Appendix A

Project Team Route Selection Workshop Data Tables



ROUTE SELECTION ASSESSMENT SELECTION CRITERIA - ENVIRONMENT

						(L	SECTI ength =	ON B = 5.7km)			_	CTION C th = 4.8kr	n)		SECTION ngth = 7.8	
CATEGORY	CRITERIA NO.	DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA	METHODOLOGY	ASSUMPTIONS	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 Threatened Species Conservation Act 1997 or Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 as mapped by DEC (NPWS) and DEH respectively.	0	О	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 det investigations during concept des although noted likely in Wells Cros		cept design, ells Crossing
	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	investigation although r	n subject to fur ons during cond oted possible i Halfway Creek	cept design, n vicinity of



ROUTE SELECTION ASSESSMENT SELECTION CRITERIA - ENVIRONMENT

							SECTIO ength =					CTION C th = 4.8km)			ECTION igth = 7.8	
CATEGORY CRITI	CRITERIA NO.	DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA	METHODOLOGY	ASSUMPTIONS	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 Threatened Species Conservation Act 1997, Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act or Fisheries Management Act	ns or communities das those er the ed Species tion Act vironment a and ety tion Act or show to Act or show to Act or show the street of the set of the the the street of the	investigation although not values aro	ct to further do ns during con led that likely und Halfway ossing Flora	cept design high habita Creek and								
		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	detailed inve design, altho Crossing	own subject testigations du bugh noted lik g FR and in v dalfway Creek	iring concept kely in Wells ricinity of
	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		ould require corridor thr		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 ne through 1 F	



ROUTE SELECTION ASSESSMENT SELECTION CRITERIA – FUNCTIONAL

							SECTIO ength = {					TION C 1 = 4.8km	1)		SECTION ength = 7.8	
CATEGORY	CRITERIA NO.	DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA	METHODOLOGY	ASSUMPTIONS	Blue	Green	Purple	Orange	Refined Orange	Blue	Green	Purple / Orange	Refined Orange	Blue	Green / Purple / Orange	Refined Orange
TRANSPORT EFFICIENCY (LIGHT VEHICLES)	2.4.2	Comparatively, what is the travel time for the route option?	Measured as travel time. (Seconds)	Taken from the Road User Delay - Working Paper, November 2005, revision 3.	232	235	230	220	220	183	168	193	166	319	315	315
ENGINEERING RISK – SOFT SOILS, FLOOD PLAINS	2.7.1	Comparatively, what length of the route is over soft soils / flood plains	Measured of length of the route over identified soft soil areas / flood plains	Indicates difficulty of construction and has impact on cost and time for construction.	2670	3080	2870	2260	2220	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
TRANSPORT EFFICIENCY – (HEAVY VEHICLES)	3.1.2	Comparatively, assess the mean speed of B Doubles for each option.	Mean Speed of B Doubles for each section. Note that higher mean speed does not necessarily relate to shorter travel time.	Best = 5 0-5% = 4 5-10% = 3 10-20% = 2 >20% = 1	Mean Speed: 90km/h	Mean Speed: 90km/h	Mean Speed: 88km/h	Mean Speed: 89km/h	Mean Speed: 72km/h	Mean Speed: 65km/h	Mean Speed: 54km/h	Mean Speed: 57km/h	Mean Speed: 73km/h	N/A	N/A	N/A
REUSE OF EXISTING ASSET	5.2.2	Comparatively, does the option maximise the use of the existing road reserve?	Measured as length of existing road pavement used as a highway carriageway.		4728 (84%)	2935 (51%)	3542 (63%)	339 (6%)	0 (0%)	2338 (53%)	1564 (38%)	2450 (53%)	2360 (56%)	7300 (93%)	475 (6%)	3250 (42%)
STAGING OPPORTUNITIES (INVESTMENT FOR EARLY BENEFITS)	6.3.2	Can the option be constructed in stages to achieve early benefits in safety or traffic interfaces with the works area?	The group will be briefed on the advantages and disadvantages of each option and a decision made based on consensus.													
SAFETY DURING CONSTRUCTION		Extent of areas where speed zones would be required during construction, extent of traffic interfaces within the works area.	The group will be briefed on the advantages and disadvantages of each option and a decision made based on consensus.													



ROUTE SELECTION ASSESSMENT SELECTION CRITERIA – COMMUNITY

							SECTION I					TION C h = 4.8km	1)	SECTION E (Length = 7.8km)		
CATEGORY	CRITERIA NO.	DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA	METHODOLOGY	ASSUMPTIONS	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 / CONSOLIDATIO	6.3.4 - Severance	Comparatively, does the option sever parts of a community(s). Eg	Comparison of route corridor with defined community villages,	Defined communities are Corindi Beach and Corindi.	Corindi E	Beach: Options potions to western ed	•	pass appro	ach: Options ox. 450m to west							
N		Corindi.	including consideration of new or existing impact.		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.	approx. 4 west.	ptions pass 00m to the Additional on required	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PROPERTY IMPACT – PRIVATE PROPERTY	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	22	28	26	48	54	22	21	26	30	33	38	40
ACQUISITION	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

					SECTION B SECTION C (Length = 5.7km) (Length = 4.8km)							SECTION E ength = 7.8I				
CATEGORY	CRITERIA NO.	DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA	METHODOLOGY	ASSUMPTIONS	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	Vested land	ls: none affe	i cted			Vested	lands: none	e affected	į	Vested lands: potentially impacts on 2 parcels.	lands: impacts on 1 parcel. potentially impacts on imp	
				planning instrument or statutory register	Owned lands: potentially impacts on 1 parcel in Corindi	Owned lands: none affected	Owned lands: potentially impacts on 1 parcel in Corindi	Owned lan affected	ds: none	Owned	lands: none	e affected		Owned lands	: none affected	
					AHIMS: nor	ne affected				AHIMS:	none affec	ted		AHIMS: none	affected	
					Unlisted site pass adjace sensitivity b Corindi.	ent to areas		Unlisted sites: passes adjacent to known burial area.	Unlisted sites: passes adjacent to known burial area.	Unlisted	d sites: nil k	nown		Unlisted sites: traverses two areas of historical campsites / movement corridors.	Unlisted sites: areas of histor / movement co Potentially imp near Luthers F Ck.	ical campsites orridors.
					Non-Indiger	nous: nil kno	wn			Non-Inc	digenous: ni	l known		Non-Indigeno	us: nil known	



ROUTE SELECTION ASSESSMENT SELECTION CRITERIA – COMMUNITY

					SECTION B (Length = 5.7km)					SECTION C (Length = 4.8km)				SECTION E (Length = 7.8km)		
CATEGORY	CRITERIA NO.	DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA	METHODOLOGY	ASSUMPTIONS	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	Jane	17/08/06
Technical Review	Pa Matt Faust	Peter J. Stell	17/08/06
Project Manager	P. Scott Campbell	Potes 1. Mit	17/08/06

Document Approval

Position	Name	Signature	Date
GHD Project Director	Scott Campbell	Geoff Wichens	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

GHD Document No. 22/12058/06/69513.doc