, the number to which it has been changed."</i>  <i>"Where a person is referred to by title or position and that title or position ceases or is changed, the person referred means the person carrying out similar responsibilities no matter what his or her title may be."</i>	The Board does not consider this to be a worthwhile or workable addition, as it would require the responsible person to be aware of changes in the agency's contact details, regardless of whether he / she has been advised of any such changes or not.  Normally, the agency would notify the responsible person of any such changes and the permit conditions may then be changed by way of an EPN.	NO
Part A, Q1	Two representors [127, 172] note that the condition specifies maximum production quantities but does not ensure that the proponents fulfill their promise of an integrated site (e.g. by linking wood fibre production and	The rationale for specifying maximum quantities as part of the Board's environmental condition is to restrict the scale and nature of the activities at the Wood Centre to what is proposed in the DPMP, as production output and environmental impacts are directly linked.	NO

	vener production quantities).	Therefore, the Board does not generally specify minimum production quantities.	
Part A, G4	Representor [172] suggests that a reference to an appended table of set minimum penalties based in CPI indexed penalty units should be added.	This is unnecessary, as penalties are specified in the EMPCA. Penalties imposed in relation to any offences under the EMPCA are set in accordance with the <i>Penalty Units Act 1987</i> . The <i>Penalty Units Act</i> , which applies to all State Legislation, is not linked to the CPI. However, the penalty charged for a given offence can be modified by changing the number of penalty units associated with that offence, or by changing the value of a penalty unit.	NO
Part A, G5, G6, F7 and C7	The representor [150] suggests that after the word "Director", the words "and Council" should be inserted.	<p>The Board agrees that the suggested additions would be useful in ensuring that the Planning Authority is notified of significant project milestones (e.g. end of commissioning phase, cessation of activities, change of ownership).</p> <p>The Boards recommends that conditions G5, G6, G7 and C7 [Part A] are changed as follows:</p> <p><i>G5 The Director <u>and the Planning Authority</u> must be notified in writing within 7 days of the completion of commissioning of each production facility. In addition, the Director <u>and the Planning Authority</u> must be notified in writing if the commissioning of the Power Station has not been completed within six months of the commencement of operation of the first two production facilities on the land, and is unlikely to be completed within twelve months of the commencement of operation of the first two production facilities on the land.</i></p> <p><i>G6 If the person who is or was responsible for the activity ceases to be responsible for the activity, then within 30 days after that cessation that person must:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>(a) notify the Director <u>and the Planning Authority</u> in writing of that fact;</i></li> <li><i>(b) provide the Director <u>and the Planning Authority</u> with full particulars in writing of any person succeeding him or her as the person responsible; and</i></li> <li><i>(c) notify any such person of the requirements of the permit and of any permit or environment protection notice which amends the permit and which is binding on that person.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>G7 If the person responsible for the activity is not the owner of the land upon which the activity is being carried out and the owner of the land changes, then within 30 days after becoming aware of the change, the person responsible for the activity must notify the Director <u>and the Planning Authority</u> in writing of the change of ownership.</i></p> <p><i>C7 At least 30 days prior to the commencement</i></p>	YES

		<p><i>of construction activities on the land, a Site Development Timetable must be submitted to the Director <u>and the Planning Authority</u>. The timetable must specify the anticipated dates of:</i></p> <p><i>(a) The commencement of construction activities;</i></p> <p><i>(b) The completion of construction activities;</i></p> <p><i>(c) The commencement of commissioning; and</i></p> <p><i>(d) The completion of commissioning</i></p> <p><i>for each production facility and the site-wide infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>A revised timetable must be submitted to the Director <u>and the Planning Authority</u> at six monthly intervals from the submission date of the first timetable, until such time as all construction and commissioning steps identified in the timetable have been completed.</i></p>	
Part A, G9	Representor [172] suggests that additional requirement should be included, <i>i.e.</i> ...[the public complaints register should record]... " <i>whether or not a permit condition was breached</i> ".	This would be inappropriate as it will not always be clear whether a permit condition has been breached – the responsible person has the right to test whether a condition has been breached in a court of law.	NO
Part A, G10	Representor [150] suggests that the EMP (Operations) should be required before commissioning and operations commence.	The Board does not support the proposed modification, as it would change the intended nature of the condition. In order to reflect realistic operating conditions, the EMP (Operations) needs to be based on actual observation and measurement of equipment performance gathered during the commissioning phase.	NO
Part A, G10-12	Representor [158] comments that the requirement for an EMP (Operations) indicates that the information provided in the DPEMP is not appropriate.	<p>The conditions referred to should not be interpreted as an indication that the DPEMP is inadequate.</p> <p>The role of the DPEMP is to provide a description of the proposed activities and a basis for the assessment of environmental impacts. On the other hand, the function of an EMP (Operations) is to document on-going performance, compare actual performance against the initial predictions and to identify opportunities for improvement.</p> <p>As such, the preparation of an EMP (Operations) is a useful tool in ensuring ongoing compliance.</p>	NO
Part A, G10 and G12	<p>Representors [84, 202] note that there should be a condition which requires that the results of monitoring programs are made available to the public.</p> <p>In addition, two representors [127, 172] suggest that all documents mentioned in this condition (<i>i.e.</i> EMP (Operations) and reviews thereof) should be publicly available.</p>	<p>Environmental condition G12 [Part A] requires that a summary of the results of all monitoring programs be incorporated into the EMP (Operations) and any subsequent reviews.</p> <p>These documents are intended to be publicly available, and indeed would be in any case. However, the Board agrees that it would be useful to make this more overt and recommends that the conditions G10 and G 12 are modified as follows:</p> <p>G10: "...<i>The EMP (Operations) must be</i></p>	YES

		<p><i>prepared in accordance with the guidelines to be provided by the Director and must be made available to the public upon request."</i></p> <p>G12: "...Each revised EMP (Operations) must include, but is not necessarily limited to, the following:  (a) ...;  (b) ...;  (c) ...;  (d) ...;  (e) ...;  (f)...;</p> <p><u>and must be made available to the public upon request."</u></p>	
Part A, A2 and A3	<p>Representor [99] argues that a permit should not be granted until a meteorological station monitoring station and an air quality monitoring station have been established in accordance with conditions A2 and A3.</p>	<p>This is not necessary. The conditions contain specified deadlines by which the works need to be completed (A2: 1<sup>st</sup> March 2002; A3: 12 months prior to commissioning of the Power Station). These deadlines have been set to ensure that sufficient data will be available for further air dispersion modelling.</p> <p>The Board notes that the date of issue of the permit is likely to be later than the 1<sup>st</sup> March 2002 and that therefore, environmental condition A2 (f) would not be enforceable. It is therefore recommended that the following changes are made:</p> <p>"A2 (f): Unless otherwise approved in writing by the Director, the monitoring station must be established <u>12 months prior to the commissioning of the Power Station.</u>"</p> <p>AND</p> <p>"A10: Once specific technical data for key equipment to be installed on the land have become available (<del>delete</del>: "and at least 30 days prior to commissioning of the Power Station"), air pollution dispersion modelling must be repeated to ensure that ...</p> <p>Atmospheric dispersion calculations must be conducted using a model approved by the Director. The model used .... must be based on a representative sample of locally collected meteorological data, <u>which includes those times during which worst-case dispersion conditions, such as formation of inversion layers and cold air drainage, are most likely to occur."</u></p>	YES
Part A, T1	<p>Representor [150] suggests that "Wood Centre (Site Wide) Issues" should be replaced by "Wood Centre (Transport Issue) Issues".</p>	<p>The Board agrees that this drafting error should be corrected and recommends that the condition be amended accordingly.</p>	YES
Part A, T4 and T5	<p>The representor [150] points out that conditions T4 and T5 currently allow <u>empty vehicles</u> to enter or leave the site outside of the specified hours.</p>	<p>The Board notes that due to a drafting error, the current wording does not reflect the intended meaning.</p> <p>The Board recommends that conditions T4 and</p>	YES

		<p>T5 are modified as follows:</p> <p>T4 <i>"The person responsible for the activity must ensure that vehicles, <u>whether laden or unladen, used for the carriage from the land of -</u></i></p> <p><i>(a) wood fibre and travelling to or from the land via North Huon Road do not enter or leave the land outside the hours of 7.00 am and 9.00 pm.</i></p> <p><i>(b) products other than wood fibre do not enter or leave the land outside the hours of 7.00 am and 4.00 pm.</i></p> <p>T5 <i>"The person responsible for the activity must undertake reasonable steps to ensure that vehicles, <u>whether laden or unladen, used for the carriage from the land of wood fibre or other products do not travel on Lonnvale Road, North Huon Road or Lollara Road outside the hours of 6.30 am to 9.30 pm."</u></i></p>	
Part A, T4 and T5	The representor [97] suggests that although condition T4 restricts the hours during which trucks can enter or leave the Wood Centre site, laden trucks may be parked outside the Wood Centre premises, with the intention of leaving after the specified hours. The representor argues that this approach has been used elsewhere in an attempt to circumvent conditions specified by the RMPAT.	This issue was taken into account in the Board's assessment and as a result, condition T5 was specified. This condition prevents trucks from travelling along the most sensitive sections of the transport route (Lonnvale Road, North Huon Road, Lollara Road) outside of the specified hours.	NO
Part A, T5	The representor [150] comments that this condition will be difficult to enforce due to the term "...must take reasonable steps" used in the condition.	The Board notes that unlike the restrictions imposed in accordance with condition T4, which the responsible person can enforce by closing the entrance gates at the specified times, compliance with the requirements of T5 is not under the direct control of the responsible person. Nevertheless, the responsible person should exert all reasonable and practical influence on truck drivers to ensure that T5 is complied with. This is the intention of the condition.	NO
Part A, traffic	In accordance with the Board's recommendation in Part B, Section T4 above, it is recommended that a condition be added in relation to the impacts of traffic-related vibrations.	T8: "At least 3 months prior to the commencement of road upgrading works associated with the operations on the land, the responsible person must provide the Director with confirmation of the exact transport route. This notification must include a map on an appropriate scale which clearly identifies the location of those buildings which will be at a distance of 10 metres or less from any new or upgraded sections of road following completion of road upgrading works."	
Part A, D1	The Board noted an inconsistency in condition D1 which should be corrected.	For the purpose of clarification, the Board recommends that condition D1 is reworded as follows:	YES

		<p><i>"If permanent cessation of some or all facilities on the land is planned, then the Director must be notified of the planned cessation of operations:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>At least 180 days prior to the planned date of cessation, if practicable; or</i></p> <p>(b) <i>Within 14 days of the person responsible for the activity becoming aware that the cessation is planned; or</i></p> <p>(c) <i>If notification to the Australian Stock Exchange is required under 'Chapter 3 Continuous Disclosure' of the Australian Stock Exchange Listing Rules then, within 24 hours after that notification of the planned cessation;</i></p> <p><i>whichever is sooner."</i></p>	
Part A, D2	Several representors [84, 146, 166] argue that a condition should be added to require a decommissioning plan for the Wood Centre.	The Board notes that condition D2 [Part A] requires a decommissioning and rehabilitation plan to be approved in writing by the Director.	NO
Part A, D1 and D2	According to two representors [127, 172], the decommissioning plan should be written and approved before construction commences, not when decommissioning has been decided.	<p>The Board agrees that it will be desirable to have a decommissioning and rehabilitation plan prior to the cessation of operations. The Board recommends that condition G12 be modified to require that this be included in the first three-year revision of the EMP (Operations), and then updated with every subsequent review of the EMP. This will allow a more meaningful plan to be prepared than would be possible before the construction of the facility is complete.</p> <p>Accordingly, the following changes should be made to relevant conditions:</p> <p>Add the following words to condition G12:  <i>"(f) a decommissioning and rehabilitation plan prepared in accordance with guidelines provided by the Director."</i></p> <p>Modify D2 as follows:  <u><i>"(a) Following notification in accordance with condition D1, the proponent must review the decommissioning and rehabilitation plan contained in the latest revised EMP (Operations) and, within 21 days of the date of notification under D1, advise the Director of any changes required to the decommissioning and rehabilitation plan and seek his or her approval of the plan for the purposes of part (b) of this condition; and</i></u></p> <p><u><i>(b) Following permanent cessation of operations, rehabilitation of the land must be carried out in accordance with the decommissioning and rehabilitation plan approved by the Director."</i></u></p>	YES
Part D, S1	Representor [150] suggests that the Environmental Commitments numbers referred to in this condition (" <i>Nos. 14 and 17 to 22 for the Veneer Mill</i> ") are not correct.	<p>The Board agrees that this drafting error should be corrected and recommends that the condition is reworded to read as follows:  <i>"The activities on the land must be undertaken in accordance with Environmental Commitments</i></p>	YES

		<i>Nos. 14 and 23 to 29 for the Veneer Mill,...</i>	
Part E	Two representors [127, 172] suggest that the following additional requirement should be included, <i>i.e.</i> "the wood fibre mill shall not be operated unless at least one of the higher value components is also operated. Total wood fibre tonnage output is not to exceed 300% of the total combined output of all higher value processes, averaged over one year."	The Board does not believe that such a condition could be justifiably imposed for the purposes of the EMPCA. A wood fibre mill can be operated satisfactorily, from an environmental management perspective, as a stand-alone operation.	NO
Part F	Representors [127,172] suggests that additional requirement should be included, <i>i.e.</i> "the power station shall not be operated unless at least two of the higher value components are also operated. Total wood fibre tonnage output is not to exceed 20% of the total combined output of all higher value processes, averaged over one year."	The Board does not believe that such a condition could be justifiably imposed for the purposes of the EMPCA. A wood fibre mill can be operated satisfactorily, from an environmental management perspective, as a stand-alone operation. As timber resourcing / forest management issues are deemed to be outside of the scope of the Board's assessment, the Board is not in a position to restrict the type or nature of products produced at the Wood Centre site, other than imposing maximum production limits.	NO
Various conditions	Concern that a number of environmental conditions are worded such that they can be amended by or with the approval of the Director. The representor [150] argues that conditions of the permit may not be amended by the Director, as this can only be affected by the planning authority in accordance with S. 43 K of LUPAA.	The Director may amend permit conditions by using an Environment Protection Notice in accordance with S. 44 (1) (d) of the EMPCA.	NO
Misc.	Representor [150] suggests the following minor wording changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the definition of "boiler plant exhaust gas stacks", delete "within the meaning of this permit" and insert "means".</li> <li>- In the definition of "Communal storage ponds", delete "are" and insert "means".</li> <li>- In the definition of "LUPAA", delete "is" and insert "means".</li> <li>- In the definitions of "Veneer Mill" and "Wood Fibre Mill", delete "is" where first appearing in each case and insert "means".</li> <li>- In conditions E4 and GW4, delete "is to" in two places and in each case, insert "means".</li> <li>- In condition H5, delete "are" and insert "must".</li> </ul>	The Board agrees with these suggestions and recommends that the permit be modified accordingly.	YES
Misc.	The Board noted that the word " <i>notice</i> " is erroneously used in the following places: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Definition of "activity" (Schedule 1);</li> </ul>	The Board recommends that the wording be changed as follows:  <i>""activity" means any environmentally relevant activity (as defined in section 3 of the EMPCA) to which this <u>permit</u> relates, and includes more than one activity.</i>	YES



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Under "Note" at the end of the Definition of Terms section (Schedule 1), 1<sup>st</sup> dot point;</li> <li>- Condition M1 (a) [Part A].</li> </ul>	<p><i>"For the purposes of this <u>Schedule</u>, singular includes plural."</i></p> <p><i>"...or a laboratory approved in writing by the Director for the tests and analyses specified for such a sample in the requirements of this <u>Schedule</u>."</i></p>	
--	--	--	--