

# New Bundaberg Hospital

Application Number: **01325**Commencement Date: **15/07/2022**Status: **Locked**

## 1. About the project

### 1.1 Project details

#### 1.1.1 Project title \*

New Bundaberg Hospital

#### 1.1.2 Project industry type \*

Science and Research

#### 1.1.3 Project industry sub-type

—

#### 1.1.4 Estimated start date \*

1/04/2023

#### 1.1.4 Estimated end date \*

1/12/2027

## 1.2 Proposed Action details

### 1.2.1 Provide an overview of the proposed action, including all proposed activities. \*

The New Bundaberg Hospital is one of Queensland Government's high priority infrastructure projects and will provide a significant expansion to health capacity and capability in the Wide Bay region.

The project will enhance equitable local access to services for the local community along with service efficiency and sustainability. It will also enable the state government to better respond to the current and projected demand for health services by a growing and ageing population, which has significantly higher levels of socio-economic disadvantage and complex chronic disease than the Queensland population.

Queensland Health proposes to use part of the property described as Lot 23 on SP212513, Bundaberg Ring Road, Thabeban (61.7-hectare site) to construct the New Bundaberg Hospital, which will accommodate 320 beds.

As illustrated in the Site Plans (refer to Att 1 - Master Plan and Concept Design Report, Appendix A, pp.50-52), access to this site is intended via a proposed extension of Johanna Boulevard and a new east-west connector road from Kay McDuff Drive. Both are identified in Bundaberg Regional Council's Local Government Infrastructure Plan (refer to Bundaberg Regional Council website - Development Infrastructure and charges - Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) - Schedule of Works Model).

The New Bundaberg Hospital will provide four separate buildings – the main hospital, mental health inpatient unit, the facility support centre, and multi-level car park.

These buildings have been planned in a compact arrangement to the northwest corner of the site to minimise the environmental impact and enable significant existing trees and vegetation to be retained. This approach has also helped reduce the extent of new roads and in-ground services.

With respect to design, departments/service are distributed across three buildings as follows:

- main clinical building with a gross designed floor area of 52,128 sqm;
- mental health building with a gross floor area of 2,023 sqm;

- facility support building with a gross floor area of 7,446 sqm.

The hospital will require the construction of two new roads to facilitate vehicle access to the site. These are:

- A new north-south road to the west of the subject site (Johanna Boulevard extension), connecting with the existing road network at Johanna Boulevard and Eggmolesse Street; and
- A new east-west road to the north of the subject site (East West Road), connecting the Johanna Boulevard extension with Kay McDuff Drive.

As there is no existing infrastructure, structures or services located inside the property boundary other than a Sunwater irrigation easement on the southern extremity, the project will require the integration of supporting infrastructure including water, sewer and telecommunications, within the road corridors of the two new access roads (Johanna Boulevard extension and East West Road).

Electrical infrastructure will also be required with a new zone substation to service the hospital planned for the southern portion of the site (Lot 23 SP212513), requiring about 1 ha of vegetation clearing (refer to Att 2 - Project Area and Disturbance Footprint).

The project will require bulk earthworks across the developed portion of the site to facilitate building pads, roads and drainage infrastructure. Undeveloped portions are intended to remain vegetated. Bulk earthworks will be undertaken in accordance with the design parameters and methodology recommendations as established by a site-specific geotechnical advice.

Overall, the project has a disturbance footprint of approximately 22.2 ha (refer to Att 2 - Project Area and Disturbance Footprint). The total vegetation clearing impact area is approximately 21.6 ha (15.4 ha for the project area itself, 1 ha for the electrical substation and a total of 5.2 ha for the proposed East – West connection road to Kay McDuff Drive, comprising 3.48 ha within the main subject lot - Lot 23 on SP212513 and 1.7 ha on the lot to the east - Lot 1 on SP285136) (refer to Att 2 - Project Area and Disturbance Footprint). This clearing impact area represents approximately 28% of the total patch area of 76.3 ha. Approximately 19.9 ha of the total impact area comprises good-quality remnant vegetation. Consolidation of the development footprint to the northern portion of the site has reduced additional clearing for the bushfire asset protection zone and maximised the setback from Bundaberg Ring Road thereby removing the need for an acoustic barrier which would otherwise require additional vegetation clearing. A large parcel of natural bushland comprising a total area of 41.9 ha will be retained to the south (refer to Att 2 - Project Area and Disturbance Footprint), and the patient rooms, terraces and other spaces overlooking will benefit from this view.

Careful planning for natural overland flow drainage and detention ponds, taking into consideration the existing trees, will be a focal point of the continued design.

A decision is anticipated for the currently underway Ministerial Infrastructure Designation approval process in the second quarter of 2023.

### 1.2.2 Is the project action part of a staged development or related to other actions or proposals in the region?

Yes

### 1.2.3 Is the proposed action the first stage of a staged development (or a larger project)?

Yes

### 1.2.5 Provide information about the staged development (or relevant larger project).

The main development (New Bundaberg Hospital) is located on freehold land (Lot 23 on SP212513). The action shall also require the construction of new roads, including a new east-west connector road from Kay McDuff Drive and a proposed extension of Johanna Boulevard within existing gazetted road corridor (Unnamed Road No. 4262) to the north-west of the site. The proposed Johanna Boulevard extension is subject to a separate assessment and is not included within this referral.

The master plan identifies the government announcement (New Bundaberg Hospital) and areas for further long-term growth. No timeframes or funding have been committed for works beyond the government commitment.

As illustrated in the attached concept plan/design report (refer to Att 1 - Section 2.5, pp. 21-22) , six expansion zones have been identified in the long-term master plan.

### 1.2.6 What Commonwealth or state legislation, planning frameworks or policy documents are relevant to the proposed action, and how are they relevant? \*

A Ministerial Infrastructure Designation (MID) is required to enable the development of the new hospital site. The Department of Health is progressing the MID process for the site with the Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (DSDILGP).

The MID process provides an alternative to lodging a development application with the relevant local government authority. i.e. the development does not require approval under the Bundaberg Regional Council's local planning scheme.

Under the *Planning Regulation 2017* (Qld), operational works that is the clearing of native vegetation on designated premises for the construction of infrastructure stated in Schedule 5 of the Regulation (including hospitals) is exempt i.e. assessment against the State Development Assessment Provisions for native vegetation clearing and the significant impact guidelines for impacts to Matters of State Environmental Significance (MSES) is not required. Consequently, formal offsets for MSES are not required.

Ecological surveys have determined that two (2) species listed as Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES) are confirmed to be present or are highly likely to be present within or utilise the project area -

1. Confirmed present within the site - Rainbow Bee-eater (*Merops ornatus*) - Marine species under the EPBC Act
2. Highly likely to utilise the site - Grey-headed Flying-fox (*Pteropus poliocephalus*) - Vulnerable under EPBC Act.

A self-assessment of potential direct and indirect impacts on these MNES has been undertaken against the EPBC Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 (refer to Att 3 - Ecological Assessment Report, Section 6, pp. 46-48). Following application of the mitigation measures outlined in the EA report, it is considered unlikely that the development will result in a significant impact on these species or any other MNES. Notwithstanding this, the proponent has opted to refer the action to the Minister for a determination of whether the action is deemed to be a controlled action.

### **1.2.7 Describe any public consultation that has been, is being or will be undertaken regarding the project area, including with Indigenous stakeholders. Attach any completed consultation documentations, if relevant. \***

Extensive stakeholder and community engagement occurred throughout the detailed business case process. Activities included meetings, project flyers, media statements, the establishment of a Stakeholder Reference Group, social impact evaluation (SIE) interviews and an 11-week public and staff consultation period (including surveys and pop-up community consultation sessions).

Engagement continues with adjacent property owners, nearby businesses, interested community groups such as Bundaberg and District Urban Landcare Association (including an SIE interview to discuss potential impacts), emergency services, Bundaberg Regional Council, Department of Transport and Main Roads, Department of Resources, LifeFlight and utility providers.

A Cultural Heritage Assessment by the current Registered Native Title Prescribed Body Corporate (RNTBC), Port Curtis Coral Coast Trust (PCCC), is expected to occur in early 2023. Upon completion, Queensland Health and The Trust will enter into a Cultural Heritage Agreement for the purposes of any documenting any Indigenous heritage values and any subsequent actions required to progress the project.

It should be noted that consultation with key stakeholders did result in a significant change to the initial master plan and siting of the hospital. In responding to feedback, the footprint was compacted and relocated from the centre of the site to the northern section of the site. Maximum preservation of the existing bushland has been a key strategy for the revised design.

Wide Bay Hospital and Health Service will continue to undertake public consultation throughout the life of the project.

## **1.3.1 Identity: Referring party**

### **Privacy Notice:**

Personal information means information or an opinion about an identified individual, or an individual who is reasonably identifiable.

By completing and submitting this form, you consent to the collection of all personal information contained in this form. If you are providing the personal information of other individuals in this form, please ensure you have their consent before doing so.

The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (the department) collects your personal information (as defined by the Privacy Act 1988) through this platform for the purposes of enabling the department to consider your submission and contact you in relation to your submission. If you fail to provide some or all of the personal information requested on this platform (name and email address), the department will be unable to contact you to seek further information (if required) and subsequently may impact the consideration given to your submission.

Personal information may be disclosed to other Australian government agencies, persons or organisations where necessary for the above purposes, provided the disclosure is consistent with relevant laws, in particular the Privacy Act 1988 (Privacy Act). Your personal information will be used and stored in accordance with the Australian Privacy Principles.

See our Privacy Policy to learn more about accessing or correcting personal information or making a complaint. Alternatively, email us at [privacy@awe.gov.au](mailto:privacy@awe.gov.au).

**Confirm that you have read and understand this Privacy Notice \***

### 1.3.1.1 Is Referring party an organisation or business? \*

Yes

Referring party organisation details	
<b>ABN/ACN</b>	20162130627
<b>Organisation name</b>	CO FX PTY LTD trading as Green Tape Solutions
<b>Organisation address</b>	4506 QLD
Referring party details	
<b>Name</b>	Kelly Matthews
<b>Job title</b>	Director/Principal Ecologist
<b>Phone</b>	0423081428
<b>Email</b>	admin@greentapesolutions.com.au
<b>Address</b>	PO Box 282 Morayfield Qld 4506

## 1.3.2 Identity: Person proposing to take the action

### 1.3.2.1 Are the Person proposing to take the action details the same as the Referring party details? \*

No

### 1.3.2.2 Is Person proposing to take the action an organisation or business? \*

Yes

Person proposing to take the action organisation details	
<b>ABN/ACN</b>	66329169412
<b>Organisation name</b>	Department of Health Qld
<b>Organisation address</b>	33 Charlotte Street, Brisbane Qld 4001
Person proposing to take the action details	
<b>Name</b>	Helena Lewis
<b>Job title</b>	Senior Property Advisor

<b>Phone</b>	0467 841 756
<b>Email</b>	helena.lewis@health.qld.gov.au
<b>Address</b>	Level 1, 33 Charlotte Street, Brisbane

**1.3.2.14 Are you proposing the action as part of a Joint Venture? \***

No

**1.3.2.15 Are you proposing the action as part of a Trust? \***

No

**1.3.2.17 Describe the Person proposing the action's history of responsible environmental management including details of any proceedings under a Commonwealth, State or Territory law for the protection of the environment or the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources against the Person proposing to take the action. \***

yes, Queensland Health has a satisfactory record of responsible environment management.

QH is a State government agency that ensures all projects undertake the required environmental obligations. This is standard practice and QH has appropriate checklists and measures in place to identify, and include responsible environmental management practices. The process from QH generally involves:

- Engage town planners to undertake planning and environmental assessment, or due diligence reporting, of the site;
- Undertake recommendations as identified in the planning and environmental assessment, or due diligence reporting, and where necessary;
- Engage relevant specialist consultants (i.e. Ecological) to prepare technical reports;
- Review technical reports and undertake recommendations and actions as identified in those reports.

A recent example is the EPBC referral (EPBC 2021-8946 ) QH undertook relating to the Coomera Health Precinct, where QH undertook appropriate ecological assessment and undertook recommendations as per the Report. This included QH submitting the project for referral consideration, with a decision received in 1 July 2021 that the project was not a controlled action.

The Coomera Health Precinct is currently undergoing a Ministerial Infrastructure Designation (MID) process to obtain planning approval. As no federal environmental legislation is relevant, consideration of the project outcomes will revert back to relevant State environmental legislation. In particular, the State Government Supported Community Infrastructure Koala Conservation Policy 2017 (The Koala Conservation Policy) regulates the planning and delivery of all Queensland Government supported infrastructure projects, as listed under Schedule 5 of the Planning Regulation 2017, and applies to land within the South East Queensland Koala Protection Area (SEQKPA).

The proposed development will result in the loss of remnant vegetation, which supports non-juvenile Koala habitat trees and habitat for locally common flora and fauna. The Ecological and Protected Flora Assessment confirms the clearing of 13,528 non-juvenile Koala habitat trees which will require offsetting under the State's Koala Conservation Policy. To meet QH's obligations under the Queensland Environmental Offset Policy, QH intends to undertake a proponent-driven, land-based offset as part of the clearing works required to facilitate the Hospital and Health Precinct. This will progress once a decision on the MID has been made for the project.

**1.3.2.18 If the person proposing to take the action is a corporation, provide details of the corporation's environmental policy and planning framework**

There is no environmental policy that governs the policy and planning framework for QH. However developments for built infrastructure for hospital projects undertake a preliminary assessment/ due diligence to understand the site conditions. Where development/ planning approval is required then QH must have consideration to The Planning Act 2016, and the relevant local government planning scheme (in this case – Bundaberg Regional Council Planning Scheme 2015).

Preliminary environmental investigations are also prepared for each development proposal by QH to identify any potential legislative or policy requirements, and to understand whether the site is suitable for development. Where relevant QH is then required to engage appropriate technical consultants (i.e. ecological) to prepare a Report which outlines relevant requirements (i.e. Nature Conservation Act 1992, EPBC Act) and ensure QH recognises their environmental compliance responsibilities.

## 1.3.3 Identity: Proposed designated proponent

### 1.3.3.1 Are the Proposed designated proponent details the same as the Person proposing to take the action? \*

Yes

Proposed designated proponent organisation details	
<b>ABN/ACN</b>	66329169412
<b>Organisation name</b>	Department of Health Qld
<b>Organisation address</b>	33 Charlotte Street, Brisbane Qld 4001
Proposed designated proponent details	
<b>Name</b>	Helena Lewis
<b>Job title</b>	Senior Property Advisor
<b>Phone</b>	0467 841 756
<b>Email</b>	helena.lewis@health.qld.gov.au
<b>Address</b>	Level 1, 33 Charlotte Street, Brisbane

## 1.3.4 Identity: Summary of allocation

### Confirmed Referring party's identity

The Referring party is the person preparing the information in this referral.

ABN/ACN	20162130627
Organisation name	CO FX PTY LTD trading as Green Tape Solutions
Organisation address	4506 QLD
Representative's name	Kelly Matthews
Representative's job title	Director/Principal Ecologist
Phone	0423081428
Email	admin@greentapesolutions.com.au
Address	PO Box 282 Morayfield Qld 4506

### Confirmed Person proposing to take the action's identity

The Person proposing to take the action is the individual, business, government agency or trustee that will be responsible for the proposed action.

---

ABN/ACN	66329169412
Organisation name	Department of Health Qld
Organisation address	33 Charlotte Street, Brisbane Qld 4001
Representative's name	Helena Lewis
Representative's job title	Senior Property Advisor
Phone	0467 841 756
Email	helena.lewis@health.qld.gov.au
Address	Level 1, 33 Charlotte Street, Brisbane

---

### Confirmed Proposed designated proponent's identity

The Person proposing to take the action is the individual or organisation proposed to be responsible for meeting the requirements of the EPBC Act during the assessment process, if the Minister decides that this project is a controlled action.

---

Same as Person proposing to take the action information.

## 1.4 Payment details: Payment exemption and fee waiver

### 1.4.1 Do you qualify for an exemption from fees under EPBC Regulation 5.23 (1) (a)? \*

No

### 1.4.3 Have you applied for or been granted a waiver for full or partial fees under Regulation 5.21A? \*

No

### 1.4.5 Are you going to apply for a waiver of full or partial fees under EPBC Regulation 5.21A?

No

### 1.4.7 Has the department issued you with a credit note? \*

No

### 1.4.9 Would you like to add a purchase order number to your invoice? \*

No

## 1.4 Payment details: Payment allocation

### 1.4.11 Who would you like to allocate as the entity responsible for payment? \*

Proposed designated proponent



## 2. Location

### 2.1 Project footprint



### 2.2 Footprint details

#### 2.2.1 What is the address of the proposed action? \*



Bundaberg Ring Road, Thabeban

**2.2.2 Where is the primary jurisdiction of the proposed action? \***

Queensland

**2.2.3 Is there a secondary jurisdiction for this proposed action? \***

No

**2.2.5 What is the tenure of the action area relevant to the project area? \***

The main development is located on freehold land (Lot 23 on SP212513). The action shall also require the construction of new roads, including a new east-west connector road from Kay McDuff Drive on freehold land (Lot 1 on SP285136) and a proposed extension of Johanna Boulevard within existing gazetted road corridor (Unnamed Road No. 4262) to the north-west of the site. The proposed Johanna Boulevard extension is subject to a separate assessment and is not included within this referral.

## 3. Existing environment

### 3.1 Physical description

**3.1.1 Describe the current condition of the project area's environment.**

The project area is located approximately 5 km from the Bundaberg CBD. Under the Bundaberg Planning Scheme 2015, the main development area is zoned as Open Space and the currently identified land use under State mapping is Nature Conservation.

The surrounding area has been extensively cleared for conversion to agricultural, cropping and residential land uses. The main development area (Lot 23) supports remnant native vegetation that forms part of a larger patch. Whilst fragmented and isolated from other patches of intact and near-intact native vegetation, site vegetation is in good ecological condition but is subject to degrading processes typical of the peri-urban context. Vegetation within the proposed road development area is more disturbed as a result of anthropogenic land use.

The project area has not been subject to recent effects from bushfire, floods or major events. Further details regarding the current condition of the project area's environment is provided in the ecological assessment report.

**3.1.2 Describe any existing or proposed uses for the project area.**

The project area is almost entirely vegetated and does not support any existing development or structures nor any existing industrial, economic or social uses. The proposed use of the site is for the provision of community infrastructure - Hospital and health care services.

Land surrounding the site has been extensively cleared for conversion to agricultural, cropping and residential land uses. No existing structures are on the site and is almost entirely vegetated.

The subject site has road frontage to Bundaberg Ring Road and is proximate to the council-controlled roads of Kay McDuff Drive, Johanna Boulevard and Eggmolesse Street.

The hospital will require two new roads to facilitate vehicle access to the site – both for construction purposes and when the hospital becomes operational. These are:

- A new north-south road to the west of the subject site (Johanna Boulevard extension), connecting with the existing road network at Johanna Boulevard and Eggmolesse Street; and
- A new east-west road to the north of the subject site (East West Road), connecting the Johanna Boulevard extension with Kay McDuff Drive.

The hospital has four proposed vehicle access points, two on the new East-West Road and two on the Johanna Boulevard Extension. These vehicle access points are configured as follows:

- The service access connections at the southwest corner of the site on Johanna Boulevard Extension, and at the northeast corner of the site on new East-West Road provide access to the loading dock, ambulance bays, services parking and mental health drop-off and parking area.
- The ED access on New East-West Road provides access to ED and the main entrance set-down facilities.
- Vehicle access via the Johanna Boulevard Extension primarily for the proposed multi-deck car park.

Public transport infrastructure is proposed to be located on the East West Road. As part of future planning, it is also expected that high-quality bicycle parking and end-of-trip facilities will be provided within the proposed multi-storey car park to promote active transport as an alternative to driving to the site.

### **3.1.3 Describe any outstanding natural features and/or any other important or unique values that applies to the project area.**

Ecological surveys have determined vegetation within the project area to be in good condition and ecological values are considered to be moderate to high quality due to the remnant status and condition of vegetation within the main subject lot (Lot 23) and the presence of a large array and diversity of fauna habitat features, including supporting habitat for species listed as MNES. The site is not connected or in close proximity to any protected estate or reserves and does not support any highly significant or outstanding natural features.

### **3.1.4 Describe the gradient (or depth range if action is to be taken in a marine area) relevant to the project area.**

The topography of the project area is generally flat with elevation ranging from 26 m to 28 m AHD. The project area slopes gently to the south-east. The proposal does not involve any actions within a marine area.

## **3.2 Flora and fauna**

### **3.2.1 Describe the flora and fauna within the affected area and attach any investigations of surveys if applicable.**

Ecological surveys of the site undertaken in September 2020, July 2022 and August 2022 recorded a wide range of fauna and flora taxa, including Rainbow Bee-eater (*Merops ornatus*), Tawny Frogmouth (*Podargus strigoides*), Squirrel Glider (*Petaurus norfolcensis*), Short-beaked echidna (*Tachyglossus aculeatus*), Common Brush-tail possum (*Trichosurus vulpecula*), Northern Brown Bandicoot (*Isodon macrourus*), European Red Fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) and Eastern Grey Kangaroo (*Macropus giganteus*) (refer to Att 3 - Section 4, pp. 18-28).

One (1) species listed as an MNES was recorded on site during ecological surveys -

- Rainbow Bee-eater (*Merops ornatus*) listed as a Marine species under the EPBC Act.

In addition, one (1) species listed as an MNES is highly likely to utilise the site:

- Grey-headed Flying-fox (*Pteropus poliocephalus*) listed as Vulnerable under the NC Act (Qld) and the EPBC Act (Cth).

The site does not support any Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs) listed under either State or Commonwealth legislation. No threatened flora species are considered likely to be present within the project area.

### 3.2.2 Describe the vegetation (including the status of native vegetation and soil) within the project area.

The project area lies within the Elliott Formation stratigraphic unit of the Maryborough Basin geological province, which comprises Quartzose to sub-labile sandstone, conglomerate, siltstone, mudstone, shale. Soils within the project area comprise seasonally wet hydrosols with a fine loamy surface over an acid or neutral, mottled, fine polyhedral structured clay on deeply weathered fine grained sedimentary rocks and dermosols/ferrosols - friable non-cracking clay or clay loams with a loamy surface over a mottled, yellow, structured subsoil on deeply weathered fine grained sedimentary rocks.

The site assessment determined that the main development site supports a single vegetation community comprising eucalypt woodland dominated by white mahogany (*Eucalyptus latisinensis*) and pink bloodwood (*Corymbia intermedia*) with rusty gum (*Angophora leiocarpa*), Queensland blue gum (*E. tereticornis*) and grey ironbark (*E. siderophloia*) also associated (refer to Att 3, Sections 4.1-4.3, pp. 18-20). The sub-canopy and mid-storey within this community is dominated by swamp box (*Lophostemon suaveolens*) with scattered areas of dense broad-leaved paperbark (*Melaleuca quinquenervia*). The canopy height is approximately 20-30 m with a canopy cover of approximately 60-70% across the site. The shrub layer within the community is predominantly sparse. Dominant species within this stratum consist of *Acacia* species (*A. leiocalyx* and *A. disparrima* var. *disparrima*) and juvenile and immature canopy species. The ground stratum is dominated by native grasses and mat-rush (*Lomandra* species).

This community meets remnant status and conforms to the regional ecosystem (RE) 12.5.4 - *Eucalyptus latisinensis* +/- *Corymbia intermedia*, *C. trachyphloia* subsp. *trachyphloia*, *Angophora leiocarpa*, *Eucalyptus exserta* woodland on complex of remnant Tertiary surfaces and Cainozoic and Mesozoic sediments. This community does not appear to have been cleared at any time in the past and contains a large number of high-quality mature canopy trees.

Vegetation within the proposed east-west connector road to Kay McDuff Drive comprises predominantly regrowth vegetation that also conforms to RE12.5.4. This vegetation is more disturbed as a result of anthropogenic land uses.

RE 12.5.4 is listed as Least concern under the Qld *Vegetation Management Act 1992* and does not conform to any threatened ecological community listed as an MNES under the EPBC Act.

## 3.3 Heritage

### 3.3.1 Describe any Commonwealth heritage places overseas or other places recognised as having heritage values that apply to the project area.

No Commonwealth heritage places overseas or other places recognised as having heritage values apply to the project area.

### 3.3.2 Describe any Indigenous heritage values that apply to the project area.

A Cultural Heritage Assessment by the current Registered Native Title Prescribed Body Corporate (RNTBC), Port Curtis Coral Coast Trust (PCCC), is expected to occur in early 2023. Upon completion, Queensland Health and The Trust will enter into a Cultural Heritage Agreement for the purposes of any documenting any Indigenous heritage values and any subsequent actions required to progress the project.

## 3.4 Hydrology

### 3.4.1 Describe the hydrology characteristics that apply to the project area and attach any hydrological investigations or surveys if applicable. \*

The project area does not contain any wetland areas or watercourses. The Burnett River is the main river catchment for Bundaberg and is located approximately four (4) kilometres north of the new hospital site. Saltwater Creek (Stream Order 2) is approximately 1.5 kilometres to the north of the site on a general south-west /north-east alignment. An unnamed tributary is approximately 200m northeast of the site (Stream Order 1). Two small man-made dams are located within the southern portion of the project area.

Bundaberg Regional Council has provided a flood hazard evaluation report (Att 4 - BRC Flood Hazard Evaluation Report - Nov 2019) and hazard overlay maps specific to the project. The Bundaberg Regional Council interactive mapping and separate flood advice from Council identifies the site as unaffected by the Burnett River, Saltwater Creek or the Bundaberg Creek in flood events up to and including the 0.2% AEP flood event (1 in 500-year flood event). The site is subject to overland flow in 1% AEP flood events from local catchments. These flows primarily traverse the northern and southern site boundaries. These flows are proposed to be managed through the site design and associated earthworks, roadworks and drainage.

Given the flat topography of the site, fill will be required to manage surface runoff and overland flow. The stormwater drainage strategy will ensure that downstream collecting within the existing Bundaberg Regional Council stormwater system is not worsened by the new hospital. To achieve this a proposed detention system will be constructed as a series of vegetated wetlands for the northern and southern catchments. These detention catchment ponds will be integrated into the landscape design and planted so as to limit the attraction of flying wildlife as required by the BRC Planning Scheme Part 8, Airport and Aviation Facilities Overlay.

## 4. Impacts and mitigation

### 4.1 Impact details

#### Potential Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES) relevant to your proposed action area.

EPBC Act section	Controlling provision	Impacted	Reviewed
S12	World Heritage	No	Yes
S15B	National Heritage	No	Yes
S16	Ramsar Wetland	No	Yes

EPBC Act section	Controlling provision	Impacted	Reviewed
S18	Threatened Species and Ecological Communities	Yes	Yes
S20	Migratory Species	Yes	Yes
S21	Nuclear	No	Yes
S23	Commonwealth Marine Area	No	Yes
S24B	Great Barrier Reef	No	Yes
S24D	Water resource in relation to large coal mining development or coal seam gas	No	Yes
S26	Commonwealth Land	No	Yes
S27B	Commonwealth heritage places overseas	No	Yes
S28	Commonwealth or Commonwealth Agency	No	Yes

#### 4.1.1 World Heritage

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

##### 4.1.1.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \*

No

##### 4.1.1.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact. \*

The project area is not located within, or in close proximity to, any World Heritage Properties. The nearest World Heritage Areas are K'Gari (Fraser Island) located approximately 74 km to the south -east and the Great Barrier Reef, located approximately 40 km to the north. The project area is located over 14 m from the coast line and marine environment and will not result in any direct or indirect impacts on the World Heritage values of any World Heritage Area. The project is not likely to result in any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter.

#### 4.1.2 National Heritage

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

##### 4.1.2.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \*

No

##### 4.1.2.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact. \*

The project area is not located within, or in close proximity to, any National Heritage Places. The nearest National Heritage Places are K'Gari (Fraser Island) located approximately 74 km to the south-east and the Great Barrier Reef, located approximately 40 km to the north. The project is not likely to result in any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter.

**4.1.3 Ramsar Wetland**

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

**4.1.3.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \***

No

**4.1.3.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact. \***

The project area is located approximately 71 km from the nearest Ramsar wetland (the Great Sandy Strait). The project is not likely to result in any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter.

**4.1.4 Threatened Species and Ecological Communities**

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

**Threatened species**

Direct impact	Indirect impact	Species
No	No	Acacia attenuata
No	No	Bosistoia transversa
No	No	Botaurus poiciloptilus
No	No	Calidris canutus
No	No	Calidris ferruginea

Direct impact	Indirect impact	Species
No	No	Chalinolobus dwyeri
No	No	Charadrius leschenaultii
No	No	Cossinia australiana
No	No	Cupaniopsis shirleyana
No	No	Cycas megacarpa
No	No	Cyclopsitta diophthalma coxeni
No	No	Dasyurus hallucatus
No	No	Delma torquata
No	No	Dichanthium setosum
No	No	Egernia rugosa
No	No	Elseya albagula
No	No	Erythrorichis radiatus
No	No	Eucalyptus hallii
No	No	Falco hypoleucos
No	No	Fontainea venosa
No	No	Furina dunmalli
No	No	Geophaps scripta scripta
No	No	Hemiaspis damelii
No	Yes	Hirundapus caudacutus
No	No	Limosa lapponica baueri
No	No	Macadamia integrifolia
No	No	Macroderma gigas
No	No	Macrozamia lomandroides
No	No	Macrozamia pauli-guilielmi
No	No	Numenius madagascariensis
No	No	Nyctophilus corbeni
No	No	Petauroides volans
No	No	Petauroides volans (southern and central)
No	No	Petaurus australis australis
No	No	Phaius australis
No	No	Phascolarctos cinereus (combined populations of Qld, NSW and the ACT)
No	No	Planchonella eerwah
Yes	Yes	Pteropus poliocephalus
No	Yes	Pteropus poliocephalus
No	No	Rostratula australis



Direct impact	Indirect impact	Species
No	No	Samadera bidwillii
No	No	Turnix melanogaster

**Ecological communities**

Direct impact	Indirect impact	Ecological community
No	No	Coastal Swamp Oak ( <i>Casuarina glauca</i> ) Forest of New South Wales and South East Queensland ecological community
No	No	Coastal Swamp Sclerophyll Forest of New South Wales and South East Queensland
No	No	Lowland Rainforest of Subtropical Australia

**4.1.4.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \***

Yes

**4.1.4.2 Briefly describe why your action has a direct and/or indirect impact on these protected matters. \***

White-throated Needletail (*Hirundapus caudacutus*) may forage over the site during their non-summer visitation period. Vegetation clearing for the project shall result in minor loss of foraging resources. Given that this species does not breed in Australia and is almost exclusively aerial, the project shall not result in the loss of breeding or roosting habitat for this species.

Grey-headed Flying-fox (*Pteropus poliocephalus*) is highly likely to periodically utilise site vegetation for foraging only. The site is not currently utilised by this species as a roost site ('camp') and the closest known roosting site known to be occupied by Grey-headed Flying-foxes is approximately 5 km away. This species is capable of nightly flights up to 50 km to forage on flowering vegetation. Given that the surrounding landscape has been extensively cleared, it is likely that Grey-headed Flying-foxes would utilise the site for foraging during times of flowering. The project shall not result in the loss of breeding or roosting habitat for this species. The impacts of the project on this species are the direct loss of feeding trees, light and noise impact generated by the new buildings and activities.

**4.1.4.4 Do you consider this likely direct and/or indirect impact to be a Significant Impact? \***

No

**4.1.4.6 Describe why you do not consider this to be a Significant Impact. \***

Given that the White-throated Needletail (*Hirundapus caudacutus*) does not breed in Australia and is almost exclusively aerial, this species would not use site vegetation for breeding purposes or roosting. Vegetation clearing for the project shall result in minor loss of foraging resources; however this is unlikely to result in a Significant Impact on this species.

The site does not currently support a Grey-headed flying-fox roost site nor is it likely to be used a roost or maternity site. Site vegetation is highly likely to be utilised for foraging by Grey-headed Flying-fox during times of flowering. The development shall require the removal of foraging habitat. These trees constitute suitable foraging habitat only, and occur in the remaining of the site. The removal of these trees will not fragment foraging habitat for the species. The foraging habitat proposed to be removed and fragmented is not considered important to the survival of the species in the locality. This vegetation provide an occasional foraging resource but given the small scale of tree removal proposed it is unlikely to be important to the long term survival of the species. The proposed activity will not affect the long-term survival of Grey-headed Flying-foxes.

Please refer to Section 6.2 of the ecological assessment report (Att 3 - Ecological assessment report) for a detailed assessment against the Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 - Matters of National Environmental Significance for MNES confirmed to be present or highly likely to occur within the project area.

**4.1.4.7 Do you think your proposed action is a controlled action? \***

No

**4.1.4.9 Please elaborate why you do not think your proposed action is a controlled action. \***

Direct and indirect impacts associated with or arising from the project are unlikely to result in a Significant Impact on any MNES. Please refer to Section 6.2 of the ecological assessment report (Att 3 - Ecological assessment report) for a detailed assessment against the Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1 - Matters of National Environmental Significance for MNES confirmed to be present or highly likely to occur within the project area.

**4.1.4.10 Please describe any avoidance or mitigation measures proposed for this action and attach any supporting documentation for these avoidance and mitigation measures. \***

A range of direct and indirect impacts are expected, including the loss of approximately 16.3 ha of good-quality habitat, injury and mortality of fauna during vegetation clearing and indirect mortality due to the loss of habitat resources, compounded by limited surrounding habitat for fauna to disperse to and a lack of safe wildlife movement opportunities. Edge effects and long-term degradation of retained vegetation is also expected; the development has been sited within the northern portion of the site to minimise and consolidate the clearing footprint and reduce associated edge effects, thereby avoiding additional fragmentation. Mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce, as much as possible, the ecological impacts of the development and ensure the development complies with all relevant environmental legislation.

The ecological assessment report provides a range of mitigation measures to minimise the ecological impacts of the development in general. These mitigation measures include the following:

- Preparation and implementation of a high-risk Species Management Program (SMP) to further assess and provide mitigation measures for potential impacts to animal breeding places of species protected under the Nature Conservation Act 1992 (Qld). The SMP must be prepared and approved by DES (Qld) prior to commencement of works. An animal breeding places survey will be required as part of the SMP to inform appropriate mitigation measures to minimise injury to protected wildlife, including colonial breeding species known to occur within the site. The SMP shall outline requirements for relocation of a Wedge-tailed Eagle nest located within the development footprint.
- Preparation and implementation of a Vegetation Management Plan to protect retained vegetation, outline weed management and other restoration actions (including relocation of hollows salvaged from cleared vegetation), provide a vegetation clearing protocol to ensure compliance with sequential clearing requirements under the Nature Conservation (Koala) Conservation Plan 2017, including the presence of a suitably qualified and experienced fauna spotter catcher/koala spotter to supervise all vegetation clearing;
- Preparation and implementation of a Nest Box Management Plan to guide installation and management of nest boxes within retained vegetation to compensate for the loss of hollows; and
- Preparation and implementation of a Lighting Management Plan for the site.

**4.1.4.11 Please describe any proposed offsets and attach any supporting documentation relevant to these measures. \***

No offsets for MNES are proposed. State offsets for impacts to MSES shall not be required.

### 4.1.5 Migratory Species

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

Direct impact	Indirect impact	Species
No	No	<i>Actitis hypoleucos</i>
Yes	No	<i>Apus pacificus</i>
No	No	<i>Calidris acuminata</i>
No	No	<i>Calidris ferruginea</i>
No	No	<i>Calidris melanotos</i>
No	No	<i>Charadrius leschenaultii</i>
No	No	<i>Crocodylus porosus</i>
Yes	No	<i>Cuculus optatus</i>
No	No	<i>Gallinago hardwickii</i>
Yes	No	<i>Hirundapus caudacutus</i>
No	No	<i>Monarcha melanopsis</i>
Yes	No	<i>Myiagra cyanoleuca</i>
Yes	No	<i>Myiagra cyanoleuca</i>
No	No	<i>Numenius madagascariensis</i>
No	No	<i>Rhipidura rufifrons</i>
No	No	<i>Symposiachrus trivirgatus</i>
No	No	<i>Tringa nebularia</i>

#### 4.1.5.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \*

Yes

#### 4.1.5.2 Briefly describe why your action has a direct and/or indirect impact on these protected matters. \*

The site supports suitable non-breeding habitat and is located within the known seasonal distribution range (summer) of the following species -

- Pacific Swift (*Apus pacificus*)
- Oriental Cuckoo (*Cuculus optatus*)
- White-throated Needletail (*Hirundapus caudacutus*)
- Satin Flycatcher (*Myiagra cyanoleuca*)

None of these species were recorded by ecological surveys. Vegetation clearing for the project will result in the minor loss of non-breeding habitat for these species.

#### 4.1.5.4 Do you consider this likely direct and/or indirect impact to be a Significant Impact? \*

No

**4.1.5.6 Describe why you do not consider this to be a Significant Impact. \***

The minor loss of non-breeding habitat for migratory species is unlikely to result in a Significant Impact on these species.

**4.1.5.7 Do you think your proposed action is a controlled action? \***

No

**4.1.5.9 Please elaborate why you do not think your proposed action is a controlled action. \***

Direct and indirect impacts associated with or arising from the project are unlikely to result in a Significant Impact on any MNES (refer to Att 3 - Ecological assessment report, Section 4.5.5, pp. 24-25).

**4.1.5.10 Please describe any avoidance or mitigation measures proposed for this action and attach any supporting documentation for these avoidance and mitigation measures. \***

No specific measures are proposed for avoidance or mitigation of impacts to migratory species. General mitigation measures are provided in Section 4.1.4.10.

**4.1.5.11 Please describe any proposed offsets and attach any supporting documentation relevant to these measures. \***

No offsets for MNES are proposed. State offsets for impacts to MSES shall not be required.

**4.1.6 Nuclear**

**4.1.6.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter? \***

No

**4.1.6.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact. \***

Not applicable - the development does not comprise a nuclear action.

**4.1.7 Commonwealth Marine Area**

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

**4.1.7.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \***

No

**4.1.7.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact. \***

The project does not involve development within or in proximity of a Commonwealth Marine Area. The project is not likely to result in any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter.

#### 4.1.8 Great Barrier Reef

##### 4.1.8.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter? \*

No

##### 4.1.8.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact. \*

The project area is not located within, or in close proximity to, the Great Barrier Reef. The project is not likely to result in any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter.

#### 4.1.9 Water resource in relation to large coal mining development or coal seam gas

##### 4.1.9.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter? \*

No

##### 4.1.9.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact. \*

The project does not involve large coal mining development or coal seam gas extraction. The project will not result in any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter.

#### 4.1.10 Commonwealth Land

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

##### 4.1.10.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \*

No

##### 4.1.10.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact. \*

The project area is not located within, or in close proximity to, any Commonwealth Land. The project is not likely to result in any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter.

**4.1.11 Commonwealth heritage places overseas**

You have identified your proposed action will likely directly and/or indirectly impact the following protected matters.

A direct impact is a direct consequence of an action taken – for example, clearing of habitat for a threatened species or permanent shading on an ecological community as the result of installing solar panels.

An indirect impact is an 'indirect consequence' such as a downstream impact or a facilitated third-party action.

—

**4.1.11.1 Is the proposed action likely to have any direct and/or indirect impact on any of these protected matters? \***

No

**4.1.11.3 Briefly describe why your action is unlikely to have a direct and/or indirect impact. \***

The project area is not located within, or in close proximity to, any Commonwealth heritage places overseas. The project is not likely to result in any direct and/or indirect impact on this protected matter.

**4.1.12 Commonwealth or Commonwealth Agency**

**4.1.12.1 Is the proposed action to be taken by the Commonwealth or a Commonwealth Agency? \***

No

## 4.2 Impact summary

**Conclusion on the likelihood of significant impacts**

You have indicated that the proposed action will likely have a significant impact on the following Matters of National Environmental Significance:

*None*

**Conclusion on the likelihood of unlikely significant impacts**

You have indicated that the proposed action will unlikely have a significant impact on the following Matters of National Environmental Significance:



- World Heritage (S12)
- National Heritage (S15B)
- Ramsar Wetland (S16)
- Threatened Species and Ecological Communities (S18)
- Migratory Species (S20)
- Nuclear (S21)
- Commonwealth Marine Area (S23)
- Great Barrier Reef (S24B)
- Water resource in relation to large coal mining development or coal seam gas (S24D)
- Commonwealth Land (S26)
- Commonwealth heritage places overseas (S27B)
- Commonwealth or Commonwealth Agency (S28)

## 4.3 Alternatives

### 4.3.1 Do you have any possible alternatives for your proposed action to be considered as part of your referral? \*

Yes

### 4.3.2 Do you have an alternative timeline you are proposing for your proposed action? \*

No

### 4.3.3 Briefly describe why an alternate timeline for your proposed action was not possible. \*

Given that the action is a high priority infrastructure project, an alternate timeline for the project is not possible.

### 4.3.4 Do you have an alternative location you are proposing for your proposed action? \*

No

### 4.3.5 Briefly describe why an alternative location for your proposed action was not possible. \*

Extensive investigations were undertaken to identify and review suitable sites in and around Bundaberg for a hospital that meets the long-term needs of local communities.

The comprehensive evaluation process considered more than 40 sites, including more than 20 privately-owned sites put forward through a publicly advertised expression of interest process.

A multidisciplinary team of technical experts identified the site as being the most suitable, after assessing it against criteria vital to developing and future-proofing a new hospital.

Considerations included:

- a range of technical criteria to ensure the hospital would be able to deliver on its core purpose
- providing sufficient space for flexibility to respond to anticipated future growth

- providing space that would allow for opportunities to collaborate to increase economic, community and social value by co-locating with other services, including education and research
- addressing flood protection issues experienced at the current Bundaberg Hospital site and throughout much of the Bundaberg region
- accessibility and proximity to the existing road network
- impact on surrounding residents and services
- accessibility to public transport and active transport options for patients, families, staff and volunteers.

The project has been designed in a compact arrangement in the north-wester corner of the site to minimise the environmental impact as much as reasonably possible and to enable significant existing trees and vegetation to be retained. This approach has also helped reduce the extent of new roads and in-ground services.

#### 4.3.6 Do you have alternative activities you are proposing for your proposed action? \*

Yes

### 4.3.3 Alternatives: Activities

#### 4.3.3.1 Describe how the impacts and mitigation measures are different for your alternative activities.

The project has been designed in a compact arrangement in the north-western corner of the site to minimise the environmental impact as much as reasonably possible and to enable significant existing trees and vegetation to be retained. This approach has also helped reduce the extent of new roads and in-ground services.

### 4.3.4 Alternatives: Impact and mitigation

#### 4.3.4.1 Do these alternatives have a different impact, avoidance, or mitigation measure compared to what you have already provided? \*

Yes

#### 4.3.4.2 On World Heritage properties \*

No

#### 4.3.4.4 On National Heritage places \*

No

#### 4.3.4.6 On the ecological character of a Ramsar wetland \*

No

#### 4.3.4.8 Listed threatened species, their habitat, or threatened ecological communities \*

Yes

**4.3.4.9 Describe how this alternative has different impacts or mitigations from the original proposal relating to listed threatened species, their habitat, or threatened ecological communities. \***

The project has been designed in a compact arrangement in the north-western corner of the site to minimise the environmental impact as much as reasonably possible by minimising the extent of vegetation and supporting habitat for MNES-listed species to be cleared and to enable retention of significant existing trees and vegetation.

**4.3.4.10 Listed migratory species or their habitat \***

Yes

**4.3.4.11 Describe how this alternative has different impacts or mitigations from the original proposal relating to listed migratory species or their habitat. \***

The project has been designed in a compact arrangement in the north-western corner of the site to minimise the environmental impact as much as reasonably possible by minimising the extent of vegetation and supporting habitat for MNES-listed species to be cleared and to enable retention of significant existing trees and vegetation.

**4.3.4.12 Is a Nuclear action \***

No

**4.3.4.14 On Commonwealth Marine Areas \***

No

**4.3.4.16 Taking place in or flowing into the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park \***

No

**4.3.4.18 Impacts a water resource relating to a coal seam gas or large coal mining development \***

No

**4.3.4.20 On or near Commonwealth Land \***

No

**4.3.4.22 On Commonwealth heritage places overseas \***

No

**4.3.4.24 Action undertaken by the Commonwealth or a Commonwealth Agency \***

No

**4.3.5 Alternatives: Considered alternatives****4.3.5.1 Do you have any other alternative actions, including not taking the action, that you have considered but are not proposing as part of this referral? \***

No

**5. Lodgement****5.1 Attachments**

## 1.2.1 Overview of the proposed action

#1.	Att 1 - Master Plan and Concept Design Report	Document	This document provides the master plan, conceptual design and background information for the project.
#2.	Att 2 - Project Area and Disturbance Footprint	Document	This map shows the project area, disturbance footprint, vegetation clearing and retention areas.
#3.	Development infrastructure and charges - LGIP - Schedule of Works Model	Document	Schedule of Works Model as per detailed in the Development infrastructure and charges

## 1.2.5 Information about the staged development

#1.	Att 1 - Master Plan and Concept Design Report	Document	This document provides the master plan, conceptual design and background information for the project. Section 2.5 (p.21-22) provides details of future stages.
-----	---	----------	--

## 1.2.6 Commonwealth or state legislation, planning frameworks or policy documents that are relevant to the proposed action

#1.	Att 3 - Ecological Assessment Report	Document	Ecological assessment report for the project
-----	--------------------------------------	----------	--

## 1.3.2.18 (Person proposing to take the action) If the person proposing to take the action is a corporation, provide details of the corporation's environmental policy and planning framework

#1.	Bundaberg Regional Council Planning Scheme 2015	Link (Webpage)	<a href="https://www.bundaberg.qld.gov.au/brc-planning-scheme-2015">https://www.bundaberg.qld.gov.au/brc-planning-scheme-2015</a>
-----	---	----------------	---

## 3.2.1 Flora and fauna within the affected area

#1.	Att 3 - Ecological assessment report	Document	Ecological assessment report
-----	--------------------------------------	----------	------------------------------

## 3.2.2 Vegetation within the project area

#1.	Att 3 - Ecological Assessment Report	Document	Ecological assessment report
-----	--------------------------------------	----------	------------------------------

## 3.4.1 Hydrology characteristics that apply to the project area

#1.	Att 4 - BRC Flood Hazard Evaluation Report - Nov 2019	Document	Flood hazard evaluation report
#2.	BRC Planning Scheme Part 8 - Airport and Aviation Facilities Overlay	Document	BRC Planning Scheme Part 8 - Airport and Aviation Facilities Overlay document

## 4.1.4.6 (Threatened Species and Ecological Communities) Why you do not consider the direct and/or indirect impact to be a Significant Impact

#1.	Att 3 - Ecological assessment report	Document	Ecological assessment report
-----	--------------------------------------	----------	------------------------------

## 4.1.4.9 (Threatened Species and Ecological Communities) Why you do not think your proposed action is a controlled action

#1.	Att 3 - Ecological Assessment Report	Document	Ecological assessment report
-----	--------------------------------------	----------	------------------------------

## 4.1.5.9 (Migratory Species) Why you do not think your proposed action is a controlled action

#1.	Att 3 - Ecological Assessment Report	Document	Ecological assessment report
-----	--------------------------------------	----------	------------------------------

## 5.2 Declarations

### Completed Referring party's declaration

The Referring party is the person preparing the information in this referral.

ABN/ACN	20162130627
Organisation name	CO FX PTY LTD trading as Green Tape Solutions
Organisation address	4506 QLD
Representative's name	Kelly Matthews
Representative's job title	Director/Principal Ecologist
Phone	0423081428
Email	admin@greentapesolutions.com.au
Address	PO Box 282 Morayfield Qld 4506

- Check this box to indicate you have read the referral form. \*
- I would like to receive notifications and track the referral progress through the EPBC portal. \*
- By checking this box, I, **Kelly Matthews of CO FX PTY LTD trading as Green Tape Solutions**, declare that to the best of my knowledge the information I have given on, or attached to this EPBC Act Referral is complete, current and correct. I understand that giving false or misleading information is a serious offence. \*
- I would like to receive notifications and track the referral progress through the EPBC portal. \*

---

### Completed Person proposing to take the action's declaration

The Person proposing to take the action is the individual, business, government agency or trustee that will be responsible for the proposed action.

---

ABN/ACN	66329169412
Organisation name	Department of Health Qld
Organisation address	33 Charlotte Street, Brisbane Qld 4001
Representative's name	Helena Lewis
Representative's job title	Senior Property Advisor
Phone	0467 841 756
Email	helena.lewis@health.qld.gov.au
Address	Level 1, 33 Charlotte Street, Brisbane

- Check this box to indicate you have read the referral form. \*
- I would like to receive notifications and track the referral progress through the EPBC portal. \*
- I, **Helena Lewis of Department of Health Qld**, declare that to the best of my knowledge the information I have given on, or attached to the EPBC Act Referral is complete, current and correct. I understand that giving false or misleading information is a serious offence. I declare that I am not taking the action on behalf or for the benefit of any other person or entity. \*
- I would like to receive notifications and track the referral progress through the EPBC portal. \*

---

### Completed Proposed designated proponent's declaration

The Proposed designated proponent is the individual or organisation proposed to be responsible for meeting the requirements of the EPBC Act during the assessment process, if the Minister decides that this project is a controlled action.

Same as Person proposing to take the action information.

- Check this box to indicate you have read the referral form. \*
- I would like to receive notifications and track the referral progress through the EPBC portal. \*
- I, **Helena Lewis of Department of Health Qld**, the Proposed designated proponent, consent to the designation of myself as the Proposed designated proponent for the purposes of the action described in this EPBC Act Referral. \*
- I would like to receive notifications and track the referral progress through the EPBC portal. \*

