

Analysis of PB study responses

Issue	Times raised
Noise of trucks	35
Noise analysis poor	31
Lack of consultation with residents & property owners	30
Dust, pollution and vibration of trucks	30
Terms of reference not met	29
Ambient noise figures incorrect	29
Potential impacts on water quality at weir	29
Character and amenity of area	29
Haul routes crossing water reserve	24
Property devaluation & loss of investment	24
Impact on wildlife	23
Width of consultation zone	22
Lifestyle and future is threatened	22
Vegetation survey poor	19
Discrepancies with number of trucks	18
Loss of environment generally	18
Rankings methodology	17
Only routes suggested by Boral examined	16
Speed of trucks assumed incorrect	16
Laws pertaining to destruction of endangered ecosystems	16
Use of Amberley air quality data inappropriate	15
Applicability of noise standards adopted	14
No haul route	14
Data collected not used in report outcome	13
Impact on rain water tanks	13
Quarry traffic on local roads during or after construction	12
Threat to remnant endangered ecosystems	12
No quarry	11
Practicality of single lane bridge	11
Inconsistencies and flaws in report	10
Report inaccurate and poorly substantiated	10
Request reply to submission	10
Existing acoustic amenity and deterioration thereof not recognised	10
Missing sections in report	10
Lack of consultation feedback to residents	9
Lack of information prior to report release	9
Community severance not well addressed	9
Lack of confidence in report findings	8
Acceptability and appropriateness of haul routes not determined	8
Suggested eastern route via Anstead & Moggill pocket arterial	8
Local winds not considered	8
Stability of river banks should have been addressed	8
Community safety re recreational water users	8
Length of time issue has hung over residents	8
Lack of credibility of report	7
Conclusion that none of the routes are feasible	7
Quarry noise, dust, appearance	7
Road safety	7
Engineering assumptions not substantiated	7
Potential development not shown on searches	7
Failure of local & state govt to prevent residential development	7
Vegetation survey sites not representative	7
Impact on health of residents	7

Analysis of PB study responses

Issue	Times raised
Report not truthful	6
DSD/KCAP could not rely on this report to make a proper determination	6
Impact of quarry traffic on or entering Warrego Hwy	6
Community safety generally	6
Adequacy of buffer zones	5
Route 4 inappropriate	5
Support concerns raised by SIRA	5
Information evening useless, questions not answered	5
Prefer alternative to trucks (rail, etc.)	5
Need for quarry in this locale questioned	5
Failure of local & state govt to represent resident's interests	5
Requirement for adequate compensation	5
Timeliness of compensation	5
Haul road at odds with conservation area designation	5
Current and future residential growth not considered	5
Validity of information in report	4
Prefer route 10 over route 20	4
Invitation to DSD to visit area	4
Lack of laws regarding noise on private roads	4
Noise barriers required	4
Severance impact on wildlife movement	4
Erosion potential not considered	4
Requirement on local govt to divulge quarry issue	4
Haul route & quarry incompatible with residential area	4
Timing of report too late and inappropriate	4
Scientific rigour lacking	3
Terms of reference inadequate	3
Report is superficial, insufficient detail	3
Report difficult to comprehend	3
Report just a white wash	3
Report a waste of taxpayer funds	3
Acceptance of report should be reconsidered	3
Report should be rewritten	3
Prefer route 20 over route 10	3
Removal of DSD logo from community newsletter ~ no author	3
Poor management of process by DSD	3
Type of trucks assumed questioned	3
Applicability of emission standards adopted	3
Limited fauna species considered	3
Derived construction costs unlikely to be accurate	3
Quality of haul route construction	3
Who is paying for the haul road ~ cost to community if govt.	3
Visual impact of trucks not considered	3
Location of bridges/underpasses not identified	3
Other resources should be investigated	3
Requirement on real estate vendors to divulge quarry issue	3
Residents should not be disadvantaged due to prior govt failure	3
Insufficient time for report evaluation	2
Call for public meeting	2
Report poor in comparison to previous reports	2
Unsubstantiated and overly simplistic assumptions	2
Professionalism of current and future studies	2
Report does not fully examine issues	2

Analysis of PB study responses

Issue	Times raised
Report not objective	2
Previous work not reviewed as required	2
Haul route consideration premature given no quarry application	2
Location of noise test equipment next to residents pump!	2
Pollution to waterways generally	2
Unauthorised removal of criteria re water quality	2
Applicability and effect of 1924/26 wildlife sanctuary proclamation	2
Prevention of illegal usage of haul route	2
Spillage of hazardous materials	2
Lack of geo-technical data to assess route construction cost	2
Objection to report funding by DSD, should be potential quarry operators	2
Govt using taxpayer funds to assist private contractors	2
Govt has duty of care to residents over quarry operators	2
Failure of local & state govt to previously address haul route issue	2
Financial damages already sustained	2
Tenure of haul route lands & compensation	2
Engineering issues with NHC land crossing	2
Haul route & quarry incompatible with BCC Local Area Plan	2
Requirement for haul route prior to quarry construction	2
Requirement to consider haul routes within quarry site	2
More accurate vegetation study required	2
RE mapping not included in report	2
Quarry of no benefit to residents	2
Not all landowners affected identified	1
Increase in consultation zone to 600m justified	1
No communication re quarry to adjacent property owners generally	1
Consultation zone to include any who would be affected by noise (5km)	1
Best environmental and social practice not being observed	1
Report completely inadequate	1
Report has poor useability	1
Report should not have been released and needs further work	1
Report adequate for purpose	1
Independent investigation required	1
Public response required on all report areas questioned	1
Further investigation into haul route options is required	1
Buffer zones not properly addressed	1
Suggested upgrade to Mt. Crosby Rd or Kholo Rd	1
Need to look at wider issue of truck transport routes	1
Feedback from SIRA ignored by DSD/KCAP	1
Community newsletter did not reach all residents due to AP mistake	1
Noise modelling outside buffers zones not provided	1
Environmental Protection Policy (noise) 1997 should be used	1
EPA guidelines for selection of noise receptors not used	1
Truck noise assumed differs from EPA figures for extractive industry	1
EPA 1994 provides laws regarding noise on private roads	1
Lack of measures to prevent noise intrusion on the community	1
WHO noise management recommendations should be adopted	1
Hours of operation unacceptable	1
PB noise modelling not included in report	1
Impact of pollution outside study area	1
Development along haul route for truckies	1
Importance of water reserve lands as a wildlife sanctuary	1
EPA Naturesearch Database not used, flora/fauna lists incomplete	1

Analysis of PB study responses

Issue	Times raised
Nature Conservation Act 1992 applies	1
PB interpretation of relevant legislation incorrect	1
Impact on gazetted stock route (Stumers road)	1
Number of close intersections on Warrego Hwy & safety	1
Safety risk from spillage of truck contents	1
Maintenance of roads shared by quarry traffic	1
Maintenance of haul route, when and how often	1
Turbidity impact of bridge not considered	1
Amount of funding insufficient, reflected by poor report	1
Visual and environmental impact of 30m high bridge	1
Impact of potential lighting of haul route	1
Impact on bushfire risk and access for bushfire control	1
Quarry to the south of Ipswich more appropriate	1
Residents misled by local govt re quarry issue	1
Impact on an existing business	1
Impacts on residents not identified	1
Number of affected houses at odds with affected properties	1
Environmental issues with NHC land	1
Use of NHC land for residential subdivision	1
Environmental impact study required	1
Requirement on local govt to protect environment	1
Haul road at odds with BCC rural classification	1
Extractive industry classification incompatible with rural area	1
haul route must minimise impacts on residential amenity	1
Objectivity of REPA	1
Requirement for all quarry operators to have access to haul route	1
Quarry service needs require a full Environmental Assessment Report	1
Habitat value questioned	1
Recently altered status of 'Of Concern' RE's	1
Ecosystem disturbance incorrect	1
Ecological assessment inadequate	1
Haul route lands affected by Natural Assets Local Law	1
Prior discussion & contract with Richard Micheljohn re land purchase	1
Cultural heritage generally	1
Cultural impact not updated for route changes	1
Impact of both quarry and haul route on residents not considered	1
Community should receive quid pro quo (town water, sealed roads)	1
Quarry applicant and user are obliged to not impact community	1
Haul route access to Holdsworthy Rd to assist dev of quarry services	1
Use of haul route by residents in times of flood	1