

Appendix A

# Project Team Route Selection Workshop Data Tables



**ROUTE SELECTION ASSESSMENT**  
**SELECTION CRITERIA - ENVIRONMENT**

CATEGORY	CRITERIA NO.	DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA	METHODOLOGY	ASSUMPTIONS	SECTION B (Length = 5.7km)					SECTION C (Length = 4.8km)				SECTION E (Length = 7.8km)		
					Blue	Green	Purple	Orange	Refined Orange	Blue	Green	Purple / Orange	Refined Orange	Blue	Green / Purple / Orange	Refined Orange
WATER QUALITY	7.2.6	Does the option provide for adequate protection of sensitive aquatic ecosystems and aquaculture operations through the provision of spill control on river crossings?	Count number of watercourses crossed or affected by the option.	All options must comply.	7	7	8	11	11	7	6	8	6	6	5	6
NATIVE FLORA	7.2.8 – Flora Threatened Species	Does the option impact on known key threatened species or populations?	Comparison of route corridor with mapped from GIS data. Measured as number of recorded sightings within 250 metre wide route corridor.	Key threatened species, or populations are defined as those listed under the <i>Threatened Species Conservation Act 1997</i> or <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> as mapped by DEC (NPWS) and DEH respectively.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1
		Does the option impact on potential habitat of threatened species or populations?	Measured as the number of potential threatened species within 250 metre wide route corridor.	Potential habitat	4	4	4	4	4	6	6	6	6	None known subject to further detailed investigations during concept design, although noted likely in Wells Crossing FR and in vicinity of Halfway Creek.		
	7.2.10 – Native Vegetation	Comparatively, what is the total area of native vegetation to be cleared?	Measurement of area (Ha) directly impacted from GIS data based on indicative footprint.	-	19	27	21	26	41	30	30	29	41	73	92	90
	7.2.11 – Endangered Ecological Communities	Comparatively, what is to the area of endangered ecological community to be cleared?	Measurement of area (Ha) directly impacted from GIS data based on indicative footprint.		13	20	15	21	22	3	5	1	1	None known subject to further detailed investigations during concept design, although noted possible in vicinity of Halfway Creek.		



**ROUTE SELECTION ASSESSMENT**  
**SELECTION CRITERIA - ENVIRONMENT**

CATEGORY	CRITERIA NO.	DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA	METHODOLOGY	ASSUMPTIONS	SECTION B (Length = 5.7km)					SECTION C (Length = 4.8km)				SECTION E (Length = 7.8km)		
					Blue	Green	Purple	Orange	Refined Orange	Blue	Green	Purple / Orange	Refined Orange	Blue	Green / Purple / Orange	Refined Orange
NATIVE FAUNA	7.2.12 – Fauna Threatened Species	Does the option impact on known key significant threatened species, populations or ecological communities?	Comparison of route corridor with mapped from GIS data. Measured as area (ha) of habitat with high potential within 250 metre route corridor.	Threatened species, populations or ecological communities are defined as those listed under the <i>Threatened Species Conservation Act 1997, Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act or Fisheries Management Act</i>	H = 3 M = 7 L = 51	H = 3.5 M = 15 L = 41	H = 4.5 M = 8 L = 46	H = 3.7 M = 22 L = 30	H = 3.7 M = 27 L = 23	H = 0.6 M = 27 L = 21	H = 3.1 M = 26 L = 11	H = 1.8 M = 24 L = 21	H = 1.8 M = 24 L = 15	Subject to further detailed investigations during concept design, although noted that likely high habitat values around Halfway Creek and Wells Crossing Flora Reserve.		
		Does the option impact on potential habitat of threatened species or populations?	Measured as the number of potential threatened species within 250 metre wide route corridor.	Potential habitat	41	42	42	42	32	47	39	42	31	None known subject to further detailed investigations during concept design, although noted likely in Wells Crossing FR and in vicinity of Halfway Creek.		
	7.2.14 – Wildlife Corridors	Does the option cross known wildlife corridors.	Comparison of route corridor with DEC mapped wildlife corridors  R = Regional corridor SR = sub-regional corridor	A new severance is considered worse than widening an existing severance. Qualitative assessment	Options would require widening of existing corridor through 2 R corridors				Creation of new corridor through 1 SR, and largely widening in 1 SR	Creates two new corridors through 2 SR.	Widening of existing through 2 SR & 1 R	Creation of new corridor through 1 SR and widening through 1 SR & 1 R	Creation of new corridor through 1 SR and widening through 1 SR & 1 R	Creation of new corridor through 1 SR, and largely widening in 1 SR & 1 R	Widening of existing through 1 R, and clearing on edge of 1 SR	Creates new corridor through 1 R





**ROUTE SELECTION ASSESSMENT**  
**SELECTION CRITERIA – COMMUNITY**

CATEGORY	CRITERIA NO.	DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA	METHODOLOGY	ASSUMPTIONS	SECTION B (Length = 5.7km)					SECTION C (Length = 4.8km)				SECTION E (Length = 7.8km)		
					Blue	Green	Purple	Orange	Refined Orange	Blue	Green	Purple / Orange	Refined Orange	Blue	Green / Purple / Orange	Refined Orange
PRIVATE PROPERTY IMPACT – NOISE	6.3.2 – Noise	Comparatively, what is the relative noise impact?	Use weighted noise impact measure. See Preliminary Noise Assessment Report.	As documented in the Preliminary Noise Assessment Report.	142	136	140	69	Slightly better than orange	18	16	6	Similar to orange	42	38	Similar to orange
COMMUNITY SEVERANCE / CONSOLIDATION	6.3.4 - Severance	Comparatively, does the option sever parts of a community(s). Eg Corindi.	Comparison of route corridor with defined community villages, including consideration of new or existing impact.	Defined communities are Corindi Beach and Corindi.	Corindi Beach: Options pass adjacent to western edge		Corindi Beach: Options pass approx. 450m to the west									
					Corindi: Option severs village	Corindi: Option passes approx. 400m to the east, severing a few rural properties.	Corindi: Option passes approx. 200m to the east, severing a number of rural properties.	Corindi: Options pass approx. 400m to the west. Additional explanation required	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
PROPERTY IMPACT – PRIVATE PROPERTY ACQUISITION	6.3.6.1 – Private Property	Comparatively, total area of properties impacted.	Measured as an area (ha) from the Property Impact Report.	Privately owned property only, which is defined as non-government structures / property.	22	28	26	48	54	22	21	26	30	33	38	40
	6.3.6.2	Comparatively, how structures / houses are affected?	Measured as number of structures (S) and homes (H) identified in the Property Impact Report.	S = Structures H = Houses	S = 6 H = 3	S = 2 H = 2	S = 7 H = 6	S = 6 H = 4	S = 2 H = 2	S = 3 H = 2	S = 0 H = 0	S = 1 H = 1	S = 1 H = 1	S = 4 H = 1	S = 3 H = 1	S = 4 H = 4
VISUAL AMENITY	6.3.14	Comparatively, what is the potential visual impact of the option?	Length of option in a high visual constraint area.	As per UDLVA report	40	nil	50	170	671	1330	1360	2420	2447	290	340	233
PROPERTY IMPACT – LOSS OF ACCESS TO PUBLIC RECREATION LANDS	6.3.8	Comparatively, does the option impact on a Govt. Estate (e.g. National Park, Nature Reserve, Flora Reserve, State Forest)?	Comparison of route corridor with existing mapped Government estate. Measure area.	Government estate to be included in the assessment are Yuraygir National Park, Newfoundland State Forest (three separate parcels), Barcoongere State Forest, Yuraygir State Conservation Area and Wells Crossing Flora Reserve.	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	11	27	29



**ROUTE SELECTION ASSESSMENT**  
**SELECTION CRITERIA – COMMUNITY**

CATEGORY	CRITERIA NO.	DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA	METHODOLOGY	ASSUMPTIONS	SECTION B (Length = 5.7km)					SECTION C (Length = 4.8km)				SECTION E (Length = 7.8km)		
					Blue	Green	Purple	Orange	Refined Orange	Blue	Green	Purple / Orange	Refined Orange	Blue	Green / Purple / Orange	Refined Orange
INDIGENOUS & NON INDIGENOUS HERITAGE	6.4.2	Does the option have an impact on known heritage?	Comparison of route corridor with mapped data in vicinity from GIS data. Measured as number of sites within 250m route corridor.	Heritage is defined as: Indigenous –Lands vested in LALC under the ALR Act 1982; lands owned by an Aboriginal group, sites registered on the DEC AHIMS register, and other known sites of cultural sensitivity that are not listed. Non-Indigenous – National, State, Regional or Local listings under an environmental planning instrument or statutory register..	Vested lands: none affected					Vested lands: none affected				Vested lands: potentially impacts on 2 parcels.	Vested lands: impacts on 1 parcel.	Vested lands: potentially impacts on 2 parcels.
					Owned lands: potentially impacts on 1 parcel in Corindi	Owned lands: none affected	Owned lands: potentially impacts on 1 parcel in Corindi	Owned lands: none affected		Owned lands: none affected				Owned lands: none affected		
					AHIMS: none affected					AHIMS: none affected				AHIMS: none affected		
					Unlisted sites: Options traverse and pass adjacent to areas of cultural sensitivity between Corindi Beach and Corindi.		Unlisted sites: passes adjacent to known burial area.	Unlisted sites: passes adjacent to known burial area.	Unlisted sites: nil known				Unlisted sites: traverses two areas of historical campsites / movement corridors.	Unlisted sites: traverses two areas of historical campsites / movement corridors. Potentially impacts on Bora near Luthers Road / Halfway Ck.		
					Non-Indigenous: nil known					Non-Indigenous: nil known				Non-Indigenous: nil known		



**ROUTE SELECTION ASSESSMENT**  
**SELECTION CRITERIA – COMMUNITY**

CATEGORY	CRITERIA NO.	DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA	METHODOLOGY	ASSUMPTIONS	SECTION B (Length = 5.7km)					SECTION C (Length = 4.8km)				SECTION E (Length = 7.8km)		
					Blue	Green	Purple	Orange	Refined Orange	Blue	Green	Purple / Orange	Refined Orange	Blue	Green / Purple / Orange	Refined Orange
LAND USE – PRODUCTIVE LANDS	6.5.4	Comparatively, what is the area of productive land lost as a result of the option?	Measured as direct area (hectares) of productive land acquired for the option within the impact area. LEP	Productive land is defined as: Agricultural land zoned for rural or horticultural purposes under an LEP and State Forest – estate mapped as Zone 3, 4, 5 or 6 by Forests NSW.	58	58	58	56	59	51	34	50	48	61	58	59
			FMZ		0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	5	0	0

**Document Review**

Position	Name	Signature	Date
Author	Various		17/08/06
Technical Review	<i>PC</i> Matt Faust		17/08/06
Project Manager	<i>SC</i> Scott Campbell		17/08/06

**Document Approval**

Position	Name	Signature	Date
GHD Project Director	Scott Campbell		17/08/06

**Document Status**

Revision	Date	Description
6	17/08/06	Final report issued to RTA

**Distributed To**

Name	Date	Location
Stephen Williamson	17/08/06	RTA Grafton

**GHD Pty Ltd** ABN 39 008 488 373

352 King St Newcastle NSW 2300

PO Box 5403 Hunter Region Mail Centre NSW 2310

T: (02) 4979 9999 F: (02) 4979 9988 E: ntlmail@ghd.com.au