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FOREWORD TO THE SUPPLEMENT

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the Second Sydney Airport Site Selection Programme was released for public comment on 17 June 1985. The closing date for the receipt of submissions was 26 August but a number were received after that date. A total of 423 submissions were received by the Department of Aviation up to 6 September.

This Supplement to the Draft EIS responds to the comments made in the public submissions and, together with the Draft, forms the Final EIS.

In accordance with the Environment Protection Administrative Procedures, the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment will examine the Final EIS within twenty-eight days (or such longer period as may be agreed) of receiving it or any additional information requested by the Minister for Arts, Heritage and Environment. The Minister for Arts, Heritage and Environment shall make any comments, suggestions or recommendations concerning the proposals which are considered necessary or desirable for the protection of the environment. The action Minister (the Minister for Aviation) is obliged, as far as is practicable, to take account of such comments, suggestions and recommendations.

Treatment of submissions

The main body of this supplement constitutes the response by the Department of Aviation to the issues raised in the submissions. For ease of reference, the supplement follows strictly the format of the Draft EIS.

A summary of the public submissions received up to 6 September, listing their authors and the comments made is included as Appendix 1. Each submission has been numbered, as has each comment within each submission, thus providing a two-part code for each comment. For example, comment number 57.006 is the sixth comment in submission number 57. Against the listing of each comment is the section of the Draft EIS to which the comment applies, and therefore the section of this document in which the response is to be found.

Late submissions

Although the ten-week period for public comment was unofficially extended by two weeks thirteen submissions were received by the Department of Aviation after 6 September. It was not possible to include these in the computer listing or the detailed analysis process. However, after the completion of responses to the other submissions they were analysed briefly and are discussed at Appendix 3.

In addition, 240 late proformas were received by the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment. These have not been included in any listing. However, as they were all of the type represented by the model proforma submission number 8 readers can, if they wish, add 240 to the totals given wherever submission number 8 appears.

Content of submissions

Many more submissions were received relating to Badgerys Creek than to Wilton. This is to be expected considering the disparity in the size of the population near each of the
sites and in fact, per head of local population there were many more submissions from the Wilton area.

Many more submissions were received opposing the siting of the airport than supporting it, particularly in relation to Badgerys Creek.

Issues causing the most concern in the Badgerys Creek area were the effect on property values, the effects of aircraft noise, effects on lifestyle and the lack of compensation for those affected but whose property would not be acquired.

At Wilton the main issues were preservation of the environment, preservation of water quality in the catchment area and the effects on the mining industry.

Many other important issues of less general concern were raised in relation to each site.

No new significant issue was raised which adversely affects the assessment of the proposals.

Response to submissions

Some comments related to areas which had been adequately covered in the Draft EIS and the response needed only to direct the reader to the relevant section. Where a misunderstanding was evident some clarification and amplification of the wording of the Draft EIS, and in some cases additional material, have been included. Many comments are more in the nature of objections to particular elements of the proposals rather than criticisms of the Draft EIS and have simply been recorded as such. All errors brought to light have been corrected in Appendix 2 Corrigenda.

Following analysis, the submissions were reviewed by the Environmental Reference Group which includes representatives of the Commonwealth Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment and the NSW Department of Environment and Planning. This group confirmed the view of the Department of Aviation that no additional field work or analytic work was required to respond adequately to all concerns raised in public submissions.

A meeting was also held with the Department of Defence to consider further the effects of the proposals on Defence facilities.

No issue has arisen from any source which has necessitated any change to the proposal at either site. The proposals will therefore go forward as detailed in the Draft EIS.

It should however be borne in mind that two possibilities exist for future changes to the proposal at Badgerys Creek.

One is the possibility of minor change to the runway alignments at the detailed design stage, as discussed on page 200 of the Draft EIS. This would not affect the acquisition boundary.

The other is the possibility of the acquisition of additional land in the noise-affected areas at some time in the future if such action were to become Government policy. However, this does not form a part of the present proposal.

Conclusion

The Department of Aviation considers that the Final EIS, consisting of the Draft EIS and this Supplement, provides an adequate treatment of all issues relating to the Second Sydney Airport Site Selection decision. The Final EIS also gives some indication of the views of those likely to be directly affected as well as those within the wider community who have a strong interest in the decision.
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RESPONSES TO
SUBMISSIONS ON THE
SECOND SYDNEY AIRPORT
SITE SELECTION PROGRAMME
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
Twenty-four submissions raised issues of a general nature which can best be responded to in terms of the Preface. The issues raised were:

- the need for an early decision;
- the adequacy of the Draft EIS;
- calls for a public enquiry;
- need to review study.

Need for an early decision

Ten submissions raised this issue (2.003, 7.004, 16.001, 65.020, 75.002, 199.005, 229.001, 346.011, 368.002 and 450.003). These submission stressed the need for a site decision as early as possible, two claiming that the existing uncertainty had produced worry, stress and other health problems. One submission claimed that even after a site decision is announced residents of the chosen area will still face uncertainty over the timing of development. One submission complimented the Federal and State Governments on their initiative to end the uncertainty.

It is worth noting that, in addition to written submissions on this subject, numerous oral requests have been received stressing the need for an early decision. Officers staffing the Community Access Bus reported that this was one of the most frequently voiced sentiments, particularly in the Badgerys Creek area.

The uncertainty faced by residents and businesses is indeed an important consideration in the site selection programme and one of which the Government is acutely aware. It applied particularly to the Badgerys Creek area where the prospect of an airport has existed for at least 8 years. It is unfortunate that the technical, social and political complexity of the problem has for so long prevented a decision being taken. At the insistence of the Minister for Aviation, the Department is advancing the programme as quickly as possible commensurate with the requirements of the Environment Protection (Impact of Proposals) Act, 1974.

A public information programme was conducted, one of the aims of which was to replace rumour with fact as far as possible and thus reduce unnecessary concern. However, the fact remains that until decisions are announced the uncertainty must remain.

Adequacy of Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Fourteen submissions made general comments on the Draft EIS (7.003, 60.001, 65.001, 222.001, 222.003, 245.001, 256.001, 264.007, 302.002, 305.001, 337.038, 359.008, 390.002 391.001 and 454.001). Ten were critical, the criticisms including that the document:

- is too long;
- is inadequate;
- is incomplete;
- is inaccurate;
- is deliberately misleading;
- does not meet the requirements of the Act.
The other four submissions (including one from a protest organization) complimented the authors, using such words as 'well compiled', 'comprehensive', 'impressive' and 'factual material of high standard'.

This Draft EIS was unusual in two respects. While ostensibly about site selection and acquisition, it also had to cover, as far as this was relevant, the impacts of later development at the chosen site. It thus dealt with hypothetical events a long way in the future and inevitably suffered to some extent from a lack of certainty.

The other unusual feature was that the document had to cover two equally possible proposals rather than one. This led to increased length and a certain amount of repetition.

The authors were well aware of these difficulties and attempted to provide as accurate and comprehensive a coverage as possible within the constraints of reasonable size and cost. The Department of Aviation believes that this objective has been largely met, a view shared by both the Commonwealth Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment and the NSW Department of Environment and Planning.

Call for public inquiry

Three submissions (222.009, 311.001 and 459.013) requested that a public inquiry be held to resolve the issue of the airport site.

The Department of Aviation is of the opinion that all aspects of the question have been well aired in the Draft EIS and in the public discussion which has accompanied it and that nothing is to be gained by public inquiry. Such a move would, very properly, bring strong public criticism of further delay.

Need for review

Goulburn City Council took issue with various criteria used and conclusions reached, by the Consultant and the Department (459.027). In addition it asked what opportunities existed to review the Study, and particularly the ranking of Goulburn; and therefore presumably all potential outlying sites for which Goulburn served as the type.

The Goulburn City Council complained that there was insufficient time given the public to consider questions such as airport role and site selection factors; that in fact the study process failed to satisfy the Minister's joint press statement that the public would be invited to comment. All these matters were included in the Draft EIS in detail thereby affording the public a ten-week period to comment on all aspects of the study process, not just the statement of environmental effects for the short-listed sites.

The decision process being followed is set out in the Preface to the Draft EIS. Unless there was strong, well based and persuasive argument contained in public submissions on the Draft EIS that the study was grossly deficient or arrived at conclusions unsupported by material set out in the Draft EIS, the study conclusions will stand for consideration by Government.
CHAPTER 1
REQUIREMENT TO RESERVE A SITE

1.1 OBJECTIVE OF THE PROPOSAL

No submissions commented on this section of the Draft EIS.

1.2 GROWTH IN AIR TRAFFIC

Twenty-four submissions including seven proformas questioned the validity of the Department of Aviation's forecasts. These are discussed below. However, it is useful to note that most of these doubts were raised by those opposed to a second Sydney airport when questioning the basis of need. As outlined in Section 1.2 of the Draft EIS, there are uncertainties associated with any forecasts. These forecasts are used to demonstrate that there exists a reasonable possibility that air traffic will outgrow the capacity of Kingsford-Smith Airport. The consequences of a range of decisions in uncertain future environments are discussed in Section 1.6.

The points raised on this issue can be grouped into the following categories:

- lack of confidence in forecasting;
- projected growth in international and trunk aircraft movements do not reflect historical trends;
- trend line extrapolation is not a sufficient forecasting method;
- alternative assumptions should have been adopted.

Lack of confidence in forecasting

Five submissions expressed a lack of confidence in aviation forecasting, one introducing Major Airport Needs of Sydney Study forecasts to demonstrate that all actual aircraft movement levels were now outside the Major Airport Needs of Sydney forecast range (75.001, 233.025, 233.035, 338.032, 359.009 and 457.003).

Whilst these are all legitimate comments, it is doubtful whether any of the submissions would agree that decisions such as to proceed with a second Sydney airport site selection should be made in the absence of forecasts. Considerable uncertainty is attached to all forecasting, the uncertainty increasing with the forecast period and the degree of uncertainty attached to influencing factors. The Department of Aviation remains confident that its forecast range is reasonable for long term planning purposes. One of these submissions accepts that there is a need to reserve a second airport site.

Projected growth in international and trunk aircraft movements do not reflect historical trends

A number of submissions raised doubts about the credibility of forecasts which predict growth in international and domestic trunk aircraft movements, given that these sectors have shown negative or near zero growth over the past ten years (205.002, 264.003, 338.029, 362.003, 389.007 and 391.006).
The carriage of increased numbers of passengers with little or no growth in the number of aircraft movements has been achieved primarily by the introduction of larger aircraft.

The continued deployment of larger aircraft and direct routing is dependent on a complex interaction between city-pair passenger demand, fleet mix, route structure, frequency and commercial judgement. The forecasts used a scheduling model to determine a feasible solution with a constrained minimum cost for the entire network in introducing where possible increased numbers of smaller aircraft. This is reflected in the recently announced order for B737-300 aircraft by TAA to replace its ageing DC-9s and some larger 727s; Ansett has also announced the purchase of A320 (Airbus) aircraft comparable in size to the B727 and the purchase of new B737-300s to carry it into the 1990s. These developments reduce the emphasis on the larger aircraft types.

The limited competition from smaller operators such as East-West Airlines is currently focussed on the smaller aircraft types and this is anticipated to continue in the longer term.

One submission argued that this readjustment by the airlines is no more than a response to low utilization of large aircraft, which will simply be substituted for these smaller aircraft when growth increases again. In the longer term with continued passenger growth larger aircraft are anticipated to be substituted for smaller aircraft and this is embodied in the forecasts.

The forecasts indicated that, on balance, an increase rather than a continuing decrease in trunk (or interstate) aircraft movements is expected.

The zero or low growth in recent international aircraft movements is due primarily to the influence of the B747, with most airlines operating through Sydney moving up to that aircraft. These aircraft had a dramatic effect on international aviation, replacing, in a relatively short time, aircraft types of half to one-third their capacity. Airlines are currently attempting to match aircraft types with their route structures as a wider range of suitable aircraft becomes available. This is reflected in the introduction of smaller aircraft such as the B767ER recently acquired by Qantas and Air New Zealand for their short haul and low density routes while Qantas and Singapore Airlines are introducing the larger B747SUD with the stretched upper deck for long haul high density routes.

The forecast of increasing aircraft movements reflects the view that there will not be another dramatic change in aircraft size, but rather a more gradual growth in average aircraft size as reported in Table 1.4 and outlined on page 39 of the Draft EIS.

With the introduction of some new routes, and frequency increases on some existing routes, there are likely to be increases in international aircraft movements.

Airline activity in Australia is responsive to the general level of economic activity. It is interesting to note that for the year ending 30 June 1985, domestic airline aircraft movements (which do not include general aviation or commuters) grew by 3.5%; and the domestic airline passenger movements in the quarter ending 30 June 1985 exceeded those in the 30 June 1984 quarter by 9.3%.

**Trend line extrapolation not a sufficient method of forecasting**

This point was made in one submission (337.001).

Although the results are shown on a simple graph (Figure 1.1) in the Draft EIS, the Department of Aviation's forecasts in fact result from multiple regression statistical techniques and are not simple trend lines. This point is relevant in the following discussion.
Alternative assumptions should have been adopted

Submissions on this issue generally discussed one of the arguments set out below. However, two comments (338.089 and 385.001) were more general, briefly discussing some or all of these arguments, even including the control of growth at Kingsford-Smith Airport by introducing peak pricing (see Section 1.3 of the Draft EIS).

. Growth in general aviation and commuter traffic has been stimulated by:
   - the once only effect of intrastate airlines shedding low growth routes to commuters;
   - effective subsidy through low cost recovery (202.005, 233.026, 264.004 and 391.005);

. International traffic growth has a historical change in emphasis away from Sydney toward Melbourne;
   - and aircraft movements will be further reduced by triangulation (264.054 and 389.008)

. Progressive use of larger aircraft is not included in the forecasts (61.001, 233.027, 233.028, 340.007, 389.005);

. Alternative modes such as high speed rail not taken into account (222.010 and 289.002);

. Fuel and fare increases will reduce growth further 223.008 (proforma).

The regression analyses used in the forecasting isolate and take account of once only shifts in the pattern of airport use due for example to the transfer from intrastate airlines to commuters of some low density routes. This shift would therefore not incorrectly bias forward projections of commuter movements.

Alternative 'pricing' structures applicable to the use of Kingsford-Smith Airport would affect the forecasts. The extent of such effect is hard to predict and would depend very much on the type and application of pricing change. Several submissions claim that the general aviation and commuter growth foreshadowed in the forecasts is based on historical cost recovery practices, and if altered, these categories would have to pay more to use Kingsford-Smith Airport and their movement levels would be correspondingly less. These submissions quote or employ the Bosch Inquiry findings that only roughly 15% of the costs of general aviation and commuter operations at Kingsford-Smith Airport are recovered. It is also true, however, that Bosch found the method of allocating costs to this sector of the industry questionable, and recommended that this receive special attention. The Bosch findings are now being reviewed.

The Draft EIS makes it clear that the forecasts are based on the assumption that the present socio-economic and aviation industry environments persist, recognizing that significant changes to this environment would necessitate a review of the forecasts. General aviation and commuter operations are anticipated to be sensitive to pricing and any change in pricing policy could defer the time at which a second Sydney airport would be developed. However, protection of the site is required in the short term to assure its availability and remove constraints on development of other potential sites. Development of the selected site would be sensitive to the possibility of these changes and how they might affect the distribution of potential use of either the second Sydney airport or Kingsford-Smith Airport.

Although the Bureau of Transport Economics is quoted as having identified a historical trend of international patronage away from Sydney toward Melbourne, the reference is
to the consequences of Tullamarine opening, not to any change in the relative propensity for international travel to and from the two cities.

Triangulation was a term used for a suggested modification to the portion of international operations which entered Australia at Sydney, proceeded to Melbourne and returned to Sydney before departing from Australia (or vice versa). Triangulation required airlines to enter at Sydney and proceed to Melbourne and then depart from Australia without returning to Sydney.

Triangulation has not occurred to any significant degree due to its being unattractive from a marketing point of view. The more likely development is an increase in terminating flights at both Sydney and Melbourne. This development would be facilitated by the introduction of smaller aircraft such as the B767 and continued passenger growth. The impact of this development on peak period and annual aircraft movements is expected to be minimal.

Progressive use of larger aircraft is included in the forecasts as reported in Table 4.1; and as outlined on page 39, there are limits to the degree to which airlines can simply satisfy growth in passenger demand by continually increasing aircraft size.

The forecasts have examined historical trends and developments in airfares relative to other modes and general economic growth. These factors were projected into the future to determine future aviation demand. The forecasts took account of increasing fuel costs and subsequent changes in fares of competitive modes. Similarly the impact of the changing availability and quality of alternative modes was considered particularly in markets such as the Newcastle/Hunter Valley where rail electrification and road improvements have enhanced the competitive position of these modes with respect to air travel.

### 1.3 RUNWAY CAPACITY AT KINGFORD-SMITH AIRPORT

One hundred and eighty-five submissions including 124 proforma discussed issues related to Section 1.3 of the Draft EIS. Included in this group are a number of submissions which, while not specifically mentioning runway capacity at Kingsford-Smith Airport, questioned the need for a second Sydney airport. The main points raised related to:

- further capacity development at Kingsford-Smith is a better solution to Sydney's airport problems than a second airport;
- Kingsford-Smith should be extended before development takes place at a second airport;
- the Draft EIS has not adequately addressed capacity improvement options for Kingsford-Smith Airport, noise around Kingsford-Smith, or how a second airport would relieve Kingsford-Smith of its problems;
- claims that money would be better spent on other things;
- claims that the need for a second airport was purely a political not physical need.

**Kingsford-Smith Airport a better solution**

The greatest number of public submissions discussing, among other things, the capacity of Kingsford-Smith Airport argued that further development of Kingsford-Smith Airport
is a better option than a second airport. A variety of arguments were put, the main ones being:

- further runway development (or airport extension/expansion) was a more cost effective option than second Sydney airport development (1.003, 7.016, 7.017, 64.006, 68.003, 199.001, 202.006, 219.006, 253.003, 261.002, 331.008, 340.001, 340.010, 385.004, 389.014, 391.012, 398.004, 400.005, 452.003, 453.002 and 457.001);


- concern that alternative airport developments, particularly those considered in previous studies such as Major Airport Needs of Sydney, have not been discussed in detail in the Draft EIS. Some submissions conclude that widely spaced parallel runway development should proceed at Kingsford-Smith, and this would obviate the need for a second airport. Others criticized the lack of proof that a second airport would be required (250.017, 264.001, 328.002, 334.002 and 337.002).

It is important to emphasize the difference between the Government's long-term planning provision of a second airport site, and any commitment to a particular airport development strategy. As discussed in Section 1.3 of the Draft EIS the estimated capacity of Kingsford-Smith Airport with or without a closely spaced parallel runway is insufficient to accommodate forecast demand. If, as expected, capacity is reached, the Government has only two options: provide additional capacity at Kingsford-Smith Airport or exclude traffic growth in excess of capacity. Capacity increase by air traffic control improvements or modification of traffic profiles does not warrant detailed discussion. Air traffic control is already efficient within the prevailing operational standards. Potential changes in standards and air traffic control equipment and procedures are important and are under constant review, but they promise small rather than large changes in airport capacity.

Major capacity increase can only be achieved through the provision of additional runways. The Major Airport Needs of Sydney Study, as with studies before it, considered both closely spaced and widely spaced parallel runway options. The latter provide the greatest increase in capacity, but no study has yet concluded that a widely spaced parallel runway should be constructed at Kingsford-Smith Airport. One submission (7.016) proposed widely spaced runways on which all operations were over Botany Bay. Internationally accepted operating procedures dictate that airports cannot be run with simultaneous take-offs and landings in opposite directions, even on widely spaced parallel runways.

The exclusion of particular categories of traffic would mean that air transport growth in the Region was not being efficiently catered for, especially where there exists no alternative location for this growth to re-establish. The suppression of growth would mean that some groups in the community would be denied their choice of travel in preference to others, distorting the pattern of natural demand. The Regional Airlines Association, for example, oppose a pricing mechanism to regulate demand.

All these remain possibilities for Kingsford-Smith Airport. But good forward planning aims to provide future decision makers with choices and flexibility. The decision to select a site for a second airport represents a decision to provide now this opportunity for future flexibility. The site selection does not mean that any of the options discussed above are excluded. It does mean that when capacity is attained at Kingsford-Smith Airport there remains an alternative to sole reliance on Kingsford-Smith, should this prove socially undesirable.
Many submissions missed this point, attempting to demonstrate why further development at Kingsford-Smith was more cost effective than development of a second airport.

The site selection was judged necessary in the knowledge that except under very low or highly restrained growth, Kingsford-Smith would not have sufficient capacity to accommodate all future growth; and because of considerable doubt about the long term prospects for very extensive developments such as widely spaced parallel runway development or traffic exclusion practices, even though the latter may be necessary in the short term. These are ultimately matters of judgement rather than proof.

Five submissions agreed or accepted that Kingsford-Smith in all probability would not be capable of accommodating all future growth (16.003, 66.009, 308.002, 359.007 and 449.003).

Develop Kingsford-Smith Airport first

A number of submissions stressed or implied that Kingsford-Smith should be developed to its maximum potential before any development of a second airport took place (60.003, 196.007, 233.031, 264.005, 287.002, 294.003, 391.011, 396.019, 433.008, 457.002 and 457.023).

These submissions deliberately or unintentionally implied a preference for a development sequence rather than, as discussed above, a belief that Kingsford-Smith could be developed or modified to accommodate all future growth.

Draft EIS inadequate on Kingsford-Smith Airport

A number of submissions raised a criticism that the effects of aircraft operations at Kingsford-Smith had not been adequately addressed (223.010 (proforma), 253.004, 308.003, 338.031, 389.019, 391.002, 405.004, 432.032 and 459.028).

One or two submissions raised this point in opposition to any further development of Kingsford-Smith. Most, however, implied that the noise problem around Kingsford-Smith was the reason for the second airport site selection. Some of these proposed compensation and special land use reorganization and restriction as preferable to, and more effective in terms of total social costs than, second airport development.

Another point of view, raised by the Wollongong City Council, envisaged development of a second Sydney airport providing benefits in the form of noise relief for residents near Kingsford-Smith Airport.

Most of these submissions missed the point of Section 1.3 which was that the second airport is a necessary long term planning provision against the possibility of shortfall in capacity at Kingsford-Smith. There is no discussion in the Draft EIS of the second Sydney airport being used for noise relief at Kingsford-Smith. In fact the discussion through the relevant sections of the Draft EIS emphasizes the belief that Kingsford-Smith will remain the primary airport and will continue to be used for the foreseeable future to the limits of its capability.

Money better spent on other things

Two submissions (196.009 and 368.005) indicated that other things should have a higher priority for Government funds than airports. Issues mentioned were air and water pollution, social welfare and education.

The allocation of priorities in the spending of Government funds is a matter for Government decision as part of the annual budgetary process. The issues raised in the submissions are important social concerns and do receive large amounts of Government support. However, the Government also has a responsibility for aviation. Any money
spent on the acquisition of a site for a second airport would come from the Aviation vote and would not necessarily affect spending in other areas.

Political not physical need

Four submissions stated or implied that the decision to select and acquire a second airport site was a political rather than an economic or planning decision (1.017, 264.002, 328.026 and 399.004).

In response it can be said that all social and economic behaviour and enterprise both shape, and are undertaken within, the political economy in which economic decisions are taken in cognizance of social and political preferences. This may mean that all Government decisions are therefore political. It nevertheless does not affect the objective argument in favour of sensible long term planning provision for aviation growth in the Sydney region.

1.4 CAPACITY OF GENERAL AVIATION AERODROMES

Thirty submissions were received, including seven proforma submissions, addressing aspects related to Section 1.4 of the Draft EIS. These thirty submissions included thirty-six separate comments on general aviation traffic and facilities in the Sydney region.

The comments raised in the submissions can be categorized into four main issues. These are:

- removal of general aviation and commuter operations from Kingsford-Smith Airport;
- use of existing general aviation aerodromes;
- use of Department of Defence facilities;
- implications of second Sydney airport on general aviation industry and facilities.

These topics are discussed below.

Many of the issues raised in this section of the Draft EIS Supplement have been considered in the Sydney Region General Aviation Study, produced by consulting engineers Beca Orr Pty Ltd, for the Department of Aviation's NSW Region. The study report is expected to be released in the near future.

Removal of general aviation and commuter operations from Kingsford-Smith Airport

Eighteen of the submissions received, including seven proforma submissions, related to the increased capacity which could be achieved by relocating general aviation and commuter operations from Kingsford-Smith Airport. These submissions made thirteen separate comments (205.003, 223.011 (proforma), 241.004, 338.030, 340.005, 340.006, 342.017, 345.002, 361.029, 362.004, 385.002, 389.006 and 396.020).

These comments could be further categorized into the following issues:

- increase general aviation and commuter airport and airways charges;
- redirect general aviation and commuter operations to other airports, thus increasing airport capacity at Kingsford-Smith Airport.

Many of the comments in this category supported the view that general aviation operations receive a disproportionate subsidy compared to other users, which allows them to continue using Kingsford-Smith Airport economically.

The Government is currently reviewing its cost recovery policy following the completion of the Independent Inquiry into Aviation Cost Recovery. The Inquiry questioned the cost
allocation procedures used in the past including the implication that general aviation was heavily subsidized. The Inquiry recommendation that all aviation facilities be fully cost recoverable within ten years has been accepted in principle by the Government. The establishment of a new policy on cost recovery and the initial staged implementation of this policy should be achieved some time in 1986. It is also probable that as aircraft traffic increases in the future, and the airport capacity becomes constrained, a rationalization in airport charges will be undertaken to optimize the use of the available facilities at that time. This issue is discussed in detail in Section 1.3 of the Draft EIS.

It is true that if general aviation and commuter operations were transferred from Kingsford-Smith Airport to other airports, greater passenger volumes could be achieved at Kingsford-Smith Airport. Two other issues must however be considered in conjunction with this argument. If greater passenger flows are achieved, larger ground facilities such as terminal buildings must be established. Kingsford-Smith Airport has a shortage of land available for these facilities, and therefore rationalization of the numbers of small planes using Kingsford-Smith Airport is only one aspect of the overall capacity considerations at Kingsford-Smith Airport. The second issue is the need to maintain viable regional airline services. Many rural communities are serviced by commuter operators who interline with other, particularly interstate, airline services. If these operators were relocated to another airport, the convenience and perhaps the viability of these services could be lost.

Use of existing general aviation airports

Thirteen of the submissions received related to the possible use of existing general aviation airports as an alternative to the establishment of a second Sydney airport, and the possible effects on existing general aviation airports from the second Sydney airport. These submissions made thirteen separate comments (57.005, 108.002, 195.006, 202.008, 295.001, 334.004, 336.004, 337.004, 361.026, 361.042, 385.005, 426.003 and 453.007).

These comments could be further categorized into the following issues:

1. use existing general aviation airports as an alternative to a second Sydney airport;
2. location of existing general aviation airports in the Sydney region and the need for more general aviation airports in the Sydney region;
3. effects of the second Sydney airport proposal on operations at Bankstown.

The question of using existing general aviation airports as an alternative to the establishment of a second Sydney airport is primarily dependent on the type of air traffic that the second Sydney airport will be required to accommodate. The present general aviation airports in the Sydney region (with the exception of Kingsford-Smith Airport) are essentially limited to aircraft which weigh less than 5,700 kg. The aircraft forecast figures detailed in Section 1.2 of the Draft EIS indicate that a second Sydney airport will probably be required to accommodate jet aircraft in the future. Without substantial expansion and upgrading works and possible aircraft noise and land acquisition implications, the present general aviation airports would not be available for large jet aircraft traffic. None of the existing airports met the site selection criteria discussed in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS.

One submission questioned why many of the general aviation airports in the Sydney region were located in the west and none in the south near Wilton. There are in fact small airfields which service the particular general aviation needs in the southern areas near Wilton. The southern regional general aviation demand is at present being largely met by Camden aerodrome. If Wilton were to be chosen as the second Sydney airport site, Camden would probably remain the principal general aviation facility in the area for the foreseeable future.
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A related question raised in another submission was the need for a further general aviation airport to be established in the Sydney region. If current general aviation airports are redeveloped in the future and/or the capacity of Schofields airport is increased by allowing increased use by general aviation operators, it is unlikely that a new general aviation airport in the Sydney region would be needed until well into the next century. This issue is discussed in more detail in the Sydney Region General Aviation Study Report.

The effects of the second Sydney airport proposal on Bankstown were also raised in several of the submissions. The daily traffic flows at Bankstown are currently higher than those at Kingsford-Smith Airport. This is achieved by the use of operating procedures at Bankstown which do not require controlled separation between aircraft. Bankstown also has a parallel runway system which increases traffic flows. If commuter and heavy general aviation operations from Kingsford-Smith Airport were introduced into Bankstown, the overall capacity of the airport would fall dramatically because of the need to introduce controlled separation. This reduction in capacity would produce a cascade effect in which existing users of Bankstown would be forced to relocate to other airports.

**Use of Department of Defence aerodromes**

Six of the submissions received related to the possible use of Department of Defence airport facilities which exist within the Sydney region. These submissions made six separate comments (108.003, 195.006, 202.008, 348.001, 361.030 and 422.017).

All the comments on this topic referred to the possible use of Department of Defence airports and facilities as an alternative to a second Sydney airport or the effects of increased use of these airports.

Currently, the Department of Defence has advised that, with the exception of Schofields, all their airport facilities within the Sydney region and the Holsworthy Army Base are heavily committed and will not be available in the foreseeable future for any form of civil aircraft use. Furthermore, none of these sites met the selection criteria of Chapter 4. The possible use of Schofields is a matter for negotiation, particularly with respect to the possible noise problem associated with the HMAS Nirimba apprentice training school and the need to use Richmond airport restricted airspace. The use of Schofields for general aviation operations has been considered in detail in the Sydney Region General Aviation Study.

**Implications of a second Sydney airport on the general aviation industry and facilities**

The submission of the General Aviation Association made four separate comments on the possible implications of a second Sydney airport on the general aviation industry and facilities within the Sydney region (396.003, 396.011, 396.017 and 396.018). These can be reduced to three issues:

- there is no current demand to develop a second Sydney airport as a general aviation aerodrome;
- a general aviation aerodrome on a second Sydney airport site would have major cost recovery implications for the general aviation industry;
- airspace restrictions would have a major impact on general aviation in the Sydney region with the development of a second Sydney airport.

The submission argued that there was no current demand to develop a general aviation aerodrome at the second Sydney airport site, and that the establishment of a close spaced parallel runway at Kingsford-Smith Airport would ensure adequate capacity for the Sydney region until at least 1995. This statement may be correct but if additional
runway capacity is not developed at Kingsford-Smith Airport and a need arises for additional general aviation facilities, this could be met by the development of a general aviation aerodrome at the selected second Sydney airport site. Such a strategy is not however, an essential part of the second Sydney airport planning which at this stage is aimed solely at the selection and acquisition of a site against a probable future need.

The second issue relates to the cost recovery implications for the general aviation industry of the establishment of a general aviation facility on the second Sydney airport site. As mentioned previously the Department is developing a new policy on cost recovery based on the recommendations of the Independent Inquiry into Aviation Cost Recovery. Any decision to develop a general aviation facility on the second Sydney airport site would take into account the cost recovery implications.

The final issue concerned the impacts on general aviation of the proposed airspace associated with the development of a second Sydney airport in the Sydney region. This issue has been dealt with in the response to submissions related to Section 8.6 of the Draft EIS.

1.5 LOSS OF OPPORTUNITY TO RESERVE A SITE

Eight submissions were received relating to Section 1.5 of the Draft EIS. This section of the Draft EIS argues that, because of the outward expansion of the city, consideration must be given in the site selection process to the time at which the opportunity to reserve a second airport site would be forgone.

In this context, three submissions (comments 7.002, 274.117 and 366.005) agreed with the wisdom of acquiring land for a future airport and that finalizing a site would release up to 300 km² of metropolitan land affected by uncertainty surrounding the airport selection process.

The remaining five submissions (340.009, 361.027, 450.005, 452.004 and 453.003) argued that the expansion of Kingsford-Smith or other Sydney based airports was the most cost effective option (see Section 1.3 above for discussion on the issue of the expansion of Kingsford-Smith Airport).

1.6 CONSEQUENCES OF NO ACTION, DEFERRAL OR ABANDONMENT

Four submissions were received which related to the long term effects of a second Sydney airport development on the community and the environment.

Long term effects

Three submissions (253.002, 328.025 and 391.003) were concerned with the long term costs to the community of the development of a second airport.

The aim of the present programme is the selection and acquisition of a site. The need for such action is discussed under Section 1.3. Selection and acquisition would not of itself entail very considerable long term costs (relative to airport development costs generally). The appropriate time for the consideration of such costs would be prior to any decision to commence construction of a second Sydney airport. Detailed investigation would presumably be made at that time of the effects of a range of development strategies. The importance of site acquisition is that it preserves the option of developing a second airport if it is determined that that is the most advantageous strategy to adopt.

One submission (359.003) claimed that insufficient attention has been paid to the environmental impact associated with increasing use of Kingsford-Smith Airport.
Again, such examination is more appropriate to a study of the most desirable development strategies for both Kingsford-Smith and second Sydney airports rather than to a site selection study.
CHAPTER 2
ROLE AND NATURE OF A SECOND AIRPORT

2.1 ROLE OF SECOND AIRPORT

Eighteen submissions commented on the role of the second airport. The comments were divided as follows:

- claims that second airports do not work;
- criticisms and suggestions on the role of a second Sydney airport;
- effect on tourism;
- effects on residents around Kingsford-Smith Airport.

These are discussed below.

Second airports do not work

Six submissions (205.028, 233.033, 264.006, 319.006, 328.017 and 334.007) claimed that overseas experience shows that second airports are generally underutilized and particularly so if remote from the city they serve.

It is undoubtedly true that some second airports overseas have been less successful in attracting patronage than their planners had hoped. However, Table 2.3 of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement lists nine cities which have two or three major airports in which the second airports carry substantial amounts of traffic. In some cities second airports operate very successfully and are in fact essential to the provision of satisfactory services. To claim that second airports do not work is far too general a statement.

What can be learned from overseas is that some second airports, although not attracting the expected traffic levels, nevertheless make a very useful contribution to the airport system in the metropolitan centre they serve. It is therefore only true to say a second airport is underutilized if its traffic is less than some predetermined traffic levels. Should the airport reach 2 million annual passengers it may, by some criteria, be considered underutilized; nevertheless it would be as well used as Adelaide or Perth is today. What is important is that without a second airport, major metropolitan centres with congested airport facilities have limited prospects of providing a full range of future air transport opportunities.

If long range planning indicates that a second airport is likely to be required eventually, it is essential that the site be chosen and acquired as early as possible so that both airport planning and regional planning can proceed without undue uncertainty.

The role of a second Sydney airport

Eight submissions (229.004, 233.021, 243.003, 274.038, 338.033, 396.002, 433.004 and 449.004) were critical of the lack of specific role definition. One suggested a second Sydney airport would be limited to, or would never grow beyond, a general aviation facility and one went so far as to suggest it could never be more than an emergency field. Many made specific suggestions about what role the airport might play.
The fact is that any second airport would serve a supplementary role to Kingsford-Smith Airport. This has been made clear in ministerial statements affirming that Kingsford-Smith Airport will remain the dominant airport for the foreseeable future. This is also the lesson learned from overseas, where in many instances the second airport is not fulfilling the specific role which was intended of it. The exact nature of its role will be characterized by the type of traffic it accommodates when compared with Kingsford-Smith Airport. The Draft EIS makes this comparison for overseas airports and predicts a likely outcome for Sydney. This indicates that a second airport may have to accommodate the full range of aircraft types. To follow the suggestion that only a small general aviation airport should be reserved would mean prescribing the role of a second Sydney airport whether that was best for Sydney or not. No other choices would be possible.

Two submissions suggested that with a reduced role for a second Sydney airport a smaller site would have been required enabling a location closer to Sydney to be selected.

There are two aspects to this suggestion. Firstly, although (or because) the role cannot be defined with certainty at the present time the Department believes it would be most unwise to exclude the possibility of second Sydney airport ever being used by large long range aircraft. This leads to the requirement for at least one long runway and for large manoeuvring areas with the consequent need for a relatively large site.

Secondly, the suggestion that a smaller site would mean a close site is based, at least in part, on a fallacy. Although it is desirable from a passenger access point of view for a second airport to be close as possible to the central business district it is unlikely that a site for anything larger than a general aviation aerodrome could be found closer to the central business district than Badgerys Creek.

Good planning has dictated the course adopted by the Government: that a site be reserved which is capable of being developed to provide a wide range of roles, all supplementary to Kingsford-Smith Airport.

Tourism

Three submissions (comments 342.015, 374.004 and 432.026) argued that tourism in the region would benefit from an international airport located there while one, comment 361.041, felt better promotion would be of more benefit to tourism than an airport. However, considerations of local significance such as this are not likely to exert a strong influence on the final role of the airport.

Effect on residents near Kingsford-Smith Airport

One submission (461.003) commented on the fact that the second airport's supplementary role promised little relief to Kingsford-Smith Airport residents. It should be stated that a second Sydney airport site selection was not promoted as a plan to reduce air traffic levels at Kingsford-Smith Airport but as provision against the shortfall of capacity at Kingsford-Smith. In doing so, however, it does provide an alternative to long term sole reliance on Kingsford-Smith Airport and therefore an alternative against which to compare any future proposals for Kingsford-Smith.

2.2 SIZE OF SECOND AIRPORT

No submission received commented on this section.

2.3 TRAFFIC SPECIALIZATION

No submissions received commented on this section.
2.4 DISTRIBUTION OF TRAFFIC

Twenty-one submissions including fifteen proformas discussed the distribution of traffic between the two airports. The comments were of three types:

- the role of Kingsford-Smith Airport;
- the reluctance of airlines to move to a second Sydney airport;
- the difficulties of interlining between airports. (This subject is also dealt with under 10.4 and 15.4 Access.)

Role of Kingsford-Smith Airport

Three comments (336.002, 359.005 and 391.007) were related to the role of Kingsford-Smith Airport. One submission claimed that the Draft EIS failed to take into account the role of Kingsford-Smith Airport as a major international airport, one was opposed to any role for Kingsford-Smith Airport which permitted increased use, and one suggested that as there is a low level of cost recovery for general aviation it should not be allowed to operate from Kingsford-Smith Airport.

The Draft EIS states that Kingsford-Smith Airport 'will be maintained at least at its present level of runway capacity' and indicates that it is expected to remain the major international gateway. The question of access to Kingsford-Smith Airport by general aviation is addressed in Section 1.2.

Reluctance of airlines to move

Nine submissions, (223.007 (proforma), 328.012, 362.020, 362.022) highlighted the reluctance of established airlines to duplicate their facilities at a second airport, one claiming that this point was overlooked in the Draft EIS.

This point is recognized in the Draft EIS which states (page 63) that 'the alternative option for the airlines of relocating to a second airport is not realistic in the face of their established market and competitive relationships'. The point being overlooked in these submissions is that in the second Sydney airport airlines which cannot gain access to, or are displaced from, a congested Kingsford-Smith Airport have an alternative location at which to develop. Although this may not be their first preference, it may be preferable to the other alternative of no longer operating through Sydney at all. This has been demonstrated overseas where airlines do operate from second airports and in many cases the same airlines operate at both airports.

Interlining

Comments 1.005 and 271.007 (proforma) are dealt with here because they seemed to imply that international services would be at one airport with domestic at the other and therefore considerable inter-airport traffic would be generated. A number of other submissions also dealt with the interlining question and these are discussed in Sections 10.4 and 15.4 of the Draft EIS.

The likely distribution of traffic is discussed in Section 2.4 of the Draft EIS.

As the airlines are well aware of the reluctance of passengers to transfer between airports it can be expected that schedules would be arranged in order to minimize such transfers. Initially, flights operating from a second Sydney airport would probably be those with a small proportion of transfer passengers. Later, when movement levels had grown, reasonable connections would be possible at a second Sydney airport.
2.5 TIMING AND LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT OF SECOND SYDNEY AIRPORT

Nine submissions raised the issue of the timing of development of a second Sydney airport. These were grouped under three headings:

- When will construction commence?
- How long until it is operating at capacity?
- Cost recovery.

Construction timing

Six submissions commented on the timing of construction (65.025, 205.029, 319.005, 338.090, 359.002 and 376.011). One submission made the point that although some of the uncertainty surrounding a second Sydney airport will be resolved by selection of a site, for the residents of the chosen area the uncertainty of timing will remain.

One submission requested priority funding for the second Sydney airport to permit an immediate start on construction, one pointed out that the timing of development would be likely to depend on the choice of site, with a more distant and hence less attractive site developed later, and another claimed that if Wilton were chosen the second Sydney airport would never be built.

There has been no Government decision on major airport developments in Sydney. Based on the Department of Aviation's forecasts of demand and capacity and assuming unchanged policies on Kingsford-Smith Airport access and development it appears that a second Sydney airport could be required before the end of the century. Given an immediate start, it could not be operating for major traffic much before 1995. The Draft EIS recognizes that the timing of construction would probably be later for a more distant site.

Growth of traffic at a second Sydney airport

Two submissions (comments 246.012 and 361.019) related to this issue. One submission stated that Wilton would not attract patronage for a long time, a claim supported by the Draft EIS (page 65). The other comment referred to the time it might take before the airport was operating at full capacity.

It is important to recognize the difference between the expected future of the proposal and its possible future for planning purposes. The Draft EIS states (page 64) that the level of traffic at the second Sydney airport would initially be fairly low, possibly between 2 and 5 million passengers per annum. It would also be expected to grow slowly. However, for the purposes of planning the facilities required and hence the amount of land to be acquired and for assessment of the 'worst case' environment impact, a figure of 13 million passengers per annum was chosen.

This does not mean that the Department of Aviation expects the airport necessarily to reach this level of operations. On the contrary, this figure was chosen for the 'worst case' because it was considered most unlikely to be exceeded.

Cost recovery

One submission, comment 433.009, pointed out the difficulty for the airlines if they were to be charged interest on the cost of acquiring the site.

This is a matter for determination by the Government. Cost recovery, as it relates to the general aviation industry is discussed in Section 1.4 of this Supplement.
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CHAPTER 3
POSSIBLE SITE LOCATIONS

3.1 PREVIOUS STUDIES

Eleven submissions raised issues which can be divided into the following:

- claims that the present study ignores the findings of previous work;
- alleged discrepancies between the sites considered in this and previous studies;
- a reference to the third London airport.

Findings of previous studies

Seven submissions raised seven comments (236.003, 325.012, 328.001, 340.002, 389.017, 391.004 and 428.002) relating to the results of previous studies.

These submissions claimed that previous studies had recommended development of Kingsford-Smith Airport and that the present programme had ignored this. One submission conceded that the Major Airport Needs of Sydney Study had also recommended the reservation of a site at Badgerys Creek.

Some previous studies have recommended the development of a close spaced parallel runway at Kingsford-Smith Airport. However, most have recognized that this may well be only a stop-gap measure. For example, the Joint Committee Planning Sydney Airport stated in 1973 that 'it would be unlikely that a second airport would be necessary prior to 1990'. In 1979 the Commonwealth members of the Major Airport Needs of Sydney Committee recommended that in addition to the construction of a close spaced runway at Kingsford-Smith Airport 'a contingent site for a curfew-free major airport ... should be protected'.

There are uncertainties associated with the prospect of further development of Kingsford-Smith Airport, and the selection and acquisition of a site for a second airport represents prudent planning which would enable Sydney to preserve the option of constructing a second airport if and when this becomes desirable. It is not inconsistent with the findings of previous studies.

Discrepancies in the sites considered

Four comments (7.009, 362.012, 385.008 and 399.005) related to apparent discrepancies between sites considered in this study and previous studies.

One submission, that of the Horsley Park Protection Co-operative, suggested that no indication had been given that the Badgerys Creek area would be shared with an airport. However, the same submission conceded that for the past eight years the Co-operative has been basically concerned with questions relating to Sydney Airport.

The Badgerys Creek area was one of the options considered during the Major Airport Needs of Sydney Study as the site for a major second airport. In 1977-78 an intensive public information programme was undertaken to ensure that the residents of Sydney were aware of the proposals under consideration.
In fact the possibility of aviation activity in the area has been public knowledge since at least 1968 when the Sydney Region Outline Plan showed a possible future airfield in the area.

One submission asked why Wilton was not considered in earlier studies and one claimed that Wilton had previously been rejected on environmental grounds, implying that it should therefore not have been included in the present programme.

The Wilton site was on List A of the Benefit/Cost Study referred to on page 70 of the Draft EIS. In that study sites were eliminated by a system of pair-wise comparisons and Wilton was eliminated, largely on cost, not environmental grounds, in favour of Holsworthy. In the present study all sites were re-examined and the list for detailed comparison drawn up as stated in the Draft EIS.

Third London airport

One submission comment (233.023) stated that the Draft EIS should have included some discussion of the search for a third London airport.

The third London airport study was examined as a guide to the conduct of this study but it was not considered relevant for the Draft EIS.

3.2 REPORT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AT SYDNEY (1946)

See Section 3.1 for responses to comments relating to this section of the Draft EIS.

3.3. MAJOR AIRPORT REQUIREMENTS FOR SYDNEY STUDY

See Section 3.1 for responses to comments relating to this section of the Draft EIS.

3.4 BENEFIT/COST STUDY OF ALTERNATIVE AIRPORT PROPOSALS FOR SYDNEY (1969-70)

See Section 3.1 for responses to comments relating to this section of the Draft EIS.

3.5 THE MAJOR AIRPORT NEEDS OF SYDNEY STUDY

See Section 3.1 for responses to comments relating to this section of the Draft EIS.

3.6 SITE SELECTION PROGRAMME

Fourteen submissions raised issues related to the conduct of the study and the criteria by which sites were included for detailed examination. These can be divided into four issues:

- Criticism of the initial grid used to examine the region;
- Suggestions of other sites which should have been included in the study;
- Comments on the 'no national park' criterion and the relationship between national parks and water catchments;
Criticism of grid

The submission from Goulburn City Council made a number of comments (459.018, 459.019, 459.023 and 459.025) regarding the 80 km radius from Sydney, the choice of 9 km as the size of the grid squares and the terrain clearance limitations.

The 80km circle has no particular significance. All areas within this distance and some outside it were examined. The circle was drawn on the map merely to indicate that all the sites listed (except Goulburn) fell within this distance. The Goulburn site was included on the list as representative of all sites outside 80 km.

The programme included an examination of all sites in the Sydney region and, as much valuable information was available from previous studies, the work was facilitated by using the same grid of squares as had been used in both the Benefit/Cost Study (1971-1974) and the Major Airport Needs of Sydney Study (1977-79). A 9 km square is a convenient size for use in seeking sites for a large airport and the fact that potential sites frequently straddle more than one square does not affect the validity of the method.

As noted on Figure 3.2 of the Draft EIS some squares were eliminated on more than one criterion, only the principal one being shown on the map. For example, most of the squares shown as national park could equally have been eliminated for some other reason.

The selection criteria used at this early stage of the study were preliminary only. They were used as guides and not rigidly applied. That is, if a site failed on only one criterion it was not immediately excluded.

Other sites which should have been included

Eight submissions made nine comments (201.004, 202.007, 233.032, 308.001, 324.005, 329.008, 342.019, 342.018 and 361.043) regarding other sites. Holsworthy, Richmond, Schofields, Towra Point, 'off-shore' and Wattamolla were suggested as locations which had not been adequately considered.

Holsworthy was included in the study and the reasons for its elimination are documented in Chapter 6 of the Draft EIS.

Richmond was examined in considerable detail before it was excluded from the list. Establishment of the second Sydney airport there would have required a considerable expansion of the existing RAAF aerodrome and the location was excluded on the grounds of the number of people disturbed, noise, cost and terrain clearance. (Different obstacle clearance criteria apply to civil and military aircraft. Many airline services would be unable to operate from the existing runway at Richmond).

References to Schofields and other general aviation aerodromes are dealt with under Section 1.4 of the Draft EIS.

Prior to the commencement of the Major Airport Needs of Sydney Study the Towra Point area was designated as a Nature Reserve and it was agreed by both the Commonwealth and NSW Governments that it be excluded from further consideration as a possible airport site.

As noted in Section 3.3 of the Draft EIS, a number of off-shore sites near Sydney were studied in the Benefit/Cost Study conducted between 1971 and 1974. These included both deep water and shallow water sites. All were eliminated, largely on the basis of excessive cost. Changes in cost structures during the intervening years have been insufficient to throw doubt on the validity of these findings and consequently, no off-shore sites were included in the present programme.
Wattamolla was excluded as the site is entirely within the Royal National Park; Australia's oldest and most intensively used national park.

The 'no national park' criterion

Nine submissions made eleven comments (69.004, 205.020, 233.009, 329.008, 338.005, 338.072, 340.033, 342.020, 342.022, 361.007 and 385.010) relating to the criteria used in eliminating areas for consideration as an airport site. Most of these submissions claimed that because people have been excluded from the water catchment area, the Wilton site is largely undisturbed, of high ecological value and constitutes a de facto national park. They argue that the 'no national park' criterion should be read to include 'no catchment area'.

This argument overlooks the fact that national parks and water catchment areas are dedicated for quite different and to some extent conflicting purposes. National parks are proclaimed not only for the conservation of natural resources but also for the recreation and enjoyment of the public. In water catchment areas on the other hand, the aim is to preserve the quantity and quality of drinking water available and the conservation of nature is incidental to this purpose. Catchment areas are therefore de facto nature conservation areas but not de facto national parks.

The Draft EIS recognises the high ecological value of the Wilton site and treats this in some detail. Indeed a number of submissions have claimed that it pays too much attention to flora and fauna at the expense of social issues.

The Draft EIS also acknowledges the problem presented by the airport in the maintenance of water quality and the proponent has taken pains to show that this can be overcome.

Two submissions claimed that national parks are areas suitable for the siting of an airport where it would not affect people. An airport would constitute an incompatible land use within a national park and would require revocation of part of the park. Such revocation would require an Act of the NSW Parliament. It was judged unlikely that revocation for airport purposes would be acceptable to Governments or the community in general, and national parks were therefore excluded.

National Conservation Strategy

One submission (comment 338.065) claimed a proposal to site an airport at Wilton would run counter to the National Conservation Strategy, which has been adopted by both the Commonwealth and NSW Governments.

The Strategy recognizes that living resource conservation and sustainable development are interdependent and that some modification of the biosphere is necessary to satisfy human needs and improve the quality of human life. The Draft EIS documents the impacts of the proposal on the biosphere. Whether these impacts are considered excessive in relation to the potential benefits is a matter for Government decision.

3.7 PROGRESSIVE LOSS OF POTENTIAL SECOND AIRPORT SITES

This section of the Draft EIS concluded discussion on the history of the selection of second airport sites in Sydney and illustrated that closer sites were being progressively lost to urban development with the remaining candidate sites being necessarily located at a greater distance from the city centre.

One hundred and twenty submissions (117 of which were proformas) were received with comments relating to this section of the Draft EIS. Comment 8.002 (proforma) accepted
the need for selection of a site for a second Sydney airport. The remaining three comments were:

- why has development around possible sites been permitted (368.004)?
- the decision is fifteen years too late (460.005);
- Wilton would be the world’s most remote airport - not viable on international experience (338.038).

With reference to past development being permitted around possible sites it can be imagined that in the absence of a decision on a site there would have been immense practical difficulties inherent in any decision by the NSW Government to limit development around the eighteen metropolitan sites which have been candidates at one time or another in the past sixteen years (see Figure 3.1 in the Draft EIS). Subsequent to the short-listing of Badgerys Creek and Wilton, directions were issued by the NSW Minister for Planning and Environment to ensure that matters contained in the Draft EIS would be taken into account in determining development applications. This is an interim measure and will be reviewed when a decision is made on the site selected for an airport.

Had a decision been taken on a site fifteen years earlier, the uncertainty and controversy associated with subsequent attempts to select a site would have been avoided.

By comparison with international examples Wilton, if selected as the second airport site, would be further from the centre of the city it served. The Draft EIS acknowledges that because of this distance, the choice of Wilton would necessarily imply acceptance of some constraints on its role and manner of development (page 546). In comparison to less distant sites, Wilton’s role would be more restricted to serving:

- those travellers most willing to trade increased access time for lower air fares (mainly leisure travellers);
- those least disadvantaged by the remote location (mainly visitors to, and residents living in, the south of the city).

It follows from these constraints that the time at which development of a second Sydney airport at Wilton would become viable would be later than for a closer site.
CHAPTER 4
SITE SELECTION METHODOLOGY

4.1 APPROACH TO THE SITE SELECTION TASK

Three submissions made two comments on the methodology used to select Wilton and Badgerys Creek for detailed evaluation and comparison in the Draft EIS. One of these comments (449.005) agreed with the methodology used in selecting the final two sites. Another comment (274.013) was prescriptive, recommending that additional regional planning be undertaken and that new planning schemes for (the) airport surrounds take into account the number of existing buildings and the impact of prohibiting certain types of new buildings, (further discussion on this category of comment can be found in Sections 9.2 and 14.2).

A further submission (comment 340.034) criticized the site selection methodology on the basis that 'even the squares (presumably the 9 km x 9 km grid squares on Figure 3.2, page 74 of the Draft EIS) considered for study exclude this area (Wilton), yet it managed to be included'.

The grid square for Wilton from Figure 3.2 is accurately transposed to Figure 5.9, page 116, at a scale of 1:100,000. The Wilton sites used for short-listing and the more detailed evaluation in Part C of the Draft EIS fall within this grid square. The criteria used for selecting the Wilton grid square initially are clearly stated on page 74 of the Draft EIS.

4.2 AIRCRAFT TYPE MIX AND AIRPORT LAYOUT

One submission (comment 459.014) claimed that the document does not state a minimum area required for a location to be considered as a second airport site. The dimensional criteria for selection of candidate locations are stated on Page 74 of the Draft EIS and approximate land areas are given for different airport layout types in Table 4.2, page 80.

4.3 SELECTION OF AN AIRPORT LAYOUT AND OF A WORST CASE

Comment 202.004 questions the relevance of the site selection criteria in the light of recent low growth rates. Growth in air traffic was not considered in relation to the selection of criteria for evaluation of the ten sites. However, the possibility of a relatively low level of development at the second airport (5 million annual passenger movements) was considered in the site selection methodology (see pages 151 and 152 of the Draft EIS).

Comment 274.012 states that the selection data should have been based on the 20 ANEF and not the 25 ANEF contour. To have done this would have been inconsistent with the Department's land use compatibility advice for areas in the vicinity of Australian airports (see Table C1 page 581 of the Draft EIS). However, the site selection methodology recognized the risk in underestimating noise impacts at the selection stage by:

- evaluating sites under a 'worst case' of 25 million annual passenger movements (see page 82 of the Draft EIS);
introducing a selection criterion (No. 12, page 87 in the Draft EIS) which allowed for greater intensity of residential development within the noise contour than would otherwise be supposed from consideration of existing development and that permitted under current zoning.

Comment 459.031 queried the choice of eleven to twelve million passengers per annum as the limit for Kingsford-Smith Airport.

While it is quite possible that Kingsford-Smith Airport may be developed to handle more passengers than this, for the purposes of a worst case (that is, a maximum likely throughput) for the second airport it is necessary to assume a conservative limit for Kingsford-Smith. Eleven to twelve million passengers per annum was considered a conservative but not unreasonable figure.

4.4 SITE SELECTION FACTORS

Three submissions made comments which were critical of the site selection methodology. These comments questioned aspects of the site selection criteria as follows:

- the criteria were very, 'questionable' and in particular Wilton should have been excluded on all twenty-five criteria (385.007 and 457.008);
- the site ranking matrix does not cover all the variables (337.006).

The Draft EIS notes that there is no commonly accepted list of appropriate factors to be considered in airport site evaluation and, while some factors are common to a number of studies, local conditions and perceptions of issues are the principal basis for determining selection criteria (page 84). The Draft EIS explains how the four factors were arrived at, and the basis for selection of the twenty-five sub-factors (pages 86-88).

The submissions are not specific as to which criteria should be deleted or which should be added to the Department of Aviation's list. Comment 385.007 questions the identification of five of the sub-factors as 'more important'. The basis for the selection of these five sub-factors lies in the review of international experience and surveys by the Department (see page 127 and Table 6.21, page 147).

4.5 DATA EVALUATION METHODS

Two submissions were critical of procedural aspects of the site selection methodology. Comment 338.006 stated that the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board was not approached before September 1984. This is incorrect: officers of the Department of Aviation and the Board met in February and March 1984 and representatives of Kinhill Stearns and the Board met on 10 August 1984. Subsequently, the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board provided Kinhill Stearns with cost data for use in the site selection process (see page 118 of the Draft EIS).

Comment 338.071 claims that there was no report and almost no sitework at Wilton before the Minister's announcement. The site selection exercise was undertaken with all specialist reports to hand. The selection exercise involved representatives of the Department, the Consultant and officers of the NSW Government. In their final consideration of the data, within the framework of the methodology described in Chapters 4 and 6 of the Draft EIS, the Department and its Consultant were in full agreement on the short-listing of Badgerys Creek and Wilton. The Consultant's recommendation was conveyed to the Department by memorandum on 23 August 1984. The Consultant's recommendation, as conveyed in the memorandum, is set out on page 154 of the Draft EIS.
Subsequent to the provision of a recommendation the Consultant documented the site selection process and results in detail. This documentation forms Chapters 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Draft EIS.

The data collection methods used in the site selection process are set out on pages 93 and 94 of the Draft EIS. Field work was undertaken wherever possible and relevant; otherwise desk research was used. Airport planning consultants visited the site throughout July, August and September 1984, and the fauna and flora field studies were commenced at the beginning of August, 1984.

Some environmental studies did not require field inspections at the site ranking stage of the study. These included the anthropological, archaeological, European heritage and agricultural studies. These studies utilized materials such as heritage and archaeological registers, maps and aerial photographs, and contact with appropriate local groups such as the Local Aboriginal Land Councils, heritage groups, the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board and other appropriate contacts.

However, the Draft EIS recognized that the level of detail in data collected at the site selection stage differed from that subsequently collected for the evaluation of Wilton and Badgerys Creek (see last paragraph on page 94 of the Draft EIS).
CHAPTER 5
SITE CHARACTERISTICS

5.1 DESIGN PARAMETERS AND DATA COLLECTION

One submission was received that made three separate comments, (459.015, 459.022 and 459.026), relating to the characteristics of alternative sites discussed in Section 5.1 of the Draft EIS. These comments raised three issues:

- minimum area for second Sydney airport site;
- runway layouts;
- types of cut and fill material.

These issues are discussed below.

Minimum area for second Sydney airport site

One comment (459.015) stated that the Draft EIS does not specify the minimum suitable land area required for a location to be considered as a potential second airport site.

Although a minimum area is not given in Section 5.1, which discusses design parameters, the minimum land area required for the closely spaced parallel runway and widely spaced parallel runway layouts is given in Table 8.3 of the Draft EIS. The notional site boundary and preliminary master plan for environmental assessment at each location was based on the widely spaced parallel runway layout.

Passenger movement capacities and land requirements for other runway layouts considered during the course of the study are also given in Section 4.2 of the Draft EIS.

Runway layouts

Two comments (459.022 and 459.026) queried the process of selecting runway layouts for consideration.

Layouts considered are illustrated in Figure 4.1 of the Draft EIS. The four layouts considered constitute a progression from the simplest, relatively low capacity layout, that is a single runway with a cross wind runway, to the double widely spaced parallel runways with cross wind runways. The last provides about four times the capacity of the single runway layout.

Types of cut-and-fill material

One comment (459.022) suggested that details of the types of cut and fill material at each site should have been given in the Draft EIS.

Calculations of the volume of cut and fill were made for the ranking of each of the ten nominated locations. With the exception of Holsworthy, all sites were able to provide the required quantities for a 'balanced' cut/fill. Some 50 to 70 million cubic metres of borrow would be needed to prepare the Holsworthy site for airport development. No special provision was made for obtaining this material. Further volume and area calculations were made for the two short-listed sites at Wilton and Badgerys Creek, and the information is presented in tabular, cross sectional and site plan form in Tables...
10.1.6 and 15.1.6 and Figures 10.1.7 and 15.1.8. The bedrock geology and soils of each short listed site, which would constitute the cut and fill material in each location, are also considered in Sections 10.1 and 15.1 of the Draft EIS. The geology and soils of each of the ten nominated locations is also discussed in Chapter 5 of the Draft EIS.

5.2 CLOSER SITES

No submission commented on this section of the Draft EIS.

5.3 MID DISTANCE SITES

Two submissions were received that related to the assessment of characteristics of the mid-distance sites made in Section 5.3 of the Draft EIS. These submissions made two separate comments, raising two issues relating to the proposed Wilton site:

- timing of subconsultant's visits;
- location of proposed site.

Timing of subconsultant visits

One submission (comment 205.005) stated that no subconsultants had visited the proposed site prior to its shortlisting.

This is false. A number of subconsultants visited the sites throughout July, August and September 1984. Environmental investigations commenced at the beginning of August, 1984 and it was not necessary for all specialists to visit the sites as some environmental studies did not require field inspections. Those studies utilized materials such as heritage and archaeological registers, maps and aerial photographs, and contact with appropriate local groups such as the Local Aboriginal Land Councils, heritage groups, the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board and other appropriate contacts.

Location of proposed site

One submission (274.096) commented that the proposed site which impinges on the Metropolitan Catchment area should not have been preferred over a site within the village of Wilton without study of the differential costs and benefits of the two locations.

The decision to alter the proposed site from that which was shown in the press release dated 18 September 1984, which included the village of Wilton, was based on several factors of which the social dislocation that would result from resumption of the village site was one. Other factors considered included:

- the currently proposed site is topographically more suitable than the site including the village;
- the village site required a larger area due to the probable need for a cross wind runway to satisfy usability criteria at that site whereas the currently proposed site allows a more compact layout and does not require a cross wind runway;
- the currently proposed site potentially sterilizes less good quality coal than would the village site;
- the proposed site does not affect potential areas for future urban development whereas the site encompassing the village of Wilton would have had an adverse effect on large areas suitable for potential future urban development;
discussions of alternatives with the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board resulted in a statement of conditions which would attach to an airport sited substantially within the catchment. These conditions could be satisfied as outlined in the Draft EIS.

It should also be noted that the site encompassing the village area encroached upon the Metropolitan Catchment although to a lesser extent.

5.4 OUTLYING SITE

No submission commented on this section of the Draft EIS.
CHAPTER 6

SELECTION OF THE SHORT-LISTED SITES

6.1 SUMMARY OF THE SHORT-LISTING PROCESS

No submissions were received relating to Section 6.1 of the Draft EIS.

6.2 SITE ANALYSIS AND GROUPING

Two submissions were received that made two separate comments (385.009 and 337.009) critical of the approach taken in grouping the sites by distance and then evaluating like sites within groups. The first (385.009) questioned 'manageability' as a reason for grouping sites; the second (337.009) suggested that this process involved a selective reduction in the number of competing sites, and that if Wilton or Badgerys Creek was the superior site, then it should come out on top without the need to divide into two groups.

The grouping of sites was necessary because of the greatly differing characteristics of the ten sites and because it was the only means by which more distant sites could be legitimately evaluated. Inspection of the data, as described in Section 6.2 of the Draft EIS led to the conclusion that there were obvious differences between groups of sites and that, as in any comparative exercise, teaming competitors with like capabilities is essential to the achievement of a fair result.

Five of the ten sites were included in the initial list for evaluation even though they had been examined and rejected in earlier studies. These sites were included because it was considered that changes in the intervening years and the continuing public interest and strong promotion by the press and personal representation made it desirable that they be reviewed again (Section 3.6, Draft EIS). These five sites were Somersby, Darkes Forest, Wilton, Warnervale and Goulburn; the four mid-distance sites and one outlying site. These sites had been publicly promoted for a variety of reasons including the stimulus an airport could add to a local economy (eg. Goulburn) and the fewer people likely to be affected by land acquisition and aircraft noise at less populated sites (e.g. Darkes Forest, Wilton). None of the five sites was suggested because it was more convenient as an airport site.

The alternative to grouping sites would have been to consider all together (as the site ranking matrix does) using cost-benefit analysis. However, the essential limitation of any cost-benefit analysis is its inability to value convincingly major planning considerations, for example the value of environmental amenities. Fundamental issues of urban structure and form are not adequately argued in the context of a cost-benefit analysis. Insofar as the decision to establish a second Sydney airport reflects a choice as to the direction and form of Sydney for the year 2,000 and beyond, it requires more than a cost-benefit analysis.

A more specific defect of a cost-benefit analysis is its sensitivity to relatively minor assumptions which then assume apparently enormous importance when multiplied by millions of people over many years. Seemingly minor changes in assumptions on the parameters of access costs can, in most cases, substantially alter the perceived advantages or disadvantages of any option.
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In particular, access user costs may swamp all other factors and lead inevitably to the selection of the closest site, as it did in the case of the Major Airport Needs of Sydney Study.

Such an approach would have excluded further serious consideration of the four mid-distance and one outlying site, on the basis that they were unlikely to survive conventional cost-benefit analysis (as demonstrated by the Major Airport Needs of Sydney Study). Such an outcome might have been welcomed by opponents to various mid-distance sites, but not by the proponents of those sites whose concerns are no less legitimate and worthy of serious analysis.

6.3 SITES WITH SEVERE LIABILITIES

Four submissions made a total of twenty separate comments relating to the elimination of Goulburn, Holsworthy and Darkes Forest from the list of ten nominated sites following first site ranking. These comments could be categorized into three main issues:

- elimination of Goulburn and Holsworthy;
- high speed access system;
- benefits of outlying site.

These issues are discussed below.

Elimination of Goulburn and Holsworthy

Four submissions made eleven separate comments (233.022, 311.003, 403.001, 459.001, 459.003, 459.005, 459.006, 459.007, 459.008, 459.009 and 459.032) arguing that the nominated sites of Goulburn and Holsworthy should not have been eliminated from the detailed short-listing analysis. No similar comments were made for Darkes Forest.

Two comments related to the Holsworthy site. One suggested that the second Sydney airport should be located close to Sydney, in a location such as Holsworthy, Richmond or Schofields. The other suggested solutions to the practical difficulties at Holsworthy of airspace impacts and unexploded ordnance, but the suggested solutions are not feasible.

The remaining two submissions commented at length on the elimination of the Goulburn site. Comments by the Goulburn City Council state reasons why Goulburn should have been selected for short-listing. These include its lower environmental costs, less significant noise problem, freedom from transport congestion, expansion potential, lower risk of accidents in a densely populated area, ability to serve other major population centres, and the fact that altering factor weights could result in a more favourable ranking for the Goulburn site.

However, the overwhelming liability of the Goulburn site, the difficulty of access from Sydney, remains of sufficient significance to override all these considerations. The high speed access system, discussed below, is too uncertain a proposal to effectively reduce the disadvantage of poor access.

High speed access system

One submission made eight separate comments (311.001, 311.002, 311.004, 311.005, 311.006, 311.007, 311.008, and 311.010) suggesting that a high speed rail access system between the second Sydney airport and Sydney city centre would be feasible and would remove the access restriction on Goulburn and any other outlying sites.

This option was considered during the initial ranking of the ten nominated sites. However, as stated in Section 6.3, the uncertainties associated with the practical aspects of implementing a high speed transport system, including whether or not a broader social
or economic justification exists for such a system, the availability of funding, and the
timing of implementation, were considered to be too great to allow site selection to be
made on the basis of this proposal.

Benefits of outlying sites

One submission commented (311.009) that the location of the second Sydney airport at a
decentralized growth centre would provide a stimulus to employment and economic
activity in that centre. This was recognized in the preparation of the Draft EIS, but this
objective was subsidiary to the major objective of the study, the reservation of a site
which would effectively serve the aviation needs of Sydney. The outlying sites were not
considered to satisfy this major objective because of their access difficulties.

The Goulburn City Council submission (comment 459.033) raised a number of arguments
aimed at supporting the view that the Goulburn option was disadvantaged and raised a
number of matters of particular concern to the council. These were:

- inflated access times because of the failure to consider the Dr Wild rapid rail
  proposal;
- identification of the optimum site and role of the Goulburn option, and site
  operational factors particularly wind coverage and site flexibility;
- capital costs of site preparation and road access.

The Goulburn City Council indicated that Dr Wild's proposal for a high speed rail service
between Sydney and Melbourne promotes Goulburn but not Wilton or any intervening site
because this proposal envisages no stops between Ingleburn and Goulburn. The Goulburn
City Council questions whether the Consultant contacted Dr Wild on this matter.
Dr Wild was not contacted since he was overseas at the time, but contact was made with
CSIRO who had access both to his proposal and to details of the Trans-rapid Maglev System. The team considered other concepts of high speed travel to the city centre,
other than the proposal put forward by the Goulburn City Council. These were
impractical, for reasons set out on p 131 of the Draft EIS. Undoubtedly any high speed
rail system, if it were built, would service a major airport at Wilton. It is also worth
noting that the study team's scepticism about the high speed rail proposals was shared by
the Federal Department of Transport, the State Government and the Consultant. It
represents a most uncertain basis on which to select an airport site.

The Goulburn City Council goes on to indicate by how much the assessed access time, on
which Goulburn is ranked so badly, would decrease if a high speed rail system were
introduced. A similar system operating to Wilton or even Badgerys Creek would also
yield reductions in access time. In addition this type of proposition overlooks the cost of
this level of high speed access both in terms of capital costs and fares. The Goulburn
City Council perhaps assumes that since the rail system is to be constructed between
Sydney and Melbourne the marginal capital costs and fares to Goulburn would be very
low or even zero. Again the same arguments apply to other possible sites.

The Goulburn City Council also raised an argument that the role assigned to a second
airport would be minor if Kingsford-Smith Airport remains the dominant business
oriented airport; and Goulburn ranks better with a higher level of activity. This
comment appears to overlook the fact that the ranking was based on 25 million
passengers and 5 million passengers. Goulburn is situated more than 200 kilometres from
the market it would have to serve and suffers a major access disadvantage relative to
the closer and mid distances sites. The Goulburn City Council submission remains the
only submission which seriously challenges this conclusion ignoring the reality of this
disadvantage and promoting reliance on a high speed proposal which could only be
described as preliminary. It should also be remembered that Goulburn was included as a
representative for all possible outlying candidate sites. If the Department and its
Consultant ignored the reality of this access disadvantage, all possible sites within a 200 km radius (and even beyond) would need to be considered since there remains no obvious reason why Bathurst, Orange, Newcastle or other centres would not prove superior to Goulburn.

The Goulburn City Council were also critical of the Department for failing to identify the apparent optimum site in the Goulburn area in terms of costs and wind coverage. This could well be true, since the more detailed study of Badgerys Creek and Wilton produced sites superior to those used in the site ranking. This is in fact what one would expect to result from a detailed investigation; but such detailed investigation is not warranted for sites which are clearly inferior to the short-listed sites. The point above should also be reiterated; if Goulburn had ranked well, it would have first precipitated the search for, and ranking of, all other outlying sites before consideration was given to the detailed examination of any one outlying site. The level of detail afforded the Goulburn site was the same as that afforded all ten candidate sites and is all that is necessary for the short-listing process. Only the Goulburn City Council and the Society Responsible for Social Engineering seem to disagree.

6.4 THE REMAINING CLOSER SITES COMPARED

Two submissions made two separate comments (236.002 and 290.008) relating to the comparison of the remaining closer sites. The issues raised were a suggested upgrading of RAAF Richmond Base to take interstate traffic and to function as a second Sydney airport, and the high level of building activity in the Bringelly area in the last fifteen years which should militate against selection of the Bringelly site.

RAAF Richmond Base suffered several restrictions in the selection process resulting in the list of ten nominated sites. The three major restrictions were that the Base lies too close to the Blue Mountains escarpment for civil operations to occur on the present east-west runway alignment (which would also cause considerable noise nuisance to residents of Richmond and Windsor); that the present airport is too small and the only direction available for its extension is to the south which would impinge both on built-up areas and flood-liable land; and that use of the base as a second Sydney airport would displace its existing user, the Royal Australian Air Force.

In the comparison of the four closer sites in Section 6.4, the scale of disruption that could be occasioned by acquisition of the Bringelly site, together with the generally better ranking of the Badgerys Creek site with which Bringelly shared other characteristics, led to the exclusion of the Bringelly site from further consideration as a location for the proposed second Sydney airport.

6.5 THE REMAINING MID-DISTANCE SITES COMPARED

Three submissions made three separate comments (233.007, 274.110, and 338.003) relating to the relative merits of the proposed Wilton site and the nominated Somersby site.

These comments suggest Wilton's superiority over Somersby was not sufficient to clearly identify Wilton as the preferred site. The Draft EIS acknowledges the difficulty of this choice but the reasons for selecting Wilton are clearly stated in Table 6.19 and Section 6.5 of the Draft EIS.

The most important difference between the nominated Wilton and Somersby sites was the number of people that would be displaced; 860 at Somersby against 310 at Wilton. Greater disruption would also be caused by development at Somersby as a result of a greater area of existing and possible future noise-incompatible land use, and the existence of a well established citrus orcharding industry at the Somersby site.
Essentially, it was considered that engineering solutions were available to mitigate or eliminate the perceived risk to Sydney's water supply in an airport development at the Wilton site, but that opportunities to reduce the disruption impacts at Somersby by relocating that site within the general Somersby area at the more detailed site planning stage were limited.

6.6 SENSITIVITY TESTING

Seven submissions made eleven separate comments relating to the design and outcome of the site ranking procedure outlined in Section 6.6 of the Draft EIS. The comments can be categorized into two main issues:

- weighting of particular factors;
- method of selection and weighting of factors.

These issues are discussed below.

Weighting of particular factors

Three submissions made three separate comments (63.001, 200.002 and 338.073) suggesting that particular factors had been wrongly weighted.

Two of these comments criticized the relative weighting of social environmental and natural environmental factors used in the site ranking process of the Draft EIS. One suggested that too little weight was given to the impact of development on people, as opposed to the natural environment; the other suggested precisely the reverse.

The third comment suggested that the major consideration (and hence heaviest factor weighting) should have been the distance of the site from the centre of Sydney's population.

The determination of factor weights is explained in Section 6.6 of the Draft EIS. As conceded in the text, no one set of 'correct' weights can be defined. However, the weights used (the average of the weights nominated by the principal members of the study team), are consistent with the public perception of the order of factor importance, as established by a survey of public attitudes carried out by the Department of Aviation in January 1984. This survey covered a total of 1,350 respondents drawn by a random quota technique from the Sydney metropolitan area and other locations which could be potentially affected by development at the proposed sites.

Method of selection and weighting of factors

Five submissions made eight separate comments (329.007, 337.007, 337.008, 338.070, 457.006, 457.009, 459.001 and 459.002) relating to various aspects of the methodology of factor selection, and assignment of factor weights used in the site ranking process.

The comments questioned the justification for the manner in which sites, factors and factor weights were selected, and criticized the working of the site ranking matrix on the basis of lack of objectivity in the assigning of factor scores and weights, and the exhaustiveness of variables selected for consideration.

The method of selection of sites for evaluation and factors for consideration in that evaluation is fully explained in the Draft EIS in Chapter 3 (Section 3.6 in particular), and Section 4.4 respectively.

Possible sites were selected by a review of sites proposed in earlier studies, and a systematic examination of all land within the Sydney region on a 9 km grid basis. The
criteria used for selection were density of population, national park reservation, topographic suitability, and suitable terrain clearance.

Factors on which sites were to be evaluated were defined through a review of international site selection standards and studies, and of the results of the Department of Aviation's survey of the attitudes of Sydney residents to airport related issues. The factors were defined on the basis of comprehensiveness, exclusiveness, objectivity and appropriateness, and had to represent one or more of five conditions of:

- a unique or important environmental resource which could be adversely affected by airport development;
- a critical determinant of airport location;
- a constraint of sufficient magnitude either to preclude or to severely restrict airport development;
- an issue likely to arouse public controversy;
- a legal or statutory obligation of the proponent.

The highly methodical and overt approach to selection both of sites and factors for consideration has resulted in an approach to site evaluation the justification of which is made very clear in the Draft EIS.

There is inevitably a degree of subjectivity in the weighting given to factors and sub-factors of the site selection matrix because the intention of the weighting is to express public perceptions of the relative importance of the factors considered. The degree of severity of impact is reflected in the raw factor score assigned to each factor at each site.

The weightings given, as outlined in Section 6.6 of the Draft EIS, were the average of the weights nominated by the principal members of the study team. That this approach was successful in approximating community opinion is indicated by the fact that the order of importance of factors derived from the factor weights is consistent with the order derived from the views expressed in the survey of a sample of the population of the Sydney metropolitan area carried out by the Department of Aviation in January 1984.

The Goulburn City Council lodged a late submission, comment 459.032, which raised a variety of questions best related to sensitivity of site ranking, as the thrust of the questions were aimed at promoting the Goulburn site.

The points raised include:

- insufficient weight was given to the noise effects;
- the criterion used for site flexibility was poor;
- costs should have included compensation for aircraft noise effects;
- site selection factors should have included employement, decentralisation and regional development;
- other aspects of the Goulburn site.

The Goulburn City Council attempts to argue that insufficient weighting was given to noise, for example when compared to the general aviation potential. Not surprisingly Goulburn ranks high on environmental factors such as noise, and low on accessibility factors such as potential to attract a general aviation market. The Goulburn City
Council arguments overlook the sensitivity testing which allowed a wide variety of weights to be applied to all major factors, and therefore to the individual contribution of sub factors.

The summary of results as outlined in Figure 6.3 in the Draft EIS indicates that even under weightings favourable to Goulburn - high environmental weighting and low access weighting - Goulburn is not likely to displace Wilton. The Goulburn City Council's submission is the only public submission received which suggests factor weightings being altered sufficiently to make outlying sites rank well.

The Goulburn City Council also asked what constituted a serious noise problem, and went on to suggest that if Kingsford-Smith Airport with 1945 ha of land area inside the 25 ANEF (a Major Airport Needs of Sydney figure) was considered serious, how could Badgerys Creek with 2511 ha within the 25 ANEF not be rejected. Kingsford-Smith Airport is surrounded by a densely populated urban structure and the appropriate measure of the extent of noise nuisance is, and always has been, number of people affected. In the ranking of sites in semi-rural areas, the area measure was chosen as a substitute for numbers of people affected. For those sites considered in detail, the number of people affected became the criteria.

The ability of a candidate site to accommodate a number of alternative runway orientations was the criteria for site flexibility. The rationale behind the use of this factor was that, all other things being equal, a site with high flexibility would offer more potential for detailed assessment of alternatives than one with only one possible runway alignment. Given that ultimately any adjustments made to the location and orientation of runways on highly ranked sites would be done to minimise costs and impacts, this factor could equally represent the cost of increasing capacity as suggested by the Goulburn City Council submission.

The Goulburn City Council submission argues that the cost of compensation for aircraft noise effects should have been included; such compensation representing acquisition of some affected properties and sound insulation or alternative forms of compensation for others. There are two reasons why this was not done. First there is no basis upon which to do so, since there is no generally accepted measure of the degree to which compensation should be paid if at all; i.e. there are no objective guidelines. Second, the analysis would have to dispense with the surrogate noise effect factors, since to leave them in the analysis after introducing the cost of compensation would constitute double counting. The Department believes its approach to noise in the site ranking was reasonable and few public views have questioned this.

The Goulburn City Council argue that there would be differences between sites in the impact of employment and the contribution of the airport to regional development and decentralisation.

The employment argument embraces two aspects: employment displaced and airport employment impact. The employment displaced is clearly a function and land use (e.g. agricultural activity) displaced which is included in site selection factors. Assuming each site could support the same development potential, the employment impacts would be the same for each site, provided the airport region had the necessary commercial and industrial structure to exploit the flow on employment potential of airport development and operation. Although this was not assessed, it is likely that the most remote sites would not support the same development potential and could not provide the same commercial and industrial structure as the least remote sites. In any case, there is no objective way of quickly assessing whether 10,000 job opportunities at Goulburn is better than the same employment potential Wilton or Badgerys Creek for example.

The same arguments apply to decentralisation and regional development. At least for the closer and mid distances sites there were no indications that urbanisation and
infrastructure demands in the airport region would create problems of sufficient magnitude to discriminate between them on that basis.

The Goulburn City Council's submission also raises a number of questions related to both Wilton and Badgerys Creek on the basis that superior sites (presumably Goulburn) with greater capabilities may have been excluded because of deficiencies in the site selection process. These capabilities include:

- The capability to virtually eliminate the existing problems of noise, risk to health, risk of aircraft crash in densely populated areas, completely eliminate air traffic congestion and road congestion, capability to provide an alternative to sole reliance on Kingsford-Smith Airport and thereby offer better prospects of continued access to Kingsford-Smith Airport for NSW country residents.

The submission raises questions related to these capabilities. The short answer is that all second Sydney airport sites offer these capabilities, but some better than others. A number of the questions focussed on the capability of providing a cross wind runway, the implication being that this remains a practical possibility for Goulburn but not Badgerys Creek or Wilton. This is not correct.

The Goulburn City Council mistakenly quote 95% usability from Badgerys Creek, quickly concluding that one day in twenty would be unavailable for freight aircraft operating at night, putting pressure on the maintenance of the curfew at Kingsford-Smith Airport. Reference to p 166 of the Draft EIS would reveal a usability of 99.6% of the time at Badgerys Creek for aircraft with crosswind capability of 20 knots, a common capability of commercial aircraft. The 95% usability applies to very small general aviation aircraft unable to operate on crosswind conditions exceeding 10 knots.

6.7 THE CLOSER AND MID-DISTANCE SITES COMPARED

One comment, 325.009, involved a comparison between the closer proposed Badgerys Creek site and the mid-distance proposed Wilton site. This comment suggests that the site ranking had a number of faults, and that Badgerys Creek is the most favourable site by a wide margin.

The comment argues that the difference of 1.4 in the aggregated ranking of the Badgerys Creek and Wilton sites is almost as great as the difference between the proposed Wilton site and Darkes Forest, the eighth ranked proposed site, and that this difference should be considered sufficiently large to remove Wilton from a competitive position.

However, the objective of the study was to identify two or three favoured sites for detailed evaluation. Examination of the characteristics of the ten nominated sites established that sites with a similar geographic relationship to the centre of Sydney shared a number of characteristics, and could therefore be grouped together. In general, sites that were closer to the metropolitan area:

- were more accessible to potential air travellers;
- were located in relatively developed or urban environments;
- would affect more people through site acquisition and noise impacts associated with airport development;
- involved greater interaction with existing airspace arrangements;
- involved greater site acquisition cost.
Sites situated at a greater distance:

- were less accessible to potential air travellers;
- would affect fewer people through site acquisition and noise impacts associated with airport development;
- involved lesser interaction with existing airspace arrangements;
- involved less site acquisition cost.

The distance related characteristics of the ten sites reflect a basic choice to be made between types of sites, and therefore it was appropriate to consider the best ranking site from each of the two most feasible distance categories. That these two sites also emerged as the two best ranking sites from the site ranking exercise conducted without grouping on the basis of distance from Sydney confirms the logic of their selection.

6.8 SITES FOR EVALUATION IN AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Ten submissions made twelve separate comments regarding the selection of the two proposed sites at Wilton and Badgerys Creek for evaluation in an environmental impact statement. The comments addressed three main issues:

- comments on short-listed sites;
- other alternatives;
- comments on the process of selection.

These items are discussed below.

Comments on short-listed sites

Four submissions made four separate comments (278.001, 305.002, 361.035 and 459.010) relating to various aspects of the two short-listed sites.

Comments made include that the selection of either proposed site would have the potential for unacceptable interference with military operations, that neither short-listed site provides the beneficial effects to an outlying growth centre that an outlying site such as Goulburn could have provided, that Wilton is unacceptable on environmental grounds, and that Badgerys Creek is unacceptable on the grounds of quality of life and economic costs to residents.

All of these aspects were considered in the evaluation of the ten nominated sites leading to the short-listing of the proposed Badgerys Creek and Wilton sites.

Interference with military operations is considered both under 'Airspace arrangements' and under 'Variable capital costs', which considers the cost of relocation of Commonwealth facilities. Beneficial effects to an outlying centre, together with low environmental and social disruption impacts, are seen as one of the advantages of the nominated Goulburn site, though not of sufficient magnitude to override its severe access problems. Finally, low social disruption costs, and low natural environmental costs associated with the proposed Wilton and Badgerys Creek sites respectively, are seen as the major advantages of each of the short-listed sites, and the reciprocal high environmental costs at Wilton and high social costs at Badgerys Creek are acknowledged in the Draft EIS as the major faults of the two sites.

The consideration of all of these factors is incorporated in the scores received by these sites in the site ranking matrix, Figure 6.2 of the Draft EIS.
Other alternatives

Three submissions made four separate comments (59.001, 201.004, 202.003 and 202.006) suggesting alternative sites or arrangements to the development of a second Sydney airport at one of the two short-listed sites.

Suggestions included the use of Canberra airport as an international airport in lieu of building a second Sydney airport, extending Kingsford-Smith Airport to provide the needed capacity, using RAAF Richmond Base or other of Sydney's existing airport facilities to provide extra capacity, or considering a third site.

Canberra would suffer the same disadvantages of access as the nominated Goulburn site, and can be eliminated from further consideration as a second Sydney airport on the same basis as Goulburn.

The option of increasing the capacity of Kingsford-Smith Airport by constructing an additional parallel runway has been examined, but it is considered that such an increase would do no more than defer the requirement for an additional site in the Sydney Region (Draft EIS Summary).

Factors militating against the use of RAAF Richmond Base have been discussed in this Supplementary report under the heading 6.4, The remaining closer sites compared.

The suggestion of considering a third site for more detailed evaluation was also examined in the Draft EIS. Section 6.8 outlines the possible combinations of site types that would have been considered and suggests the most suitable site representing each type. However, it was concluded that there was no apparent benefit in analysing three sites in detail for presentation in the Draft EIS: a two site comparison would enable all relevant issues to be examined.

Comments on the process of selection

Four submissions made four separate comments (205.004, 233.008, 338.004 and 457.005) relating to the procedure for selection of the two short-listed sites.

Three of these comments suggested that there had been no site report made to the Minister regarding the selection of the two short-listed sites before the Minister's announcement on 18 September 1984 that the number of locations being studied for reservation of a site for a second Sydney airport had been reduced to two: Badgerys Creek and Wilton. The Consultant's recommendation was conveyed to the Department of Aviation by memorandum on 23 August 1984.

The other comment queries the relevance of the short-listing process on the basis that both the Wilton and Badgerys Creek sites have been altered since the site rankings were drawn up and the Minister's announcement made. However, the alterations made in designing the preliminary master plan used for detailed assessment of impacts at each of the two short-listed sites involved simply a re-orientation of runways which did alter the land affected in small areas, but did not involve a relocation of the site. Much of the site area remained the same as that used in the short-listing process and therefore it could not be considered that the short-listing evaluation had been made redundant by later alterations to the precise site boundaries. All subsequent detailed evaluation of impacts was based on the preliminary master plan site boundaries. It should also be noted that the alterations made to the notional site boundaries in both cases reduced adverse impacts on settled areas bordering the two proposed sites.
CHAPTER 7

INTRODUCTION TO THE ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPOSED AIRPORT SITE AT BADGERYS CREEK

7.1 ASSESSMENT PROCESS

No submissions made comments on Section 7.1 of the Draft EIS.

7.2 LOCATION OF THE PROPOSED BADGERYS CREEK SITE AND ITS ENVIRONS

One submission 65.018, commented on Section 7.2 of the Draft EIS. The comment was that, because Badgerys Creek would disappear if airport development were to proceed, it was misleading to state that the proposed airport site is situated between the villages of Luddenham and Badgerys Creek.

The statement in the Draft EIS has been misinterpreted by the author of the submission as it was intended to indicate to the reader the location of the proposed site using known features of the region. The statement does not purport to describe the area at some unknown time in the future.

7.3 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF THE BADGERYS CREEK SITE

No submissions made comments relating to this section of the Draft EIS.
CHAPTER 8
DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AT BADGERYS CREEK

8.1 PURPOSE OF THE PRELIMINARY MASTER PLAN

No submissions made comments in relation to this section of the Draft EIS.

8.2 THE PROPOSED AIRPORT SITE

One submission (comment 263.003) indicated concern about the boundary of the proposed airport in that it excluded properties adversely affected by noise.

The boundary of the airport was drawn to include only the land needed for airport purposes. Under existing Commonwealth government practice the boundary could not be extended to include properties not directly required for airport purposes. However, there is a Parliamentary Select Committee on Aircraft Noise enquiring into, among other things, the matters raised in the above comment. See also Section 9.2 of this Supplement.

8.3 PRELIMINARY MASTER PLAN ASSUMPTIONS

Ten submissions raised issues relating to the master planning assumptions. These were concerned with:

- the need for a curfew-free airport;
- the possible need to expand the airport at a later date;
- usability of airport.

Curfew-free operation

Comments (65.011, 248.004, 264.031, 264.032, 267.002 (proforma), 328.004, and 330.008) sought an explanation of the need for twenty-four hour operation of the airport or expressed opposition to such operation. Two submissions (243.002 and 433.005) supported the need for curfew-free operations.

Airline operations are restricted by the present inflexible curfew at Kingsford-Smith Airport. This leads to less than optimum utilization of aircraft and increased operating costs. For example, when an incoming aircraft is delayed to such an extent that it may not be able to reach Sydney before the curfew it must be held at another airport and the passengers accommodated overnight. This leads to substantial additional costs for the airline.

A number of airlines have also expressed interest in night operations and on the basis of overseas experience it is expected that if the opportunity existed, a significant market could develop.

In the light of these present and possible future demands it would be short-sighted to select a site for the second airport where the option for curfew-free operation could not be reasonably preserved. Because of the importance of the curfew issue very conservative assumptions were used for the calculation of noise contours with the
number of night flights assumed being considerably higher than is expected to occur (see Section 9.2).

Later expansion

Two submissions (comments 264.015 and 341.016) suggested that the acquisition area of the proposed Badgerys Creek site be extended to preserve the option for future expansion of the airport.

The area of the site was calculated as sufficient to accommodate the 'worst case' of thirteen million passengers per annum. This is sufficiently in excess of the passenger levels actually likely to be achieved as to make the likelihood of further expansion negligible.

Usability

The Goulburn City Council (comment 459.029) claimed that the low wind usability of a second airport at either Badgerys Creek or Wilton would affect its role and particularly its contribution to relieving pressure on Kingsford-Smith Airport.

The Goulburn City Council has apparently misunderstood the discussion on wind usability in Sections 8.3.3 and 13.3.3 of the Draft EIS. It is stated there that the Consultant recommended to the Department that the wind coverage standard be relaxed from 99.8% to 95% for the aeroplanes the airport is intended to serve. The Department has not formally relaxed its 99.8% standard for wind usability, but has recognized that there is room for concessions against this standard for second airports in a region. In fact no major concession was necessary because at both Badgerys Creek and Wilton, wind usability exceeding 99.6% is available for aircraft with cross wind capability of 20 knots - a commonly achieved or exceeded capability for commercial aircraft operating on dry runways.

8.4 PRELIMINARY MASTER PLAN CRITERIA

One submission (comment 459.020) indicated that the Draft EIS did not indicate what procedures were applied to identify possible runway layouts within each 'cell' relating to the ten nominated sites.

Four schematic alternative airport layouts were used and adapted to each of the ten sites (Section 4.2 of Draft EIS). Section 4.3 of the Draft EIS indicates how specific layouts were used for site ranking and sensitivity testing to rank the ten nominated sites. Once the two short-listed sites were nominated, a further review was undertaken of runway layouts to be used for the environmental assessment. Section 8.3 of the Draft EIS gives the reasoning behind the selection of the proposed airport layout used for environmental assessment. Section 8.4 of the Draft EIS indicates the design/dimensional criteria used in the proposed airport layout. This information was considered adequate for the purpose of defining a proposed airport boundary. It should also be noted that the actual layout as depicted in the Draft EIS is preliminary.

8.5 PRELIMINARY MASTER PLAN

Five submissions were received relating to Section 8.5 of the Draft EIS. These four submissions included five separate comments (1.007, 305.007, 429.008, 433.002 and 433.003) relating to a range of matters concerning the preliminary master plan.

Two comments were concerned with the alignment of runways. One supported the north-east/south-west runway alignment as it minimizes community noise exposure and
recognizes prevailing wind conditions. The other comment queried the changed runway alignment.

Three alternative runway alignments were examined in relation to the proposed airport at Badgerys Creek. These are shown at Figure 8.2 of the Draft EIS. The principal reason for selecting the north-east/south-west alignment for the preliminary master plan was its lesser noise impact on people in surrounding areas. Additionally, consideration was given to a range of operational factors, mainly airspace requirements and prevailing wind conditions.

The Department of Defence commented on the fact that the siting of nav aids around the proposed airport was not addressed in relation to the Kingswood armament facility.

During the preparation of the Draft EIS the Department of Defence supplied the Department of Aviation with dimensional criteria in relation to the safe siting of nav aids with respect to their facilities at Kingswood.

The Department of Aviation does not propose to locate any nav aids within the dimensional criteria provided by the Department of Defence.

Penrith City Council indicated they were concerned about the prospect of rotating the runway alignment counter-clockwise by up to 8° and would wish to examine detailed layouts before it could fully support the selection of the Badgerys Creek site.

The rotation of the runway alignment counter-clockwise by up to 7° as discussed on page 200 of the Draft EIS would only be undertaken if further reductions could be achieved in minimizing the noise impacts and if topographic and airspace considerations could be further optimized. The Department of Aviation would ensure that liaison is maintained with all councils in the region if the Badgerys Creek site is selected so that they are informed of the Department’s continuing programme and plans for development.

One comment indicated the area allowances for the proposed airport would be adequate.

For planning purposes the preliminary master plan layout has made allowances for aircraft gate and apron areas for each of the different categories of aircraft. It has assumed a mix of aircraft based on the maximum forecast capacity and converted this to peak period requirements. This should ensure adequate provisions for groundside aircraft operations.

8.6 AIRSPACE

Eleven submissions raised questions related to airspace if the Badgerys Creek site was chosen. These covered five issues:

- comments relating to the overall airspace arrangements;
- loss of training areas in western Sydney;
- effects on activity at existing aerodromes;
- reduced safety;
- effect on Kingswood military area.

Airspace arrangements

Three comments, 360.007, 396.013 and 433.007, related to airspace arrangements.

The General Aviation Association is concerned that the airspace arrangements outlined in the Draft EIS are described as notional and argues that because of the seriousness of the consequences, the site decision should be based on current requirements rather than on a reliance on possible future technological and procedural changes. Qantas sees...
future technology enabling Kingsford-Smith Airport and the second Sydney airport to operate at their full potential.

The airspace arrangements described in the Draft EIS are based on current standards and procedures and the analysis shows that it would be quite possible for airline, general aviation and military operations to function satisfactorily with an airport at Badgerys Creek. The airspace diagrams shown in the Draft EIS depict one way in which this might be arranged. It is of course inevitable that the addition of another major airport in the Sydney region would involve some restriction on all current airspace users. Given the long-term nature of the second Sydney airport development, technological advances may render these restrictions less severe than appears from the Draft EIS. The document therefore depicts the 'worst case' which is required to be considered by the Government when taking its decision.

Loss of training area

Five submissions objected to the loss of flying training areas currently located to the west of Sydney (234.003, 324.002, 324.003, 396.004, 396.005, 396.006, 457.014 and 458.005). The General Aviation Association rejected the suggestion that training areas could be relocated south of Camden on the grounds of insufficient area, poor terrain, the cost of travelling the extra distance and the dangers from increased congestion.

There is some truth in all these criticisms and any area south of Camden would undoubtedly be less attractive for training purposes than the areas currently used. However, these disadvantages do not necessarily render the suggested area completely unacceptable. As stated previously, if aviation traffic in Sydney grows to the extent that a second major airport is required it is inevitable that restrictions will be necessary for all airspace users. The details of airspace allocation would be determined by negotiation before the airport commenced operating. Such negotiations would include representatives of sports aviation, general aviation, the airlines, the Department of Defence and the Department of Aviation.

Effects on other aerodromes

Six submissions were concerned with the effects of a Badgerys Creek airport on existing aerodromes (57.006, 234.002, 234.003, 324.001, 360.003, 360.004, 396.008, 396.009, 396.010 and 422.020).

These submissions were concerned with the effects of a Badgerys Creek airport on Hoxton Park, Camden, Bankstown and Schofields, due mainly to the increased difficulty of operating outside controlled airspace.

The effects of a Badgerys Creek airport would be most strongly felt at Hoxton Park and could lead to closure of that aerodrome. However, the loss of adjacent training areas and the increased difficulty of access may eventually bring about closure or relocation of various enterprises now operating at the other aerodromes. The lead time for such changes would be long and it could be expected that with the general increase in traffic of all kinds and the increasing sophistication of general aviation aircraft and technological advances in radars etc., a larger proportion of general aviation aircraft would be routinely operating within controlled airspace than is the case at present. The effect of the changes may therefore not be as severe as appears at the present time.

As regards sports aviation, the Department of Aviation would endeavour as far as possible to ensure that gliding and other activities could continue within a reasonable distance of Sydney for as long as possible.
Reduced safety

Two submissions (328.013, 396.007 and 396.012) expressed concern over the increased probability of mid air collision due to the increased number of aircraft in the area, the proliferation of flight paths and the channelling of non-controlled general aviation into a narrow corridor.

It is the responsibility of the Department of Aviation to provide rules, procedures and surveillance which will permit the expected increase in the quantity and complexity of aviation activity in the Sydney region to operate without a reduction in safety standards. The Department believes that this requirement does not preclude the establishment of a major airport at Badgerys Creek.

It should be noted that even with a major airport at Badgerys Creek the complexity of airspace allocation in the Sydney region would be less than that currently existing around some overseas cities.

Effect on Kingswood military area

The Department of Defence pointed out (comments 305.003 and 305.005) that the Kingswood explosives storage facility could not be partly relocated as suggested on page 174 and called for further consultation with the Department of Aviation.

Further discussion has now been held and the Defence point has been accepted. As stated on page 258, the airport would not greatly affect, nor would it be affected by, the Kingswood facility.

8.7 AIRCRAFT EMERGENCY PROCEDURES

Ten submissions raised issues related to aircraft accidents and/or the emergency dumping of fuel in the Badgerys Creek area. Four concerns were raised in relation to accidents:

- the risk to people on the ground from an aircraft crashing in a populated area;
- the lack of emergency facilities in the area to cope with a major accident;
- the risk of an aircraft crash causing a bushfire;
- the risk of water pollution from an aircraft crashing into Prospect Reservoir.

Accident in a populated area

Six submissions (7.015, 64.004, 201.003, 295.007, 330.018 and 457.024) commented on the risk of accidents in a populated area.

Aviation is one of the safest forms of transport and Australia's record in this respect is second to none. There are many places in Australia where aircraft regularly make landing approaches and take-offs over heavily built up areas. In some cases these areas are much more densely populated than the Badgerys Creek area is or is ever likely to be. Such aircraft operations are considered routine and are accepted as such by all relevant authorities and by the community at large.

Lack of emergency facilities

Three submissions (65.032, 250.013 and 330.020) were concerned with the lack of emergency facilities.

The fact that existing hospital and other emergency facilities in the area might be considered inadequate has little relevance. Such facilities are provided by the relevant
planning authorities where and when they are needed. The presence of a major airport would no doubt be a consideration in the planning of future facilities.

**Bushfire risk**

Two submissions (330.017 and 457.025) were concerned with the possibility of bushfires.

The risk of air accident is low and the risk of an accident starting a bushfire in the Badgerys Creek area must be considered very low. As the high bushfire risk area of the Blue Mountains is well away from the airport site the risk of accident in that area from an airport at Badgerys Creek would be no higher than from present operations.

**Water pollution**

Two submissions (7.027 and 274.040) considered the possibility of an aircraft crashing in Prospect Reservoir.

The likelihood of such an accident is very low. However, as Prospect forms an important part of Sydney’s water supply it is necessary to consider what the effects might be.

The Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board has well established and documented procedures for the control of contaminants which may be discovered in any part of the system. The release of a small quantity of aircraft fuel into the reservoir could be relatively easily handled as the fuel would float on the surface while the take off point for the water supply is well below the surface. The release of a large quantity of fuel as could happen from the crash of a fully fuelled airliner would however constitute a major emergency and would require the urgent deployment of a large clean up force. It could be necessary during such an operation for Prospect to be temporarily by-passed by the proposed direct Warragamba-Potts Hill pipeline. This system would have some limitations but could cope for a few days.

Two other points are worth making. Firstly, although the risk of such an accident might be slightly higher if an airport were placed at Badgerys Creek, it is not entirely non-existent at the present time. Secondly, if some aircraft fuel did get into the drinking water it could produce an unpleasant taste but it would not be dangerous. There are many other potential sources of pollution of the water supply which could lead to far more serious consequences.

**Fuel dumping**

Four submissions raised the issue of the emergency dumping of fuel in the Badgerys Creek area, one in relation to its tendency to increase the bushfire hazard and all four in relation to the possibility of water pollution if carried out over Prospect Reservoir (7.014, 274.040, 330.019 and 341.024).

Fuel dumping is the term used to refer to the deliberate discharge of fuel from airborne aircraft. The term is not used to refer to accidental leaking, discharge or venting of fuel. Generally, accidental leakage has insignificant environmental consequences owing to the rarity of the occurrence and the small quantity discharged.

Fuel dumping occurs for two reasons. More often than not it is the result of the development of a fault that requires the aircraft to land at an airport other than its destination, either the airport of departure or an en-route airport.

The allowable maximum take-off weight of an aircraft may be greater than the allowable maximum landing weight. Consequently, if an aircraft is required to land unexpectedly, there will be occasions when the weight of the aircraft is too high for landing and weight must be reduced; this can be done by dumping fuel. On rare occasions
it is considered desirable to dump fuel in order to minimize the risk of fire during an emergency landing.

On the great majority of occasions a choice can be made about where the fuel is dumped, in which case it is done either at high level, over the sea or over uninhabited land. In other than emergency situations the Department of Aviation nominates the location for fuel dumping. A minimum height of 1,800 m is recommended and fuel is directed to be dumped at a location that minimizes the environmental consequences.

From the figures for the last nine years of the number of times fuel was dumped by aircraft associated with Sydney Airport, on average only one in about every 60,000 aircraft movements would be involved in fuel dumping.

The Department of Aviation is not aware of any environmental problems that have been caused in the past by fuel dumping in Australia or overseas. There is no evidence to suggest that the existing procedures covering fuel dumping are inadequate, nor are any problems expected around either Badgerys Creek or Wilton.
CHAPTER 9
THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT AND EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSAL

9.1 ACQUISITION

A large number of submissions were received, including two hundred and thirty-two proforma submissions, relating to aspects covered in Section 9.1 of the Draft EIS. From these submissions eighty separate comments were made on various aspects relating to the possible acquisition of the site at Badgerys Creek.

The comments made in these submissions can be categorized into eight main topics.

These topics are:

- acquisition cost for the Badgerys Creek site;
- property and house counts;
- acquisition procedures and property administration;
- compensation;
- planning blight;
- effects of the Badgerys Creek airport development on the local area;
- relocation difficulties;
- acquisition of land for access routes.

Acquisition cost for the Badgerys Creek site

One hundred and thirty-five submissions were received, 117 of which were proforma submissions, relating to the acquisition cost of the Badgerys Creek site, detailed in Section 9.1.1 of the Draft EIS. From these submissions a number of comments were identified as relevant to this topic (7.023, 8.001 (proforma), 63.002, 64.005, 65.027, 68.007, 231.003, 236.005, 237.001, 264.016, 264.019, 279.003, 319.003, 335.006, 336.005, 424.004, 424.005, 424.006, 457.007 and 458.008).

The comments raised in the submissions could be further categorized into the following issues:

- estimated acquisition figure of $31.5 million is much too low - more like $75 million to $80 million;
- the figure used was determined from property values depressed over many years due to the possibility of an airport development occurring at Badgerys Creek;
- the cost of the acquisition of the Badgerys Creek site is not justified.

The figure of $31.5 million used in Section 9.1.1 of the Draft EIS was produced by the Valuation Branch of the Australian Taxation Office as a budgetary estimate of the realty cost of the properties within the site. This is the normal costing basis by which Governments assess various projects. The prime purpose of using this figure was to establish an order of cost (not including the compensation payments outlined in Paragraph 9.1.1 of the Draft EIS) to be used to give an indication of the level of funding required and a comparison of the level of cost between the Badgerys Creek and Wilton sites. At no stage was the figure intended as a formal valuation figure. Such valuations can only be obtained when a commitment to purchase has been established and the valuers are
permitted to enter the properties for a formal examination of the land and improvements. The budgetary estimate figure was derived from aerial photographs, kerbside inspections and reference to recorded property sales, also without inspection and research.

The final acquisition cost for the site will only be known once all the properties have been purchased. If the acquisition by agreement method is used to acquire the sites, an agreed purchase price must be determined for each property. It may therefore be years before a final figure can be put on the total site cost. If the compulsory acquisition method is used to purchase the site, full valuation figures will be produced for each property, but it may be some time before the total compensation cost has been established.

In developing the estimate figure, the Commonwealth Valuers have considered the blighting influence of the proposed airport development on property values. When formal valuations are required to be made for the purposes of acquisition, considerable research will be necessary to establish whether blight has had an influence on the property values in the site area.

The need for a second major airport is discussed in Chapter 1 of the Draft EIS. Whether or not the cost of acquisition of the Badgerys Creek site is considered too high is a matter for Government decision. In the long term, the price paid will be a small percentage of the full development cost of the airport once the need to build has been established.

Finally, none of the public submissions which questioned the Draft EIS's land acquisition figure of $31.5 million supported their criticism of the Commonwealth Valuer's figure with an assessment of the site acquisition cost by a qualified valuer.

Property and house counts

Six submissions were received which challenged the accuracy of the house and property counts detailed in Section 9.1.1 of the Draft EIS (81.003, 237.002, 328.016, 376.009, 379.003 and 400.006).

The figures quoted in Section 9.1.1 of the Draft EIS were: number of houses within the boundary - 207; number of properties within the boundary - 241. The property figure was determined from title searches of the area which encompasses the Badgerys Creek site and is believed correct as at February 1985.

Some difficulty was experienced in positively identifying houses from the aerial photographs and in March 1985 a discrepancy existed between the figures of the Department of Aviation and the Badgerys Creek Anti Airport Group. At the Department's suggestion, representatives of both organizations counted houses together and agreed on the figure of 207 houses within the site boundary. It should be stressed that this change did not affect the valuation figure as this was developed by the Taxation Valuers independently of the house counts of the Department of Aviation and the Badgerys Creek Anti Airport Group.

Acquisition process and property administration

Four submissions were received relating to the acquisition process and property administration detailed in Sections 9.1.2 through 9.1.5 of the Draft EIS (264.023, 274.033, 376.007, and 457.029).

The four comments raised the following issues:

- a large dairy would be affected;
One submission raised the issue that the Leppington Pastoral Company dairy would be adversely affected by the site acquisition process. The proposed methods of acquisition being considered are outlined in the Draft EIS in Sections 9.1.2 and 9.1.3. Each method allows for the dairy to remain operational prior to the commencement of construction on the airport site. The compulsory acquisition option allows for a lease back arrangement to be established after purchase. The acquisition by agreement method would entail purchasing the property from the owner only when the owner was ready to sell or when the land was finally required for development.

A further issue raised was the question of the level of interest the Commonwealth would pay on the compensation figure if a court decision is required to determine the level of payment. The Draft EIS in Section 9.1.2 states that the Lands Acquisition Act 1955 provides, in the compulsory acquisition option, for payment of interest on the compensation amount from the date of acquisition until the date of settlement. The rate of interest is prescribed in the Act and simply put is similar to interest rates payable on Commonwealth securities which vary from time to time. Recently the rate has been in the order of 12% to 14%.

The approximate number of residents affected by the acquisition of the Badgerys Creek site is nominated in Section 9.1.1 of the Draft EIS as 750. Data from the 1981 Census supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics give an average figure of 3.6 persons per household for the Badgerys Creek area. This was multiplied by the agreed 207 houses and rounded to obtain the figure of 750.

The final issue identified under this topic was the question of rates payable to Local Government following site acquisition. The usual arrangement in cases of this type is that prior to site development, the acquired properties are offered for lease by the Commonwealth. As part of the leasing agreement, the Commonwealth will, in accordance with normal practice, require the lessee to be responsible for the payment of all Local Government charges attracted by the leased properties. Once airport development is implemented, the normal ex gratia payments scheme currently operated by the Department of Aviation would apply to Local Government charges. This issue is discussed in Section 9.6.6 of the Draft EIS.

**Compensation**

Seven submissions were received relating to the amount and forms of compensation available to affected property owners. Section 9.1.2 of the Draft EIS details the compensation which is available in accordance with the provisions of the Lands Acquisition Act 1955. From the seven submissions, eleven comments were identified as relevant to the compensation issue (264.017, 264.020, 264.022, 264.023, 319.004, 328.005, 329.006, 337.013, 381.003, 460.007, and 460.008).

The comments made in the submissions can be categorized into two main topics:

- compensation determination and valuation;
- interest payable on compensation.

The compensation process and compensation payable are discussed in Section 9.1.2 of the Draft EIS. This section covers the question of relocation and disturbance expenses which was raised in several of the submissions.

Two submissions also raised doubts about the payment of adequate compensation for business conducted on properties compulsorily acquired. Basically, the approach taken under the compulsory acquisition option is to as place dispossessed owners as nearly as
possible in the same financial position they enjoyed immediately before the acquisition, taking blight into account if appropriate. Normal disturbance and relocation expenses as discussed in Section 9.1.2 are also payable. In addition, compensation may also be negotiated for loss of profits incurred between selling the existing business and establishing a new business elsewhere, and may also include an element for loss of goodwill during this re-establishment period. If a larger business or property is purchased elsewhere by the property owner, the difference in estimated value of a comparable property and the actual price paid would not be compensated.

Compensation to the University of Sydney for the possible displacement of the Fleurs Radio Observatory will be a matter for negotiation once a decision to develop the Badgerys Creek site is taken.

Similar principles to those for business compensation apply to residential property owners. The actual valuation is determined by Commonwealth valuers during the acquisition negotiations. Reasonable costs for private independent valuation and legal advice will be paid by the Commonwealth. All improvements are included in the valuation, and adjustments to the final valuation for the blighting affect of the airport proposal will be made if appropriate. Further compensation payments as discussed in Section 9.1.2 of the Draft EIS are also available to residential property owners.

The points discussed above primarily apply to property or business owners affected by the compulsory acquisition option. When acquisition by agreement is chosen as the method for the acquisition of a site, the negotiated price will be the only compensation available. However, the negotiated price usually includes some allowance for disturbance plus reasonable legal and valuation fees.

Compensation for increased interest charges which may apply to new home or business loans would be considered during the property purchase negotiations and each case would be considered on its merits.

The issue of interest payable on compensation payments has been addressed in the previous comment response, 'Acquisition process and property administration'.

The principles required to be taken into account for the protection of affected owners have been clearly established as a result of previous litigation in Australia and elsewhere.

Planning blight

One hundred and twenty-four submissions, including 112 proforma submissions, were received relating to the depressed land and property values in the area due to the proposed airport development. Planning blight can be considered as the influence a major development proposal has on regional property values and businesses. Section 9.1.4 of the Draft EIS discusses the planning blight issue. From the 124 submissions, a number of comments were identified as relevant to the planning blight issue (7.022, 65.026, 67.004, 68.004, 219.004, 229.007, 267.003 (proforma), 278.003, 328.018, 330.003, 345.011, 366.003, 376.002, 400.003, 402.004, 405.003 and 458.006).

All comments received addressed the effects of planning blight on property values and business investment.

Once negotiations have commenced for the sale of a property to the Commonwealth, a formal valuation of the land plus improvements is undertaken. One aspect of the valuation work is to investigate whether the valuation figure has been influenced by planning blight. If it can be shown that this has occurred the valuation figure is adjusted to compensate the owner for the effect of blight.
The effect of planning blight on business investment within the airport boundary is also a matter for negotiation prior to the acquisition of a property.

Under present Commonwealth legislation, the effects of planning blight on properties outside the airport boundary are not subject to compensation. The Law Reform Commission considered the blight question in its Report No. 14. The Government has deferred its decision on this matter until it has had a chance to consult with other levels of Government.

**Effects of the Badgerys Creek airport development on the local area**

Twenty-one submissions including three pro formas were received relating to various effects the airport development would have on the local area. From these submissions, a number of comments were identified as relevant to this topic (2.002, 4.004, 7.005, 60.002, 60.004, 63.004, 65.016, 65.039, 229.006, 292.002, 314.002, 315.002, 324.004, 338.091, 353.002 (proforma), 354.002, 356.002, 357.002, 367.002, and 460.009).

These comments can be categorized into four issues:

- general comments;
- purchase or closure of local facilities;
- acquisition of land for airport purposes;
- reduction of local population over time.

Many of the comments were not criticisms of the Draft EIS as such, but a statement of the perceived effect of the airport on the local area. A summary of these comments is as follows:

- destruction of homes within the site a waste;
- airport will adversely affect people who have moved to the area within the last seven years;
- worry affecting health;
- rights of residents to retain and enjoy their properties;
- fears of urban blight after the site selection;
- too many people affected;
- impossible to relocate;
- difficulty of finding comparable facilities elsewhere;
- site affects small industry but not large industry.

The validity of some of these comments is accepted as there are always consequential effects associated with the need to plan airport facilities for an uncertain future demand.

Two submissions were concerned with the acquisition and closure of two public facilities, the Badgerys Creek Primary School and the Luddenham Showground. As the primary school is within the site, it would eventually need to be acquired once a decision to develop the airport was made. It is expected that the school would remain operational until this time and then presumably be closed or relocated to a situation appropriate to the demands of the time. The Luddenham Showground would not be required for the airport development, and therefore would not be acquired by the Commonwealth.
Three submissions expressed the concern that many people would be adversely affected if a decision was taken in the future not to develop the acquired airport site.

Chapter 1 of the Draft EIS discusses the requirement to reserve a second Sydney airport site for the future airport needs of the Sydney region. Acquisition of the site will be undertaken in accordance with the procedures discussed in Section 9.1 of the Draft EIS. Under these provisions, property owners will be offered the opportunity to lease back their properties if acquired by the Commonwealth (whether compulsorily or by agreement), or maintain ownership of their properties if the acquisition by agreement option is chosen. Should a decision be made at a later date not to develop an airport on the site, owners who are leasing their former properties would be given the option of repurchasing their properties at a fair price in accordance with Section 53 of the Lands Acquisition Act 1955. This situation is however highly speculative.

The Wilton Airport Resistance submission suggests that the mobility and mortality of the population at Badgerys Creek would produce a 50% reduction in population over ten years if Badgerys Creek were nominated as the second Sydney airport site. However, if properties are leased back following acquisition, the local population base should be sustained indefinitely.

**Relocation difficulties**

Six submissions were received relating to relocation difficulties which may be experienced by people affected by site acquisition (283.005, 295.004, 328.022, 380.002, 399.002 and 400.002).

Again, as with the previous topic, all of the comments except one were statements of perceived problems, namely:

- difficulties associated with relocating businesses, and in particular, the shortage of suitable areas which meet specific physical and climatic criteria. These comments related to businesses such as dog breeding, horse training, poultry farming and plant nurseries;
- relocation will be hard on aged people;
- if relocated, acquisition payments would be insufficient to maintain the same standard of living.

Certain aspects of these points have been discussed in the compensation section of this Supplement.

The final comment made relates to the number of people from Badgerys Creek who would need to be relocated due to the proposed airport development. This was discussed in the Draft EIS in Section 9.1.1.

**Acquisition of land for access roads**

Three submissions each made one comment relating to the further acquisition of land for airport access purposes (65.003, 222.002 and 391.008).

Both comments criticized the Draft EIS for not addressing the impacts of the need to acquire further properties for road and rail access to the airport.

The Draft EIS did not address this matter as it is primarily a State Government matter, and could not be dealt with in the absence of detailed definition of access proposals for the Region. This matter therefore had to be deferred, to be taken up in the Macarthur Regional planning processes now being undertaken.
9.2 NOISE

Ninety submissions, including eight proformas, raised aspects relating to Section 9.2 of the Draft EIS. These aspects can be categorized into the following issues:

- appointment of an independent consultant to assess aircraft noise effects;
- the ANEF system;
- objections to various aspects of aircraft noise effects;
- effects of alternative runway alignments;
- compensation for injurious affection;
- purchase of properties within potentially noise-affected areas.

**Appointment of an independent consultant to assess aircraft noise effects**

Three submissions (276.001, 328.021 and 329.011) argued that an independent assessment of noise should have been undertaken. In fact, the noise contours were produced by the subconsultant Greiner Engineering, based on assumptions agreed jointly with the Department of Aviation. The ANEF system of generating noise contours is an adaptation of the U.S. Federal Aviation Agency's integrated noise model (version 3.8), the adaptation being based on the results of the work of the National Acoustics Laboratories. The estimation of numbers of people and houses affected was undertaken by Kinhill Stearns using criteria on population percentages moderately or seriously affected from the National Acoustic Laboratories work. It is unlikely that an independent consultant could have introduced any different methodology which commands broad acceptability.

**The ANEF system**

Two submissions raised points about the ANEF system generally (236.007 and 274.010). The first argued that decibels would be a less misleading measure than ANEF units. The ANEF unit or contour is not widely understood, and this fact alone has precipitated repeated criticism. The use of decibels, however, whilst providing a more widely understood measure of sound intensity, does not take account of such other considerations as frequency of occurrence and time of occurrence.

Most people would consider one aircraft noise event less annoying than ten at the same noise level; and aircraft noise at 3 a.m. to be more annoying than at 3 p.m. The ANEF system is able to take account of these types of variations, and is generally accepted as a more reliable measure of annoyance than the simple decibel measure.

The second submission was that of the State Government, which agreed that the use of the ANEF system was appropriate for this purpose.

Many submissions on noise raised points related to the accuracy of the ANEF contours presented in the Draft EIS.

Fifteen comments implied that the noise affected areas should be considerably larger than depicted in the Draft EIS owing to the low ambient noise levels surrounding Badgerys Creek (1.009, 1.010, 7.019, 65.017, 222.008, 264.024, 274.003, 312.002, 328.008, 329.002, 329.009, 330.006, 341.013, 345.006 and 420.002).

In fact, the noise contours themselves are a function of aircraft operations and have no relationship with ambient noise levels. The objection more accurately relates to the 20 ANEF cut-off for the noise area used for evaluation. The implication is that if 20 ANEF is a reasonable cut-off for urban environments, something less than 20 ANEF would be appropriate for rural and semi-rural environments. It is likely that areas surrounding Badgerys Creek do have lower ambient noise levels than those areas around urban airports like Sydney and Adelaide. Whether this affects reaction to aircraft noise exposure or not is however not clear. The National Acoustics Laboratories findings were used because they represent the most recent and most comprehensive scientifically
established data on Australian reaction to aircraft noise. The National Acoustics Laboratories survey included airports like Tullamarine, Richmond and Perth, which are distinctly more like the Badgerys Creek environment than the urban environments around Sydney or Adelaide airports. No significant differences were observed between reaction at Melbourne, Richmond etc. and the 'urban' airports.

Some submissions were critical of the treatment in the Draft EIS of night time aircraft noise (1.010, 250.010, 264.029, 329.013, 330.007 and 457.012).

The criticisms were that:

- reaction to night time noise would be worse than predicted by the National Acoustics Laboratories because of lower ambient noise levels around Badgerys Creek;

- the weighting applied to night operations is too small;

- the percentage of operations assumed to be night operations is too small.

The weighting applied to night time operations effectively equates one night time operation to four day time operations. This weighting was adopted on the basis of National Acoustics Laboratories findings which indicated that the previously used greater weighting was too high. There has been general acceptance of the night and evening weightings now used in the ANEF system.

The allocation of forecast traffic to evening and night operations to permit the estimation of noise contours is set out in 9.2.5, page 192 of the Draft EIS. This suggests that 30% of all jet movements would occur after 7 p.m., with 10% occurring after 10 p.m. The Department of Aviation maintains that this is a much higher proportion than is likely to occur and is therefore appropriate for the worst case estimate of noise exposure.

One submission (7.006) argued that, rather than being difficult to define, the 20 ANEF contour is so uncertain as to probably include large areas of the city of Fairfield. This exaggeration is rejected. As stated on page 188 of the Draft EIS, the ANEF computation is based on an average day. "If the 20 ANEF contour were calculated day by day, its position would vary considerably according to traffic patterns." In estimating ANEF contours assumptions are made about the average performance of aircraft and pilots. To the extent that in practice actual performance varies from the assumptions made in estimating the contours, there will be variation in the location of the 20 ANEF.

This does not necessarily mean the whole 20 ANEF contour moves uniformly in or out in response to any variations. The actual contour may fatten and shorten for example. The typical variation is relatively small, the National Acoustics Laboratories measuring a variation of less than 3 decibels in actual aircraft noise compared to that corresponding to the level input in the computation of the contour. This variation is certainly not significant when compared to the underlying assumptions of the worst case, and certainly cannot legitimately be extended to cover large areas of Fairfield.

Seven submissions (7.006, 64.001, 196.005, 232.002, 264.027, 274.002 and 345.007) were critical of the fact that the ANEF system failed to take account of topography. One stated that Badgerys Creek was a 'natural amphitheatre'. All implied that the topography around Badgerys Creek would exacerbate the noise effects presented in the Draft EIS. In fact, the topography within the noise areas around Badgerys Creek is essentially flat with an occasional hill or low mountain. These are similar topographical conditions to those around Kingsford-Smith Airport, although the hills around Kingsford-Smith Airport are higher (relative to the airport) than at Badgerys Creek. There is no evidence that this topography distorts community reaction to aircraft noise as presented by National Acoustics Laboratories and these criticisms are consequently rejected.
Eight submissions made nine comments on the question of wind and temperature inversions affecting noise propagation (7.008, 7.018, 67.003, 196.005, 274.006, 329.003, 330.012, 341.018 and 386.004). All imply that these effects must result in a worse or more distorted pattern of noise exposure than that outlined in the Draft EIS.

As discussed on page 188 of the Draft EIS the ANEF computation is based on an average day and temperature, wind, temperature inversions, cloud cover and humidity can all contribute day-to-day variations in the propagation of noise.

The ANEF system of estimating noise exposure contours, in common with similar noise exposure systems employed around the world, does not attempt to make allowances for these sources of variation for two main reasons. Firstly, there is no consistently reliable method of accounting for variations in each of these factors as they vary over time and space.

Secondly, the generation of noise contours is only half of the task of estimating aircraft noise exposure effects. The other half involves assessing how people respond to different noise exposure levels determined by the ANEF contours.

The investigation of reaction is typically undertaken using social surveys, in which respondents are requested to describe their reaction to aircraft noise. Their response is clearly based not on the experience of a particular survey day but on their accumulated experience of living in areas exposed to aircraft noise. Consequently their response is an average rather than instantaneous reaction to aircraft noise.

The ANEF system is therefore an average measure of exposure and response, and it has been consistently confirmed as the best method for Australia for estimating the effects of aircraft noise.

Although all the sources of possible variation listed above are common in varying degrees to all airports around the world, there is no evidence to suggest they significantly affect average response. This was confirmed in the National Acoustics Laboratories survey, where for example, areas close to Sydney airport but outside the 20 ANEF contours were surveyed as control areas. The absence of any particular annoyance due to aircraft noise in control areas served to confirm the reasonable accuracy of the ANEF system, and the absence of significant distortion of the ANEF contours due to factors such as those listed above.

This lack of significant variation can be observed for noise exposure associated with current operations. The noise exposure areas assessed for Badgerys Creek are worst case areas, which are unlikely to be attained let alone exceeded. It is therefore extremely unlikely that the variation which might arise from these effects would result in exposure in excess of that outlined in the Draft EIS. A noise monitoring system set up after the airport became operational would confirm this. As is normal practice at major airports, noise abatement procedures would be developed aimed at minimizing the disturbance due to aircraft noise.

Nine submissions were general criticisms of the adequacy of the ANEF system (65.022, 274.003, 298.002, 312.003, 330.010, 335.003, 341.002, 392.009 and 422.003.) These argued that particular effects were inadequately described. Blacktown City Council pointed out that noise effects at other airports affected one way or another by the Badgerys Creek proposal had not been included. This comment probably relates most to Schofields aerodrome, which itself remains relatively unaffected by the Badgerys Creek proposal. Noise generation by Schofields is much more likely to flow from any relaxation of current use restrictions by the airport owner than by the Badgerys Creek proposal. Other comments either suggested the Draft EIS was deliberately vague on the effects of aircraft noise, or criticized the fact that noise effects evaluation had been restricted to within the 20 ANEF area.
Comment 304.005 argued that simulated operations at Badgerys Creek by small and large aircraft during a temperature inversion should be undertaken to demonstrate noise levels. However, even if this could be arranged, it would not serve the intended purpose. Reactions to single events are not likely to accurately represent reaction to habitual noise exposure, and would probably be affected by the prejudices (for or against) of those attending the simulation.

A number of submissions claimed that the estimates of people potentially affected by noise were incorrect (1,012, 7,026, 287.003, 329.012, 457.027).

These claims seem to be based largely on a misunderstanding of the method used. The estimates were obtained by assuming that all land within the ANEF contours would be subdivided to the maximum extent permitted by present zoning restrictions and that all such subdivisions would be populated to the average degree. Existing subdivisions below the present zoning restrictions were allowed for. The estimate is therefore considerably higher than the present population of the area and could only be an underestimate if it is assumed that the present zoning restrictions will be relaxed in the future: an unlikely occurrence if Badgerys Creek is chosen as the airport site.

One submission (256.006) noted that many of the people listed as potentially noise-affected would have moved into the area subsequent to the announcement of the airport site.

Objections to aircraft noise


A number of others made the specific complaint that many who have moved into the area within the last few years will be affected (1.002, 71.006, 352.002 (proforma), 353.003 (proforma) and 405.002). Clearly it is true that aircraft noise would affect lifestyle. Most of Section 9.2 is dedicated to explaining and assessing the incidence and nature of these effects. No distinctions were made, nor could be made, about the length of residence of those affected.

Four submissions (71.002, 250.003, 328.009 and 380.004) asserted that people affected by aircraft noise would suffer hearing damage and stress related health problems. The Department of Health, in its submission to the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Aircraft Noise stated that the possible effects of aircraft noise on physical and mental health remains an unsolved question but it appears possible that although not a cause, aircraft noise acts on those already stressed. A good deal of specific research is needed before more definite conclusions can be reached. Clearly the effects are neither great nor widespread, or they would be far more evident. Although hearing protection is worn by airport workers exposed to high noise levels over extended periods of time there is no evidence of hearing damage to residents outside the airport boundary.

One submission raised the question of health effects from airport radars. However, there are no known public health risks from this source.

One submission pointed out that there would be no compensation for any such consequences.
Two comments (71.004 and 81.004) asserted that few houses are designed to withstand the vibration from overflying aircraft. This is incorrect. The vibration from aircraft is quite low and for houses, except those very close to the runway ends perhaps, the effects have been described as no worse than that generated by a person jumping from a chair onto the floor.

Two submissions raised the question of interference with TV reception from overflying aircraft and airport radars. Because of the greater distance from the TV transmitters the effects of reflected signals from aircraft would be less than is currently experienced around Kingsford-Smith Airport. Airport radars should have no effect. The Parliamentary Select Committee on Aircraft Noise is aware of this problem of TV flicker around airports, and is considering what action can be taken. Its report is due to be presented to Parliament before the end of this year.

Comment 1.006 requested information on the approximate height of aircraft flying over Truman Road, Horsley Park. The answer is roughly 500m above the ground for landing aircraft and something in excess of that for aircraft taking off over Truman Road.

A number of submissions raised questions relating to the effects of noise on schools, hospitals and nursing homes (1.008, 1.014, 7.011, 7.012, 63.006, 64.002, 64.003, 67.005, 71.005, 199.004, 244.005, 252.003, and 274.116).

Horsley Park Public School, Marion School and Anowah School are all outside the 20 ANEF zone and more than 7 km from the proposed runway and should therefore not be seriously inconvenienced by aircraft noise. Luddenham Public School, although closer to the airport, is outside the 20 ANEF contour and well away from the normal flight paths. Again little inconvenience is anticipated. Wetherill Park College is more than 4 km outside the 20 ANEF zone.

Fairfield Hospital is more than 5 km outside the 20 ANEF contour and about 14 km from the runway. The Department considers a hospital in this location entirely compatible with the airport.

The nearest known retirement village or nursing home is at Austral, about 8 km from the airport and not in line with the runways. Liverpool City Council has advised that no planning approval has been granted for any similar establishment in the vicinity of the airport.

The submission of CSIRO (244.003) claimed that aircraft noise could interfere with the breeding of small animals at the Badgerys Creek Research Station. As part of this property is within the 30 ANEF zone this is a possibility and it may be necessary to relocate this activity, either to the western part of the property or to another site.

Two submissions (274.004 and 457.017) raised the question of construction noise. One argued that the effects would be worse at Badgerys Creek than Wilton. The other comment (by the State Government) implied that more detail was needed on construction noise. However, the information set out in Section 9.2.9, page 204 of the Draft EIS, is considered sufficient for a site selection process. More detailed construction noise estimates including the time and duration of the noise is more appropriate to the construction phase than to site selection.

The State Government also argued that noise from access roads and railways should have been quantified (274.008). This conflicts with the agreement reached with the access and environmental working groups, which included State representatives, that these aspects could only be meaningfully addressed when access routes were determined in the Macarthur Regional Environment Plan.

One submission (389.016) claimed that Kingsford-Smith Airport residents do not complain about aircraft noise, because they enjoy the benefits of housing rendered cheaper by
aircraft noise effects. Residents adjacent to Kingsford-Smith Airport do object to aircraft noise, and those objections are outlined in the National Acoustics Laboratories study; and there is no evidence that their house prices are depressed relative to similar properties in areas not affected by aircraft noise exposure.

Effects of alternative runway alignments

Comment 1.013 claimed that anti-clockwise rotation of the runways would reduce noise exposure in Horsley Park. The State Government's submission stated (comments 274.109 and 274.120) that the rejected alternative north/south runway alignment would affect the University of Sydney's teaching facility at Cobbitty and the Nepean College of Advanced Education. There is no disagreement with these statements.

Injurious affection compensation

Eighteen submissions on the subject of injurious affection compensation were received (2.001, 4.001, 16.006, 53.004, 69.005, 81.002, 219.003, 219.005, 229.002, 236.006, 274.014, 274.126, 278.002, 283.004, 283.007, 287.004, 337.015, 367.006, 368.007, 376.005, 376.010 and 379.006).

As stated on page 204 of the Draft EIS, under the present Commonwealth acquisition legislation (Lands Acquisition Act 1955) no compensation is available for injurious affection such as noise, effect on lifestyle, family heritage etc. where no land is taken. Compensation in the case of property severance is covered in Section 9.1.4 of the Draft EIS.

The Law Reform Commission considered the injurious affection question in detail and recommended in its report No. 14 that the current legislation should be changed to make this aspect of compensation to property owners more equitable. The Government has deferred its decision on this matter until it has had a chance to consult with other levels of Government and until the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Aircraft Noise has released its report and recommendations.

Purchase of properties within potentially noise-affected areas

Fourteen submissions were received relating to the purchase of properties within the potentially noise-affected areas (7.010, 221.001, 231.002, 235.002, 263.002, 264.018, 276.002, 276.004, 303.001, 308.004, 322.002, 345.012, 370.002, 371.001, 420.003).

The comments made on this topic were of two types: a requirement to acquire all properties within the 25 ANEF noise contour and requests to acquire individual noise-affected properties, including one within the 40 ANEF.

The potential aircraft noise problem associated with the establishment of a second Sydney airport could adversely affect the value of properties and influence peoples' lifestyle in areas of high noise levels. However, at present, no established policy exists on whether the Commonwealth will purchase land in addition to that required for airport purposes. It is pertinent to note that legal advice tendered in 1985 to the Parliamentary Select Committee on Aircraft Noise indicated that the Commonwealth Lands Acquisition Act 1955 would allow the Commonwealth to acquire land around and adjacent to airports for noise buffer zone purposes. However, even if this advice was adopted by Government, there is no current policy on how such a decision would be implemented. For example, to what ANEF contour would such a noise buffer zone acquisition be extended? Would voluntary or compulsory acquisition apply? Would this measure only be introduced if State land use controls were likely to be amended? Should controls apply to owners of properties adjacent to the airport boundaries whose properties are within the high noise zone?
In establishing its policy on this matter, the Government would no doubt be guided by the findings of the Parliamentary Select Committee on Aircraft Noise. Until it is known which findings of this Committee are adopted by Government, they cannot be applied to the properties affected by the second Sydney airport proposal.

It is expected that the report of the findings of the Parliamentary Select Committee on Aircraft Noise will be tabled in Parliament later this year.

9.3 ARCHAEOLOGY

Two submissions were received that discussed archaeological aspects of the Badgerys Creek site. These submissions raised two separate issues:

- the extent of the area surveyed for Aboriginal sites;
- the recording of archaeological sites and the preservation of any finds in museums.

These issues are discussed below.

Extent of area of survey

One submission (264.026) commented on the extent of the area studied for both Aboriginal and European sites of significance.

The comment suggests that the significance of the land to the Aboriginal people was considered only within the site area. Sections 9.3.1 and 9.3.2 of the Draft EIS discuss the archaeological investigation of the proposed site and its environs. As outlined in Section 9.3.1 archaeological value was considered on a regional as well as a local basis, by means of a review of previous studies that have been undertaken, and discussion with Gandangara Local Aboriginal Land Council and twenty-nine Aboriginal residents of the area, and the Draft EIS notes seventeen sites within a 10 km radius of Badgerys Creek. Original survey work was, however, confined to the site itself and the method of selection of sampling locations and results of the survey are given in Section 9.3.2. Section 9.3.3 points out that further investigation would be required to assess associated effects arising from induced development or from the location of new road or rail access routes. These investigations would occur when the final site had been selected and the locations of these facilities determined.

European heritage value likewise was assessed by field survey only within the proposed site boundary, but heritage registers were inspected for any significant sites within the 25 ANEF corridor, and archival research and discussion with heritage groups and local people was conducted to locate any potentially sensitive sites both around and within the proposed site. Assessment of European heritage is discussed in Section 9.5 of the Draft EIS. As for Aboriginal heritage value, further assessment at the stage of planning of associated facilities would be required to assess any effects arising from induced development or the location of new road or rail access routes.

Recording and display of artefacts

Two submissions (264.034 and 457.020) commented on the possible display of any artefacts located on the proposed site.

All Aboriginal sites in New South Wales are protected by the National Parks and Wildlife Service under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1974. Permission must be sought from the Service before any site can be destroyed, and the advice of the Service and the Gandangara Local Aboriginal Land Council regarding preservation of any site or artefacts and display of any artefacts would be sought by the Department of Aviation. The Department of Aviation at present proposes to undertake no further archaeological work, in view of the relatively low sensitivity of the proposed site. However, should any
additional information concerning the archaeological sensitivity of the site and areas likely to be affected by airport development become available prior to commencement of construction the Department would review the need to appoint a qualified archaeologist to monitor the development during ground disturbance.

9.4 CONCERNS OF ABORIGINAL PEOPLE

Two submissions discussed the concerns of Aboriginal people. These submission made two separate comments, which considered the following issues:

- extension of archaeological survey outside the site boundary;
- liaison with Aboriginal communities.

These issues are discussed below.

Extension of archaeological survey

One submission (422.004) suggested that sites of archaeological significance outside the boundary of the proposed site should be surveyed as well as those within. A similar concern about the possibility of environmental impact on sites of archaeological and anthropological significance to Aboriginal people outside the proposed site boundaries was expressed by a number of the Aboriginal residents interviewed by the Anthropological Consultant.

Section 9.4.2 of the Draft EIS repeats the acknowledgement and undertaking given in Section 9.3.3 that further investigation would be required to assess associated effects arising from induced development or from the location of new road or rail access routes. Liaison with the Gandangara Local Aboriginal Land Council and the National Parks and Wildlife Service would continue during the course of these additional investigations if Badgerys Creek were the selected site.

Liaison with Aboriginal communities

The submission (274.018) relating to the involvement of Aboriginal communities in the archaeological and anthropological investigation of the proposed Badgerys Creek site simply involved an expression of support for the views of the Gandangara Local Aboriginal Land Council. These views are stated fully in Section 14.4.3 of the Draft EIS and should the proposed site at Badgerys Creek be selected for airport development consultation with the Land Council would continue so that the views of the Council could be taken into consideration.

9.5 EUROPEAN HERITAGE

Nine submissions were received that made ten separate comments on aspects of the Draft EIS relating to European heritage value of the Badgerys Creek area. The comments could be categorized into two main issues:

- the historical value of the area;
- graveyards and churches within the proposed site.

These issues are discussed below.

Historical value of the area

Seven submissions made seven separate comments (1.014, 7.013, 65.023, 67.002, 264.035, 337.022 and 451.004) relating to the historical value of the Badgerys Creek area.
Two comments simply raised the point that Badgerys Creek is a historical area and development of the proposed airport would affect the area’s historical resources.

The Draft EIS recognizes the historical nature of the Badgerys Creek area, and outlines its history from first European settlement in the early nineteenth century. An archaeological survey of the proposed site was conducted during the preparation of the Draft EIS but only one feature within the 25 ANEF contour was determined to be of heritage value. This was Vicary’s Winery and its associated house, vineyard and outbuildings, which has both architectural and historical merit. It also has some regional significance as an example of a particular industry that was once important to the locality but has since been relocated.

A slab shed and woolshed on the proposed site are the only physical evidence of significance originating in the mid to late nineteenth century. Most of the standing historical structures are of only local importance and of minimal heritage value, although it is possible that there may be some archaeological material below the surface of the site, which would be of national interest and heritage value if it dated from the first half of the nineteenth century.

Should the proposed Badgerys Creek site be selected the Department of Aviation would, before construction commenced, appoint a qualified archaeologist to investigate and recommend any recording or other conservation measures which might be appropriate for Vicary’s Winery, and also to monitor the development during ground disturbance.

Two submissions were concerned specifically with possible detrimental effects on Horsley homestead, which is located in Horsley Park, between the 20 ANEF and 25 ANEF contours. The homestead lies 10.6km from the end of the nearest runway in the preliminary master plan used in determining the noise contours and at this distance aircraft landing would be roughly 500 m above the ground and aircraft taking off would be somewhat higher. Vibration effects would be extremely low at this distance. So would any fallout effects, which would make an insignificant contribution to corrosive action on masonry when compared with the effects of regional air quality generally.

Two submissions indicated that more prominence should be given to European heritage values. The weighting given (Figure 6.2, Draft EIS) was fourth among those for environmental factors, following population displaced, existing noise incompatible land use, and future noise incompatible land use. The weighting was heavier than that given to flora and fauna, mineral resources, agriculture, flood risk and water and air quality. In addition one other submission suggested ‘overkill’ on European heritage effects, which would indicate that the weighting may be regarded as too heavy.

Graveyards and churches within the proposed site

Four submissions made four separate comments (65.002, 81.005, 283.002 and 376.006) regarding the existence of churches within the proposed site. The comments voice concern that the churches may have to be demolished and graveyards relocated. Should the proposed Badgerys Creek site be selected for airport development, the Department of Aviation would consult with the churches concerned and the Department of Environment and Planning Heritage Branch to determine the best method of commemorating and/or relocating these facilities. It may be possible to retain these small graveyards within the airport boundary.

9.6 ECONOMIC EFFECTS

Twenty submissions were received querying aspects of the economic effects of the proposed second Sydney airport. These submissions made forty-one separate comments, which could be further categorized into five main issues:

- time lag in employment effects;
number of jobs created;
- regional economic effects and effects on local facilities;
- economic analysis of the Draft EIS.

These issues are discussed below.

**Time lag in employment effects**

Three submissions made three separate comments (65.010, 264.009 and 345.013) regarding the time that would elapse between acquisition of the proposed site and generation of any employment.

These comments point out that site acquisition would create no jobs and that there may be a considerable time lag before the construction and operation stages which would generate employment.

This is acknowledged in the Draft EIS. Section 9.6.4 describes the effect of site acquisition as a possible displacement of some existing economic activity, although the leasing arrangements proposed should ensure that any such loss would be minimal. Sections 9.6.5 and 9.6.6 describe the employment and economic generating effects that would be anticipated at construction and operation stages, but point out the difficulty of accurately specifying the effects of construction at a date not yet determined. During the lag period between acquisition and construction, the Commonwealth proposes to manage land acquired for productive use, as far as possible. The Commonwealth's preferred course of action would be to lease land back to original owners, or where this arrangement was not feasible, to lease through the invitation of public tenders. This arrangement should maintain the present economic role and employment generation of the site area at a level almost equivalent to that now existing.

**Number of jobs created**

Eleven submissions made fourteen separate comments (4.003, 7.020, 65.009, 199.003, 264.011, 264.013, 274.027, 290.010, 328.015, 341.003, 341.006, 341.007, 391.009 and 422.005) relating to the number of jobs that would be created by airport development, should the proposed Badgerys Creek site be selected.

A slight majority of these comments queried the estimated maximum employment levels expected to be generated by airport development. The method of estimation is detailed in the Draft EIS, including any assumptions made about level of operation of the proposed airport and assumptions relating to the regional economy. It is also stated that the estimates made for airport associated and induced employment, and multiplier or flow-on employment are maximum levels. This is a result of the use of the same 'worst-case' for analysis of economic effects as had been used for evaluation of all other environmental factors in preparing the Draft EIS.

Most of the remaining comments relating to job creation pointed out that employment gains through airport construction and operation may be offset to some extent by employment losses in the local area resulting from site acquisition, and in the Kingsford-Smith area through the possible relocation of some airport associated activity. As outlined in Section 9.1 of the Draft EIS, the Commonwealth proposes to manage the acquired site area for existing productive use as far as is possible, thereby maintaining close to the present levels of employment generated by this land. However, Section 9.6.4 of the Draft EIS acknowledges that there may be some loss of production on the land acquired and that any such loss would be accompanied by negative flow-on effects in the local region.

Possible loss of employment at Kingsford-Smith Airport is not specifically discussed in the Draft EIS. This is because a second airport is seen as supplementing the capacity of Kingsford-Smith Airport rather than being in competition. Section 2.4 of the Draft EIS
considers the role of Kingsford-Smith Airport in the presence of a second Sydney airport. The conclusion reached is that Kingsford-Smith Airport would remain the dominant, business oriented airport, remaining the focus for business and intrastate commuter traffic. It is also expected that Kingsford-Smith Airport would remain the principal airport of the established major airlines as a result primarily of the fact that the option for these airlines of relocating to a second airport is not realistic in the face of their established markets and competitive relationships. A secondary reason is that each has substantial investments in facilities at Kingsford-Smith Airport. It is also regarded as unlikely that airline associated activities would relocate their operations, as outlined in Section 9.6.6. Therefore loss of employment in the Kingsford-Smith sub-region as a result of establishing a second Sydney airport is considered unlikely.

The remaining comments about to employment aspects of the proposed second Sydney airport related to a perceived reduction in employment generated by the airport resulting from technological advances.

Section 9.6.6 considers the extent to which productivity improvements may reduce direct employment generated by the proposed airport. It is stated that the estimated ratio of 540 airline employees per million passengers could represent two situations:

- no improvement in airline productivity and limited maintenance activity;
- significant improvement in productivity but a high level of maintenance activity.

### Regional economic effects and effects on local facilities

A number of submissions made separate comments (7.021, 16.002, 65.028, 71.007, 73.003, 196.008, 250.008, 250.009, 264.043, 274.029, 274.032, 312.006, 328.024, 337.017, 337.021, 341.015, 422.007 and 422.015) relating to economic and employment effects in the Badgerys Creek sub-region and to effects the proposed airport development might have on local facilities and services.

Three comments responded positively to siting of the proposed airport at Badgerys Creek, suggesting that the economic and employment generating effects of the proposed airport would benefit the region. There is little doubt that economic and employment benefits would occur.

Two more comments suggested strategies to maximize local benefit from the economic generating effects of the proposed airport. Strategies included encouragement for local location of a freight forwarding industry and aircraft servicing, repair and catering industries in the early stages of airport and local and regional planning.

A number of comments discuss the extent to which airport generated employment could be expected to benefit the sub-region, postulating that skilled labour would be likely to be drawn from outside the region and that economic benefits might not flow on to local businesses. Sections 9.6.5 and 9.6.6 discuss these aspects of economic and employment generation, and the application of the multipliers derived from the Kingsford-Smith sub-region to the Badgerys Creek sub-region. It is acknowledged that the multipliers must be discounted when applied to the Badgerys Creek sub-region to reflect the simpler economic structure and higher leakages of expenditure that would apply to the Badgerys Creek case. These factors are taken into account in projecting direct, airport associated and airport induced employment in the Badgerys Creek sub-region.

Four comments suggest costs to the local region through loss of rate income from land acquired by the Commonwealth, and through provision of additional services and maintenance of facilities. The Draft EIS discusses the possible rate loss to Council during the site acquisition stage in Section 9.6.4, and at the operational stage in Section 9.6.6. At the acquisition stage, the Commonwealth undertakes to make ex gratia payments to the Council in lieu of rates, and at the operational stage, ex gratia payments would be made on those sections of land within the airport that are revenue earning.
The provision of infrastructural services such as water, electricity, sewerage, telecommunications, waste disposal and fuels is discussed in Section 10.5 Infrastructure and Energy Consumption. The provision of these services would be the subject of future discussion between the Department of Aviation and the departments involved. The major area of Council responsibility lies in provision and upkeep of the local road system which would primarily be affected by the routing of new major roads as discussed in Section 10.4 of the Draft EIS. Primary responsibility for the construction and routing of major roads to the proposed airport would lie with the Department of Main Roads, and effects on the local road network would be the subject of discussion between the Department of Main Roads, Liverpool City Council and the Department of Aviation.

Economic analysis of the Draft EIS

Four submissions made seven separate comments (422.019, 341.014, 264.037, 264.008, 264.039, 264.041 and 457.028) criticizing aspects of the economic analysis made in the Draft EIS.

One comment suggests that the Draft EIS failed to consider effects such as the regional loss of employment that could be occasioned by airport development. The only areas of loss would be loss of on-site agricultural employment that might result at site acquisition and development stages, and loss of regional agricultural employment resulting from change of land use in the region. These aspects are discussed in Sections 9.6.4 and Sections 9.7.4 of the Draft EIS. It should be noted that jobs created by airport development would exceed jobs lost, and that sectoral changes in employment distribution are most likely to occur in the region as a result of continuing urbanization with or without airport development.

Three comments query the application of multipliers derived from the Kingsford-Smith sub-region to the Badgerys Creek sub-region. This has been discussed above under the heading 'Regional economic effects and effects on local facilities', and is dealt with in Sections 9.6.2 and 9.6.4 to 9.6.6 of the Draft EIS.

One comment queries the definition of the Badgerys Creek sub-region given in the Draft EIS, suggesting that parts of the Fairfield and Blacktown local government areas should have been included. As outlined in Section 9.6 of the Draft EIS the sub-region was defined for study purposes on the basis of convenient administrative boundaries of districts immediately adjacent to the proposed site. Fairfield and Blacktown local government areas may have characteristics common to the cities of Liverpool and Penrith, and would therefore be likely to share at least some of the effects of airport development should the proposed Badgerys Creek site be selected.

The remaining comment states that the use of the 'worst case' for a economic analysis has in fact led to 'best case' employment and economic analysis. This is discussed above under the heading 'Number of jobs created'. The Draft EIS states throughout the analysis of employment and economic effects that estimates generated are maximum levels.

9.7 AGRICULTURE

Twenty-one submissions were received concerning aspects of Section 9.7 of the Draft EIS. These submissions included thirty separate comments on the loss of agricultural land and production.

The comments made in the submissions can be categorized as follows:

- loss of prime agricultural land within the airport site;
- loss of agricultural production;
- broader impact on agriculture.
These issues are discussed below.

Loss of prime agricultural land within the airport site

Nine of the submissions received expressed concern at the loss of agricultural land. There were eleven separate comments (68.005, 68.008, 253.005, 253.006, 274.021, 290.004, 295.005, 328.010, 329.005, 345.005 and 457.015).

Concern was expressed at the loss of prime agricultural land, especially land so well situated with regard to markets, trotting tracks, broiler processing and with particular physical characteristics such as frost freedom and level terrain. Associated with the above was concern about the consequent loss of agricultural production and the need for adequate compensation for affected landholders.

It is the policy of the NSW Department of Agriculture that prime agricultural land (80% of the site area is so classified) be retained for agriculture. However, this has not prevented the gradual loss of agricultural land in the western Sydney area to other uses such as urban development, rural residential and small hobby farms in response to economic pressures.

The land affected by the proposed airport development, though very well located for various activities, is not unique and land use in the area would change over time under the pressure of market forces. This process of change has been demonstrated time and time again as farms on the fringe of cities are sub-divided for housing and industrial development. Farmers are induced to sell out due to economic pressure and the prospect of substantial capital gain and subsequently either leave the land altogether or move elsewhere to renew their farming activities. If they leave the industry, their place would very often be taken by other producers in other districts.

Land would increase in value owing to urban pressures, unless its use is restricted by planning controls and eventually, even with intensification, farming activities of almost any kind would become uneconomic. Rural residential and small hobby farm use would then be a logical usage as increased ownership and other overhead costs outweigh location, freight, processing and marketing advantages. This has been confirmed in studies carried out for the Macarthur Regional Environmental Study currently in preparation.

The effect of airport construction at Badgerys Creek would be to reduce the availability of suitable sites for the existing activities and speed up the process of change. The precise effects would however be very dependent on the timing of airport construction, that is, on the extent to which change had occurred before construction. Mere acquisition of the site for airport purposes should have little effect and some agricultural activities could continue to exist adjacent to the airport within the noise affected area even after it becomes operational.

Dairying has been in decline for many years in the Sydney region and there is now an additional threat of industry deregulation with competition from efficient New Zealand and Victorian producers. Over the years dairies have either relocated or obtained replacement production from dairies in other districts operating on cheaper land. Similarly vegetable production is also likely to decline as a Regional Environmental Study survey showed that only 25% of producers' children expected to continue the farm business. Likewise 70% of poultry producers indicated they would sell if they received a good price and 60% of these would leave the industry permanently.

Loss of agricultural production

Nine of the submissions received expressed concern at the loss of agricultural production. There were ten separate comments raised (1.015, 3.002, 65.006, 274.022, 274.025, 330.016, 338.088, 376.008, 451.003 and 460.006).
All but one of the comments considered that the Draft EIS underestimated the value of agricultural production from the Badgerys Creek site. Only the Wilton Airport Resistance Committee claimed that it had been overestimated. Their submission suggested that of the $5 million gross value of production lost ($0.6 million net) some $2.5 million would be replaced from within the local region, a further $2.4 million elsewhere in the Sydney region and $0.1 million outside the region.

The NSW Department of Agriculture contends that the total loss of agricultural production would be $10 million due to the development and urbanization of other areas as a result of the loss of potential homesites within the 20-25 ANEF contour.

Studies undertaken for the Macarthur Regional Environmental Study suggest that the Australian Bureau of Statistics estimates of value of smallholder production of tomatoes and other vegetable crops are underestimated by a factor of 2.5. This could increase gross value of vegetable production within the airport site by $450,000.

The construction of an airport would probably only hasten the rate of change in the character of the region. As was pointed out previously, dairying and vegetable production are already in decline owing to economic and social factors. The majority of poultry producers would also leave the region and the industry at a price. Dairy and vegetable production can be replaced by production from other areas. Poultry production is infrastructure dependent but it can also be transferred to other districts where land is cheaper and pollution of less concern. It is appreciated that there would be transport disadvantages for broiler producers and less opportunity for direct marketing activity by vegetable and cut flower producers.

Thus it is likely that there would be little if any loss of production overall as any agricultural production lost from the airport site and adjacent areas can be replaced by increased production from other districts. The net value of production after deducting costs of production from the affected area, while obviously important to the producers in the area, is insignificant on a state and national basis and can be replaced.

The other main point raised concerned the impact of noise, particularly on poultry, dairy and horse enterprises adjacent to the airport site within the 25 ANEF contour. Studies have been carried out overseas and to a limited extent in Australia but local experience at Richmond suggests that stock do adapt and that production losses are more likely to occur when stock first come on to property affected by aircraft noise. It seems that such effects are temporary and production returns to normal levels in most situations.

Broader impact on agriculture

Eight submissions received expressed concern at the likely broader impact of the proposed development. There were nine separate comments (65.007, 237.003, 244.004, 264.046, 274.023, 274.118, 290.005, 345.005 and 422.021).

The majority of comments on the broader impact of the airport were concerned with the effect of noise on livestock production which might possibly occur as far from the site as the 20 ANEF contour. Concern was also expressed regarding induced development pressures in other districts and the impact on the CSIRO and McGarvie Smith Research Centres.

It is clear that the shifting of agricultural activities to other areas will increase the demand for land and services in those areas though it is difficult to quantify such additional costs. The type of agriculture carried out on noise affected properties may change but change is normal and agriculture in some form will continue. Certain forms of agriculture may be inhibited but the land would not be sterilized as could be the case if a larger area was included in the airport site. The research activities of both CSIRO and University of Sydney research stations may also be affected and these stations have
a wide industry impact. However, the stations can be relocated and the effect would therefore be an economic cost rather than a loss of research effort to the industry.

It should also be noted that neither poultry production nor trotting training requires the use of prime agricultural land. Broiler producers need to be close to the processors and trotting owners need to have level training track sites reasonably close to race tracks. There are many trotters in country NSW who travel much longer distances to compete.

Land use is dynamic, not static, and would change as circumstances change. This means that agricultural land would be lost to other uses over time, but Australia is not short of good land and production can be intensified on land in other regions. The development of an airport would mean the complete loss of some agricultural land, but it would also mean that land outside the boundary but within the 25 ANEF noise contour would, owing to associated land use controls inhibiting urban development, remain in agriculture as the most logical use. Without an airport, all the land within and without the site may eventually be lost to agriculture.

9.8 REGIONAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

A number of submissions were received making fifty-two separate comments relating to Section 9.8 of the Draft EIS. The comments can be categorized into five main issues:

- restriction of land use;
- disruption of rural character of the area;
- disruption of community facilities and public institutions;
- urban growth needs of Sydney;
- disruption of urban areas.

These issues are discussed below.

Restriction of land use

Five submissions made six separate comments (65.019, 345.008, 345.009, 396.001, 433.006 and 459.016) relating to restriction of land uses and land sterilization, and compensation for these effects.

The submissions question whether land within the 20 ANEF contour would be sterilized, what zoning restrictions would apply should the proposed Badgerys Creek site be selected, whether consideration is being given to the acquisition of an airport 'buffer' area, and who would bear the cost for restrictions in land use.

Section 9.8.5 of the Draft EIS deals with the effects of site acquisition and airport operation on land use and zoning in the Badgerys Creek area. As stated in this section, the Department of Environment and Planning has put in place interim planning measures in order to restrict noise-sensitive uses in potentially noise affected areas. Essentially, these measures restrict any change of use that may be incompatible with airport development. These measures do not sterilize any land, as many of the land uses now permitted are compatible with the worst case noise levels. Further zoning controls that may be applied at the construction stage would be determined by the Department of Environment and Planning at that time.

The acquisition of an airport 'buffer' area is not currently being considered as a component of airport planning.

Compensation for any effects of site acquisition and airport construction and operation on surrounding residents would be a matter for negotiation between residents and the Commonwealth.
One comment criticized Figure 9.8.2 for giving the misleading impression that all properties surrounding the site are of 40 ha minimum size.

This figure shows the zoning of the area although some properties have been sub-divided into smaller blocks. All work which involved counting properties took account of the actual numbers of properties.

**Disruption of rural character of the area**

A number of submissions made comments (65.021, 66.010, 68.002, 248.001, 282.001, 295.008, 314.003, 321.004, 345.014, 398.002, 399.003 and 422.022) expressing concern at the disruption of the quiet rural lifestyle of Badgerys Creek and the rural industry of the area that would occur should the proposed site be selected.

The present rural atmosphere of the Badgerys Creek area is likely to alter with or without airport development, depending upon the development guidelines laid down in the Macarthur Regional Environmental Study currently in preparation by the Department of Environment and Planning and the Draft Regional Environmental Plan that will follow. The extent to which airport development, should the proposed Badgerys Creek site be selected, would influence the character of the locality apart from in the immediate site surrounds would also depend to a large extent on the land use zonings devised by the Department of Environment and Planning to complement airport development. Construction of the airport would, however, as outlined in Section 9.8.4 of the Draft EIS, encourage residential development by reason of the airport's employment opportunities and associated infrastructure improvements, and would also encourage some commercial and industrial development.

**Disruption of community facilities and public institutions**

A number of submissions made comments (53.001, 53.002, 53.003, 244.002, 250.012, 274.124, 274.125, 290.006, 295.006, 305.004, 305.005, 457.022 and 458.004) relating to the effect airport development might have on the operation of facilities within the Badgerys Creek area.

These comments discussed: the possibility that the Fleurs Radio Observatory would become inoperable should an airport facility with radar and communications equipment commence operations in the area; the location of an airport at the proposed Badgerys Creek site possibly requiring the relocation of Kingswood Ammunition Storage and Maintenance Facility; and general concern at the possible adverse effects on research and technical facilities.

Section 9.8.5 of the Draft EIS deals with the effects that airport operation, should it be sited at the proposed Badgerys Creek site, could have on facilities in the area. It is acknowledged that the Fleurs Radio Observatory would be rendered inoperable by the presence of an airport, but the Kingswood Ammunition Storage and Maintenance Facility is not expected to be substantially affected by airport operations. Possible effects on other facilities are given.

**Urban growth needs of Sydney**

A number of submissions made comments (274.016, 274.024, 319.002, 328.003, 328.019, 329.004, 422.006, 422.024, 432.003, 432.034 and 432.038) relating to the possible requirement for land at Badgerys Creek for urban expansion. The comments pointed out that should the proposed Badgerys Creek site be selected for airport development, a large area of land would no longer be available for future urban use.

Sections 9.8.2 and 9.8.3 of the Draft EIS discuss the anticipated future urban development of Sydney in the medium and long term.
The Macarthur Region, within which both the Badgerys Creek and Wilton proposed sites lie, has been identified as an area suitable to meet Sydney's future requirements for further urban land. The allocation of particular land areas within the region for urban and other uses will not be determined until the Regional Environmental Plan for the Macarthur Region, scheduled for preparation by the Department of Environment and Planning, is complete. The Department is considering implications of the two shortlisted airport sites in terms of regional issues as well as the long term urban space needs of Sydney in its current preparation of the Regional Environmental Study which precedes the Regional Environmental Plan.

Disruption of urban areas

Seven submissions made twelve separate comments (203.001, 203.002, 235.003, 250.001, 250.002, 250.004, 250.005, 250.006, 252.004, 422.014, 432.036 and 458.002) relating to the disruptive effects of noise and zoning requirements in urban areas in the vicinity of the proposed site, including the comment that the Badgerys Creek area is far too heavily populated for airport development (see also 9.2 and 17.1).

The extent and severity of noise nuisance has been dealt with in Section 9.2 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS which considers submissions relating to noise. Zoning and building control requirements would depend largely upon the provisions of the Macarthur Region Draft Regional Environmental Plan and of local councils. Section 9.2. of the Draft EIS acknowledges that a substantial population would be affected by location of the airport at the proposed Badgerys Creek site, but it should be noted, as shown in Table 9.2.10 of the Draft EIS, that the future maximum population within the 20 ANEF contour around Badgerys Creek is much lower than existing populations within 20 ANEF contours around four major Australian airports.
10.1 GEOLOGY, SOILS AND PHYSIOGRAPHY

Four submissions were received relating to Section 10.1 of the Draft EIS. These four submissions raised five separate comments which could be categorized into three main issues:

- sterilization of clay/shale resources;
- the quality of coal;
- land reshaping.

**Sterilization of clay shale resources**

Three comments, 337.024, 422.010, and 458.007, were concerned with the sterilization of possible clay/shale resources at the proposed Badgerys Creek should that site be selected.

One of the submissions suggested that the resource would be a significant barrier to airport development. The other two comments did not express any opinion as to the significance of the resource but were concerned about its potential sterilization should the proposed Badgerys Creek site be selected for airport development.

The Draft EIS discusses the potential occurrence of economically significant clay/shale deposits within the proposed site area. The extent and precise location of economic deposits is yet to be confirmed.

The Department of Mineral Resources is currently investigating the resource in the area to confirm the potential for resource extraction. Should the proposed site at Badgery's Creek be selected, the Department of Aviation would consult with the Department of Mineral Resources to establish the feasibility of extracting any economic resource prior to airport construction, or allowing partial extraction from the site during airport construction and operation.

**The quality of coal**

One submission, comment 274.039, related specifically to the coal resource that is known to underlie the Badgerys Creek site. The comment made is that the coal does not present a major obstacle to development of the airport, which accords with the conclusion of the Draft EIS, which states that the depth of the resource in relation to other coal resources and known reserves makes it unlikely to be mined within the next fifty years.

**Land reshaping**

One submission, comment 422.013, requests more detailed consideration of the scale and likely nature of reshaping of landscape than is given in the Draft EIS. The extent of land reshaping necessary, volume of cut-and-fill that would be required, and a site plan indicating areas of clearing, levelling and fill both in cross section and plan form is given in Section 10.1.3 of the Draft EIS. In addition, Sections 10.6.3 and 10.6.4 of the Draft
EIS consider the broad guidelines for building form, planting and screening that would be utilized in detailed design. Guidelines for screening and rehabilitation during construction are also discussed in Section 10.6.4. The Department of Aviation would ensure that detailed landscape planning was carried out at the detailed design stage.

The scale of reshaping that would occur is set in context by the description of local and regional landscape features given in Section 10.6.1 of the Draft EIS.

10.2 DRAINAGE AND WATER QUALITY

Thirteen submissions were received on drainage and water quality aspects of Section 10.2 of the Draft EIS. The comments can be categorized into the following main issues as addressed below:

- effects on water quality;
- effects on hydrology.

Water quality

The submissions on water quality effects have been divided into aspects of:

- tank and farm dam water quality (16.005, 65.033, 229.003 and 345.010);
- pollution of reservoirs (1.016, 290.003, 301.003 and 341.001);
- range of general water quality issues including groundwater contamination, non-compliance with regulations, pollution of South Creek and the Hawkesbury-Nepean system, non-addressing of water quality issues, level of detail, and costing of protection (196.006, 222.006, 222.011, 274.045, 274.050, 274.053, 274.055, 274.057, 337.026 and 422.023).

Tank and farm dam water quality

Under normal conditions airport operations would only contribute a small percentage of overall airborne contaminants in the region. It is expected that the 'rainout' of the contaminants to enter tanks and farm dams would be minimal. Emergency fuel dumping could, under extreme conditions, lead to some contamination of tanks or farm dams but the likelihood of these procedures occurring is very small. When they do, fuel is usually dumped over non-sensitive areas and at an elevation which would ensure the fuel is vaporized before it reaches the ground (see Section 8.7).

Pollution of reservoirs

Comments relating to pollution of reservoirs were concerned with general pollution from normal aircraft operation and also with emergency fuel dumping. As with the tank and farm dam water quality (see above) normal aircraft operation would have only very minimal effect on the water quality. The diffusion of aircraft emissions in the atmosphere is such that the concentration of chemical products from atmospheric reactions involving those emissions which would be found in rainfall or fallout would be very small.

In 1982, the then Department of Transport arranged for an analysis of water samples taken from household water tanks in areas under flight paths close to Adelaide Airport following complaints about pollution of water by unburnt aviation fuel. The analysis, undertaken by Australian Mineral Development Laboratories, showed that there were no detectable pollutants in the water samples which could be identified as being of aviation origin. It can reasonably be concluded that normal aircraft operations do not lead to pollution of water supplies.
General water quality issues
The overall planning, design, construction and operation phases of the airport would take proper account of water management so that State requirements were met and the environment protected. The Draft EIS has adopted a conceptual water management plan and identified aspects such as the probable need for nutrient removal from sewage effluent. More detailed investigation and design would develop the concept further to ensure appropriate environmental protection. It should also be noted that a properly managed extensive development such as an airport is more likely to lead to appropriate water quality control than a pattern of agricultural (or rural) land use under multiple ownership.

Hydrology
One submission made three separate comments (274.119, 274.041 and 274.043) relating to aspects of site drainage design and the potential for flooding. The Draft EIS presented a concept drainage plan to indicate the type and magnitude of potential effects and to demonstrate how potential adverse effects could be appropriately managed. During detailed planning and design appropriate objectives and design criteria would be established with State authorities and incorporated into any airport development. Key factors would include maintenance of, if not an improvement in, the existing pattern of flood flows downstream of the site.

10.3 AIR QUALITY
There were twenty-six submissions containing forty-five separate comments that addressed the question of air quality. The matters raised fall into the following subject areas:

- effects of air pollution on people and on plants and animals;
- effects of meteorological conditions on air quality;
- effects of motor vehicles on air quality;
- amelioration measures, monitoring programmes and safeguards;
- dust levels during airport construction;
- fog effects on airport operations.

Effects of air pollution on people and on plants and animals
Fifteen submissions made eighteen comments (65.005, 69.003, 71.003, 196.004, 244.007, 244.067, 301.002, 304.003, 321.003, 323.002, 330.005, 330.014, 330.015, 337.028, 337.034, 380.003, 402.003 and 426.007), relating to the effects of air pollution on people, plants and animals. The Draft EIS indicates that the second Sydney airport would contribute to pollution levels in the Sydney basin. The level of contribution, determined in Table 10.3.4 of the Draft, is by itself insufficient to raise overall pollution levels above acceptable standards. Overall emissions of hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide have fallen over recent years and are predicted to continue to fall. Currently monitored levels of carbon monoxide do not exceed United States Environmental Protection Agency and World Health Organisation standards. Hydrocarbons are major contributors to photochemical smog, whose major constituent ozone does occasionally exceed National Health and Medical Research Council standards. However, with the continued predicted fall in the level of hydrocarbon emissions, the number of occasions on which these standards are exceeded is expected to diminish even further. That is, if the reduction of ozone production is in fact attributable to the fall off of hydrocarbon emissions and not to meteorological causes.

In the case of nitrogen oxides, levels are predicted to increase and the second Sydney airport's contribution is higher than for any other constituent. Apart from nitrogen oxides being a pollutant per se, they are also significant as an essential contributor in the production of photochemical smog. The State Pollution Control Commission is drawing
up regulations to reduce hydrocarbons since photochemical smog needs both reagents for its production. If this policy proves successful the significance of nitrogen oxides as contributors will also decline.

Thus in all respects, with the occasional exception of nitrogen oxides, contributions of the second Sydney airport to pollution loads in Sydney's atmosphere would not be sufficient to cause pollution levels to exceed the accepted standards set out in Table 10.3.1 of the Draft EIS. These standards have been determined in the light of international findings on the adverse effects of air pollution on health and can be extended to include animals as well as humans. However, they do not apply to plants or materials and more research is necessary to determine these relationships.

With regard to particulates in the atmosphere, aircraft engines have steadily been improved as evidenced by the lack of prominent smoke trails from modern engines. Thus it is considered that particulate generation from the second Sydney airport would be negligible.

In the case of lead emissions, fuel for all non-piston aircraft is unleaded and thus emission levels are considered to be very low against a predicted rapid lowering of these emissions generally with the introduction of unleaded fuel for motor vehicles in 1985.

**Effect of meteorological conditions on air quality**

Nine submissions made fourteen comments (196.003, 218.002, 248.002, 254.003, 274.060, 337.030, 341.017, 341.019, 341.020, 369.003, 386.001, 386.003, 386.006 and 386.008) relating to the effects of meteorological conditions on air quality. Comments concerning this subject area can be divided into those related to meteorological effects and those related to meteorological data.

Regarding meteorological effects, concerns were raised that air pollutants would be trapped by temperature inversions which are frequent around Badgerys Creek and this would cause high pollution levels to occur.

Inversions at Badgerys Creek are likely to be more frequent, stronger and deeper than at Mascot and air pollutants attributable to the airport would be trapped in the inversion layer. Air pollution levels in the local airshed are likely to be greater during the night and morning when inversions are well developed. In the afternoons, mainly during the warmer months, pollutants such as ozone are advected to the Badgerys Creek area from Sydney by sea breezes. At such times airport related pollutants, although additive to prevailing pollution levels would not be significant.

Local night and morning air flows are likely to spread the airport related emissions into the Hawkesbury Valley and possibly the Liverpool and Parramatta Valleys as well. The percentage increase in pollution levels due to the airport is likely to be higher in these areas at this time than the percentage levels expressed in the Draft EIS for the Sydney basin as a whole.

Those localities lying at some altitude, such as Blue Mountain townships and to a lesser degree Silverdale, are generally well ventilated and are often above Cumberland Plain ground inversions. They are therefore unlikely to experience air pollutants trapped by those inversions.

The Bureau of Meteorology queried some of the meteorological data and concepts. These queries and responses are listed below:

1. Wind characteristics for Badgerys Creek (Draft EIS Figure 10.3.2) show only the 9 a.m. wind and do not indicate winds for other times of the day or the data source;
2. The true nature of the mixing layer is not explained.
The data presented were supplied by the Bureau of Meteorology and advice at the time was that p.m. data for Badgerys Creek were not available.

The Draft EIS refers to transport both up and down (page 294 of the Draft EIS) of pollutants in the mixing layer in lapse conditions and provides what is considered to be a clear explanation of the processes at work.

**Effects of motor vehicles on air quality**

Three submissions made four comments (65.005, 274.062, 337.010 and 337.032) regarding the effects of motor vehicles on air quality. Submissions on this subject claimed that the Draft EIS omitted motor vehicle effects on Sydney's air pollution levels and that total emission levels derived from motor vehicle emission trends are meaningless.

The Draft EIS argues that although vehicle kilometres adjacent to Badgerys Creek would increase due to the airport, their emissions would not necessarily be additional to air pollutant levels occurring in the absence of a second airport. The Draft EIS on page 299 says 'the airport would not necessarily add significantly to either figure (total vehicles and average vehicle kilometres in the year 2000), any more than would major new regional shopping centres, recreation centres, and other such major traffic generating projects built between now and 2000.' Thus in Table 10.3.4 in the Draft EIS the estimated net addition to annual emissions comes from non-vehicular emissions, i.e. aircraft and airport related services.

The contribution of motor vehicle emissions to Sydney's pollutant levels is complicated by the wide distribution of motor vehicles. Airport related vehicle movements would distribute throughout Sydney although about 50% would be within 40 km of the airport.

The other matter raised, concerned the total emission levels for the year 2000. This submission stated that year 2000 figures have been calculated using 1980 figures without extrapolation and that they are not referenced to a standard and are therefore meaningless.

The figures come from a paper discussing future trends in emissions, there being no official pollution forecasts. In order to arrive at total emission figures for 2000 the assumption was made that relative contributions from all sources remained the same as in 1980. With figures for forecast motor vehicle emissions to 2000 available it was then possible to forecast total emission levels. Other assumptions were made as stated on page 296 of the Draft EIS.

Regarding the lack of information on how the year 2000 figures can relate to accepted standards these figures were derived from proportional changes in motor vehicle emissions, 1976 to 2000. These proportional changes can also relate to concentrations shown for each pollutant in the Table 10.3.1 in the Draft EIS so that it is possible to extrapolate concentrations to the year 2000 levels and compare these levels to established standards as shown in the table.

**Amelioration measures, monitoring programmes and safeguards**

Three submissions (comments 218.003, 337.036 and 341.010) expressed concern about monitoring programmes.

Airport related motor vehicles and airport ground vehicles would, like all motor vehicles, be subject to the State Pollution Control Commission's vigorous programme designed to reduce motor vehicle pollutants. The Commission constantly monitors air pollution levels to ensure that its policies are taking effect.

Section 10.3.6 of the Draft EIS indicates the reasons why standards for jet engine emissions are standardized and why Australia cannot impose more stringent controls.
Dust levels during airport construction

Three submissions (comments 65.031, 65.035, 274.046, 274.062 and 337.012) were concerned about dust levels during airport construction. The Draft EIS indicates in Section 10.3.6 how such levels would be ameliorated. Watering dust prone areas is a common practice in other operations such as sand and gravel extraction, and has proved effective.

Fog effects on airport operation

Five submissions (229.005, 328.014, 451.002 and 460.003) were concerned about the effects of fog on airport operation.

The number of fog days for Badgerys Creek favourably compares with fourteen days per year for Kingsford-Smith Airport and thirteen to fifteen days per year for Wilton and are equal or superior to other short-listed sites for which data were available.

10.4 ACCESS

Twenty submissions were received relating to this section of the Draft EIS. From these, thirty-nine separate comments were identified addressing four main issues:

. the acquisition of additional land for access purposes;
. effects on local areas;
. travel distance, time and cost;
. rail access.

Land acquisition

Three submissions (345.004, 422.002 and 457.016) were concerned with the amount, location and cost of additional land which might be needed for road and rail access corridors.

Some additional land would be required for airport access purposes. However, the precise location of such areas cannot be determined at the present time as the detailed design of the roadworks necessary is not appropriate to the present stage of planning. Such work would be undertaken by the NSW Government when the timing and scale of the second Sydney airport development was known.

The access work would be carried out in stages and would largely be associated with road widenings. The main north-south access road shown diagrammatically in Fig. 8.3 could be largely constructed through areas that are non-residential.

Effects on local areas

Eleven submissions were received relating to the effects of airport roads and traffic on local areas (57.001, 57.003, 65.004, 65.030, 65.038, 66.001, 66.003, 66.005, 237.004, 248.003, 250.014, 250.015, 274.069, 274.071, 274.074, 274.121, 308.005, 328.023, 341.008, 341.012, 341.021, 341.022 and 422.009).

The issues raised mainly related to increased traffic congestion and air pollution and the need to upgrade the local road system.

The impact of airport development is discussed in Section 10.4.4 of the Draft EIS. To minimize the effects of increased traffic flows on the local area, airport traffic would be directed away from roads whose primary function was to service residential areas. Selected routes would be upgraded and widened to provide adequate capacity for airport traffic in addition to their base load. With changed road conditions in the area it is
possible that some particular journeys may take longer than at present, but in general
terms, the upgrading of roads is likely to have a beneficial effect on local travel times.
This point was commented on by the State Government in relation to access to the
Nepean College of Advanced Education.

One submission asked why Smithfield Road was not mentioned as an airport access route.
The Draft EIS listed the major routes, but some other streets could also be expected to
carry some airport traffic. Smithfield Road is one of these.

The question of transfer facilities between the two major airports was raised in the
context of passengers, freight and fuel and the implications for the proposed South-
Western Freeway east of King Georges Road. This latter was also raised by the State
Government in the broader context of airport traffic generally.

As stated in the Draft EIS (Section 10.4.3) it is expected that only about 1% of the air
passengers would require to transfer between airports and this would be insufficient to
justify any special provision. (This is also discussed under Chapter 2.)

Similarly a freight transfer is unlikely to be required. Air freight operators would not
wish to include a relatively long land transfer in any service they offered and would
therefore seek to ensure that any transfers which were necessary could be carried out at
one airport.

A possible exception to this is international freight. If international traffic remained
largely at Kingsford-Smith Airport and Badgerys Creek developed as a major domestic
freight hub, some form of fast direct link, perhaps by rail, might be required. However,
this is very speculative and a long way in the future.

Except in the early stages of airport development, aviation fuel would most likely be
transported by pipeline or by rail.

The question of the extension of the South-Western Freeway is a matter for later
consideration when and if the airport traffic becomes significant in that area. It is
unlikely that airport traffic would ever, on its own, justify the extension of the Freeway.

As indicated in Table 10.3.3 of the Draft EIS, vehicle emissions constitute by far the
largest proportion of all airport related air emissions. The question of air quality is
discussed in detail in Section 10.3.

Distance, time and cost

Eleven submissions raised the matter of the difficulty of travelling to Badgerys Creek,
four claiming that the distances and/or times quoted in the Draft EIS were
underestimated (1.004, 63.003, 65.015, 81.008, 250.016, 274.071, 274.106, 328.006,
330.013, 362.025, 367.004 and 422.008).

The Draft EIS recognizes that the distance from the city it serves is one of the most
important factors to be considered in the siting of an airport. Other things being equal,
an airport at Badgerys Creek would therefore be at a disadvantage compared to
Kingsford-Smith Airport. It is largely for this reason that the Draft EIS accepts that
Kingsford-Smith will always remain Sydney's primary airport. However, the object of
the Draft EIS is to facilitate a comparison, not between Badgerys Creek and Kingsford-
Smith, but between Badgerys Creek and Wilton and access distance thus becomes one of
the major advantages of Badgerys Creek.

The road distances and times quoted are based on the output of the State Transport
Study Group's Sydney road network model for 2015. This is the most authoritative source
of information available on future road travel times in the Sydney area. The distance to
Badgerys Creek is given as 48 km and this is also confirmed by the most recent edition of
Gregory's Street Directory.
Rail distances and times were estimated by the State Rail Authority.

Two submissions criticized the lack of information in the Draft EIS on the origin and destination of airport users and the user population profile.

As outlined in the Draft EIS (page 311) a distribution of passenger origins/destinations was estimated based on the present distribution (as revealed by Department of Aviation surveys) and the forecast Sydney population distribution for the year 2011 (supplied by the NSW Department of Environment and Planning). As the actual future distribution would be heavily dependent on the airport role, sensitivity tests were conducted with alternative distributions.

Rail access

Six submissions raised issues related to the provision of rail service to an airport at Badgerys Creek (66.007, 274.066, 274.067, 274.068, 274.069, 328.020, 341.023, 359.006, 359.011 and 422.008). Three of these supported the provision of a rail service while the State Government claimed there would be insufficient demand to justify such provision. One claimed that a rail service was needed between the city and Kingsford-Smith Airport.

Section 10.4.5 of the Draft EIS provides estimates of rail patronage and it is accepted that, particularly in the early years of the airport's operation, a rail service may not be economic on its own. It is possible, however, that it could be seen as desirable on environmental grounds or as an alternative to major road upgrading. This would be more likely if an airport link could be developed in conjunction with some other rail development, as is the case at Wilton. This now seems less likely, however, for Badgerys Creek as the State Government's submission notes that the Werrington-Glenlee freight railway which was previously under consideration has been deemed not necessary in the foreseeable future.

Any decision to provide a rail service to an airport at Badgerys Creek would need to take into account both the airport-related factors and the effects on the Metropolitan Railway system as a whole.

The State submission disputes the claim that additional potential capacity exists on the Main Western Line between Strathfield and Sydney but accepts that this does not materially affect the comparison between Badgerys Creek and Wilton. However, these considerations led the State Rail Authority to prefer the Glenfield route to the St Marys route for any railway constructed to Badgerys Creek.

One submission claimed that the cost of the railway had been underestimated. The cost estimates were based on unit costs provided by the State Rail Authority and are considered sufficiently accurate for the purposes of site comparison. More detailed costing would of course be necessary if railway construction were being seriously contemplated.

The provision of a rail service between the city and Kingsford-Smith Airport does not form part of the subject of this EIS.

10.5 INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENERGY CONSUMPTION

Twelve submissions were received querying aspects relating to Section 10.5 of the Draft EIS. These ten submissions included twelve separate comments dealing with a range of issues which can be categorized as follows:

- transport of fuel
- water supply
services

These issues are discussed below.

Transport of fuel

Three submissions relating to the transport of fuel were received. These submissions made four separate comments (256.002, 256.004, 328.011 and 359.012).

Three of the comments were that the Draft EIS did not indicate the mode of transport of fuel, specifically jet fuel, while the fourth comment suggested it could be transported by pipeline to the site at a cost of about $10 million.

Section 10.5.6 of the Draft EIS indicates what might be the likely requirements for energy and fuel consumption. While the mode of transport of jet fuel is not specifically mentioned the Draft EIS indicates that diesel and petrol could be transported to the site by road. Because of the relatively large quantity of jet fuel that would be consumed when the airport reaches its ultimate capacity it would be undesirable to transport that by road. A pipeline facility could possibly provide the best and most environmentally acceptable solution. In the interim small quantities could be transported by road.

If Badgerys Creek were selected, the Department of Aviation would investigate the safest and most environmentally acceptable means of transporting jet fuel to the site. Whatever means were finally selected for the transport and storage of jet fuel, the Department of Aviation would ensure that the provisions of the Dangerous Goods Act, 1975, were complied with.

Water supply

Four submissions raised comments relating to the supply of mains water to the proposed site (3.002, 65.037, 335.007 and 379.004).

Two of the comments indicated that the Draft EIS was incorrect in stating that the site is not serviced by a reticulated water supply. One comment was concerned about the expense that residents would have to bear in connecting to mains water supply, while the other indicated that mains water supply was available at Badgerys Creek.

It should be noted that while some properties may be connected to mains water supply the general area is not serviced by a reticulated water supply system which could be readily upgraded to service any possible future airport and related development. Section 10.5.2 of the Draft EIS indicates that the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board does not have any immediate plans to provide a reticulated water supply to the area and that to provide for future development would require a new water supply system. The sequence and processing of these new facilities would be a matter for discussions between the Department of Aviation and relevant government authorities prior to the development of an airport. The question of residents bearing the expense of connecting to mains water is one for the NSW Government and the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board to determine.

Services

Four submissions raised general points relating to services (274.019, 279.004, 337.019 and 341.009). One comment was concerned that there was no commitment from the Commonwealth Government on the funding of additional services. This would be a matter of detailed consideration between both the Commonwealth and NSW governments once a decision was made to proceed with development of an airport at the proposed site.
Another comment was concern about a decision to acquire the Badgerys Creek site, indicating that the construction of some planned infrastructure works would have to be brought forward and others modified. This would be a matter for more detailed consideration if a decision is made to acquire the Badgerys Creek site.

One submission indicated that electrical power and underground fuel lines should be used to eliminate the use of auxiliary power units and tankers, thereby reducing noise levels. This would be a matter for the Department of Aviation to determine once detailed planning and development of the airport commenced.

**Sewage disposal**

Two submissions made comment on the disposal of treated sewage (222.004, 222.007 and 274.051).

One submission commented that disposal of treated sewage to the Nepean River was not environmentally acceptable while the other suggested that disposal by land irrigation would be preferable to discharging into surface streams.

Section 10.5.3 of the Draft EIS indicates that land disposal by irrigation would be considered if the water pollution control plant were located within the airport site and served only the airport development. An off-site plant serving a larger catchment would require large areas of pasture/crop land to receive treated effluent all year round if land disposal by irrigation was to be possible. This might not be feasible in the context of future development within the area.

One submission was concerned about the disposal of quarantined waste. Quarantined waste would be incinerated and would not be discharged to the sewer system if there was any likelihood of disease. The Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board has strict regulations governing the acceptance of effluents and undertakes a water/effluent quality monitoring programme to ensure these standards are maintained. Waste generated by future airport development would be disposed of in accordance with the requirements of the Metropolitan Waste Disposal Authority.

### 10.6 LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL QUALITY

Five submissions were received that commented on Section 10.6 of the Draft EIS. The five separate comments made in the submissions were concerned about the assessment of landscape quality and can be categorized into two main issues:

- the impact the airport would have on the rural character of the area;
- the assessment of landscape quality of the proposed site.

These issues are discussed below.

**Impact on rural character**

Two comments (264.049 and 353.004) expressed concern about the impact airport construction would have on the rural character of the area should the proposed Badgerys Creek site be selected. Both considered that the impact would be detrimental.

The Draft EIS acknowledges (Section 10.6.4) that construction of the airport would irreversibly alter the landscape and visual character of the proposed site. It also outlines measures to reduce the visual impact of the construction and operational phases of the proposed airport on the surrounding rural areas. These measures include vegetation screening, landscaping, rehabilitation at the construction stage and careful building design. Other impacts on rural character would include changes in land use, noise, and the effects of an increased level of activity in the region generally. These impacts are...
discussed in Chapter 9 of the Draft EIS. The Department of Environment and Planning is also undertaking a Regional Environmental Study of the Macarthur Region. This study among other things would examine the future urban and rural development potential of the region.

**Assessment of landscape quality**

One submission (65.008) queried the assessment of landscape quality given in the Draft EIS, considering that the visual quality of the Badgerys Creek area had been underestimated. The landscape quality of the proposed site was assessed according to the method used by the NSW Department of Environment and Planning. It is a modified version of that used by the United States Department of Agriculture's Forest Service and as such is amongst the most accepted and systematic methods available. Assessment is based on accepted community preferences of the visual quality of landform features, with allowance made for their spatial arrangement and other factors (see Section 10.6 of the Draft EIS). The Draft EIS acknowledges that individual perceptions may differ from the community preferences used in the assessment, but the major advantage of the landscape assessment method is its systematic approach which would ensure that the same relative degree of assessment of visual quality would occur at all sites assessed.
CHAPTER 11

THE BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT AND EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSAL

11.1 FLORA

Three submissions commented on aspects of the Draft EIS relating to flora. The two comments raised the following separate issues:

- rare species of shrubs at Bents Basin;
- indirect impacts on vegetation surrounding the airport.

These issues are discussed below.

**Rare species of shrubs at Bents Basin**

One submission (376.004) commented that there is a rare species of shrub at Bents Basin. This has not been investigated but Bents Basin lies approximately 7 km from the end of the nearest runway as shown in the preliminary master plan in Section 8.3 of the Draft EIS, and 5.9 km from the nearest point on the proposed site boundary. At this distance, emissions of incompletely burnt fuel should have a negligible effect on vegetation. Bents Basin lies between the 20 and 25 ANEF contours and is currently zoned non-urban 'd', County Open Space. This zoning is compatible with this ANEF range, so the Basin should not be adversely affected if the Badgerys Creek site is selected.

**Indirect impacts on vegetation surrounding the airport**

Two submissions (81.007 and 422.011) suggested further investigation of the likely indirect impacts of airport construction and operation at the proposed site on the vegetation in the vicinity of the site.

Section 11.1.2 of the Draft EIS deals with the effects of direct clearing of vegetation, and with the indirect effect of possible pollution, siltation, and altered flow regimes on the vegetation fringing Badgerys Creek. Ameliorative measures that would be implemented, including drainage controls during airport construction and operation, landscape planting with species now growing on the site, and measures to preserve and replant the one rare species occurring on the site, *Pultenaea parviflora*, are also outlined. The only indirect effects on vegetation not considered in Section 11.1 are the possible effect of aircraft emissions during take-off and landing, and the possible effect of emergency fuel dumping over wide areas. These effects are fully discussed in Section 16.1 of the Draft EIS. The conclusion is that effects of fuel dumping are minimal as such emergency procedures are rarely implemented, and fuel is then dumped at high altitudes so that most if not all would have vaporized before it reached the ground. Emissions during take-off and landing may damage vegetation near the ends of the runways. It should be noted that most of the vegetation of the Badgerys Creek site is already highly disturbed, and there are no rare or endangered stands of native vegetation near the approach and take-off areas of the proposed airport that would be affected by aircraft emissions.
11.2 FAUNA

Five submissions commented on aspects of the Draft EIS relating to the fauna of the proposed Badgerys Creek site. The five comments made could be classified into three main issues:

- concern at destruction of fauna;
- impact on fauna beyond the site boundary;
- omissions from the fauna survey.

These issues are discussed below.

Concern at destruction of fauna

One submission (376.003) expressed a general concern that construction of the proposed airport would destroy the fauna of the area.

Section 11.2.2 of the Draft EIS assesses the impact that construction of the proposed airport would have on the fauna of the area. In terms of the conservation of native fauna in the region the proposed site is of relatively low value, but the Draft EIS acknowledges that on a local level many of the animals that would be displaced during construction would probably not be successful in colonizing other territories. Species with a more nomadic lifestyle such as the magpie, Australian raven and some of the waterbirds should be far more successful in relocating. Impact on species on the site would be diminished during construction and operation by limiting the amount of clearing at each stage of construction; by preserving the fringing vegetation along Badgerys Creek as much as possible; by replanting the site with selected native species to provide small bird habitat; and by controlling drainage to Badgerys and South Creeks through the water management policy described in Section 10.2 of the Draft EIS.

Impact on fauna beyond the site boundary

Two submissions (264.052 and 422.012) commented that effects on fauna could extend beyond the proposed site boundaries.

Section 11.2.2 of the Draft EIS acknowledges that this may occur through two main mechanisms:

- fauna displaced from the site seeking new habitats;
- changes to the wildlife habitats along Badgerys Creek and South Creek due to possible changes in hydrology and water quality in the two creeks.

In addition, Section 11.1.2 of the Draft EIS recognizes the effects arising from induced development or the location of new road or rail access routes.

Competition for new territories would mean probably some loss in total animal numbers in the local area. There should be no loss in terms of species diversity, however, as the habitats of the proposed site are not uncommon in the surrounding area. The creekline habitats would be protected by careful drainage control, as outlined in Section 10.2 of the Draft EIS.

Impact on fauna from induced development or the location of new road or rail access routes would require further investigation once the locations for these facilities were determined.
Omissions from the fauna survey

Two submissions (65.036 and 274.085) considered that the fauna survey conducted at the proposed site had some shortcomings.

One comment was that certain species of fauna known to occur in the area had not been detected. It is inevitable in any fauna survey that during the survey period some species will not be active in the locality or will simply not be sighted or trapped. These species can then only be listed as known from earlier studies, where their occurrence has been recorded previously or from local knowledge.

On the basis of the local knowledge revealed in this submission the following have been added to the list of fauna:

Table 11.1 Additional fauna sighted in Badgerys Creek area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>Common name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birds</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelicanus conspicillatus</td>
<td>Pelican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poephila bichenovii</td>
<td>Double bar finches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poephila guttata</td>
<td>Zebra finch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reptiles</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelodina longicollis</td>
<td>Long-necked tortoise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudechis porphyriacus</td>
<td>Red-bellied black snake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiliqua scincoides</td>
<td>Blue-tonged lizard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second comment noted that no aquatic fauna survey had been undertaken as part of the evaluation of the Badgerys Creek and Wilton sites. The Department of Aviation acknowledges the omission of a survey of aquatic fauna. However, in view of the methods proposed by the Department to maintain water quality and stream flow regimes in receiving waters, the omission of an aquatic fauna survey is not seen as materially affecting either the environmental evaluation or the final selection of a site.
CHAPTER 12

INTRODUCTION TO THE ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPOSED AIRPORT SITE AT WILTON

12.1 ASSESSMENT PROCESS

One submission (comment 293.001) was received relating to Section 12.1 of the Draft EIS. Concern was expressed that no study had been undertaken regarding environmental impacts of development outside the airport boundary.

The Draft EIS has indicated that, where off-site development is expected, an assessment of the associated effects would require further investigation once the details of the off-site development were known. In addition, the Department of Environment and Planning is currently undertaking a regional environmental study of the region. This study is examining the choices for future urban development, including regional planning issues associated with airport site selection.

Any future development would also need to comply with the Commonwealth and New South Wales environmental legislation requirements.

12.2 LOCATION OF THE PROPOSED WILTON SITE AND ENVIRONS

No submissions made comments in relation to this section of the Draft EIS.

12.3 RECENT BUSHFIRE

Three submissions were received which commented on Section 12.3 of the Draft EIS. The comments (245.010, 257.006 and 427.001) indicated concern about the incidence and potential effects of a major bushfire on the proposed airport.

The Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board has had a policy of low intensity burning in the catchment for many years to reduce fuel loads in the forest areas so as to reduce the risk of major high intensity wild fires.

During airport construction accidental fires, for instance from the burning of wind-rowed logs, or the operation of earth-moving equipment, or from carelessness on the part of construction workers, could spread to surrounding bushland. Easier public access, particularly during construction activities, could also lead to more fires, whether deliberately lit or accidental. Once the airport was operational, the need might arise for more frequent hazard-reduction burning. Over a long period a regime of more frequent fires, from whatever cause, would simplify the plant communities.

During airport construction, the Department of Aviation would institute measures such as staff education and strict maintenance of equipment in order to minimize the danger of accidental fires. Any deliberate alteration to the existing fire regime would as far as possible be consistent with the preservation of the surrounding vegetation, and would be accompanied by a comprehensive assessment of long-term effects. Precautions would be taken against unauthorized public access: the site would be fenced at the start of construction work with a 2 m chainmesh fence and strict site security would be maintained. Construction of access roads would be limited to permit essential access only.
12.4 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF THE WILTON SITE

No submission made comments relating to this section of the Draft EIS.
CHAPTER 13

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AT WILTON

13.1 PURPOSE OF THE PRELIMINARY MASTER PLAN

No submissions made comments relating to this section of the Draft EIS.

13.2 THE PROPOSED AIRPORT SITE

No submissions made comments relating to this section of the Draft EIS.

13.3 PRELIMINARY MASTER PLAN ASSUMPTIONS

Four submissions raised issues relating to the master planning assumptions.

They were concerned with:

- the need for a curfew-free airport;
- the possible need to expand the airport at a later date;
- usability of second airport.

Curfew-free operation

Two submissions (243.002 and 264.032) raised the question of curfew-free operation. One sought an explanation of the need for twenty-four hour operation of the airport; the other supported the need for curfew-free operations.

International airline scheduling is restricted by the present inflexible curfew at Kingsford-Smith Airport. This leads to less than optimum utilization of aircraft and increased operating costs. In addition, when an incoming aircraft is delayed to such an extent that it may not be able to reach Sydney before the curfew it must be held at another airport and the passengers accommodated overnight. This leads to substantial additional costs for the airline.

A number of airlines have also expressed interest in night operations and on the basis of overseas experience it is expected that if the opportunity existed, a significant market would develop.

In the light of these present and possible future demands it would appear very unwise and short-sighted to select a site for the second airport where the option for curfew-free operation could not be reasonably preserved. Because of the importance of the curfew issue very conservative assumptions were used for the calculation of noise contours with the number of night flights assumed being considerably higher than is expected to occur. (See Section 9.2)

Wind usability

The Goulburn City Council (459.030) claimed that the low wind usability of a second airport at either Badgerys Creek or Wilton would affect its role and particularly its contribution to relieving pressure on Kingsford-Smith.
The Council has apparently misunderstood the discussion on wind usability in Section 8.3.3 and 13.3.3 of the Draft EIS. It is stated there that the Consultant recommended to the Department of Aviation that the wind coverage standard be relaxed from 99.8% to 95% for the aeroplanes the airport is intended to serve. The Department has not formally relaxed its 99.8% standard for wind usability but has recognised that there is room for concessions against this standard for second airports in a region. In fact no major concession was necessary because at both Badgerys Creek and Wilton wind usability exceeding 99.6% is available for aircraft with cross wind capability of 20 knots — a commonly achieved or exceeded capability for commercial aircraft operating on dry runways.

One submission (362.018) claimed that the usability of an airport at Wilton would suffer because of the presence of smoke from the frequent bushfires.

A reduction of 0.1% in the airport's usability would require the airport to be closed by smoke for 9 hours per year: a fairly unlikely occurrence.

13.4 PRELIMINARY MASTER PLAN CRITERIA

One submission (459.021) claimed that the Draft EIS did not indicate what procedures were applied to identify possible airport runway layouts within each 'cell' relating to the ten nominated sites.

Four schematic alternative airport layouts were used and adapted to each of the ten sites (Section 4.2 of Draft EIS). Section 4.3 of the Draft EIS shows how specific layouts were used for site ranking and sensitivity testing to rank the ten nominated sites. Once the two short-listed sites were nominated a further review was undertaken of runway layouts to be used for the environmental assessment. Section 13.3 of the Draft EIS gives the reasoning behind the selection of the airport layout used for environmental assessment. Section 13.4 of the Draft EIS indicates the design/dimensional criteria used in the proposed airport layout. This information was considered adequate for the purposes of defining a proposed airport boundary. It should also be noted that the actual airport layout as depicted in the Draft EIS is preliminary.

13.5 PRELIMINARY MASTER PLAN

Five submissions were received relating to aspects of Section 13.5 of the Draft EIS. These five submissions made six separate comments, which can be categorized into the following issues:

- fuel storage
- availability of land for coal mine facilities
- runway alignment alternatives.

These issues are discussed below.

Fuel storage

Four of the submissions were concerned about details relating to the storage of fuel. Comments 205.001, 207.007, 233.034 and 338.024 indicated more details should be provided regarding fuel storage and some were concerned about safety measures particularly in regard to possible ignition by bushfire.

There are stringent design and handling requirements relating to the storage, transport and transfer of aviation fuel. The code of practice to be complied with is set out in:
In addition the transport and storage of fuel would comply with the provisions of the Dangerous Goods Act, 1975, and Australian Standard A51940-SAA Flammable and Combustible Liquids Code.

The fuel storage facility in the preliminary master plan has been located outside the Metropolitan Catchment in an area adjacent to the main access road and rail spur. This would facilitate either road or rail transport of the fuel to the site if either method were selected.

Availability of land for coal mine facilities

One comment (331.004) was that the final airport design should ensure suitable land was still available for the Bellambi Coal Company Pty Limited for the proposed pit top facilities.

The acquisition of land owned by the Bellambi Coal Company Pty Limited for the proposed airport site would preclude that company from proceeding with its proposals to develop a new pit-head complex at its currently preferred location. The company may have difficulty in finding a suitable alternative site for these facilities in view of the limited availability of land that is outside the Metropolitan Catchment but still relatively close to the South Bulli mining operations. A number of alternative sites have been suggested for these facilities. They are discussed in Section 15.1 of this Supplement.

If the Wilton site were selected the Department of Aviation would inform the Department of Mineral Resources and the Joint Coal Board in order to allow further consideration of the issue of future extraction of underlying coal. Discussion would be held with the Bellambi Coal Company Pty Limited to consider the effects of acquisition of the company's land and to determine the feasibility of finding alternative land suitable for the pit-head.

Runway alignment alternatives

One comment (338.064) indicated that the north/south primary runway alignment would only be feasible at considerable cost.

For the short-listing phase of the study, a north/south primary runway orientation was used. Subsequent to the short listing of Wilton, two additional alignments were examined. These were a north-west/south-east alignment and an east/west alignment. The east/west alignment was finally selected as the preferred orientation of primary runways at the Wilton site. The principal reasons for selecting the east/west alignment were:

- it avoided the need to acquire land within the village of Wilton (thereby reducing the social impact);
- it did not affect large areas of land suitable for potential urban development.

13.6 WILTON AIRSPACE

Eight submissions were concerned with aspects of airspace associated with a second Sydney airport at Wilton. The following issues were raised:
Effects on activity at existing aerodromes

Seven submissions addressed the effects on activities at existing aerodromes (234.004, 340.020, 360.001, 360.005, 360.006, 375.007, 390.015, 396.015, 396.016 and 432.006).

Camden Aero Club commented that Bankstown and Camden aerodromes would be able to retain their present role while two other submissions considered aspects of present facilities would be affected in some way. One suggested that a second Sydney airport at Wilton would affect existing aerodrome facilities and airspace of Bankstown, Camden and Wedderburn; the other that Wilton would cause the closure of parachuting in the area. Wollongong Council claimed that Wilton would not interfere with other airspace.

The requirement for parachuting to relocate if the Wilton airport proposal is developed is discussed in Section 13.6 of the Draft EIS.

It is agreed that Bankstown and Camden would be able to retain their present roles albeit with some effect on operations. Some small effects are unavoidable with the inclusion of a second major airport and its associated restricted airspace in the Sydney Region. The main effects on the introduction of Wilton controlled airspace would be a reduction in the ease of access to the south coast and in the size of training areas south-west of Camden.

Wilton's effect on the Sydney Region's airspace is significantly less than that of Badgerys Creek.

The Southern Cross Gliding Club stated that the club would not wish to move its operations to a site more than two hours drive from Sydney and suggested Fleurs and Schofields as possible bases in the event of Camden becoming untenable following construction of an airport at Wilton.

It is too early at this stage to decide on a site for the future relocation of gliding activities. However, should relocation become necessary, the Club's suggestion would be considered.

Suggested amendments to airspace design

One submission (360.001) recommended amendments to the airspace requirements to reduce the effects of a second Sydney airport at Wilton on the Sydney Region. The General Aviation Association suggested modifying Holsworthy restricted airspace to allow better access to the south coast. The Southern Cross Gliding Club suggested a modification to controlled airspace around Wilton airport from circular to more rectangular which would reduce interference with gliding activities at Camden.

The airspace diagrams in the Draft EIS are notional in character and simply indicate that it would be feasible to operate a major airport at either of the sites. Detailed design of airspace is not appropriate at this stage because of the many uncertainties involved in looking so far into the future. Airspace allocation is not in any case the sole prerogative of the Department of Aviation but is undertaken in consultation with the Department of Defence and other airspace users. If the Wilton site were selected the Department of Aviation would attempt to minimize the requirement for controlled airspace consistent with its responsibility for the safe operation of controlled aviation. It would however be necessary for the Wedderburn and Wilton aerodromes to cease operations.
Safety

Two submissions (349.004 and 432.020) claimed that the Wilton site would be an appropriate place for an airport because flight paths are available in all directions over largely unpopulated areas.

13.7 AIRCRAFT EMERGENCY PROCEDURES

Six submissions raised issues relating to aircraft accidents and/or the emergency dumping of fuel in the Wilton area.

Aircraft accidents

Five submissions (257.005, 338.078, 342.003, 361.003 and 455.006) expressed concern about possible pollution of the water supply from the release of fuel in the event of an aircraft accident in or near one of the dams.

Aviation is one of the safest forms of transport and Australia's record in this respect is second to none. The likelihood of an aircraft accident in or near the dams is therefore low. However, as the catchment area forms an important part of Sydney's water supply system it is necessary to consider what the consequences might be.

The Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board has well established and documented procedures for the control of contaminants which may be discovered in any part of the system. The release of a small quantity of aircraft fuel into the water could be relatively easily handled as the fuel would float on the surface while the take off points for the water supply are well below the surface.

The release of a large quantity of fuel, as could happen from the crash of a fully fuelled airliner, would, however, constitute a major emergency and would require closure of the dam concerned while the clean-up operation was in progress. There remains the remote possibility of a fuel spill into the Cataract River between Cataract Dam and the Broughtons Pass Weir. In this event it would not be possible with the present arrangements to isolate the Campbelltown area from the polluted supply. If it were thought that the risk of such an accident was sufficiently high it would be necessary to consider the installation of a system which permitted direct supply of the upper canal from the Pheasants Nest Weir. That is, a system which allowed the Broughtons Pass Weir to be by-passed.

Two other points are worth making. Firstly, although the risk of an accident involving one of the dams might be slightly higher if an airport were placed at Wilton it is not non-existent at the present time. Secondly, if some aircraft fuel did get into the drinking water it could produce an unpleasant taste but it would not be dangerous. There are many other potential sources of pollution of the water supply which could lead to more serious consequences.

One submission raised the fact that the Wilton area lacks hospital facilities to cope with a major disaster.

The presence of a major airport would no doubt be a consideration in the planning of such facilities in the future.

Fuel dumping

Four submissions (264.051, 342.003, 361.004, 455.006 and 455.009) were concerned with pollution of the water supply as a consequence of the emergency dumping of fuel by aircraft. One also claimed that dumping over the ocean would have an adverse impact on marine life.
Fuel dumping is the term used to refer to the deliberate discharge of fuel from an airborne aircraft. The term is not used to refer to the accidental leaking, discharge or venting of fuel. Generally, accidental leakage has insignificant environmental consequences owing to the rarity of the occurrence and the small quantity discharged.

Fuel dumping occurs for two reasons. More often than not it is the result of the development of a fault that requires the aircraft to land at an airport other than its destination, either the airport of departure or an en-route airport. The allowable maximum take-off weight of an aircraft may be greater than the allowable maximum landing weight. Consequently, if an aircraft is required to land unexpectedly, there will be occasions when the weight of the aircraft is too high for landing and weight must be reduced. This can be done by dumping fuel. On rare occasions it is considered desirable to dump fuel in order to minimize the risk of fire during an emergency landing.

On the great majority of occasions a choice can be made about where the fuel is dumped, in which case it is done either at high level, over the sea or over uninhabited land. In other than emergency situations the Department of Aviation nominates the location for the fuel dumping. A minimum height of 1,800 m is recommended and fuel is directed to be dumped at a location that minimizes the environmental consequences.

From the figures for the last nine years of the number of times fuel was dumped by aircraft associated with Sydney Airport, on average only one in about every 60,000 aircraft movements would be involved in fuel dumping.

The Department of Aviation is not aware of any environmental problems that have been caused in the past by fuel dumping in Australia or overseas. There is no evidence to suggest that the existing procedures covering fuel dumping are inadequate, nor are any problems expected around either Badgerys Creek or Wilton.
CHAPTER 14
THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT AND EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSAL

14.1 ACQUISITION

Eleven submissions were received relating to aspects covered in Section 14.1 of the Draft EIS. From these submissions, fourteen comments were made on various aspects relating to the possible acquisition of a site at Wilton.

The comments made in these submissions can be categorized into four main issues:

- acquisition cost for the Wilton site;
- compensation;
- planning blight;
- acquisition process and property administration.

Acquisition costs for the Wilton site

Seven submissions (202.015, 246.001, 349.006, 389.002, 390.003, 428.004 and 432.021) were received relating to the acquisition cost of the Wilton site, detailed in Section 9.1 of the Draft EIS.

All the submissions questioned the adequacy of the land acquisition figure of $1.8 million quoted in Section 14.1.1 of the Draft EIS. Two of the submissions considered the figure to be an overestimation of the property value for the Wilton site and four of the submissions considered it to be an undervaluation.

The figure used in Section 14.1.1 of the Draft EIS was produced by the Valuation Branch of the Australian Taxation Office as a budgetary estimate of the realty cost of the properties and land within the site. This is the normal costing basis by which Governments assess various projects. The prime purpose of using this figure was to establish an order of cost (not including the compensation payments outlined in paragraph 14.1.1 of the Draft EIS) to be used to give an indication of the level of funding required and a comparison of the level of cost between the Badgerys Creek and Wilton sites. At no stage was the figure intended as a formal valuation figure. Such valuations can only be obtained when a commitment to purchase has been established and the valuers are permitted to enter the properties for a formal examination of the land and improvements. The budgetary estimate figure was derived from aerial photographs, kerbside inspections and reference to recorded property sales, also without inspection.

The $1.8 million figure was stated in Section 9.1.1 of the Draft EIS as an estimation of the market valuation of private land and improvements on the proposed Wilton site. This statement was not strictly correct as the Commonwealth valuers in their estimate did make a valuation allowance for the procurement of Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board land and this is included in the $1.8 million total. However, it must be emphasized that this figure is an estimate at this stage. Should the Wilton site be selected, the final acquisition cost will only be known once all the properties have been purchased by or transferred to the Commonwealth. Should the acquisition by agreement method be used to acquire the site, an agreed purchase price must be determined for each property. Should the compulsory acquisition method be used to purchase the site, full valuation figures would be produced for each property, but it may be some time
before the total compensation cost could be established. The final figure would also of course depend on the terms and conditions of the transfer or sale of the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board land negotiated between the Commonwealth and the State Governments.

In developing the estimate figure, the Commonwealth valuers considered the blighting influence of the proposed airport development on property values. When formal valuations are required to be made for the purposes of acquisition, research will be necessary to establish whether blight has had an influence on the property values in the site area.

None of the submissions which suggested that the site acquisition figure did not represent the true value of the properties and land at Wilton has substantiated its claims with a property valuation of the site produced by an independent qualified valuer.

Compensation

Three submissions (274.077, 337.039 and 432.050) were received relating to the compensation applicable to land and property owners within the Wilton site should it be selected for airport development.

The comments related to:

. compensation from the Commonwealth to the State Government for the loss of Crown land at Wilton;

. compensation and relocation costs applicable to displaced property owners.

The matter of Crown land transfer and compensation payable between the Commonwealth and State Governments would be a matter for negotiation between the appropriate Departments within these Governments and would be made in accordance with the conditions established in the Commonwealth/State Land Exchange Agreement, 1979.

The compensation payable to property owners affected by either compulsory acquisition or acquisition by agreement is detailed in Sections 14.1.2 and 14.1.3 of the Draft EIS. The actual compensation payable cannot be fully established until a negotiated sale or a court determination has been finalized.

Planning blight

Two submissions (264.021 and 338.026) were received relating to the depressed land and property values in the area due to the proposed airport development. Planning blight can be considered as the influence a major development proposal has on regional property values and businesses. Section 9.1.4 of the Draft EIS discusses the planning blight issue.

Once negotiations have commenced for the sale of a property to the Commonwealth, a formal valuation of the land plus improvements is undertaken. One aspect of the valuation work is to investigate whether the valuation figure determined has been influenced by planning blight. If it can be shown that this has occurred the valuation figure would be adjusted to compensate the owner for blight.

The effect of planning blight on business investment within the airport boundary is also a matter for negotiation prior to the acquisition of a property.

Under present Commonwealth legislation, the effects of planning blight on properties outside the airport boundary are not subject to compensation. The Law Reform Commission considered the blight question in its report No. 14, but the Government has deferred its decision on this matter until it has consulted with other levels of Government.
Acquisition process and property administration

Two submissions were received relating to the acquisition process and property administration following site acquisition. Two comments were made addressing the requirement for the Commonwealth to make ex gratia payments to Councils in lieu of lost rates and the need for a quick acquisition process (274.034 and 432.022).

The first submission asked about rates payable to Local Government following site acquisition. The usual arrangement in cases of this type is that prior to site development, the acquired properties are offered for lease by the Commonwealth. As part of the leasing agreement, the Commonwealth would, in accordance with normal practice, require the lessee to be responsible for the payment of all Local Government charges attracted by the leased properties. Once the airport development is implemented, the normal ex gratia payments scheme currently operated by the Department of Aviation would apply to Local Government charges. This issue is discussed in Section 14.6.6 of the Draft EIS.

The second submission requested that a quick acquisition process be implemented once a decision to purchase a second Sydney airport site was made. If the compulsory acquisition option is chosen, then the acquisition process should be finalized within months of the announcement of the purchase of a site — subject to the time taken for any compensation litigation. The acquisition by agreement option, as the name suggests, may take many years to complete but will ensure that people sell their properties only when they wish to vacate the site. The method of acquisition chosen will be a matter for Government decision in conjunction with the decision on which of the two sites is to be acquired for the second Sydney airport.

14.2 NOISE

A number of submissions raised aspects relating to Section 14.2 of the Draft EIS. These aspects can be generally categorized into issues relating to:

- the ANEF system;
- objections to various aspects of noise;
- assessment of effects;
- soundproofing and compensation;
- other noise.

The ANEF system

Many submissions on noise raised points related to the accuracy of the ANEF contours presented in the Draft EIS, although one comment (274.011) agreed with the use of the ANEF system for estimating aircraft noise.

Five comments implied that the noise affected areas should be considerably larger than depicted in the Draft EIS owing to the low ambient noise levels surrounding Wilton (246.002, 264.025, 274.005, 338.021 and 342.021).

In fact, the noise contours themselves are a function of aircraft operations and have no relationship with ambient noise levels. The objection more accurately relates to 20 ANEF cut-off for the noise area used for evaluation. The implication is that if 20 ANEF is a reasonable cut-off for urban environments, something less than 20 ANEF would be appropriate for rural and semi-rural environments. It is likely that areas surrounding Wilton do have lower ambient noise levels than those areas around urban airports like Sydney and Adelaide. Whether this affects reaction to aircraft noise exposure or not is, however, not clear. The National Acoustics Laboratory findings were used because they represent the most recent and most comprehensive scientifically established data on Australian reaction to aircraft noise. The National Acoustics Laboratory survey included...
airports like Tullamarine, Richmond and Perth, which are distinctly more like the Wilton environment than the urban environments around Sydney or Adelaide airports. No significant differences were observed between reactions at Melbourne, Richmond etc. and the 'urban' airports.

The State Government agrees (274.011) that the ANEF system is the appropriate method of assessing noise exposure effects.

Two comments were critical of the treatment in the Draft EIS of night time aircraft noise (264.030 and 385.012). The general criticisms were that:

- the weighting applied to night operations is too small;
- the percentage of operations assumed to be night operations is too small.

The weighting applied to night time operations effectively equates one night time operation to four day time operations. This weighting was adopted on the basis of National Acoustics Laboratory findings which indicated that the previously used greater weighting was too high. There has been general acceptance of the night and evening weightings now used in the ANEF system.

The allocation of forecast traffic to evening and night operations to permit the estimation of noise contours is set out in Section 9.2.5 (page 192) of the Draft EIS. This suggests that 30% of all jet movements would occur after 7 p.m., with 10% occurring after 10 p.m. The Department of Aviation maintains that this remains a higher proportion than is likely to occur and is therefore appropriate for the worst case estimate of noise exposure.

Two comments (195.003 and 264.028) were critical of the fact that the ANEF system failed to take account of topography. They implied that the topography around Wilton would exacerbate the noise effects presented in the Draft EIS but did not explain how. Although the terrain surrounding the Wilton site is characterized by gullies and ravines through which rivers and streams flow, the general form of the land is undulating. It does not exhibit the abrupt variations in height such as are typical of the Illawarra escarpment, nor mountainous terrain which might contain noise effects. The ANEF system does not take account of topography, but, even if it did, it is not immediately clear how the noise contours would differ at Wilton compared with other Australian airports.

Two submissions raised the question of temperature inversions affecting noise propagation (274.007 and 386.005).

As discussed in Section 14.2 of the Draft EIS, the ANEF computation is based on an average day, and temperature, wind, temperature inversions, cloud cover and humidity can all contribute to day-to-day variations in the propagation of noise.

The ANEF system of estimating noise exposure contours, in common with similar noise exposure systems employed around the world, does not attempt to make allowances for these sources of variation for two main reasons. First, there is no consistently reliable method to take account of variations in each of these factors as they vary over time and space.

Second, the generation of noise contours is only half of the task of estimating aircraft noise exposure effects. The other half involves assessing how people respond to different noise exposure levels determined by the ANEF contours.

The investigation of reaction is typically undertaken using social surveys, in which respondents are requested to describe their reaction to aircraft noise. Their response is clearly based not on the experience of a particular survey day, but on their accumulated experience of living in areas exposed to aircraft noise. Consequently, their response is an average rather than instantaneous reaction to aircraft noise.
The ANEF system is therefore an average measure of exposure and response and it has been consistently confirmed as the best method for Australia for estimating the effects of aircraft noise.

Although all the sources of possible variation listed above are common in varying degrees to all airports around the world, there is no evidence to suggest they significantly affect average response. This was confirmed in the National Acoustics Laboratory survey, where, for example, areas close to Sydney airport but outside the 20 ANEF contours were surveyed as control areas. The absence of any particular annoyance due to aircraft noise in control areas served to confirm the reasonable accuracy of the ANEF system.

This lack of significant variation can be observed for noise exposure associated with current operations. The noise exposure areas assessed for Wilton are worst case areas, which are unlikely to be attained let alone exceeded. It is therefore extremely unlikely for the variation which might arise from these effects to result in exposure in excess of that outlined in the Draft EIS. A noise monitoring system set up after the airport became operational would confirm that the noise generated was within the levels predicted.

Objections to various aspects of noise

A number of comments simply objected to the potential aircraft noise (11.004, 244.009, 270.002, 299.002, 300.003, 361.018, 394.003 and 394.006).

Most were unconcerned with the ANEF system in particular and simply commented that aircraft noise would affect their lifestyle.

Clearly, it is true that aircraft noise would affect lifestyle. Most of Section 14.2 is dedicated to explaining and assessing the incidence and nature of these effects.

One submission (246.023) raised the question of interference with TV reception from overflying aircraft and airport radars. Because of the greater distance from the TV transmitters, the effects of reflected signals from aircraft would be less than is currently experienced around Kingsford-Smith Airport. Airport radars should have no effect. The Parliamentary Select Committee on Aircraft Noise is aware of the problem of TV flicker around airports, and is considering what action can be taken. Its report is due to be presented to Parliament before the end of this year.

Wollongong City Council, Wollongong Chamber of Commerce and the Building Workers Industrial Union, however, did not believe there would be significant noise effects at Wilton (349.003, 394.006, 432.013, 432.031 and 432.037).

Comment 425.003 argued that simulated operations at Wilton by a B747 aircraft should be undertaken to demonstrate noise levels. However, even if this could be arranged, it would not serve the intended purpose. Reactions to single events are not likely to accurately represent reaction to habitual noise exposure, and would probably be affected by the prejudices (for or against) of those witnessing the simulation.

Assessment of effects

A number of submissions raised several criticisms of the way in which the ANEF system was presented and used in the assessment of aircraft noise effects set out in the Draft EIS (244.009, 246.003–246.006, 270.003, 338.020, 338.022, 338.069, 432.013 and 432.037).

The criticisms were that:

- the Draft EIS implicitly treated the 20 ANEF contour as an impervious sound barrier by failing to take account of noise effects on those outside the 20 ANEF;
the National Acoustics Laboratory surveys underlying community reaction to aircraft noise were inadequate;

the Draft EIS failed to justify the recommended land use table.

Whilst it is true that the comparison of noise effects was restricted to 20 ANEF, there was no conscious attempt in the Draft EIS to disguise the fact that aircraft noise effects do occur outside the 20 ANEF as indicated in Figure 14.2.2. The choice of 20 ANEF as a cut-off for evaluation simply reflects the National Acoustics Laboratory's conclusion that for land use planning purposes there should be a finite limit for consideration of land use measures and that above 20 ANEF represents areas of 'excessive aircraft noise' (page 381). The general criticism that the National Acoustics Laboratory surveys were inadequate refer to their inadequacy for application to quiet rural areas. This is responded to above in comments on low ambient noise levels.

The Draft EIS did not attempt to justify the recommended land use table which the Department of Aviation makes available to land use authorities for application in aircraft noise affected areas. The Department believes this to be good practical advice, but there is nothing to prevent land use authorities adopting a different practice.

The same submission was critical of treatment of noise effects (246.007 and 246.008). The claim is that the Draft EIS deliberately plays down noise relative to other effects by ignoring the fact that a lower level of operations would still generate substantial noise impacts, but promotes the employment benefits, for example, that would accompany the 13 million passenger per annum maximum development.

This is highly selective criticism. The worst case was used in all assessments of effects as required by the guidelines. However, although halving the annual operations may reduce the ANEF contours by 3 ANEF, it remains true that very few people are contained within them. There are other effects such as level of development and possible impact on flora and fauna which are much more sensitive to such changes in use of the airport. In any event, one could not have the 'worst case' noise effect without the 'best case' employment effect.

Several comments were about noise effects outside the 20 ANEF contour (208.002, 240.006, 245.009, 297.002, 338.023). These comments protested about noise over Bargo, Yanderra and North Wollongong. One raised the prospect of noise nuisance to public facilities around Wilton, Campbelltown and Wollongong; another argued that quiet enjoyment of the Royal National Park would be compromised by operations from Wilton.

There is little response which can be added to what already is in the Draft EIS regarding these general observations except to say that, although aircraft noise may be heard outside the 20 ANEF areas, it quickly ceases to be a nuisance to the majority of people the further outside the 20 ANEF they are.

Soundproofing and compensation

Seven submissions were received relating to the need for the Commonwealth to pay for noise compensation and house soundproofing in high aircraft noise areas (11.005, 195.001, 274.015, 337.016, 340.032, 385.012 and 390.026). As stated in Section 14.2.8 of the Draft EIS, under the present Commonwealth acquisition legislation (Lands Acquisition Act 1955), no compensation is available for injurious affection such as may be caused by aircraft noise.

The Law Reform Commission considered the injurious affection question in detail and recommended in its Report No. 14 that the current legislation should be changed to make this aspect of compensation to property owners more equitable. The Government has deferred its decision on this matter until it has consulted with other levels of Government and until the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Aircraft Noise has released its report and recommendations.
Furthermore, the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Aircraft Noise is also considering the related issues of the acquisition of noise affected properties in the vicinity of airports and the insulation of housing within high noise zones. Government policy on these issues may be subject to the recommendations contained in the Noise Inquiry Report, scheduled for release later this year.

Other noise

The State Government submission stated that noise from access roads and railway should have been quantified (274.009). This contrasts with the agreement reached with the access and environmental working groups, which included State Government representatives, that these aspects could only be meaningfully addressed when access routes were determined in the Macarthur Regional Environment Plan.

14.3 ARCHAEOLOGY

Five submissions were received that commented on the archaeological section of the Draft EIS. These made eight separate comments that could be categorised into two issues:

- comments on the method and extent of the archaeological survey;
- threat to sites of significance.

These issues are discussed below.

Comments on the archaeological survey

Three submissions commented on the method and extent of the archaeological survey conducted during preparation of the Draft EIS. Five comments were made (327.001, 327.002, 327.004, 338.061 and 385.013) noting that the value of the Wilton area in archaeological terms is increased by its geographical and geological features and the proximity of a tribal boundary, suggesting shortcomings in the predicted nature and frequency of sites in the Draft EIS, and the need for further investigation in areas of associated disturbance such as infrastructure routes.

The archaeological survey involved three components: a review of previous investigations relevant to the area, an identification of likely locations for sites based on patterns of distribution noted in earlier studies of the Sydney region and on features of landform and geology, and a field search of likely places to locate existing sites. In general, the field survey confirmed the predictions made on the basis of earlier studies and features of landform and geology, with the exception of entrenched creek lines in sandstone, where a complete survey revealed far lower archaeological value than had been predicted.

The existence of a tribal boundary in the vicinity of the site, although not crossing it, is noted in the Draft EIS in Section 14.4. Section 14.4.2 also acknowledges the need for further investigation to assess effects arising from induced development or the location of new road or rail access routes, this investigation to be carried out once the locations for these facilities were determined.

Threat to sites of significance

Three submissions (205.022, 264.033 and 327.003) were concerned about the possible disturbance of both the Allens Creek sites recorded by Haglund in 1982 and other possible sites in the area.

The occurrence of two of the Allens Creek sites within the notional site boundary is acknowledged in the Draft EIS. No other sites within the notional airport site boundary could be identified either through field survey or through the series of interviews held with members of both the Tharawal and Illawarra Local Aboriginal Land Councils.
Section 14.3.3 of the Draft EIS contains an undertaking that should it be determined after further detailed design that the Allens Creek art sites might be affected by airport development, the Department of Aviation would consult with the local Aboriginal land council and the National Parks and Wildlife Service to determine recording, preservation and excavation work that should be undertaken. In addition, the Draft EIS states that should any further information concerning the archaeological sensitivity of the site become available before construction, the Department of Aviation would review the need to appoint a qualified archaeologist to monitor the development during ground disturbance.

14.4 CONCERNS OF ABORIGINAL PEOPLE

Five submissions were received relating to the concerns of Aboriginal people with respect to the proposed Wilton airport site. These submissions made seven separate comments, which could be categorized into three issues:

- liaison with Aboriginal communities;
- significance of the land to Aboriginal people;
- attitude of the Tharawal Land Council.

These issues are discussed below.

Liaison with Aboriginal communities

Three submissions made five comments (205.023, 205.024, 205.025, 274.081 and 338.085) related to the process of liaison with Aboriginal communities. Four of these comments, from two submissions, criticized aspects of the liaison process; the time allowed for contacts with the Land Councils and the interpretation of the Land Councils' attitude as conditional approval.

The Draft EIS acknowledges in Section 14.4.3 that the time available for preparation of the Draft EIS was insufficient to enable full negotiating processes to be followed. This was mainly the result of the scheduling of South Coast Regional Land Council meetings and the cancellation of a scheduled Illawarra Land Council meeting. One meeting of the Western Metropolitan Regional Land Council and one of the Tharawal Local Aboriginal Land Council were, however, successfully attended by the Anthropological Consultant. Liaison officers appointed by each of the Land Councils supplied the Consultant with lists of Land Council members for interview. Forty-one members of the two Land Councils were interviewed by the liaison officers to determine their views on airport development and to compile information on the proposed site area and surrounds.

The interpretation of the Land Councils' attitude as conditional approval arose from the fact that the majority of Aboriginals contacted stated that they had no objection to the proposed acquisition and airport development provided that it did not cause any direct or indirect damage to sites of significance.

Should the Wilton site be selected for airport development, these initial contacts with the Tharawal and Illawarra Land Councils, and the National Parks and Wildlife Service, would be used to set up a consultative process with the Department of Aviation aimed at resolving conflicts between the interests of Aboriginal people and airport development.

The fifth comment relating to liaison with Aboriginal communities constituted an expression of support for the views of Tharawal Land Council. These views are quoted fully in the Draft EIS at Section 14.4.3, and discussion between the Department of Aviation, Tharawal Land Council and the National Parks and Wildlife Service would take account of these views if the Wilton site is selected for acquisition and development.
Significance of the land to Aboriginal people

One submission (362.027) indicated that the Metropolitan Water, Sewerage and Drainage Board's water catchment land at Wilton is significant to Aboriginal people. This is confirmed in the Draft EIS through the comments of members of the Tharawal Local Aboriginal Land Council, the comments of officers of the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service, and through the large number of Aboriginal sites which have been recorded by the National Parks and Wildlife Service in the area generally. In addition, two rock shelters containing drawings and two containing possible stone artefacts are located within the proposed site boundary. It should be noted, however, that the two art sites within the proposed site boundary are not well preserved compared to other art sites that have been located in the district, and they are continuing to deteriorate, so that their scientific, aesthetic and heritage significance decreases with time. Their significance is also decreased by the existence of a large number of Aboriginal sites recorded by the National Parks and Wildlife Service in areas beyond the proposed airport site. The Cataract River and gorge are particularly significant areas as the locations where many Tharawal people died in their confrontations with Europeans, and as sacred sites.

It is in recognition of the archaeological sensitivity of the proposed site that the Department of Aviation proposes to undertake further consultation with the Tharawal Land Council and National Parks and Wildlife Service should the proposed Wilton site be selected for airport development.

Attitude of Tharawal Land Council

One submission (432.015) indicated that Tharawal Local Aboriginal Land Council is not opposed to development of the proposed Wilton site. This accords with the statement of attitude by the majority of Aboriginals contacted. The Tharawal Land Council's submission to the Department of Aviation presents a list of considerations which would become the subject of discussion between the Department and the Council should the proposed Wilton site be selected for development.

14.5 EUROPEAN HERITAGE

Two submissions were received that made two separate comments relating to Section 14.5 of the Draft EIS.

One submission (264.036) suggested that the weighting given to European heritage value at both Wilton and Badgerys Creek proposed sites seemed very low.

European heritage value has been ranked fourth in terms of factor weights, following population displaced and existing and future noise incompatible land use. The weighting given is heavier than that given for flora, fauna, mineral resources, agriculture, flood risk, water quality and air quality. European heritage value of the proposed Wilton site is, however, assessed as minimal, so that the overall weighted score for this factor at this site is very low. This low score reflects the low historical significance of the proposed site rather than a low weighting factor.

The second comment (362.009) states that the Draft EIS does not state the significance of the catchment area to the National Estate. Section 14.5.3 of the Draft EIS states that the proposed site and immediately adjacent areas are of minimal heritage significance due to the absence of major nineteenth century development in the area and of any sites or buildings of heritage value. Sections 14.3 and 14.4 of the Draft EIS however, acknowledge the value of the catchment area, and in particular the wider catchment area beyond the proposed site, to the Aboriginal people, and Sections 16.1 and 16.2 outline its value in ecological terms. It should be noted, however, that the proposed site excises only a small area at the boundary of the Metropolitan Catchment.
There were a significant number of comments made about the economic effects of the proposed airport at the site acquisition, construction and operation stages. These comments can be categorized into four issues:

- method of estimation of employment;
- number of jobs created;
- effects on sub-regional economy;
- time lag in job creation.

These issues are discussed below.

**Method of estimation of employment**

Five submissions made seven separate comments (246.011, 264.040, 264.042, 274.028, 340.008, 389.009, 389.013) relating to the method of estimating employment that could be generated in the Wilton area should the Wilton site be selected for development.

Some comments related to the multipliers applied to the Wilton sub-region. One suggested that the multipliers were inaccurate, and two that they were applied to the Wilton area largely unchanged from the Kingsford-Smith sub-region economic benefits study, from which they were derived. The first of these criticisms has some substance. The multipliers estimated for the Wilton case cannot be thoroughly accurate due to the uncertainties surrounding the precise role of the second Sydney airport and to the uncertain characteristics of the future local economy to which they would be applied. However, the figures given represent the best estimate possible given the present level of knowledge. These limitations are acknowledged in Section 14.6.5 of the Draft EIS.

The suggestion of two of these comments that the multipliers derived from Kingsford-Smith sub-region have been applied largely unaltered to the Wilton sub-region is, however, false. Sections 14.6.5 and 14.6.6 discuss the application of the construction sector employment multipliers and the ratios of employees to air traffic derived from the Kingsford-Smith sub-region to the Wilton sub-region. In both cases the figures were considerably discounted: in the first case to reflect the high leakages of expenditure from the sub-region, and in the second to reflect uncertainties in the balance between domestic and international traffic, location of headquarters of airlines and the possibility of productivity improvements in the airline industry.

Others pointed out aspects of the second Sydney airport that might reduce its employment generating capacity. These were that the employment level of general aviation and commuter activities would be smaller than for major airlines, and that the second Sydney airport would be likely to be smaller than Kingsford-Smith Airport so that estimates of direct employment should be reduced proportionately. These factors have been taken into account in the estimation of direct employment at the operational stage given in Section 14.6.6.

One comment relating to the method of estimation of employment queries whether both sites would have equal employment generating characteristics. The Draft EIS does not assume that this would be the case. In Sections 9.6 and 14.6 which deal with economic effects at the two sites allowance has been made for the characteristics of the local economy at each site. These characteristics affect flow-on employment particularly. The economic multipliers applied to the two sites and presented in Tables 9.6.5 and 14.6.5 therefore differ, and the justification for the differences between the two sites is given in Sections 9.6.5, 9.6.6, 14.6.5 and 14.6.6 of the Draft EIS.

**Number of jobs created**

389.012, 391.010 390.012, and 456.002) relating to the number of jobs that would be created by airport development, should the proposed Wilton site be selected.

A small majority of these comments queried the estimated maximum employment levels expected to be generated by airport development or criticized the Draft EIS for considering estimated maximum employment levels. The method of estimation is detailed in the Draft EIS, including the assumptions made about level of operation of the proposed airport and assumptions relating to the regional economy. It is also stated that the estimates made for airport associated and induced employment, and multiplier or flow-on employment are maximum levels. This is a result of the use of the same 'worst-case' scenario for analysis of economic effects as had been used for evaluation of all other environmental factors in preparing the Draft EIS.

Most of the remaining comments relating to job creation pointed out that employment gains through airport construction and operation may be offset to some extent by employment losses resulting in the local area from conflict with mining activity, and in the Kingsford-Smith area through the possible relocation of some airport associated activity. As outlined in Section 14.6.4 of the Draft EIS, the Commonwealth proposes to manage the acquired site surface area for existing and productive use as far as is possible, thereby maintaining close to the present levels of employment generated by the land. However, Section 14.6.4 of the Draft EIS acknowledges that there may be some loss of production on the land acquired and that any such loss would be accompanied by negative flow-on effects in the local region.

In the Wilton area, agricultural activity is a less important employer than are mining and manufacturing activities. Submissions from the Bellambi Coal Company Pty Limited, into whose lease area the proposed airport site extends, indicate that the possible sterilization of reserves in the South Bulli holding could jeopardize the continuing operation of the company, which employs about 600 people. However, the company considers that it would be possible to design a mine plan to permit the extraction of the resource beneath the airport. This is discussed more fully in Section 15.1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS, and would be the subject of discussion between the Department of Aviation, the NSW Department of Mineral Resources, the Joint Coal Board and the Bellambi Coal Company Pty Limited. Should such extraction proceed, employment in the mining sector would not be affected.

One comment suggested that jobs would be lost around Kingsford-Smith Airport if some airport and airport associated industry were to relocate to the second Sydney airport site.

Possible loss of employment at Kingsford-Smith Airport is not specifically discussed in the Draft EIS. This is because a second airport is seen as supplementing the capacity of Kingsford-Smith Airport rather than being in competition. Section 2.4 of the Draft EIS considers the role of Kingsford-Smith Airport in the presence of a second Sydney airport. The conclusion reached is that Kingsford-Smith Airport would remain the dominant, business oriented airport, remaining the focus for business and intrastate commuter traffic. It is also expected that Kingsford-Smith Airport would remain the principal airport of the established major airlines as a result primarily of the fact that the option for these airlines of relocating to a second airport is not realistic in the face of their established markets and competitive relationships. A secondary reason is that each has substantial investments in facilities at Kingsford-Smith Airport. It is also regarded as unlikely that airline associated activities would relocate their operations, as outlined in Section 14.6.6. Therefore loss of employment in the Kingsford-Smith sub-region as a result of establishing a second Sydney airport is considered unlikely.

Effects on the sub-regional economy

Thirteen submissions made a total of nineteen separate comments (58.002, 243.010, 243.011, 243.015, 274.030, 274.031, 331.007, 332.002, 349.007, 361.023, 374.005, 374.006, 389.011, 390.023, 394.002, 426.006, 432.004, 432.016 and 432.025) relating to economic
and employment effects that the selection of the proposed Wilton site may have in the
sub-region.

The majority of these comments responded positively to siting of the proposed airport at
Wilton, suggesting that the economic and employment generating effects of the airport
would benefit the region, which currently has a relatively high rate of unemployment.
The proposed airport is seen as a possible stimulus to tourism in the region and as a
means of diversifying the regional economy. There is little doubt that economic and
employment benefits would occur.

Several comments discuss the extent to which airport-generated employment could be
expected to benefit the sub-region, postulating that skilled labour would be likely to be
drawn from outside the region and that economic benefits might not flow on to local
businesses. Sections 14.6.5 and 14.6.6 discuss these aspects of economic and employment
generation, and the application of the multipliers derived from the Kingsford-Smith sub-
region to the Wilton sub-region. It is acknowledged that the multipliers must be
discounted when applied to the Wilton sub-region to reflect the higher leakages of
expenditure that would apply to the Wilton case. These factors are taken into account in
projecting direct, airport associated and airport induced employment in the Wilton sub-
region.

Several comments suggested strategies to maximize local benefit from the economic
generating effects of the proposed airport. Strategies included a suggestion that
government contracts should specify a minimum proportion of local labour to be
employed in airport construction, and encouragement for nearby location of a freight
forwarding industry and aircraft servicing, repair and catering industries in the early
stages of airport and local and regional planning.

One comment relating to effects on the sub-regional economy stated that selection of
the proposed Wilton site would result in a capital drain from the area. This may result in
the short term through the suspension of capital works and improvements on properties
likely to be affected by airport development. In the longer term, the result of site
acquisition and airport development is likely to be capital inflow into the sub-region, as
investment in airport associated and induced industries occurs.

Time lag in job creation

Five submissions made five separate comments (205.008, 264.010, 334.006, 342.013 and
361.025) regarding the time that would elapse between acquisition of the proposed site
and generation of any employment.

These comments point out that site acquisition would create no jobs and that there may
be a considerable time lag before the construction and operation stages which would
generate employment.

This is acknowledged in the Draft EIS. Section 14.6.4 describes the effect of site
acquisition as a possible displacement of some existing economic activity, and Sections
14.6.5 and 14.6.6 describe the employment and economic generating effects that would
be anticipated at construction and operation stages, but point out the difficulty of
accurately specifying the effects of construction at a date not yet determined. During
the lag period between acquisition and construction, the Commonwealth proposes to
manage acquired land for productive use, as far as possible. The Commonwealth's
preferred course of action would be to lease land back to original owners, or where this
arrangement was not feasible, to lease through the invitation of public tenders. This
arrangement should maintain the present economic role and employment generation of
the site surface area at a level almost equivalent to that presently existing. It should
also be noted that the site area only has a direct effect on a small number of existing
businesses as a large portion of its falls within the Metropolitan Catchment.
As discussed above and in Section 15.1 of the Supplement to the Draft EIS, maintaining employment in the coal mining industry throughout the site acquisition stage and beyond airport development would be the aim of discussions between the Department of Aviation, the NSW Department of Mineral Resources, the Joint Coal Board and the Bellambi Coal Company Pty Limited if the site were selected.

14.7 AGRICULTURE

Only two submissions were received concerning aspects of Section 14.7 of the Draft EIS. These submissions include two separate comments on the broader impact of the proposed airport development (264.047 and 385.017).

The issues raised were negative and concerned with the wider impact of the project. One concerned the noise impact on poultry farms within the 25 ANEF contour at Bargo. The 25 ANEF contour does not encompass the Bargo area so the comment is not relevant. The other suggested that all land within the 25 ANEF contour should be acquired as it would be sterilized by airport development. This would not be the case though clearly a change in agricultural land use might occur.

14.8 REGIONAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

There were a considerable number of submissions, approximately half of which were proforma submissions, relating to Section 14.8 of the Draft EIS. These submissions raised points which can be categorized into five main issues:

- effects of population growth and associated activity;
- further regional planning;
- impact on wider population;
- compatibility with Hawkesbury/Nepean Valley Study;
- regional benefits.

These issues are discussed below.

**Effects of population growth and associated activity**

A number of submissions made a total of thirteen separate comments (205.012, 223.005 (proforma), 243.008, 243.009, 270.005 (proforma), 271.005 (proforma), 312.004, 321.005, 340.027, 358.002, 337.018, 431.006, 459.017) relating to the social effects that may result from the selection and development of the proposed Wilton site.

Twenty-six of these submissions (including all the proforma submissions) expressed concern at the disruption that would occur to the rural lifestyle of the area (and in some cases to the natural environment) through the attraction of a substantial residential population and commercial and industrial activities to the area should the proposed Wilton site be selected for acquisition and subsequent airport development.

Sections 14.8.3 and 14.8.4 of the Draft EIS examine the effects of airport development that would encourage urban development in the Wilton sub-region. A maximum of 22,000 jobs is expected to be attributable to the second Sydney airport, and of these only approximately 13,800 jobs, (made up of 10,500 employed by airlines, administration and airport commercial services; 1,000 by airport associated and airport induced activities; and about 2,300 flow-on jobs) could be in the economic sub-region around Wilton (including Campbelltown and Wollongong).

No projection is made of the estimated sub-regional population that may be generated by these jobs because population fluctuations would be far more dependent upon regional planning measures than upon employment opportunities. The deciding factor in regional
population distribution would be the Macarthur Sub-Region Draft Regional Environmental Plan which will be prepared by the Department of Environment and Planning following the completion of the Regional Environmental Study which is in preparation. The Macarthur South Sub-Region, which contains the proposed Wilton site, is one of four regions identified by the Urban Development Committee as suitable to meet Sydney's requirement for further urban development in the medium term, following the first priority North-West Sector. The second Sydney airport, if located at the proposed Wilton site, may encourage earlier urban development near the airport, but it is quite feasible that this development would already have occurred before the commencement of airport construction. It would almost certainly have occurred before the airport reached its ultimate development with the associated employment levels referred to above.

Two submissions that commented on the social effects of acquisition expressed concern that development of the airport at the proposed Wilton site would encourage 'urban sprawl' to proceed toward Wilton. As outlined above in relation to population growth, locations for urbanization would be determined far more by regional planning instruments that are in preparation rather than the location of the second Sydney airport site.

The final comment within this category related to 'blight' effects that could occur if the proposed Wilton site were selected. There is no doubt that interim planning measures would be applied during this period with the aim of controlling development in potential noise affected areas. However, this would not sterilize land, since many of the existing permitted land uses are compatible with the worst case noise levels. There may be some effect in terms of improvements being postponed or abandoned, and there may be an effect of reductions of options of land use within noise affected areas.

Selection and acquisition of the proposed Wilton site would, however, release some 200-300 km² of land within the Cumberland Plain from the necessity of similar restraints to potential urban development.

Further regional planning

Five submissions made eight separate comments (255.007, 274.017, 332.006, 338.025, 432.033, 432.035, 432.039 and 432.043) relating to further planning required for associated developments and transport links, influences on the regional economy, and the urban space needs of Sydney.

One comment referred to the need for further planning to co-ordinate changes that may occur in the regional economy and to derive most benefit from the employment and industrial opportunities that may arise should development proceed at the proposed Wilton site. One comment referred to planning modifications required to provide access corridors for transport links to the proposed airport. Four comments considered the urban space needs of Sydney and the possible alternative roles of the Wilton area should the proposed site not be selected for airport development. Two further comments stressed the need for environmental protection measures to be given considerable weight in planning for transport links to the proposed airport and in planning for regional development generally.

Planning issues such as these would be discussed in the Regional Environmental Study for the Macarthur Sub-Region currently being prepared by the Department of Environment and Planning, which will consider implications of airport development at either short-listed site as one aspect of a regional scenario.

Should the proposed Wilton site be selected for airport development, planning involving the Department of Aviation, Local Councils and the state and regional offices of the Department of Environment and Planning would continue, in order to consider particular aspects relating to airport development, including corridors for airport transport links,
regional economic and employment changes, urban expansion and environmental issues. However, it should be noted that the proposed site does not directly affect large areas of lands which could be used for future urban development.

Impact on wider population

Eight submissions made nine separate comments (11.003, 66.011, 244.008, 256.007, 257.007, 342.004, 342.007, 361.040 and 432.040) relating to possible impacts on a population beyond the local population of the Wilton area should the proposed Wilton site be selected for airport development. The majority of these submissions suggested impacts through deleterious effects on the resource and urban buffer values of the natural and rural environments of the region. CSIRO submitted that their entomological research activities in the vicinity of the proposed site, which are of both national and international value, would be affected by airport development, but probably not to the extent that they would have to be discontinued. The last submission in this category stated that the Draft EIS did not consider the noise nuisance that would be felt by people moving into potentially noise affected areas before development commenced.

The most important point relating to impacts on the natural and rural environments of the area is that these impacts are likely to occur, as outlined in Section 14.8.2 of the Draft EIS, as a result of the identification of the Macarthur South locality as suitable for medium term urban development, with or without airport development. Planning for either contingency would aim to minimize unnecessary alteration to natural areas and to protect the resource values of the catchment area, in order to best serve both the regional population and the population of Sydney as a whole.

Compatibility with the Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley Study

One submission (comment 255.004) queried whether the concept of siting an airport at the proposed Wilton site could be compatible with the State Government’s concern for the Hawkesbury-Nepean river system exemplified by their preparation of a report on the Hawkesbury-Nepean valley in 1983. It is not anticipated that acquisition and subsequent development of a second Sydney airport at the proposed Wilton site in the headwaters of the Nepean River system would be of major significance to this study, subject to environmentally sensitive development of the proposed site.

Regional benefits

Three submissions made three separate comments (274.123, 374.003 and 432.024) suggesting benefits that may accrue to the region as a result of airport development, should the proposed Wilton site be selected, and positive aspects of the region that would support airport development.

The benefits that were suggested were that the proposed airport would be particularly conveniently placed to serve Wollongong and the south-west of Sydney and that the airport would benefit the Macarthur Institute of Higher Education. Wollongong City Council pointed out that the region offers most of the resources and infrastructure required for airport development such as available residential land, transport routes and workforce.

It is acknowledged that these benefits are likely to occur in the region as a whole, along with others such as impetus for commercial and industrial development and employment generation.
CHAPTER 15
THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT AND EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSAL

15.1 GEOLOGY, SOILS AND PHYSIOGRAPHY

Thirty-eight submissions were received, including nine proforma submissions, querying aspects relating to Section 15.1 of the Draft EIS. These thirty-eight submissions included seventy-three separate comments mainly relating to the coal resources underlying the proposed airport site.

The comments raised in the submissions can be categorized into five main issues. They are issues relating to:

- social implications of coal sterilization;
- feasibility of extracting the resource from beneath the proposed airport site;
- economic implications to the coal industry, particularly the Bellambi Coal Company;
- geophysical constraints at the site: in particular, seismic activity, subsidence and site preparation;
- siltation and soil erosion.

These issues are discussed below.

Social implications of coal sterilization

Twenty-seven of the submissions received, eight of which were proforma submissions, related to the social implications of the sterilization of coal resources that would occur were the Wilton site selected. These submissions made twenty-one separate comments (205.014, 243.014, 271.008 (proforma), 274.084, 277.006, 325.008, 332.003, 337.023, 339.001, 340.018, 361.031, 362.013, 390.011, 393.004, 394.007, 425.004, 428.007, 431.004, 455.002, 456.001, and 456.003).

The comments made in the submissions could be further categorized into the following issues:

- the possible loss of a valuable and not unlimited resource;
- the threat to coal industry employment if the resource is not mined.

Of the twenty-seven submissions raising these issues, three felt that the potential problems could be avoided or overcome, eleven were concerned about potential detrimental effects, and four expressed no attitude as to whether development of an airport at the proposed site would have positive or negative implications in terms of the issues they raised.

Section 15.1.1 of the Draft EIS details the quantity and types of coal resources occurring in the proposed site. This information was provided by the Department of Mineral Resources. The importance of the resource in producing coking coal for the domestic steel industry and for export, and the potential use of the Wongawilli seam to provide steaming coal or a component of a coal blend is acknowledged. The loss of these
resources, or a part of them, would be considered by the Government in the process of selecting its final site. Total in-situ coal resources within the proposed site (including a 35° angle of draw) are 84.4 million tonnes. Of this 53.6 million tonnes are regarded as recoverable. Due to the location of the airport additional tonnages would be sterilized between the 35° marginal zone and the colliery holding boundary. It is proposed to extract the coal using longwall mining techniques. A number of longwall blocks between the marginal zone and the colliery boundary would contain insufficient tonnages of coal to be regarded as economically recoverable. In-situ and recoverable coal resources underlying the proposed site are as set out in Table 15.1.1.

Table 15.1.1 In-situ and recoverable coal resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seam</th>
<th>West Bellambi</th>
<th>East Bargo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-situ</td>
<td>Recoverable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(million tonnes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulli</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balgownie</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wongawilli</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the value of potentially sterilized saleable coal resources is of real but unquantifiable value to the Bellambi Coal Company, the value to New South Wales would be up to $100 million (net present value).

A number of submissions contested the assessment of quality of the Balgownie seam given in the Draft EIS. Advice from the Department of Mineral Resources indicates that the quality of the Balgownie seam in the vicinity of the proposed site is lower than elsewhere and uneconomic under parts of the site.

It must be stressed that the Balgownie seam would not constitute a viable mining proposition at this time. The inclusion of this seam within the resource assessment relates to the fact that it is not possible to predict the mining constraints and coal quality parameters that will govern the viability of such an operation within the first half of the next century.

The unemployment rate in the Wilton sub-region (local government areas of Campbelltown, Wollondilly and Wollongong) is relatively high when compared with those of the Kingsford-Smith sub-region and the Sydney region, and mining and manufacturing are more important employers. If future mining in the region is affected by the proposed airport between 300 and 400 mining jobs could be threatened.

Location of the proposed airport at Wilton would generate between 500 and 900 jobs associated with the airport and up to 100 jobs induced by it. These jobs would, however, probably be concentrated in the manufacturing and trade sectors rather than mining (see Section 14.6). Should the Wilton site be selected, there is likely to be some negative effect on mining employment in the local region but, as indicated in Section 15.1.1 of the Draft EIS, the Department of Aviation would hold discussions with the Department of Mineral Resources, Joint Coal Board and Bellambi Coal Company. These discussions would be aimed at allowing extraction of coal to proceed either before airport construction or following construction, using methods and mine plan designed to avoid subsidence effects on airport facilities. If partial extraction were feasible, then loss of mining employment would be small.
Feasibility of extracting the resource from beneath the proposed site

Eight submissions were received concerning the feasibility of extracting the resource from beneath the proposed site. These submissions made fourteen comments (205.009, 274.087, 274.088, 274.090, 331.003, 342.025, 346.001, 374.008, 374.009, 385.015, 432.002, 432.044, 432.045 and 432.047).

The thirteen comments raised in the submissions could be further categorized into the following issues:

- resolution of timing conflicts between airport development and mining;
- extent of avoidance of sterilization that may be possible;
- feasibility of overcoming subsidence difficulties;
- discussion of the quality of the resource and therefore the feasibility of economically extracting it.

Mining of the region prior to construction of an airport facility would require a drift/shaft connection in the west of the leasehold and the development of a complete underground mine. Consequently, new mine capital investment would be required to create a production capacity over and above the current South Bulli operation and it is unlikely that this could be justified economically given the marginal economics of the present West Bellambi concepts. It is also unlikely that coking coal markets would be available for the extra volume in the foreseeable future. The alternative of redeploying existing equipment westward would result in major development expense and a serious coal quality problem.

The coal quality problem would be alleviated to a certain extent by the new coal preparation plant. Upgrading of the existing coastal washery facility is not feasible because of the environmental problems that this plant creates within the residential areas north of Wollongong and the length and subsequent maintenance costs of the current underground conveyor system.

The recovery of the coal within the Bulli seam underlying the proposed site would necessitate the following scheduling of operations:

- four years to commissioning of the surface facilities and drift from the commitment date; and
- approximately fifteen to twenty years to extract the Bulli seam on a two longwall basis.

This assumes that coal within the East Bargo authorization, affected by the proposed airport, was mined from West Bellambi. It would also be necessary for the company to make a commitment to the West Bellambi mine facility within the next twelve months.

The indefinite, but very considerable time scale for working the Balgownie and Wongawilli seams also would require consideration to achieve the concept of total extraction.

Bellambi Coal Company Pty Limited has developed a mine plan for all its existing colliery holding and the mine has been planned accordingly, so the construction of this airport would impact upon the company's mine development.

It would be possible to mine the coal after the airport is constructed without causing necessary sterilization of resources. To achieve this it would be necessary to design all facilities, with the possible exception of the runways, to withstand subsidence.
If protection was required around the runways and taxiways the tonnage of sterilized, recoverable Bulli seam coal would be reduced from 11.8 million tonnes to approximately 3.6 million tonnes within the West Bellambi lease. If protection was required surrounding the runways only, the sterilized tonnage would be reduced to approximately 2.5 million tonnes. These tonnages are based on a 26° angle of draw surrounding the structures requiring the protection and assuming that first workings will be permitted beneath the runways and other facilities.

The submission of the NSW Premier's Department suggested that the tonnage of sterilized recoverable coal would be reduced even further if one primary runway was located parallel to and directly over the main West Bellambi development headings. With this concept the majority of the sterilized coal would be accounted for in the barrier and chain pillars which must remain to provide stability and protection for the main mine headings. This would have the additional effect of relocating an additional proportion of the secondary runway over the unmineable portion of the East Bargo authorization.

Unfortunately such a relocation of the runways would be very difficult due to the topography of the various gorges bordering the site and would also greatly increase the potentially noise-affected area between Bargo and Tahmoor.

In respect of the South Bulli mine (West Bellambi), the orientation of the runways in a north-south direction may also help to minimize sterilization. However, this too is not considered desirable as it would adversely affect the village of Wilton and substantially increase the area of potential noise affected land uses. A north-south orientation of main runways would also probably require a cross-wind runway in the east-west direction to ensure the airport met Department of Aviation usability criteria. Hence such a change in direction would increase the adverse impacts of the airport in the surrounding area and not improve the potential for coal extraction.

Assuming the Bulli seam was extracted first, followed by the Balgownie and Wongawilli seams, the maximum subsidence parameters would be as shown in Table 15.1.2 (supplied with the submission of the Premier's Department).

Table 15.1.2 Subsidence parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seam</th>
<th>Maximum subsidence (m)</th>
<th>Maximum tensile strain (mm/m)</th>
<th>Maximum compressive strain (mm/m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulli</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balgownie</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wongawilli</td>
<td>1.925</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table applies to the coal resources underlying the West Bellambi lease. It is noted that within the East Bargo area the Balgownie seam is uneconomic and the subsidence and strain parameters for this seam must be subtracted from the total.

Surface structures associated with the airport should be designed to withstand ground movements relating to the extraction of the underlying coal resources. The reasons for this include the minimization of sterilized coal resources and the fact that the majority of the site is located within a proclaimed mine subsidence district.
Subsidence investigations in the Southern Coalfield have revealed that surface subsidence movements beyond a 26\(^{\circ}\) angle of draw are insufficient to cause damage. As the runways cannot tolerate differential movements they would need to be protected by coal pillars. The protection to runways could thus be based on an angle of draw of 26\(^{\circ}\).

Taxiways and other facilities including the control tower and terminal buildings probably could be designed to accommodate subsidence. If taxiways required protection then more coal would have to be sterilized.

In order to minimize disruption to the existing mine plan first workings should be permitted under the runways and taxiways. Subsidence movement due to these headings under a minimum of 400 m of cover are considered to be negligible.

The three seams affected by the airport development are the Bulli, Balgownie and Wongawilli seams.

The variation in thickness of the working section is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seam</th>
<th>West Bellambi</th>
<th>East Bago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulli seam</td>
<td>1.6 m - 2.2 m</td>
<td>1.2 m - 2.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balgownie seam</td>
<td>1.0 m - 1.1 m</td>
<td>1.0 m - 1.1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wongawilli seam</td>
<td>2.2 m - 2.6 m</td>
<td>2.1 m - 2.8 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the West Bellambi area there is a deterioration in coking coal quality compared to the eastern half of the South Bulli Colliery holding. The Bellambi Coal Company is of the opinion that the coal can be economically extracted, producing a multi-stream and blended product. It is envisaged that coal from the Bulli seam would be washed to produce a coking and a thermal coal fraction. The Balgownie seam would be washed to produce either a single product thermal coal or a coking/thermal multiple product. The coking coal fraction of the Balgownie seam could be blended with the Bulli seam to enhance the coking properties of the latter. The Wongawilli seam could be washed to prepare a single product thermal coal.

The coal seams within the southern half of the East Bargo area have been intruded and the coal has been cindered. Evaluation of the regional drilling that has been undertaken indicates that the majority of the intruded and/or cindered seams lie outside the proposed airport site. However, the north-western sector of the site has been excluded from the resource assessment of the Bulli and Wongawilli seams because the seam is either too thin or the washed coal ash exceeds acceptable limits. The majority of the Balgownie seam has been excluded for the same reasons. The quality of the coal within the East Bargo sector must be regarded as marginal to sub-economic under current market criteria.

Three of the eight submissions expressed confidence that extraction could proceed without enormous resource loss, while five considered that difficulties associated with coal extraction would be a major disadvantage of the proposed Wilton site.

If Wilton is the selected site, the Department of Aviation, Department of Mineral Resources, Joint Coal Board and Bellambi Coal Company would need to discuss in detail the resolution of these issues.

The Bellambi Coal Company Pty Limited holds Coal Lease No. 132 over the eastern third of the Wilton airport site. This lease does not confer any rights regarding the extraction of the underlying resources between the surface and a depth of 152.4 m. The Premier's
Department submission recommended that if the resumption of land for the purpose of constructing an airport proceeds, ownership should be restricted to the surface so as not to conflict with the extraction of the underlying coal resources within Coal Lease No. 132 or the East Bargo area, the Company's title to the coal and any developments (i.e. drifts and/or shafts) which may have to be constructed to gain access to the coal. This would be a matter for later consideration by the two governments.

**Economic implications for the coal industry, particularly the Bellambi Coal Company**

Nine submissions were concerned with the economic implications for the coal industry if the proposed airport site at Wilton were selected. These submissions raised twenty separate comments (202.012, 208.003, 274.086, 274.091, 331.001, 331.002, 338.028, 338.087, 346.002, 346.003, 346.004, 346.005, 346.006, 346.007, 346.008, 346.009, 362.014, 431.005 and 432.046).

The main thrust of the comments concerned the following issues:

- the adverse effect on the Bellambi Coal Company's proposed new pit top facilities and its ability to economically mine its coal resource;
- the potential loss of access to other coal resources in the area;
- the contention that the coal reserve in the Balgownie seam within the proposed site is economic (not as the EIS has indicated).

These issues have been raised in the Draft EIS and if the Wilton site were selected the Department of Aviation would undertake to hold discussions with the NSW Department of Mineral Resources, the Joint Coal Board and the Bellambi Coal Company Pty Limited to discuss the effects of the acquisition of the Company's land and to determine the feasibility of future coal extraction within the proposed airport site.

The development of an airport at the proposed Wilton site would have a considerable impact on the western development of the Bellambi Coal Company Pty Limited's colliery holding.

In excess of 11 million tonnes of recoverable Bulli seam reserves would be sterilized if no mining is allowed under the proposed site. In accordance with the current extraction schedule it is anticipated that extraction of the Bulli seam would not commence until after the turn of the century.

The principal effect of the proposed airport would be to jeopardize the future of the West Bellambi project by consuming a large proportion of the available flat land existing outside the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board's catchment. This land has been purchased by the company and is designated for the mine surface facilities. The only available non-catchment land lies to the north of the proposed airport. The Bellambi Coal Company has suggested three possible alternative sites for the surface facilities (Figure 15.1.1).

**Site A:** Immediately north of the north-west corner of the airport area and south-east of Thornton's Hill.

**Site B:** Immediately north of the central part of the airport area and south of Lisa Road.

**Site C:** Within the north-west corner of the West Bellambi lease area.

Site A is preferred by the company since:

- it lies closest to the Maldon-Dombarton railway line;
it is environmentally severed from the township of Wilton;

it presents the most favourable construction site;

it is not located within the catchment area;

it is underlain by coal resources within the East Bargo area which are classified as uneconomic.

Site B contains considerable rural/residential subdivision.

Site C would sterilize more coal reserves, present environmental problems with respect to the catchment area and is distant from the railway line.

It might be necessary, if Site A were chosen, to relocate the proposed drift connecting the Bulli seam workings to the surface facilities. The original proposal sited the drift portal on the eastern side of the surface facilities and at a 1 in 4 gradient entered the Bulli seam at the western boundary of the colliery holding. If the airport development were to proceed the company propose that the drift be situated to intersect the seam in
the vicinity of the current development workings and surface within the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board catchment area.

Configuration of the drift would be affected by Wallandoola Creek which runs through a fairly steep gorge in this area. For the drift to surface east of the creek a substantial transport route crossing will be required. To surface west of the creek will require a long drift and may intrude into aircraft approach safety clearance zones. Thus a drift surfacing east of Wallandoola Creek is dictated. From the drift portal it is envisaged that coal would be transported across the creek within an enclosed conveyor system to a truck loading facility on the north-eastern side of the proposed airport. The transport of the coal across the Wallandoola Creek would necessitate the construction of a suspension bridge to support the conveyor system. The coal would then be transported by road to the raw coal stockpile located adjacent to the coal preparation plant outside the catchment area.

The recoverable coal resources within the Balgownie and Wongawilli seams are 24 million tonnes. At present it is not planned to extract these resources until mining within the Bulli seam has been completed. However, this would depend to a certain extent on future market conditions.

Apart from the potential sterilization of coal resources, the principal effect of the airport on the West Bellambi development would be the increase in capitalization costs associated with the relocation of the drift and surface facilities. Preliminary estimates put this figure in the order of $2 million. They may not include the additional cost of purchasing land outside the catchment area and the airport site. The resultant effect of this increase in costs would be to increase the pay-back period necessary to achieve the return on the investment.

**Geophysical constraints at the proposed site**

A number of submissions, eight of which were proforma submissions, were concerned with particular geophysical constraints at the proposed site which would affect the development of an airport. These submissions raised seventeen separate comments (271.009, 274.089, 338.046, 338.047, 340.015, 340.016, 340.017, 342.026, 361.020, 362.015, 390.009, 431.005, 432.017, 432.019, 432.023, 432.048 and 432.049).

Of the seventeen comments raised, twelve indicated that the geophysical conditions relating to the site would be adverse to airport development if Wilton were the selected site. The comments indicated the following reasons:

- possible subsidence;
- seismic stability;
- extensive amount of excavation works required.

Five of the comments indicated that the development of an airport would not pose any undue difficulties and indicated that:

- coal washery reject and slag could be used as a suitable material for fill for airport development;
- mining beneath the site, while presenting certain problems, could be resolved by adopting special mining techniques which would reduce the risk of subsidence and resultant effects on airport structures and facilities.

The Draft EIS indicates that part of the proposed site is within the Wilton Mine subsidence district (Figure 15.1.2 Draft EIS). This is declared under the Mine Subsidence Compensation (Amendment) Act, 1983, and the Mine Subsidence Compensation Act, 1961. These Acts require all surface facilities to be constructed in accordance with design criteria approved by the Mine Subsidence Board.
The Draft EIS also acknowledges that Wilton is in a Zone 1 area based on the Standards Association of Australia's earthquake hazard classification maps. The Earthquake Code AS2121 for Zone 1 requires certain parameters to be taken into account when designing ductile and non-ductile structures. If Wilton were the selected site the Department of Aviation would comply with these requirements.

In relation to site preparation works Wilton ranked third and sixth compared to all other sides considered during the site ranking phase. Further consideration could be given to final site levels if Wilton were the selected site and if appropriate coal washery reject or slag could be used as fill to reduce the need for site excavation.

Siltation and soil erosion

Three submissions were concerned with problems relating to siltation and soil erosion. These submissions raised four separate comments (245.004, 340.014, 385.020 and 385.022).

The comments were primarily concerned with the removal of vegetation, changes in soil moisture and the likelihood of resultant erosion and siltation.

The Draft EIS recognizes the site contains soils which are potentially highly erodible. Consequently, the Department of Aviation would, if Wilton were the selected site, enter into an agreement with the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board (Appendix H of Draft EIS) which would establish conditions under which construction of the airport would occur. As part of these conditions the Department would be required to construct, stabilize and maintain a fully functional drainage system around the perimeter of the site prior to any other earthworks being undertaken. In addition to this requirement other specialized erosion and sedimentation control measures would be adopted. These would be determined in consultation with the NSW Soil Conservation Service.

15.2 DRAINAGE AND WATER QUALITY

Forty-seven submissions including twenty-two proforma submissions, of which there were three separate types, were received commenting on aspects relating to Section 15.2 of the Draft EIS. These submissions included 113 separate comments mainly relating to the effects of airport development and operation on the catchment and on water quality.

The comments raised in the submissions can be categorized into the following main issues as detailed below.

1. effects on the Upper Nepean water supply;
2. effects on other than water supply system, and particularly on the Nepean system;
3. technical and economic feasibility of water management techniques.

Effects on Upper Nepean water supply

The comments raised in the submissions could be further categorized into the following issues:

- retention of catchment area and government policy;
- threat to the water supply from construction and operation activities;
- threat to the water supply from emergency operations;
- associated operations not adequately considered.

**Retention of catchment area and government policy**

Submissions relating to policy issues stated or implied that water catchment areas were of high importance, that there should be no development within existing catchments and that a reduction in catchment area was not acceptable. A variation of this is that catchment use for major developments would set a bad precedent. Other less specific comments noted that the airport 'should not be located in the water catchment area'.

The Draft EIS explicitly recognizes the importance of the Upper Nepean system. The site development as shown in the Draft EIS would involve acquiring about 1245 ha of the Metropolitan Catchment. However, only about 875 ha of this would be excised from the Catchment. The Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board has estimated the value of lost water at $23,600 per annum. The airport does not excise any land from areas behind the main catchment storage dams.

One submission wrongly noted that the site was within the Woronora Catchment Area.

**Threat to the water supply from construction and operation activities**

A common misunderstanding apparent in many submissions is that there would be direct drainage of polluted water to the water supply of Sydney. The Draft EIS noted that the site drainage would be modified by a major system of perimeter drains and dams so that even under a maximum possible rainfall event all surface drainage would be diverted away from the water supply system. While the airport would also be legally excised from the water catchment area there would be close co-operation between Commonwealth and State authorities to ensure that all airport-related activities were appropriate considering the proximity of the airport and the catchment.

A few submissions noted the possibility of groundwater contamination, with inference of subsequent contamination of Sydney's water supply, by movement either to the Cordeaux and Cataract Rivers or via Allens Creek to groundwater and into the Nepean Tunnel. Initially it must be recognised that the water management system adopted would have as its major objective protection of the water supply. In relation to groundwater, the location and design of facilities such as first flush retention storages and effluent irrigation areas (if any) would be such as to minimise the possibility of contaminants entering the water supply system. Even if small amounts of contaminants were in contact with the soil, the soil normally acts as a very efficient treatment system degrading and absorbing the contaminants and preventing their long-distance movement with groundwater. However, it is possible under certain conditions for some water to enter the Nepean Tunnel from the Allens Creek catchment via groundwater movement and through fine joints in the rock. In addition to the extensive water management at the airport site and the purifying effects of passage through the soils any groundwater entering the tunnel would represent only a very small proportion of the treated water flowing along Allens Creek. In the unlikely event of any contaminants being present, they would be very greatly diluted by the water feeding from Pheasant's Nest Weir.

**Emergency operations**

Some submissions were concerned at the possible threat to the water supply arising from emergency operations, particularly crashes or dumping of fuel. The Draft EIS acknowledges the possibility of such incidents. The Department of Aviation works closely with State authorities to develop airport and aircraft operating procedures to minimize the risks of such events affecting the catchment area and hence quality of the water supply. In addition, procedures would be developed so that, in the unlikely event
of an incident's occurring to contaminate the catchment and water, the concentrations of all contaminants would be reduced to acceptable levels by the time the water was consumed (see also Section 13.7).

Associated operations not adequately considered
Several submissions noted that the implications on the water supply of, for example, re-routing Mount Keira Road and the 330 kV transmission line were not addressed in the Draft EIS. The Draft EIS recognized that detailed assessments of the effects of airport related developments such as roads and realignment of transmission lines would be in accordance with State legislative requirements and would be undertaken prior to their construction.

Effects on other than water supply system


The responses to the comments are considered below in terms of:

. water quality downstream in the Nepean-Hawkesbury system;
. changes to hydrology.

Water quality downstream in the Nepean-Hawkesbury system
As noted in the Draft EIS the water management plan for the area is directed to ensuring that acceptable water quality is maintained in the creeks and rivers. Advice was also sought from the State Pollution Control Commission as to the appropriateness of the water management concept discussed in the Draft EIS. It should also be noted that the details of the system would require approval of the Commission under the Clean Waters Act should development of the Wilton site proceed.

The initial planning for the airport recognizes the importance of water management and this would be carried through to the detailed design, construction and operation phases. This would mean that an effective integrated system would be developed. This contrasts with problems inherent in imposing water quality controls on existing operations or on a pattern of land use with many individual landowners or occupiers.

Changes to hydrology
The airport development concept would increase the surface catchment draining to Allens Creek, and the developed area would have greater than existing run-off for most storm events. The concept drainage design has incorporated flow controls so that maximum flows in Allens Creek would not be greatly increased by airport development. Should the airport be developed at Wilton the Department of Aviation would liaise with State authorities to determine the appropriate design objectives and criteria to ensure that the post-development hydrology was acceptable.

Technical and economic feasibility of water management techniques


The comments are addressed below in terms of:

. insufficient detail concerning water management controls;
. possibilities of appropriate controls;
. the cost of water management controls.
Insufficient details concerning water management controls
The details relating to water management controls contained in the Draft EIS are appropriate to this stage. When detailed planning and design of the airport is undertaken the Department of Aviation would be in a position to provide additional information on the proposed water management systems. These systems would take account of the existing State Government requirements. The Draft EIS identifies major issues such as the need to divert airport run-off away from the water supply catchment and the probable need for nutrient removal from sewage treatment plant effluent. These concepts would be developed further and designed in detail if the airport was to be sited at Wilton.

Possibility of appropriate controls
There are technical methods for ensuring that all pollutants are removed from stormwater drainage, sewage and similar wastes. However, total removal is not necessary to protect the beneficial uses to be made of the water from the stream and river systems. At the time of detailed planning and design the Department would, in conjunction with State authorities, determine the appropriate criteria for water management. This would include a combination of well proven techniques such as:

- containment and removal off-site of certain liquid wastes such as spent oils and solvents;
- on- or off-site treatment of sewage and compatible wastes in a full sewage treatment plant, probably including nutrient removal, prior to discharge to land or to the river system;
- containment and treatment of 'first-flush' and other potentially contaminated stormwater run-off.

The cost of water management controls
Several comments were made on the high cost that would be associated with water management at Wilton. The Draft EIS acknowledges the cost of water management and this was incorporated into the cost comparison undertaken during the site ranking. Based on the cost of drainage and flood control works carried out for the new Brisbane Airport it is expected that the cost of the drainage system as outlined in the Draft EIS would be less than the difference in the land acquisition costs for the Badgerys Creek and Wilton sites.

15.3 AIR QUALITY
Eighteen submissions made thirty-nine comments on air quality or meteorological matters. These can be divided into the following subject areas:

- Pollution levels and their effects;
- Factors affecting pollutant distribution;
- Meteorological factors;
- Motor vehicle emissions.

Pollution levels and their effects
Nine submissions made fourteen comments (241.003, 270.004, 274.047, 274.063, 299.003, 313.003, 337.029, 337.035, 337.040, 338.053, 361.014, 361.017, 361.033 and 432.007) and relating to pollution levels and their effects.

The Draft EIS states that the second Sydney airport would contribute to pollution levels in the Sydney basin. However, the level of contribution determined in Table 15.3.4 of the Draft is by itself insufficient to raise overall pollution levels above acceptable standards. Overall emissions of hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide have fallen over
recent years and are predicted to continue to fall. Currently monitored levels of carbon monoxide do not exceed United States Environmental Protection Agency and World Health Organisation standards. Hydrocarbons are major contributors to photochemical smog, whose major constituent ozone does occasionally exceed National Health and Medical Research Council standards. However, with the continued predicted fall in the level of hydrocarbon emissions the number of occasions on which these standards are exceeded is expected to diminish even further. That is, if the reduction of ozone production is in fact attributable to the fall off of hydrocarbon emissions and not to meteorological causes.

In the case of nitrogen oxides, levels are predicted to increase and the second Sydney airport's contribution is higher than for any other constituent. Apart from nitrogen oxides being a pollutant per se, they are also significant as an essential contributor in the production of photochemical smog. The State Pollution Control Commission is drawing up regulations to reduce hydrocarbons since photochemical smog needs both reagents for its production. If this policy proves successful the significance of nitrogen oxides as contributors will also decline. Thus in all respects, with the occasional exception of nitrogen oxides, the contribution of the second Sydney airport to pollution loads in Sydney's atmosphere is not sufficient to cause pollution levels to exceed the accepted standards set out in Table 15.3.1 of the Draft EIS. These standards have been determined in the light of international findings on the adverse effects of air pollution on health and can be extended to include animals as well as humans. However, they do not apply to plants or materials and more research is necessary to determine these relationships.

With regard to particulates in the atmosphere, aircraft engines have steadily been improved as evidenced by the lack of prominent smoke trails from modern engines. Thus it is considered that particulate generation from the second Sydney airport would be negligible.

In the case of lead emissions, fuel for all non-piston aircraft is unleaded and thus emission levels are considered to be very low against a predicted rapid lowering of these emissions generally with the introduction of unleaded fuel for motor vehicles in 1985.

It needs to be restated that emission levels predicted from the second Sydney airport are for the worst case which is unlikely to be reached in the foreseeable future.

One submission claimed that removal of the forest on the Wilton site would adversely affect air quality. There is no evidence to suggest that comparatively small cleared areas, compared to the forested surrounding country, deleteriously affect air quality. After construction extensive replanting would occur in non-operational areas and either grass or a sealed surface would occupy the remaining open areas. None of these measures would by themselves cause reductions in air quality.

Another submission claimed that at present Wilton's air quality is higher than that of Badgerys Creek. In terms of local pollution sources the areas are similar in that there are no significant local sources. However, as a reception area for photochemical smog advected by sea breezes in the warmer months, Badgerys Creek has a greater susceptibility than Wilton due to Wilton's greater distance from the source areas near the city.

Figures for the second Sydney airport's contribution to Sydney's emissions are basin wide and do not refer to the local area of Wilton.

Regarding dust levels during airport construction, the Draft EIS indicates at paragraph 15.3.6 on page 482 how such levels could be ameliorated. Watering dust prone areas is a common practice in other operations such as sand and gravel extraction and has proved effective.
Factors affecting pollutant distribution

Nine submissions made ten comments (233.001, 245.003, 246.016, 274.061, 290.009, 337.031, 338.011, 342.023, 342.024, and 385.024) relating to factors affecting pollutant distribution.

Submissions claimed that an airport at Wilton would increase pollution at Wollongong and seawards, Campbelltown and locally. Distribution of emissions is as described at 15.3.5 on page 481 of the Draft EIS. It can be seen from this paragraph that when air drainage flows are established, emissions advect towards the north. Most emissions seaward of the Illawarra scarp are likely to be from aircraft at an altitude above the mixing layer thereby preventing pollutants from reaching the surface.

Emissions from an airport at Wilton would be more significant for the local area than for the Sydney region as a whole, especially when temperature inversions exist to prevent dispersal.

Because of its topographical location, the Wilton site has better dispersion characteristics than does Badgerys Creek.

Meteorological factors

Ten submissions made a total of fourteen comments (233.002, 246.017, 246.019, 338.012, 338.062, 338.063, 362.016, 386.002, 386.007, 390.007, 390.008, 432.027 and 455.008) relating to meteorological factors.

Submissions covering this subject area covered the following points:

- meteorological data were incorrect;
- wind velocities would increase when the trees were removed from the site;
- Wilton has high frequency of fogs;
- Wilton has incidence of hail, lightning and wind shear;
- Wilton has unfavourable wind patterns.

The wind data were obtained from the Bureau of Meteorology’s anemometer at Picton. Additional data used to determine runway usabilities were obtained from a temporary anemometer station at St Marys towers operated by Macquarie University.

Regarding the relationship of wind velocities to cleared land, one of the criteria for a properly sited anemometer as determined by the Bureau of Meteorology is for there to be no obstructions that could hamper the free flow of the wind. Thus wind data obtained are in fact representative of a cleared area and not a forested one. Thus, although wind velocities near the ground would increase once the site was cleared of trees, this increase is known and is acceptable for airport operations.

Radiation fog frequency as supplied by the Bureau of Meteorology for the plateau site is eight to ten fogs per year, most of which would dissipate by 10 a.m. Low lying stratus cloud may add an additional five fogs per year. This compares with fourteen days for Sydney airport and between twelve and twenty-five days per year for Badgerys Creek. The Wilton figure of fifteen to twenty days per year stated on page 129 of the Draft EIS is the figure supplied by the Bureau of Meteorology for the lower level site adjacent to the Wilton township.

The fog frequency figure for Wilton is the lowest for any of the sites considered for which fog data were available.

Regarding the incidence of wind shear the presence of river gorges nearby is likely to cause some wind shear and turbulence effects but these are judged as not significant.
Available data indicate that the frequency of thunderstorms is insufficient to inhibit airport operations to any significant extent.

**Motor vehicle emissions**

Two submissions made four comments (274.063, 337.011, 337.027 and 337.033) relating to motor vehicle emission.

Submissions on this subject claimed that the Draft EIS omitted motor vehicle effects on Sydney's air pollution levels and that total emission levels derived from motor vehicle emission trends are meaningless.

The Draft EIS argues that although vehicle kilometres adjacent to Wilton would increase largely due to the airport, their emissions would not necessarily be additional to air pollutant levels occurring in the absence of a second airport. The Draft EIS on page 480 says 'the airport would not necessarily add significantly to either figure (total vehicles and average vehicle kilometres in the year 2000) any more than would major new regional shopping centres, recreation centres, and other such major traffic generating projects built between now and 2000.' Thus, in Table 15.3.4 in the Draft EIS the estimated net addition to annual emissions comes from non-vehicular emissions, i.e. aircraft and airport related services.

The contribution of motor vehicle emissions to Sydney's pollutant levels is complicated by the wide distribution of motor vehicles. Airport related vehicle movements would distribute throughout Sydney although about 50% would be within 40 km of the airport.

The other matter raised concerned the total emission levels for the year 2000. This submission stated that year 2000 figures have been calculated by using 1980 figures without extrapolation and that they are not referenced to a standard and are therefore meaningless.

The figures come from a paper discussing future trends in emissions, there being no official pollution forecasts. In order to arrive at total emission figures for 2000 the assumption was made that relative contributions from all sources remained the same as in 1980. With figures for forecast motor vehicle emissions to 2000 available it was then possible to forecast total emission levels. Other assumptions were made as stated on pages 476 and 477 of the Draft EIS.

Regarding the lack of information on how the year 2000 figures can relate to accepted standards, these figures were derived from proportional changes in motor vehicle emissions, 1976 to 2000. These proportional changes can also relate to concentrations shown for each pollutant in Table 15.3.1 in the Draft EIS so that it is possible to extrapolate concentrations to the year 2000 levels and compare these levels to established standards as shown in the Table.

**15.4 ACCESS**

Thirty-eight submissions, including eight proformas, were received addressing aspects relating to Section 15.4 of the Draft EIS. From these a large number of separate comments were identified relating to access time, distance and cost to Wilton. The comments can be categorized into seven main issues relating to:

- accessibility of the Wilton site;
- effects of access proposal on local areas;
- rail access;
- origins and destinations of airport users;
- capital costs;
- construction traffic;
- high speed access.
Accessibility of Wilton

Nineteen submissions were received relating to the time, distance and cost of travel to Wilton. Fourteen of these (205.013, 205.026, 205.027, 220.004, 223.006, 257.004, 271.006 (proforma), 274.072, 277.004, 297.004, 313.006, 338.034, 338.050, 340.012, 362.023, 390.014 and 455.007) were concerned that the distance was too great for the site to be a viable option. Two also claimed that the Draft EIS underestimated the distance and time. The other submissions in this group (65.014, 330.022, 349.002, 349.005, 394.004, 432.018 and 432.028) believed that the accessibility of Wilton was acceptable, one claiming that the travel times quoted were exaggerated.

The additional time, distance and cost of travel to an airport at Wilton would undoubtedly make it less attractive to the travelling public and the airlines than a similar airport at Badgerys Creek. This point is acknowledged in the Draft EIS which states (page 65) that the timing of traffic growth would depend on the location of the airport. However, increasing congestion at Kingsford-Smith Airport and the expansion of Sydney's population towards the south-west could be expected to improve Wilton's acceptability over time.

All road travel times quoted in the Draft EIS are based on the output of the State Transport Study Group's Sydney road network model for 2015. This is the most authoritative source of information available on future road travel times in the Sydney area.

Rail travel times were estimated by the State Rail Authority.

Effects on local areas

Five submissions were concerned about the effects of airport traffic and airport road construction on local areas (57.002, 245.008, 246.021, 339.002, 340.004 and 340.029). The issues raised included the social and environmental effects of the access road between the airport and the F5 Freeway, the effects on coal traffic and the effects of airport traffic on suburbs as far away as Bankstown.

An indication of the likely access route from the South-West Freeway is given on page 361 of the Draft EIS (Figure 13.3). A precise route for this road has not yet been determined as this is beyond the scope of the present planning work which is directed towards the selection of an airport site. Detailed identification of routes for airport access roads would be the responsibility of the NSW Government following selection of the site by the Commonwealth. However, the access road would seek to avoid the township of Wilton which would therefore not be subject to large volumes of airport traffic.

Any upgrading and re-alignment of Mount Keira Road should have a beneficial effect on local traffic including coal transport.

The section of Mount Keira Road which has recently been upgraded would be mostly unaffected by the airport proposal. Future work on the road would require close cooperation between State and Federal authorities to determine the most appropriate timetable and to ensure that the requirements of all users were adequately met.

Rail considerations

Seven submissions (66.008, 331.006, 340.019, 362.026, 385.025, 390.013 and 432.029) commented on the provision of a passenger railway between the city and the airport. Three claimed such a link was necessary to the success of the airport while four felt it would not be viable.
The Draft EIS provides (page 498) estimates of patronage by rail. It is accepted that, particularly in the early years of the airport’s operation, a rail service may not be economic on its own. However, it may be necessary to the successful operation of the airport and could possibly be justified as a part of the total airport system. Depending on the route chosen, the airport railway could also play an important role in the development of new suburban areas.

Four submissions discussed the need for public transport transfers between Wilton and Kingsford-Smith Airport and/or the need for a rail link between the airports for the carriage of freight and fuel. One submission, that of the NSW Government, stated that there would be insufficient patronage to justify a passenger rail service (57.004, 66.002, 66.004, 274.075 and 430.008.) This issue is also addressed under Chapter 2.

The Department of Aviation agrees with the NSW Government that a passenger rail service between the airports would be unnecessary. The Draft EIS states (page 500) that only about 1% of passengers would be expected to require such a service.

Similarly a freight transfer is unlikely to be required. Air freight operators would not wish to include a relatively long land transfer in any service they offered and would therefore seek to ensure that any transfers which were necessary could be carried out at one airport.

A possible exception to this is international freight. If international traffic remained largely at Kingsford-Smith Airport and Wilton developed as a major domestic freight hub, some form of fast direct link, perhaps by rail, may be required. However, this is very speculative and a long way in the future.

The transport of aviation fuel to the airport, except in its early development phase, would most likely be by rail direct from an oil refinery.

Australian Iron & Steel Pty Ltd (339.004) was concerned that railway planning for the airport should preserve the option for a future rail link to the Tower Colliery. No conflict is seen between the two proposals, the only interaction being the need for grade separation between the colliery railway and the airport access road.

One submission (65.013) enquired the original purpose of the Maldon-Dombarton railway. This railway, which is at present under construction, is intended to transport coal and grain to Port Kembla.

Location of airport users

Two submissions (274.108 and 362.025) criticized the lack of information in the Draft EIS on the origin and destination of airport users and the user population profile.

As outlined in the Draft EIS (page 492) a distribution of passenger origins and destinations was estimated based on the present distribution (as revealed by Department of Aviation surveys) and the forecast Sydney population distribution for the year 2011 (supplied by the NSW Department of Environment and Planning). As the actual distribution would be heavily role-dependent, sensitivity tests were conducted with alternative distributions.

Access costs

Six submissions raised the issue of the cost of providing access infrastructure for an airport at Wilton (66.006, 274.072, 274.073, 274.111, 338.048, 340.003, 342.027 and 389.004). The main theme of these submissions was that the cost of providing access to Wilton would be much higher than for Badgerys Creek.
This is not borne out by the Draft EIS which shows (page 545) that the capital costs for the two airports would be of the same order. (User costs would of course greatly favour Badgerys Creek.)

The State Government raised the issue of the attribution of rail costs but this is a matter for later consideration by the two governments.

Two submissions were concerned with the implications of airport traffic for the South-West Freeway east of King Georges Road. This too is a matter for later consideration when and if airport traffic becomes significant in that area. It is unlikely that airport traffic alone would ever justify construction of this road.

Construction traffic

One submission (246.020) criticized the lack of attention to the needs and effects of construction traffic.

This would be considered at the time construction was due to begin and the scale of the first stage of development was known. If the effect on local traffic and/or Wilton township was likely to be significant it might be necessary to consider the upgrading and re-alignment of Mount Keira Road before airport construction proper commenced.

High speed access

Two submissions (243.006 and 312.005) claimed that a high speed transport link would be either desirable or essential.

The issue of a high speed link is addressed on page 504 of the Draft EIS where it is pointed out that for the relatively low level of patronage expected, any system involving high capital costs would be even harder to justify than the conventional rail system envisaged in the proposal. Eventually, if use of the airport grew sufficiently, such a system might be required. Alternatively, if a high speed system was built between, say, Sydney and Canberra, it might well be routed via an airport at Wilton.

15.5 INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENERGY CONSUMPTION

Twelve submissions were received making twenty-five separate comments on aspects relating to Section 15.5 of the Draft EIS. The comments dealt with a range of issues which can be grouped as follows:

- transport of fuel;
- upgrading of services;
- relocation of services;
- sewage and waste disposal;
- airport services.

These are discussed below.

Transport of fuel

Five submissions (256.003, 256.005, 274.082, 340.028, 359.010 and 390.024) made reference to the issue of fuel transport.

Three were concerned with the difficulty of supplying fuel and the additional cost due to transport. Two of the comments indicated the Draft EIS did not specify the mode of transport of fuel, specifically jet fuel, while two other comments suggested jet fuel could be conveniently transported by either pipeline (at an estimated cost of $19 million) or by rail.
Section 15.5.7 of the Draft EIS indicates what might be the likely requirements for energy and fuel consumption. The mode of transport of jet fuel is not specifically mentioned in the Draft EIS although it is expected that diesel and petrol could be transported either by road or rail from Sydney or Wollongong.

Because of the large volume of jet fuel which would be required when the airport reached ultimate capacity it would be undesirable to transport it all by road. Because the Maldon-Dombarton railway line passes adjacent to the site it would be convenient to consider rail as a means of transporting jet fuel to the site. Alternatively a pipeline could be considered. In the interim smaller amounts of jet fuel could be transported by road.

If Wilton were selected, the Department of Aviation would investigate the safest and most environmentally acceptable means of transporting jet fuel to the site. Whatever means were finally selected for the transport and storage of jet fuel, the Department of Aviation would ensure that the provisions of the Dangerous Goods Act, 1975, were complied with.

Upgrading of services

Two submissions made four comments (340.024, 340.026, 390.021 and 390.022) relating to the upgrading of services.

Two of the comments were concerned with the need to upgrade water supply services and sewage facilities. Costs were also a concern raised in one of these comments. The other two comments were concerned with the need to upgrade telephone facilities and one submission was concerned that if priority was given to facilities to service the airport, local surrounding towns would have a lower priority for improvement.

The Draft EIS recognizes the need to upgrade both water and sewage facilities (Section 15.5.3 and 15.5.4). If Wilton were the selected site, the Department of Aviation would undertake discussions with the relevant NSW government authorities prior to airport development to ensure the optimal provision of services.

Section 15.5.5 of the Draft EIS also recognized the need to upgrade telecommunication facilities. However, the matter of priority is one for Telecom Australia to determine in consultation with other authorities.

Relocation of services

Seven submissions made ten comments (205.010, 208.006, 245.007, 274.081, 274.082, 338.045, 338.049, 338.081, 361.032 and 432.041) on matters relating to the relocation of services. Five comments were concerned with either relocating the transmission line or gas pipeline, two of the comments were concerned with the cost of relocating existing infrastructure (road/transmission line) and one was concerned about the need for further forest clearing in the water catchment area to meet airport associated needs.

Comments about relocating the transmission line or gas pipeline were mainly concerned with the likely environmental effects on the catchment due to the relocation of those facilities. It is anticipated that the existing gas pipeline would be placed in an easement beside the re-routed Mount Keira Road (Section 15.5.2 of Draft EIS). It would therefore not further encroach on the water catchment beyond the realignment of the road. All but about a 1 km section of the proposed re-routed road would occur within the proposed site.

Between 12 and 15 km of new construction would be required to divert the transmission line around the proposed airport. Section 15.5 of the Draft EIS recognizes that the assessment of effects associated with specific infrastructure proposals would require
further investigation once the sites or routes were determined. The construction of these facilities would be required to comply with the NSW environmental legislation.

Other facilities, for example telecommunication facilities, could be located within road easements.

Costs associated with the relocation of existing infrastructure were estimated for the purposes of site ranking. The estimated costs of relocating existing infrastructure for Wilton was about $4.2 million. This cost was estimated for the site ranking and it was the fourth lowest of ten sites being ranked. In terms of overall cost Wilton was ranked second in terms of the present value of savings relative to the most expensive site (Appendix B of Draft EIS). It was estimated to be $156 million cheaper than the most expensive site. The cost of relocating the transmission line is estimated at about $2 million, not $5 million as indicated by one submission.

There are no other planned airport associated facilities which would require further clearing within the water catchment. Off-site clearance of vegetation within the water catchment would not be undertaken unless it was necessary for aircraft safety in order to maintain flight clearance levels. If such circumstances arose clearance would be limited to tree lopping if feasible. Other airport associated facilities would be part of the overall regional development of the area currently being planned by the NSW government. This is being undertaken in areas outside the water catchment.

All works carried out outside the airport boundary would take account of the environmental sensitivity of the area. One submission suggested the environmental principles evolved for the Maldon – Port Kembla railway should be used as a guide.

**Sewage and waste disposal**

Four submissions made six comments (222.005, 274.052, 338.051, 338.055, 338.079 and 390.020) about sewage and waste disposal.

Four of the comments were concerned about the disposal of quarantined wastes and the possible effect on water supply. One comment was concerned about the cost of waste disposal and one comment indicated that land disposal of sewage by irrigation would be preferable to it being discharged to surface streams.

Quarantined wastes would be incinerated and would not be discharged to the sewer system if there was any likelihood of disease. The Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board has strict regulations governing the acceptance of effluents and undertakes a water/effluent quality monitoring programme to ensure these standards are maintained. Waste generated by future airport development would be disposed of in accordance with the requirements of the Metropolitan Waste Disposal Authority.

Section 15.5.4 of the Draft EIS indicates that an alternative or supplementary method for disposing of treated effluent would be to use it as needed for irrigation rather than discharging it to the surface stream system. This method would be considered particularly if the water pollution control plant were located within the airport site and serviced only the airport development.

**Airport services**

One submission made a comment (337.020) indicating that electrical power and underground fuel lines should be used on the airport aprons to eliminate the use of aircraft auxiliary power units and tankers, thereby reducing noise levels. This would be a matter for the Department of Aviation to determine once detailed planning and development of the airport was commenced.
15.6 LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL QUALITY

Three submissions were received that referred to the assessment of landscape quality within the proposed airport site. The comments could be categorized in two issues:

1. the landscape quality of the proposed site;
2. the impact of airport development.

These issues are discussed below.

Landscape quality of the proposed site

Two submissions (197.002 and 385.027) maintained that the assessment of landscape quality, specifically the visual quality of the landscape, had been underestimated in the Draft EIS.

The method used to evaluate landscape quality for the purposes of site selection is that used by the NSW Department of Environment and Planning, and has been modified from that used by the United States Department of Agriculture's Forest Service. The landscape is assessed on the basis of accepted community perceptions of the visual quality of the landform features present, and it is acknowledged that individual perceptions may differ. The systematic nature of the assessment method should, however, ensure that the same relative degree of assessment of visual quality would occur at all sites assessed.

Impact of airport development

One submission (264.048) indicated that the effect of construction and operation of an airport at the proposed site would be greater than the Draft EIS suggested.

The visual impact of the proposed airport facility during its construction and operational phases is dealt with in section 15.6.4 of the Draft EIS. It is acknowledged that the visual character of the proposed site would be totally altered should construction of the airport proceed at the Wilton site. Screening of works and buildings, and rehabilitation and landscaping of disturbed areas would be utilised to reduce visual impact as much as possible.
16.1 FLORA

Forty-three submissions, of which fifteen were proforma submissions, commented on aspects of the Draft EIS relating to the flora of the proposed Wilton airport site. These submissions made fifty-four separate comments, which could be categorized in the following six issues:

- concern at vegetation clearing;
- high ecological value of the area;
- introduction of exotic species;
- indirect effects on flora;
- bushfire risk;
- comments on flora survey.

These issues are discussed below.

Concern at vegetation clearing

Fifteen submissions made seventeen separate comments (205.021, 208.008, 240.002, 240.005, 274.026, 300.004, 313.004, 342.008, 361.015, 361.016, 362.005, 385.029, 390.005, 393.005, 453.005, 455.003 and 457.019) indicating concern at the prospect of clearing of native vegetation from the proposed site, from approach paths and emergency access routes and from the routes of the relocated Mount Keira Road and relocated infrastructure.

The Draft EIS acknowledges the value of the vegetation found on the site, both in terms of the presence of six species classified as rare and in terms of the general conservation status of these vegetation associations in the Sydney region. It is also acknowledged, (Section 16.1.2 of the Draft EIS), that little can be done to reduce the direct impact of airport development on the flora of the proposed site, and that the destruction of the vegetation associations occurring on the proposed site would constitute a significant loss.

In the same section, ameliorative measures to help reduce the direct effects on surrounding vegetation are outlined. These measures would be implemented should the proposed Wilton site be selected for airport development. They include restriction of off-site clearing to areas absolutely necessary for safety of aircraft, the selection of species for revegetation of the site so as to minimize the risk of exotic species invading surrounding areas, the replanting of embankments above surrounding bushland with selected local species, and continuing monitoring programmes to assess the performance of the revegetation programme and the occurrence of weed infestation and floristic changes in surrounding areas.

High ecological value of the area

A large number of submissions, including proforma submissions, were received emphasizing the ecological value of the proposed site. These made twenty separate comments (202.002, 205.015, 223.003 (proforma), 230.002, 255.005, 271.003 (proforma),
These comments range from a general statement that the area is ecologically valuable to several detailed comments dealing with the high floral diversity of the site, the presence of rare species and poorly conserved communities, the situation of the site as a portion of an extensive bushland area including the Royal National Park to the north, and the particularly high vegetation conservation and faunal habitat value of the native vegetation of the proposed site due to the very low level of disturbance that has resulted from its protection as water catchment.

All of these with the exception of the corridor role of the catchment area are acknowledged in Section 16.1 of the Draft EIS. This section outlines the plant communities present and their distribution and significance, the species present and their conservation status, and the management policies of the past in relation to their effect on the present condition of the various plant communities. The corridor role of the water catchment, although not specifically discussed in the Draft EIS, would not be affected should the proposed Wilton site be selected, since its development would excise only a very small portion of catchment area at its western boundary. The main corridor for faunal movement lies to the east of the proposed Wilton site. (See Figure 14.8.2 in the Draft EIS.)

One submission suggested that a public relations exercise accompany the development of Wilton, in the interests of promoting precautions to be taken to minimize environmental effects. If Wilton is selected, the Department of Aviation would consider the merits of this suggestion.

Introduction of exotic species

Two submissions (338.057 and 342.009) were concerned about the risk that exotic species might invade the native vegetation of the surrounding catchment area should the proposed Wilton site be selected for airport development.

This possibility is dealt with in Section 16.1.2 of the Draft EIS, which states that during airport operation, stormwater discharged into Allens Creek might carry propagules of plants introduced to the airport site. Although a system of retention basins would be incorporated into the drainage scheme, this may not provide effective protection against such introduction. Introduction of exotic species would remain a risk of airport operation, but this risk would be reduced by use of native species in the rehabilitation of disturbed areas.

Indirect effects on flora

Nine submissions (202.013, 230.005, 264.050, 292.004, 323.004, 338.080, 342.029, 361.034 and 427.005) were concerned with the possible indirect effects of airport development at the proposed site on the flora of the proposed site and surrounds.

One comment was concerned with the effects of altering drainage patterns on the site, indicating that this may have an adverse effect on downslope vegetation and vegetation along drainage lines. This is discussed in Section 16.1.2 of the Draft EIS, which acknowledges that such effects may result in impacts on vegetation of the Cordeaux River, Allens Creek, and in extreme events, (including failure of the structures intended for drainage diversion and erosion control during construction), of other watercourses draining the site. The site drainage scheme would incorporate a system of retention basins that should ensure that streamflow rates in Allens Creek remain fairly similar to those experienced at present, and as far as possible tributary gorges to the Cordeaux River would be left unaffected. Effects of the perimeter canal on the soil moisture regime available to vegetation downslope would however, be more difficult to control. This is also stated in Section 16.1.2 of the Draft EIS.
Other comments on indirect effects on vegetation included the effect of emergency fuel dumping over wide areas of vegetation in the catchment area and of the emission of partially burnt or unburnt fuel on vegetation near the ends of runways. Both of these effects are discussed in Section 16.1.2 of the Draft EIS. Emergency fuel dumping poses only a very slight risk to vegetation. Such incidents are infrequent and if fuel is to be dumped it is usually at as high a level as possible, allowing most of it to vaporize before it reaches the ground. Effects on riverine vegetation near the ends of runways from emissions during takeoff and landing would, however, be more likely to occur.

Bushfire risk

Two submissions made four separate comments (338.027, 338.059, 338.083 and 455.005) relating to bushfire risk at the proposed site. The comments related to increased fire risk that would result from airport construction and operation. The Draft EIS acknowledges the possibility of increased incidence of fire through accidental releases during construction, easier public access to the surrounding bushland, and through escapes from hazard-reduction burning once the airport was operational. Methods that would be used to reduce this risk, including staff education, strict maintenance of equipment, carefully planned hazard-reduction burning and restricted public access, are also outlined. The hazard-reduction burning programme would be designed as far as possible to be consistent with the preservation of the surrounding vegetation.

Comments on flora survey

Three submissions commented on the adequacy of the flora survey (207.002, 351.002 and 385.030). One commented that the botanical section of the Draft EIS was very thorough, the other two comments suggested inadequacies such as inadequate coverage of rare and endangered species, inadequate description of flora survey methodology and incomplete field survey.

A full description of the flora survey methodology is given in Section 16.1 of the Draft EIS. The flora survey involved inspection of aerial photographs and geological and topographic maps to draw up a field reconnaissance schedule generating a species list and complete mapping of vegetation communities over the proposed site. Over 350 species were identified during the survey of the site. The conservation status of both communities and individual species were investigated, and other samples of similar vegetation in the surrounding region were inspected for occurrence of significant species and associations.

16.2 FAUNA

A total of forty-six submissions, of which fifteen were proforma submissions, were received commenting on aspects of the Draft EIS relating to the fauna of the proposed Wilton site. These made sixty-five separate comments relating to the following issues:

- damaging effect on fauna;
- high ecological value of the site;
- concern for particular species;
- criticism of fauna section of the Draft EIS;
- problem of bird strike;
- risk of invasion by exotic and feral fauna.

Damaging effect on fauna

A number of submissions (223.004 (proforma), 230.006, 271.004 (proforma), 290.007, 300.005, 313.005, 338.015, 338.077, 385.032 and 453.006) indicated in general terms that construction of the proposed airport would have a damaging effect on the region's fauna.
Five expressed concern while one suggested that animals displaced from the site could rehabilitate themselves in ample bushland elsewhere.

The Draft EIS acknowledges that fauna would be adversely affected by construction of the proposed airport, both in terms of overall conservation status of a number of species classed as fauna of special concern, or uncommon or threatened species; and in terms of destruction of habitat of both threatened and common species. The fauna study also concludes that although animals that would be displaced should airport construction proceed may be able to colonize other suitable areas that exist outside the site boundary, it could be assumed that there would be a local fall in the numbers of many of the species at present found within the proposed site. This fall in numbers would be most significant where the species were classed as being in low or declining numbers.

Section 16.2.2 of the Draft EIS discusses measures which would be used to reduce the impact of airport construction and operation on the fauna of the site and its surrounds as much as possible. Measures include limiting the amount of clearing to that required at each stage of construction; restricting off-site clearance to that necessary for aircraft safety; searching the proposed site for koalas and removing any found to favourable locations outside the area; landscaping with native shrubs to attract small native bird species that are not likely to constitute a hazard to aircraft; fencing the site to prevent herbivores straying onto runways, taxiways etc.; and retaining good quality water flows with a flow regime as near as possible to that presently existing in Allens Creek and other creeks draining the site through the water management policy described in Section 15.2 of the Draft EIS.

High ecological value of the site

Fifteen submissions made sixteen separate comments (207.001, 230.003, 240.004, 255.006, 274.104, 274.109, 277.005, 296.003, 338.040, 342.005, 362.006, 393.006, 428.006, 431.002, 432.011 and 455.004) emphasizing the ecological value of the proposed site.

The comments centred on the undisturbed nature of much of the proposed site, and its consequent value as wildlife habitat. Some comments compared the state of preservation of the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board area to that of a national park, and others declared that disruption of an area of such ecological value ran counter to the National Conservation Strategy.

Section 16.2.1 of the Draft EIS acknowledges the scientific and ecological value of the proposed Wilton site. The vegetation is described as diverse and relatively undisturbed, with the exception of some understorey depletion due to periodic burning by the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board. Diversity of fauna is high, and seven bird species and one mammal (the koala) found on the site are regarded as being threatened. The proposed site satisfies all criteria for high ecological value, and although the ameliorative measures outlined in the previous section would be implemented by the Department of Aviation, the ecological value of the proposed site area would be greatly reduced and some impacts would be felt in the surrounding area.

Concern for particular species

Seven submissions made fifteen separate comments (233.003, 233.004, 233.005, 233.006, 246.022, 293.004, 325.006, 338.005, 338.016, 338.017, 358.004, 361.010, 361.011, 361.012 and 361.013) relating to the impact of the airport on particular species within the proposed site area.

Eight comments related to the koala, expressing concern at the effects that relocation may have on this species should the proposed Wilton site be selected for airport development. The Draft EIS acknowledges (Section 16.2.2) that disturbance of noise and bright lights may affect herbivores, including koalas, in the immediate vicinity of the site, to the extent of displacing these animals. In the case of koalas, however, it is
proposed to search the site area and relocate any found prior to airport construction. The advice of the National Parks and Wildlife Service would be sought in order to conduct this relocation programme in the most successful manner possible.

Other comments related to effects on the platypus (which may occur in pools of streams draining the proposed site, but for which no signs or evidence were located during the faunal survey), wombats and other burrowing species which may burrow under the site fence and intrude on runways and taxiways, bats whose sonar may be upset by airport noise, and endangered bird and other species whose habitats would be depleted by airport construction should the proposed Wilton site be selected.

In the case of the platypus and the wombat and other burrowing animals, careful design of the site drainage system and fence, respectively, should be able to keep impacts on these species to a low level. The advice of the National Parks and Wildlife Service would be sought on amelioration measures aimed specifically at the other species of concern.

Criticism of the fauna section of the Draft EIS


Several of these criticisms related to species not detected in the site survey. It is common for some species occurring at a location not to be sighted or trapped during any period of faunal survey so that the omission of this species from the list of species recorded is not surprising in itself. In addition, the Draft EIS notes in Section 16.2.1. that the diversity of reptiles located during the survey was relatively low, due to the cool conditions prevailing during the spring sampling period. On the basis of local knowledge revealed in a number of submissions, the species named in Table 16.1 have been added to the list of probable fauna.

A number of other comments pointed out that impacts on fauna would be likely to extend beyond the site boundary. The Draft EIS identifies four main ways in which these could occur. They may arise through competition for territory in neighbouring areas by animals displaced from the site during construction; increased dust, noise and light levels during construction and operation; the possibility of collisions between aircraft and avifauna; and the risk of altered water regimes and quality in Allens Creek and other small watercourses draining the site.

The first of these hazards cannot be effectively overcome, except in cases such as the koala, where a capture and relocation programme would ensure that individuals displaced from the proposed site would be released in suitable habitat elsewhere. Dust nuisance would cease when construction was complete, but animals affected by noise and light are likely to permanently vacate the immediate site surrounds.

The Department of Aviation would implement whatever measures may be needed to minimize the hazard of bird strike. However, this will mean discouraging any avifauna likely to be a hazard to aircraft from frequenting the airport site, which may alter the species and probably numbers of birds present in the immediate site area. Control of site drainage through the water management policy described in Section 15.2 would be aimed specifically at maintaining water quality and, as nearly as possible, the present flow pattern of Allens Creek. This should ensure that both aquatic and terrestrial fauna dependent upon the creek would not be unduly disrupted. Reduction of flow in other small watercourses whose catchments would be interrupted by the perimeter canal may be a more significant impact.

Other comments suggested that particular faunal groups (bats and aquatic fauna) had not been considered in the Draft EIS, or that coverage of other groups (birds, out of season wildlife, and rare and endangered species) had not been considered adequately. The
Department acknowledges the omission of a survey of aquatic fauna and of bats. However, in view of the methods proposed by the Department to maintain water quality and stream flow regimes in receiving waters, the omission of an aquatic fauna survey is not seen as materially affecting either the environmental evaluation or the final selection of a site. Should the proposed Wilton site be selected for airport development, the Department of Aviation would seek the advice of the National Parks and Wildlife Service on measures which could be taken to reduce the impact of construction and operation on any species of concern including any rare or endangered species of bats likely to occur in the site area. Full consideration was given to the conservation status of all species located on the proposed site, and seven bird species and one mammal were identified as threatened species.

Table 16.1 Additional fauna sighted in the Wilton area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>Common name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reptiles</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoplocephalus bungaroides*</td>
<td>Broad-headed snake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birds</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calyptorhynchus lathami</td>
<td>Glossy black cockatoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colluricinclia harmonica</td>
<td>Grey shrike-thrush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cracticus nigrogularis</td>
<td>Pied butcher-bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuculus variolosus</td>
<td>Brush cuckoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cygnus atratus</td>
<td>Black swan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomyzon cyanotis</td>
<td>Blue-faced honeyeater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurystomus orientalis</td>
<td>Dollar-bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falcunculus frontatus</td>
<td>Eastern shrike-tit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerygone olivacea</td>
<td>White-throated warbler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hieraaetus morpnhoides</td>
<td>Little eagle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirundapus caudacutus**</td>
<td>Spine-tailed swift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalage sueurii</td>
<td>White-winged triller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichenostomus penicillatus</td>
<td>White-plumed honeyeater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myiagra inquieta</td>
<td>Restless flycatcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myiagra rubecula</td>
<td>Pelican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelecanus conspicillatus</td>
<td>Rose robin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroica rosea</td>
<td>Little pied cormorant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalacrocorax melanoleucos</td>
<td>Little black cormorant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalacrocorax sulcirostris</td>
<td>Bronze-wing pigeon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaps histrionic</td>
<td>White-cheeked honeyeater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phylidonyris nigra</td>
<td>Channel-billed cuckoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scythrops novaehollandiae</td>
<td>Sooty owl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyto tenebricosa†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bats</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyctophilus sp++</td>
<td>Jacksons long-eared bat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Listed as endangered within NSW and Australia

** A migratory bird and therefore included in the agreement between the governments of Japan and Australia for the protection of migratory birds and their habitat.

+ Listed as endangered in NSW.

++ Identification to generic name only was possible. It would appear that an error may have been made in the common name of this animal which prevents identification to species level.
Bird strike problem

Seven submissions made ten separate comments (195.005, 233.017, 233.018, 292.011, 293.003, 293.002, 338.014, 338.060, 340.031 and 362.017) relating to the possibility that birds may constitute an important hazard to aircraft at the proposed Wilton site.

Four of these comments asserted that bird strike may be a major problem at the proposed Wilton site because of the attractiveness of the surrounding bushland to birds. However, the Department of Aviation has found in other operations that forest surrounds are in fact preferable to grasslands from the point of view of bird hazard to airport operations. This is because the types of birds that frequent forest areas tend to be smaller, less inclined to form large flocks and are unlikely to fly at altitudes where they would interfere with aircraft. Large water birds and grassland birds are a greater hazard to airport operations.

Three comments requested clarification of methods of bird control, two suggesting that defoliants may be used and that such use would be incompatible with water catchment management. The Department of Aviation has not in the past used defoliants for purposes of bird control, and does not intend to do so at any second Sydney airport site selected. The Department is also not aware of such use at airports elsewhere in the world. Methods used by the Department for airport bird control involve minimizing the attractiveness of the site to birds through efficient and effective drainage, regular mowing and slashing of grassed areas to control weed and seed production, care in the choice of plants used in landscaping and the design of landscaping works as outlined in Section 16.2.2, and the use of deterrents such as dummy hawks, cracker shells and where necessary shooting birds to frighten them away from sensitive areas.

One submission specifically suggested a hazard from flocks of cockatoos. The Department accepts that birds such as cockatoos may be associated with forest areas such as that surrounding the proposed site, but their occurrence at the proposed Wilton site is no more likely than at the proposed Badgerys Creek site or the occurrence of flocks of seagulls at Kingsford-Smith Airport. The Department does not anticipate conflict between aircraft operations and flocks of cockatoos. Further study of bird populations at both proposed sites may be necessary, however, for a fuller understanding of the potential hazard posed and the design of control measures.

Exotic and feral fauna

Two submissions (338.058 and 342.010) were concerned with the possible introduction of exotic and feral fauna to the bushland surrounding the site as a result of airport construction and operation. The only likely mechanism through which this could occur would be through increased public access to the bushland along emergency access routes that may be necessary for airport safety. Public access to these routes would be denied, as it is now under the management of the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board, and as the airport site itself would be fenced early in the construction stage, the risk of such introduction would be minimal.
CHAPTER 17
COMPARISON OF THE BADGERYS CREEK AND WILTON SITES

17.1 FORM OF THE COMPARISON

Four hundred and twenty-three submissions were received in response to the ten-week exhibition period of the Draft EIS. These submissions were from private individuals, community groups, companies and government organizations. Of the total number of submissions, 265 were of a proforma nature. Although the submissions do not necessarily represent a statistical cross section of the Sydney population, an analysis of opposition or support for the sites was undertaken.

The analysis was made using two methodologies. The comments listed in Appendix 1 with a Draft EIS reference of 17.1 include only those submissions that made an explicit statement of attitude in favour of or opposition to one or both of the proposed sites. About one-third of the submissions received made an explicit comment of this nature. Table 17.1, however, presents a tally of the attitudes of all submissions received, based on the overall sentiment expressed in each submission, whether or not an explicit statement of attitude was made. Table 17.1 therefore represents the best indication of the weight of attitudes to the two sites expressed in submissions received on the Draft EIS.

Table 17.1 Comparison of sites and analysis of submissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of support</th>
<th>% of submissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opposes Badgerys Creek site</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favours Badgerys Creek site</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposes Wilton site</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favours Wilton site</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For purposes of comparison, the number of residents that would be displaced by site acquisition at each of the two short-listed sites, and the future maximum number of people within the 20 ANEF contour, assuming the continuation of existing zoning controls, is presented in Table 17.2. The information contained in this table is drawn from Table 17.1 of the Draft EIS.

Table 17.2 Affected populations of the short-listed sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Badgerys Creek</th>
<th>Wilton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents displaced by site acquisition</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future max. number of people within 20 ANEF contour</td>
<td>1,951</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Forty-three submissions made ninety separate comments comparing the proposed Wilton and Badgerys Creek sites.

The most commonly made comparison related to the accessibility of the two short-listed sites (1.011, 233.020, 233.024, 233.029, 233.030, 243.005, 274.070, 294.004, 325.011, 334.005, 342.011, 342.032, 342.033, 361.036, 375.003, 426.005, 428.008, and 432.014). These comments overwhelmingly favoured the proposed Badgerys Creek site. Most pointed out the shorter travel times required to reach an airport at Badgerys Creek as opposed to Wilton, and suggested that this may be an important factor in determining the airport’s viability. However, a small number of comments relating to access pointed out that the proposed Wilton site may be better situated to provide access to the south-west of Sydney, to Wollongong and other centres such as Canberra and Goulburn, or suggested that adequate access to the proposed Wilton site could be provided.

The next most common comparison made related to regional planning and development issues affecting the two proposed sites (4.002, 7.007, 237.006, 243.004, 244.001, 248.006, 250.018, 253.007, 274.115, 314.004, 335.008, 367.005, 374.011, 375.002, 379.002, 424.003, 457.011 and 460.002). These comments overwhelmingly favoured the proposed Wilton site. The majority related to the relatively greater number of people that would be affected by airport development at Badgerys Creek, as a result of alterations to the area’s existing semi-rural character and the greater number of residents in the area as compared to the Wilton area. A smaller number of submissions referred to the alienation of productive agricultural land or future urban expansion area that could result from airport development at the proposed Badgerys Creek site, or to institutional uses that might be affected.

Disruption as a result of land acquisition was the next most common form of comparison. These comments (62.001, 237.005, 248.006, 252.001, 274.114, 374.002, 375.006 and 460.004) also favoured the proposed Wilton site. The two points raised were that the Wilton site would be cheaper to acquire and that fewer people would be displaced by acquisition of the land required at this site.

Other comparisons made in more than 5% of comments (246.015, 246.018, 257.002, 264.045, 274.094, 274.095, 274.064, 274.065, 338.035, 338.068, 338.086, 341.004, 342.030, 361.037, 362.024, 375.004, 432.012, 457.018 and 461.004) compared the two sites on the following factors: geology and physiography (value of mineral resources and topographical constraints on construction) which generally favoured the Badgerys Creek site; air quality factors which favoured Wilton slightly; cost factors which favoured Badgerys Creek; effects of aircraft noise which favoured Wilton (374.010 and 460.010); and noise considerations which favoured both sites equally.

Other aspects on which a number of comments (205.001, 233.019, 250.019, 257.003, 264.044, 264.055, 274.113, 274.036, 274.037, 274.059, 325.010, 337.005, 338.036, 338.076, 338.092, 341.005, 342.030, 361.024, 361.038, 373.002, 373.003, 373.004, 373.005, 374.005, 374.012, 375.005, 385.026, 396.014 and 432.005) were made included: airspace arrangements which were generally felt to favour the Wilton site; higher archaeological values at the Wilton site which favoured development at Badgerys Creek; higher natural environment values at the Wilton site which favoured development at Badgerys Creek; easier infrastructure provision at Badgerys Creek; maintenance of water quality which favoured development at Badgerys Creek; loss of agricultural land which favoured development at Wilton; existence of emergency facilities which favoured Badgerys Creek; comments on economic effects which applied equally to both sites; relative ease of expansion at Wilton and relative viability of the two sites. The aspects on which comparisons were made, the proportion of comments raising these aspects, and the site favoured by the majority of comments on each aspect are summarized in Table 17.3.
Table 17.3  Comparison of short-listed sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of comparison</th>
<th>% of comments</th>
<th>Site generally favoured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional planning and development</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology, soils and physiography</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost factors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Neither favoured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airspace arrangements</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and energy consumption</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage and water quality</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft emergency procedures</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic effects</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>Neither favoured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18.1 SCOPE OF THE PROGRAMME

Five submissions were received which suggested that the Community Access Programme was inadequate (205.006, 335.004, 337.014, 337.037, 382.003 and 461.006).

The major issues raised could be categorized as follows:

. the Community Access Programme was not a full public participation programme;

. there was a lack of publicity for the programme;

. there was a lack of provision for disadvantaged groups who find it difficult to put views in writing to contribute effectively to the programme.

In general the Community Access Programme allowed a high level of involvement by the community, especially groups in more remote areas and people of restricted mobility. The success of this exercise can in part be measured by the significant numbers of submissions which have been received. There was a high level of publicity in local media and efforts were made to ensure that anyone sufficiently interested had access to information, either by way of mailing lists, information displayed in post offices, shopping centres, local councils and libraries, or by the second Sydney airport Community Access Bus, which could also be contacted by phone. The submission from the Wilton Airport Resistance group notes in its preamble, 'The Department's attitude in seeking to have as much information made available as possible has gone a long way to ensuring that the public would be convinced that it has made a reasonable attempt at choosing a site in a manner which can be justified.' It is apparent that even amongst opposition groups there is a recognition that the Department of Aviation has made a genuine attempt to involve the community in the site selection process.

18.2 COMMUNITY ACCESS CENTRE

One submission (461.005) criticized the extent to which the Community Access Centre was publicized.

The view was expressed that a leaflet providing information on the second Sydney airport Programme and giving phone contacts for more information should have been sent to residents.

This in fact was done following the opening of the Access Centre in the city in July 1984. The same information was also sent to a mailing list of about 1,000 organizations, newspapers, radio stations and individuals. A 'hotline' was established at the Access Centre and its number was on the leaflet.

18.3 LOCAL DISPLAYS

Four submissions (63.005, 65.034, 335.005 and 379.005) claimed bias in the photographic display material available at the Access Centre and in the Community Access Bus.
The main element of this criticism claimed misrepresentation of the nature of the Badgerys Creek area and the numbers of houses in the area.

In fact the main photographic display elements used in the Access Centre, Community Access Bus and publications (including the Draft EIS) were aerial photographs of both sites taken during 1984 which showed every structure visible from the air within and just outside site boundaries. Other photographs displayed were representative of the essentially rural character of the site. No attempt was made to hide the fact that there are over 200 dwellings on the site.

18.4 BRIEFINGS AND MEETINGS

Two submissions raised the question of consultations over the second Sydney airport Programme, or sought further consultations (305.008, 305.009 and 459.011).

The Department of Defence requested further consultations on implications of both proposals. Further consultations have since been held with that Department.

The view was expressed that the Goulburn option included in the preliminary investigation would have benefited from more consultation with Goulburn Council. This is with reference particularly to the preliminary evaluation stage, at the conclusion of which the Goulburn option was amongst those eliminated from further consideration.

Before the announcement of the two short-listed sites, direct consultations were held with Goulburn Council and through the agency of the NSW Local Government and Shires Association with Councils generally. At that time, Goulburn Council was the only such local government authority consulted individually. During consultations it was stressed that any representations should be made to the Department of Aviation as soon as possible to permit these to be taken into account before short-listing. The tight timetable of the second Sydney airport programme was also stressed. Goulburn Council's representations were not received before it was necessary to select two sites for detailed evaluation. The content of subsequent Goulburn representations would nevertheless not have altered the decisions that were taken at that time.

18.5 INFORMATION ON PROGRESS

One submission (382.002) expressed the view that the media misrepresented the character of the Badgerys Creek site. More specifically it was claimed that insufficient houses appeared in media coverage.

This claim is similar to the claim that the Department of Aviation has been selective in representing the area photographically (see comments in relation to Section 18.3). As media coverage is independent of the Department's own photographic efforts, it appears unlikely that there was any conscious bias in portraying the area. Single pictures including any significant numbers of houses are very difficult to achieve in the area.

18.6 SURVEYS OF COMMUNITY ATTITUDES

Three submissions contained references to the level of support or opposition to second Sydney airport proposals (243.012, 257.008 and 312.007).

Two submissions claimed that support for a second Sydney airport is high while the other two claimed that it is not high.

The evidence available to the Department of Aviation, based on a telephone survey and public response to the operations of the Community Access Bus, indicates that general
community support for a second Sydney airport is high. While support within areas immediately affected (e.g. Wilton or Badgerys Creek) is not high, support within the surrounding regions is high according to opinions offered to officers manning the Community Access Bus. The survey conducted into this question in 1984 resulted in seven out of ten respondents endorsing the need for a second Sydney airport.

18.7 LETTERS TO THE MINISTER
No comments were received in relation to this section.

18.8 MAJOR SUBMISSIONS
Two submissions (338.001 and 459.012) requested that earlier material should be reconsidered in the context of evaluation responses to the Draft EIS. One of these requests relates to material provided in support of the Goulburn option and the other to material supplied in opposition to the Wilton site being selected.

In respect of Goulburn, material supplied earlier has been evaluated and no departure from the current course of the second Sydney airport Site Selection Programme is considered merited.

In respect of material earlier supplied by Wilton Airport Resistance, it is pointed out that the summary of this material was incorporated into the Draft EIS, so that as wide an audience as possible could have the opportunity of considering it. The material was also evaluated by the Department of Aviation, and the points it raised are in the main already covered by various sections of the Draft EIS. Any outstanding issues are being covered in the response of which this forms a part.

18.9 RESPONSE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AVIATION
A number of submissions commented on the operations of the Community Access Bus, which visited advertised sites in the affected areas.

The criticisms made can be divided into three groups:

. the accessibility and hours of operation of the Community Access Bus;
. bias or unhelpfulness on part of officers staffing Community Access Bus;
. need for additional staffing by the Department of Local Government and Administrative Services;
. contradictory information supplied.

These issues are discussed below.

Accessibility and hours of the Community Access Bus

Five submissions (230.004, 231.001, 283.003, 313.007 and 368.003) about the accessibility of the Community Access Bus were received.

Criticisms were that the bus was not available at times when working commuters could visit it, did not stay in some locations long enough, or was inaccessible to people in some areas.
The Community Access Bus was staffed by senior officers associated with the second Sydney airport site selection programme and was accessible by a widely advertised telephone link. It operated throughout the exhibition period for five days a week, and on one occasion for six days. During ten weeks, over 3,000 people visited the bus. The schedule, reproduced in Table 18.1, was devised in consultation with local MPs, local councils, community groups and interested individuals. The Community Access Bus operated from 10.00 a.m. each morning until late each afternoon. On request, it remained in operation for several late night shopping nights. These evenings were not well attended and one (in Picton) attracted no visitors at all despite promises by members of opposition groups that some fifty commuters from Wilton and surrounds would be visiting the bus on that night.

It was further suggested that the Community Access Bus service was inadequate in that it provided no facility to register complaints or opinions. This was not the case as the bus was set up as a mobile library and visitors were encouraged to sit at desks and either read, discuss or take notes on the Draft EIS. Enquirers were also told that formal submissions could be lodged at the Community Access Bus for forwarding to the appropriate authority. It was pointed out, however, that an oral opinion would not carry as much weight as a written one, and therefore submissions were encouraged.

It was also alleged that no information was available from the Community Access Bus to assist those living just outside airport boundaries.

Officers assisted enquirers to the best of their ability. Where questions arose beyond the expertise of an officer, phone calls were made to Department of Aviation Central Office or to the Department of Local Government and Administrative Services or enquirers were given a phone number to ring themselves.

Table 18.1 Community access bus schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-19 June</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>adjacent to P.O. Badgerys Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-21 June</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td>adjacent to P.O. Luddenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>24-26 June</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>adjacent to P.O. Wilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27-28 June</td>
<td>Picton</td>
<td>adjacent to Council Chambers, Menangle Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>1-2 July</td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>adjacent to Council Chambers, John St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5 July</td>
<td>Campbelltown</td>
<td>Macarthur Shopping Square entrance near florist shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>8-9 July</td>
<td>Blacktown</td>
<td>railway station mall, Main St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-12 July</td>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>Penrith Shopping Square outside Grace Bros' main door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 July</td>
<td>Blaxland</td>
<td>Hope St near Station St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>15 July</td>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>outside Crown Centre, Crown St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 July</td>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>Civic Centre quadrangle Spencer St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 July</td>
<td>Cabramatta</td>
<td>mall, corner of John St and Railway Parade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 July</td>
<td>Wetherill Park</td>
<td>Stocklands Shopping Centre, main entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 July</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>adjacent to park, corner Arundel Rd and Horsley Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>22 July</td>
<td>Douglas Park</td>
<td>adjacent to P.O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23-25 July</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>adjacent to P.O. Macquarie St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 July</td>
<td>Mittagong</td>
<td>Southern Highlands Tourist Office, Hume Hwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td>29 July</td>
<td>Tahmoor</td>
<td>shopping centre, Old Hume Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 July</td>
<td>Sargo</td>
<td>shopping centre, Old Hume Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 July</td>
<td>Thirlmere</td>
<td>Daka St, opposite P.O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 August</td>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>outside Crown Centre, Crown St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 August</td>
<td>Appin</td>
<td>adjacent to playing fields Appin Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8</td>
<td>5 August</td>
<td>St Clair</td>
<td>adjacent to shopping centre, Endeavour Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 August</td>
<td>Brinnelly</td>
<td>community hall, Greenacres Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 August</td>
<td>Rossmore</td>
<td>opposite P.O. Brinnelly Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 August</td>
<td>Kemps Creek</td>
<td>adjacent to fire station Elizabeth Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 August</td>
<td>Austral</td>
<td>adjacent to P.O. Edmonson Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 August</td>
<td>Mt Druitt</td>
<td>Mt Druitt Shopping Square, main entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9</td>
<td>12-13 August</td>
<td>Picton</td>
<td>locations are the same as for weeks 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14-16 August</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 10</td>
<td>19-20 August</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-23 August</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bias or unhelpfulness from Community Access Bus staff

Three submissions (63.007, 205.007 and 207.005) complained of bias or unhelpfulness from Community Access Bus staff.

The basic criticisms were that officers on the bus did not assist people in expressing their views by providing a proforma or questionnaire (especially for those of limited writing skills), would not or could not answer questions, or were biased in their attitude to airport proposals.

The purpose of the Community Access Bus was to disseminate information. As it would not have been possible to obtain a representative sample of respondents, no attempt was made to survey public opinion. A previous questionnaire, issued from the Access Centre, attracted some criticism on the basis that questions were leading or answers could be falsified. People were therefore encouraged instead to express their own views.

Not all questions were capable of being answered on the spot by the Community Access Bus staff. In these circumstances, the offer was made to provide the information at a later date. In some cases, the information was obtained by phone while the person waited. In other cases the phone on the bus was used by the enquirer to speak to the relevant expert elsewhere.

A number of enquirers expressed their appreciation of the service provided.

Need for Department of Local Government and Administrative Services to staff Community Access Bus

One submission (283.006) raised the need for appropriate Department of Local Government and Administrative Services officers to staff the Community Access Bus to provide advice on property matters.

The bus carried Department of Local Government and Administrative Services information on property matters. In addition, second Sydney airport brochures listed contact telephone numbers for reverse-charge calls to Department of Local Government and Administrative Services officers. It was also possible to call the Department from the Community Access Bus.

Contradictory information supplied

Wilton Airport Resistance Committee submitted (338.002) that the Department of Aviation had provided two sets of figures which contained slight differences, and requested the Department to publish the correct figures in the Supplement. Such discrepancies can occur for a number of reasons, for example between preliminary and final statistics. The Department will at any time furnish published statistics to Wilton Airport Resistance Committee or anyone else on request. It is the user's responsibility to check how the particular statistics being used are defined.
APPENDIX A  CONDUCT OF THE STUDY AND GUIDELINES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PREPARATION

Eight submissions were received which raised matters relating to Appendix A of the Draft EIS. These submissions included fifteen separate comments relating mainly to the scope and content of the Draft EIS.

The comments made in the submissions can be categorized into two main groups:

- those requesting more detailed investigation of a range of factors associated with the development of an airport;
- those which indicated the Draft EIS had not taken account of certain issues.

These are discussed in more detail below.

Request for more detailed investigation

The submission by Penrith City Council made seven comments (429.001 to 429.007) requesting additional investigation if Badgerys Creek were the selected site. Penrith City Council made six comments relating to a range of factors pertaining to the Badgerys Creek site which Council considered were not adequately addressed in the Draft EIS. These included:

- noise;
- drainage;
- employment;
- zoning;
- construction phase;
- access.

In addition to these factors, Council requested that the Department of Aviation investigate more fully the aspect of planning blight.

Penrith City Council requested that, if the Badgerys Creek site were selected, any future environmental impact statement relating to the development of the site would be based on a detailed airport layout and should adequately address the above issues.

If the Badgerys Creek site were selected then the Department of Aviation would continue to liaise with Councils likely to be directly affected by the future development of an airport.

The comments made by Penrith City Council concerning the adequacy of information regarding issues pertaining to the Badgerys Creek site should be viewed in the context of the study objective. It must be remembered that the Draft EIS does not propose to be a detailed statement of impacts for the development of a particular site although it does cover a wide range of impacts associated with the possible development of the site. The primary purpose of the Draft EIS is to present an environmental assessment for the purposes of selecting and defining a site for a second Sydney airport.
The guidelines from the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment for the preparation of the Draft EIS state in part:

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will discuss in detail the impacts associated with the selection and acquisition process and will cover as far as possible the impacts of possible developments at the various sites. However, as there is no commitment at this stage to any development at the selected site, this discussion can only be in broad terms with regard to airport design. However, as noise is a key issue in the environmental assessment of the proposal it would be essential for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement to show the location and alignment of the runways and to provide ANEF contours for consideration in relation to adjacent and anticipated urban development.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement should also include an analysis of access requirements in relation to anticipated metropolitan urban development. As the role of the second Sydney airport may not be determined at the time of the preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the assessment will need to be based on the 'worst possible case' for each site under consideration.

The document should include sufficient information and technical data to enable interested parties to examine the basis of the environmental implications of decisions. Relevant maps should also be included but their preparation and reproduction should be such as to minimize, as far as convenient, the cost of printing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and of making it available to the public.

The following guidelines indicate the aspects which should be considered in the preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Each aspect should be dealt with only to the extent considered appropriate to the development under consideration, with a view to concentration on the more significant impacts. It is also essential that close contact be maintained with this Department during the preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment will in turn facilitate the necessary liaison with the NSW Department of Environment and Planning with respect to the State's requirements on the form and content of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. These guidelines are not necessarily exhaustive. (Pages 568-69)

In order to achieve the above, three reference groups were established to oversee the conduct of the study.


The Land Use Working Group comprised representatives of the Department of Aviation and the NSW Department of Environment and Planning. This group provided guidance on the application of the NSW Government's regional planning policies and specific planning controls which will be gazetted to coincide with the announcement of the selected site.

The Access Working Group comprised representatives of the Commonwealth departments of Aviation and Transport, and the NSW departments of Main Roads and Environment and Planning, the State Transport Study Group, the Urban Transit Authority and the State Rail Authority. This group provided guidance on appropriate study procedures and on NSW transport policies and plans, and provided data.
Certain issues not considered

Seven submissions made eight comments (246.010, 335.002, 359.004, 384.002, 456.004, 457.013, 461.001 and 461.002) on a range of aspects which it was considered should have been covered in the Draft EIS.

One submission (335.002) commented that the Draft EIS did not address the issues required by order under sub-section 6(1) of the Environment Protection (Impact of Proposals) Act 1974-1975. This section of the Act relates to approved procedures and refers to the Administrative Procedures of the Act.

Section 4 of the Administrative Procedures deal with matters to be considered by environmental impact statements. Appendix A of the Draft EIS sets out the matters to be covered in the Draft EIS. These matters were determined in accordance with the Administrative Procedures.

Discussion on the specific matters raised in the submission are included in the Draft EIS. The discussion relating to resumption of land outside the acquisition area is limited because under present Commonwealth regulation only that land which is required for a Commonwealth facility can be acquired. The acquisition of land for road and rail access would be a matter for the NSW State government and would be dealt with under appropriate state legislation (see Sections 9.2 and 10.4 of the Draft EIS).

Two comments (384.002 and 461.002) indicated that the Draft EIS did not consider the environmental effect of the proposed airport on the surrounding region.

The guidelines for the preparation of the Draft EIS required that potential impacts on the environment be assessed in relation to all facets of the proposed development at the local, regional and, if appropriate, state or national levels. Impacts should be considered for the acquisition, construction and operational phases with emphasis being given to the major impacts.

Off-site impacts were considered particularly in relation to noise and agriculture. Matters relating to the planning of the requirements for industrial, residential and commercial development are the domain of the State and are being dealt with in accordance with State government planning procedures.

One comment (456.004) indicated that the Draft EIS did not contain sufficient information of the potential impact on the exploitability of coal reserves in relation to the Wilton site particularly so far as it affects employment opportunities.

The Draft EIS recognizes there is potential to sterilize coal (Section 15.1). However, the proposed site at Wilton was preferred to other possible sites within the Wilton area partly because it minimized the potential for coal sterilization. The Draft EIS also recognized that the acquisition of land owned by Bellambi Coal Company Pty Limited would preclude the company from proceeding with its current proposals and that the company might have difficulty in finding another suitable site for those facilities.

Additional information to that which was initially provided by the Department of Mineral Resources and the Bellambi Coal Company Pty Limited is included in Section 15.1 of this Supplement.

Three comments (359.004, 457.013 and 461.001) referred to the development of a second airport. One comment was concerned that a master plan was not provided for Kingsford-Smith Airport, one was concerned that no assurance was given that the preliminary master plan would not change in the future and the other comment raised the point that the Draft EIS did not address the development of a second airport.
The objective of the Draft EIS was to provide a basis for the selection and acquisition of a location that would be suitable for possible future development as Sydney's second major airport. On this basis there was no need to develop a master plan for Kingsford-Smith Airport as part of the Draft EIS. The Commonwealth and State government believe it is prudent planning to set aside a location for a second major airport in the Sydney Region to provide for the Region's future air traffic. The Draft EIS did not address the issue of airport development in detail as the Commonwealth commitment at this stage is to the acquisition of a site, not the development of an airport.

The Department of Aviation would continue to assess the need for the actual development of a second major airport in Sydney and initiate the appropriate action when necessary. Section 1.1 of the Draft EIS indicates the possible timing in relation to the requirement for additional runway capacity. However, as the time horizons involved are distant it is not possible to give any commitment that aspects of the airport development will not change. For this reason the master plans in the Draft EIS are called preliminary. However, the extent of any change is likely to be minimal and would be directed towards further minimizing noise effects and the optimizing of airspace and topographic considerations.

One submission (246.010) commented that the Draft EIS was inadequate and omitted to consider various matters in relation to the cost of acquisition, noise, employment, air quality, access, fauna and television reception. The comments made in relation to these matters are dealt with under the respective sections of this Supplement.

The submission also claimed the information presented was insufficient, contained misleading or biased data or arrived at incorrect conclusions. However failed to substantiate these assertions. Nor did it raise any matters which affect the basic assessment of environmental effects in relation to the sites or the comparison of environmental effects which would change the possible preference of one site over the other.

APPENDIX B ASSESSMENT AND COMPARISON OF CAPITAL COSTS FOR ALL SITES

Sixteen submissions made twenty-two separate comments relating to the assessment and comparison of the capital costs of second Sydney airport development at each of the ten nominated sites. The comments can be further categorized into three main issues:

- costs not considered;
- cost comparisons of sites;
- criticism of costing methodology.

These issues are discussed below.

Costs not considered

Eleven submissions made eleven separate comments (241.002, 274.105, 290.006, 305.006, 325.005, 338.075, 342.014, 345.003, 361.021, 362.019 and 422.016) suggesting that cost items were not estimated or had not been considered adequately.

Cost items referred to as not having been considered include airport construction costs; costs of relocation of government establishments; costs of water retention, diversion and treatment works; costs of supplying water and sewerage to development peripheral to airport; costs of cut-and-fill; costs of Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board supervision; and operating costs that vary between sites.

Most of these items have been considered, and the estimation of their costs has been given in Table B.1, in Appendix B of the Draft EIS. The first item, airport construction costs, does not, however, appear in the listing. This item may be divided into two
components: site preparation costs, which will vary considerably between sites, and construction of superstructure, which will be closely comparable for all sites. Therefore, for the purposes of site cost comparison, only site preparation costs have been considered. Costs of cut-and-fill at each site, also suggested as an omission from the cost comparison process, forms the major item considered under site preparation costs.

Access-related costs include the costs of land and facilities for access. The relocation of Commonwealth facilities is included although State facilities are not (however, the cost of relocating facilities is not expected to be a major factor in selection of the final site). Costs for water supply and water and sewerage treatment works are included under costs for new infrastructure but these do not, as one comment suggested, include costs of supply and treatment to development peripheral to the airport, as this area would not be the responsibility of the Department of Aviation but the relevant supply authority. The estimate for protection of water quality at the proposed Wilton site should allow for components of both drainage control and water treatment. The cost of Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board supervision, though not included in Appendix B of the Draft EIS, used for cost-ranking in the short-listing process, is included in Appendix H, the draft schedule of conditions applied by the Board to the construction, operation and maintenance of an airport at Wilton, and has been taken into account in the evaluation of the proposed Wilton site following short-listing. This is, in any event, a minor cost.

One submission suggested that the cost of relocating the receiver station should be included for Badgerys Creek. The cost of relocating the Overseas Telecommunications Commission receiver station was not included in the costs for Badgerys Creek on the assumption that the station would probably have to be relocated eventually with or without the development of an airport. If the development of an airport were to bring forward the time of this relocation the selection of Badgerys Creek would entail an additional capital cost dependent on the extent of this effect.

The final item referred to was operating costs that vary between sites, identified specifically in one comment as costs resulting from the distance of the second Sydney airport from the city centre. The question of operating costs dependent upon distance to the site involves three components: travel time, passenger travel preferences, and the function of the second Sydney airport relative to Kingsford-Smith Airport. Travel times to all sites were estimated during the site selection programme, but the speculative nature of future passenger preferences and the function of the second Sydney airport prevent the conversion of these distances to operating costs. The distances of all sites from Sydney are given in Chapter 5 of the Draft EIS.

Four comments refer to the costs of particular facilities. The Department of Defence suggests a cost of $250 million for relocation of the RAAF/RAN facility at Kingswood which might be affected by development at Badgerys Creek, and three comments suggest that the costs of water treatment and collection at Wilton should be dealt with in more detail. A generous estimate of the cost of water treatment works at Wilton is included in the estimate for 'new infrastructure', and it is anticipated that portions of this amount would apply to both water treatment and water containment works. Should the cost of the combined works exceed the amount allowed, it is probable that due to the far lower site acquisition costs at the proposed Wilton site, the cost of acquisition and water containment works for Wilton would still be lower than that for Badgerys Creek. (Note: For the final sites, the capital cost differences of airport construction, including acquisition, are not expected to be great.)

Cost comparisons of sites

Four submissions made four separate comments (274.078, 304.004, 361.022, and 390.010) comparing the proposed sites at Wilton and Badgerys Creek and other nominated locations on the basis of various cost factors.
The first of these suggests that there are cheaper sites available than Badgerys Creek. This is not disputed. Badgerys Creek ranks as only the sixth cheapest site in terms of capital costs as shown in Appendix H. However, capital cost is only one of four factors evaluated in ranking the nominated sites for short-listing. The scores assigned to Badgerys Creek on other factors are given in Figure 6.2 of the Draft EIS.

The other four comments making cost comparisons between sites refer to the proposed Wilton site. The Wilton site is stated to be more expensive than other sites in the areas of cut-and-fill (reflected in a fairly high site preparation cost); access (Wilton has in fact the second lowest access related cost of all of the nominated sites); and site drainage works, which would be more expensive at Wilton due to the high level of control necessary for catchment protection.

Despite some areas of capital cost in which the proposed Wilton site is more expensive than other sites, in total capital cost it still ranks as the second cheapest site. It should be noted, however, that site ranking for short-listing depended on four factors: environment, access, airport operations and variable capital cost. On the aggregated ranking of these four factors, the proposed Wilton site ranked second while the Badgerys Creek proposed site ranked first.

**Criticism of costing methodology**

Six submissions made seven comments (274.107, 305.004, 342.012, 385.011, 457.004, 457.026 and 459.004) critical of the costing method used in the short-listing process.

One of these comments suggested that no cost/benefit study had been carried out for the second Sydney airport. Although the formal structure of a cost/benefit analysis was not used, the site ranking matrix utilized contains many of the components of cost/benefit analysis, allowing evaluation to occur in monetary terms where a monetary value is readily defined but also allowing non-monetary evaluation where this is more appropriate. The site ranking matrix therefore provided an effective method of evaluating both monetary and non-monetary costs and benefits of the ten nominated sites.

One comment suggested that acquisition costs for the Wilton site were misrepresented in the Draft EIS due to other factors such as the cost of acquisition of access corridors and the costs of development on the site. These cost components are considered under access related costs and site preparation costs respectively. The acquisition costs given in Appendix B were based on unit costs and usage in June 1985.

Two comments criticized the costs given for the two short-listed sites and suggested that a more detailed costing for these sites should have been presented. At the stage of detailed consideration of the two short-listed sites, further attention was paid to the costs of agricultural production lost from the site, costing of road and rail works required for site access, and details of earthworks required for site preparation, although this information is given in terms of volume rather than of cost. Land acquisition costs cannot be finally determined until the conclusion of negotiations with landholders. For all other costs, the costs used in the short-listing process were considered sufficient for the purposes of preparation of the Draft EIS. More detailed cost estimation will be made at the stage of detailed design.

The Department of Defence noted that, if Badgerys Creek were chosen the Bringelly Remote Receiver Station would need relocation before airport construction commenced rather than mid way through construction as assumed in the exercise. The change makes little difference to the figures.
Five submissions made six separate comments relating to the application of conditions to construction of the second Sydney airport at the proposed Wilton site. These comments could be further categorized into three main issues:

- adequacy of protection measures;
- location of the facility within the catchment area;
- value of water resource.

These issues are discussed below.

### Adequacy of protection measures

Three submissions (250.007, 292.008 and 338.007) related to protection measures that would be applied during construction and operation of the proposed airport should the Wilton site be selected for airport development.

Four comments sought confirmation that effective run-off and pollution control measures would be applied. They wanted more than 'assurances' and suggestions that the application of stringent measures would be sufficient. Two comments referred to the measures applied to the Maldon-Dombarton rail link. The sedimentation and pollution control measures required by the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board, and included in Appendix H, constitute very stringent control measures requiring not only the construction of a complete run-off containment system and progressive rehabilitation works, but also allowing the Board complete supervisory power over the method and staging of all works, parking of plant and stockpiling of materials prior to the completion of the perimeter canal system, and over all works, plant and materials outside the perimeter canal system following its completion. In addition, the Department of Aviation is required to comply with any restrictions or requirements imposed by the Board relating to ground surface disturbance, scrub or tree cutting and removal, clearing, burning off and any other activities affecting the catchment area. These measures would be enforced by the Board.

The fifth comment in this category noted that no schedule of conditions from the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board similar to that applicable to the proposed Wilton site is included for Badgerys Creek. This is because the proposed Badgerys Creek site does not lie within a Metropolitan Water Supply catchment area, as does the Wilton site, nor does it drain into any classified waterways. However, as stated in Section 10.2.3 of the Draft EIS, any effluent or run-off discharged from the Badgerys Creek site would need to conform with the requirements set out in Clause 16 of the Clean Waters Act, 1970, which prohibits the pollution of any waters.

### Location of the facility within the catchment area

One submission made two separate comments (361.005 and 361.006) suggesting that location of the second Sydney airport within a water catchment area is contrary to the policy of the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board, and might set a precedent which would encourage other authorities to attempt to use the catchment area.

Planning and design of the second Sydney airport at the proposed Wilton site has been carried out in consultation with the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board, and stringent controls have been imposed by the Board to ensure that the functioning of the Sydney water supply system would not be compromised should this site be selected. In addition, the Department of Aviation has undertaken to comply with any further
directions from the Board aimed at protection of the Sydney water supply. Such requirements act as a considerable disincentive to other authorities which may consider location in the area, as well as accomplishing their primary purpose of catchment protection.

The second point is that the proposed location of the second Sydney airport within the catchment area cannot in any sense be considered a precedent when a number of developments, including several roads, the Moomba–Sydney natural gas pipeline, a 330 kV transmission line, a low voltage transmission line with several branches, and the Maldon–Dombarton railway line, already pass through the catchment area. The mining of coal from beneath the catchment is another use which has been established in the Metropolitan Catchment area for some time.

**Value of the water resource**

One submission (274.079) commented that the Draft EIS failed to consider the opportunity costs to the community if part of the water catchment area is rendered useless by the second Sydney airport site.

The Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board has estimated the monetary cost of water lost to the Board as $23,600 per annum, for which annually reviewed compensation should be paid to the Board. The proposed airport site occupies an area of 1,440 ha, of which about 1,245 ha lies within the Metropolitan Catchment. In terms of the total catchment area this is an insignificant amount of land, and the loss of water resource available from this land surface is not considered to significantly affect the function of the catchment area in supplying the water required by the population of Sydney.
APPENDICES TO THE SUPPLEMENT

APPENDIX 1 — SUMMARY OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

This section contains a list of all submissions received by the Department of Aviation up to 6 September, presented alphabetically by author. The list is divided into a number of columns which identify:

- the author(s) of the submission;
- the address of the author(s) (suburb or locality only);
- the submission and comment number, consisting of two parts. The whole number refers to the submission and the decimal to the comment within the submission. For example, comment number 57.006 is the sixth comment in submission number fifty-seven;
- the summary of comments made in each submission;
- the number of the Draft EIS section which most closely relates to the comment made in the submission;
- the Supplement page reference where the Department of Aviation has responded to the comment. The page numbering of the Supplement follows consecutively on that of the Draft EIS, starting at page 621.

A certain amount of subjective judgement is inevitable in the analysis of the submissions and their division into comments. Some quite short submissions raised a number of issues and a comment in such case may relate to a single sentence. In other cases a comment may represent the summary of pages of discussion on a single issue. As some submissions were repetitive or returned to an issue previously dealt with, the comment numbers do not always strictly follow the order of the submission. In each case, however, an attempt has been made to ensure that the point of the argument has been reflected in the comment summary and has been responded to. Where a particular comment relates to more than one section of the Draft EIS the comment has been repeated and given a separate number for each section.

Where a number of submissions were received from the same author these have been considered together and given one number, the comment numbers proceeding through the several submissions in the order in which they were received by the Department of Aviation. However, since submissions were numbered as they were received, sometimes several submissions from the same author were given separate numbers; when submission numbers were checked against authors' names, those authors with more than one number were allocated a single number to include all their submissions. As a consequence, some numbers were not allocated to any submission; these appear as blank numbers at the end of the list.

Where a number of submissions have been received from the same address but with different signatures they have been considered as separate submissions.

More than half of the submissions were of the type termed proforma. That is, a number of submissions were received with identical wording but different signatures. Each proforma has been treated as a separate submission whether it was a photocopy of a
Eight different proformas were received, with the number of copies of each ranging from three to 117. One of each type received has been termed the 'model' and its comments are listed in Appendix 1 in the normal fashion. Later copies of the same type are listed by author, but for the summary of comments the reader is referred to the model.

In each section of the Supplement the number of submissions (including proforma) relevant to that section is given. The submission numbers are listed but in the case of proformas only the model number is quoted.

Where the same person has sent an original submission and a proforma these have been given a single submission number. Similarly where the same person has submitted more than one proforma type these have been given one number and the reader referred to the relevant models for comments.

Where identical submissions have been lodged with various recipients, such as the Department of Arts, Heritage and Environment, the Department of Aviation, the Minister for Aviation, and so on, these have been considered as one submission.

In one instance the report of one consultant was included as part of their submission by three separate groups. These are treated in Appendix 1 in the same fashion as a proforma submission. That is, the report is summarised under the listing for one group only, in this case that of the Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers Anti-Airport Committee (264). Under the other listings, readers are referred to this entry for the summary of comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMENT NO</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</th>
<th>DRAFT EIS SECTION</th>
<th>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams, G &amp; S Luddenham</td>
<td></td>
<td>235.001</td>
<td>Prefers Wilton for second Sydney airport</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams, G &amp; S Luddenham</td>
<td></td>
<td>235.002</td>
<td>If Badgerys Creek selected, only fair solution would be to resume all properties within the 25 ANEF contours, and above</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams, G &amp; S Luddenham</td>
<td></td>
<td>235.003</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek site is far too heavily populated for airport development</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Families around Badgerys Creek Airport</td>
<td>Greendale</td>
<td>345.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Families around Badgerys Creek Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>345.002</td>
<td>Removal of General Aviation and commuters from Kingsford-Smith Airport, combined with effects of larger aircraft, would remove need for second Sydney airport</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Families around Badgerys Creek Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>345.003</td>
<td>Costs of airport construction and costs of land and facilities for access, should be considered in Draft EIS as well as acquisition costs</td>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Families around Badgerys Creek Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>345.004</td>
<td>How much further land would be acquired, other than the acquisition site?</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Families around Badgerys Creek Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>345.005</td>
<td>Nineteen hundred hectares of productive agricultural land would be sterilized, and noise would affect viability of neighbouring livestock enterprises</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Families around Badgerys Creek Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>345.006</td>
<td>The noise contours are inaccurate, as no consideration of the low ambient noise level of Badgerys Creek is included - night levels in rural areas need to be studied</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Families around Badgerys Creek Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>345.007</td>
<td>Nepean River Valley might be noise-trap, causing sounds to resonate</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Families around Badgerys Creek Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>345.008</td>
<td>What would happen if the site were only reserved and never built on, with respect to zoning restrictions, compensation?</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Families around Badgerys Creek Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>345.009</td>
<td>Would land within 20 ANEF contour be sterilized? Who would bear cost?</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) of Submission</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment No</th>
<th>Summary of Comments Made in Submission</th>
<th>Draft EIS Section</th>
<th>Supplement Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affected Families around Badgerys Creek Airport</td>
<td>345.010</td>
<td>Residents using tank water have no guarantee that only a small quantity of pollutants would reach the ground</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Families around Badgerys Creek Airport</td>
<td>345.011</td>
<td>Social effects of planning blight on Badgerys Creek citizens should be seriously considered</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Families around Badgerys Creek Airport</td>
<td>345.012</td>
<td>The acquisition program should extend to the 20 ANEF contour, and compensation should take in further areas beyond this</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Families around Badgerys Creek Airport</td>
<td>345.013</td>
<td>Draft EIS employment figures not relevant - acquisition of site creates no jobs and there would be an indefinite time-lag before construction</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>682</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Families around Badgerys Creek Airport</td>
<td>345.014</td>
<td>Rural character of Badgerys Creek area highly valued by residents, in terms both of social links and natural environment</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agland, Kane</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>299.001</td>
<td>Objects to an airport at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agland, Kane</td>
<td>299.002</td>
<td>Objects to an airport at Wilton because of noise</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agland, Kane</td>
<td>299.003</td>
<td>Objects to an airport at Wilton because of air pollution and environmental considerations</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agland, Kerry</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>300.001</td>
<td>Consider that development of Kingsford-Smith Airport is the direction to go</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agland, Kerry</td>
<td>300.002</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agland, Kerry</td>
<td>300.003</td>
<td>Protests against noise pollution</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agland, Kerry</td>
<td>300.004</td>
<td>Airport at Wilton would have damaging effect on flora</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agland, Kerry</td>
<td>300.005</td>
<td>Airport at Wilton would have damaging effect on fauna</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agland, R</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>313.001</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agland, R</td>
<td>313.002</td>
<td>Noise pollution would be unacceptable</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agland, R</td>
<td>313.003</td>
<td>Air pollution would be unacceptable</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agland, R</td>
<td>313.004</td>
<td>Too much flora would be destroyed</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agland, R</td>
<td>315.005</td>
<td>Too much fauna would be destroyed</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agland, R</td>
<td>315.006</td>
<td>Access to airport would be too difficult</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agland, R</td>
<td>315.007</td>
<td>Community Access Bus did not visit Bargo for long enough</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, E</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, L</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>22.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission nos B, Lave, L and 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrich, R</td>
<td>Cecil Park</td>
<td>352.001</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrich, R</td>
<td>352.002</td>
<td>Airport would affect large numbers of people in and around Cecil Park, Horsley Park, Mount Vernon and St Johns Park area, who have moved there in the last seven years</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous (name supplied)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous (name supplied)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.002</td>
<td>Would pollute water supply, whatever measures were taken</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous (name supplied)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.003</td>
<td>Would change the whole environment west of Wollongong</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous (name supplied)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.004</td>
<td>Concerned about noise pollution</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous (name supplied)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.005</td>
<td>Concerned at loss of value of house</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous (name supplied)</td>
<td></td>
<td>296.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous (name supplied)</td>
<td></td>
<td>296.002</td>
<td>Airport could have disastrous effects on quality of Sydney's water supply</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous (name supplied)</td>
<td></td>
<td>296.003</td>
<td>Concerned for possible loss of valuable wildlife habitat close to city</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold, DB</td>
<td>Glenbrook</td>
<td>398.001</td>
<td>Objects to airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold, DB</td>
<td>398.002</td>
<td>Would disrupt peace and tranquility of lower Blue Mountains</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold, DB</td>
<td>398.003</td>
<td>An airport at Badgerys Creek operating twenty-four hours a day would disturb 200,000 people - the expected population of the Penrith-St Marys-Lower Mountains area by the year 2000</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold, DB</td>
<td>398.004</td>
<td>The obvious answer is to extend Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold, GM</td>
<td>Glenbrook</td>
<td>325.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION

Arnold, SM

Airports should be built as far as possible away from residential areas to avoid disturbing the peace and tranquility of Gospel Park.

Avari, R

For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J

Australian Iron & Steel Pty Ltd

Draft EIS does not adequately cover subject of coal sterilization at Wilton site, and ways of minimizing this

Ayres, L

197.001 Opposed to siting airport at Wilton

Badgerys Creek Anti-Airport Action Group

62.001 Grounds for selection should be which of the two sites affects smaller number of people

Ball, M

376.001 Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek

Ball, M

376.002 Reduction in value of land

Ball, M

376.003 Airport would destroy fauna of area

Ball, M

376.004 Rare species of shrubs at Bents Basin

Ball, M

376.005 Adequate compensation should be made for disturbance

Ball, M

376.006 How are graves and churches in the immediate area going to be moved?

Ball, M

376.007 Biggest dairy in New South Wales is in centre of site

Ball, M

376.008 Biggest dairy in New South Wales is in centre of site

Ball, M

376.009 Draft EIS gives inaccurate count of houses affected

Ball, M

376.010 No compensation for houses outside site

Ball, M

376.011 When would airport be built?

Ball, JR

207.001 Ecological value underplayed at Wilton, as area is of high scientific interest

Ball, JR

207.002 Inadequate description of flora as regards rare and endangered species - flora survey methodology not adequately covered

Ball, JR

207.003 Fauna survey inadequate - no mention of broad-headed snake, Hoplocephalus bungaroides. Koalas are also frequently sighted

Ball, JR

207.004 No consideration given in Draft EIS to the effect on the ecology of removal of nesting sites

Ball, JR

207.005 Officers in Community Access Bus biased, no help given with submissions

Ball, JR

207.006 Capacity at Kingsford-Smith Airport could be increased by redirecting General Aviation and commuter traffic elsewhere

Ball, JR

207.007 Details required on fuel storage

Bankstown City Council

57.001 Concerned at effect on local area of road and rail network required for airport

Bankstown City Council

57.002 Concerned at effect on local area of road and rail network required for airport

Bankstown City Council

57.003 Draws attention to possible need to upgrade public transport

Bankstown City Council

57.004 Draws attention to possible need to upgrade public transport

Bankstown City Council

57.005 Concerned at possible effects on Bankstown Airport

DRAFT EIS

Section

Supplement

Page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMENT NO</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</th>
<th>DRAFT EIS SECTION</th>
<th>SUPPLEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bankstown City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.006</td>
<td>Concerned at possible effects on Bankstown Airport</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargo-Picton Branch, Aust Labor Party</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>377.001</td>
<td>Supports airport at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baric, M</td>
<td>St John's Park</td>
<td>392.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley, B</td>
<td>Bringelly</td>
<td>321.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at either Badgerys Creek or Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley, B</td>
<td></td>
<td>321.002</td>
<td>Intolerable noise levels</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley, B</td>
<td></td>
<td>321.003</td>
<td>Intolerable air pollution</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley, B</td>
<td></td>
<td>321.004</td>
<td>Residents of Badgerys Creek have located there specifically for quiet, rural lifestyle. Second Sydney airport would destroy this</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley, B</td>
<td></td>
<td>321.005</td>
<td>Residents of Wilton have located there specifically for quiet, rural lifestyle. Second Sydney airport would destroy this</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, CJ</td>
<td>Horley Park</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Badgerys Creek as it would affect too many people</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>Large number of homes recently built in Horley Park extremely affected</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>Extra runway at Kingsford-Smith Airport would be more cost efficient</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>Access to Badgerys Creek more costly than to Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>If Badgerys Creek were made an international airport, how would passengers commute to domestic airport?</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>Height of aircraft when flying over Truman Road, Horley Park?</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>Why was the runway alignment at Badgerys Creek changed?</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>New flight path would be directly over two primary schools at Horley Park</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>Requests more accurate ANEF contours, taking into consideration lower ambient noise levels around Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>What are the noise levels within ANEF contours at night, when ambient noise is less?</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td>Only point favouring Badgerys Creek over Wilton is shorter travel time, and technical progress would soon overcome this</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>Figure for people affected by 20 ANEF contour not 1,951 as stated in Draft EIS but 2,600 in Horley Park and Cecil Park areas alone</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>If runways rotated 10 degrees anticlockwise, noise would affect fewer people at Horley Park</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>Concerned about the protection of European heritage</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>Loss of produce is $8.3 million for 3,300 ha of agricultural land at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>Flight path would be over Prospect Reservoir and so would pollute drinking water</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.017</td>
<td>Political motivation, as stated on page 53, influenced the briefing of the Consultants and the writing of the Draft EIS</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>Lifestyle would be affected</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, Dr S J (Aid.)</td>
<td>Wakerley</td>
<td>304.001</td>
<td>Against airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, Dr S J (Aid.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>304.002</td>
<td>Would create noise pollution</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, Dr S J (Aid.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>304.003</td>
<td>Would create air pollution</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, Dr S J (Aid.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>304.004</td>
<td>Cheaper sites available</td>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barone, Dr S J (Aid.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>304.005</td>
<td>Suggests that simulated flights by both small and large planes should be flown over neighbouring suburbs during days when a temperature inversion condition exists</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry, D &amp; A</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>47.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassett, K</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>108.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments made, in addition to those below, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassett, K</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>108.001</td>
<td>Existing facilities should be reorganized for best possible usage. Additional runway and upgraded control facilities at Kingsford-Smith Airport a better solution than second Sydney airport</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassett, K</td>
<td></td>
<td>108.002</td>
<td>Computer and other aircraft could operate from Bankstown, and training activity could be moved to make room</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassett, K</td>
<td></td>
<td>108.003</td>
<td>Increased use should be made of Schofields, and if necessary apprentices should be moved out</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basso, A</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>468.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basso, C</td>
<td>Bossley Park</td>
<td>307.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION

Basso, L
DRAFT EIS
S
FOR SUMMARY OF COMMENTS, SEE SUBMISSION NO. 267, CLARK, K

Basso, M
DRAFT EIS
17.1

Very concerned at possible selection of Wilton site

Basso, M
DRAFT EIS
9.2

Would affect lifestyle

Basso, P
DRAFT EIS
212.000

For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J

Basso, P
DRAFT EIS
217.000

For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J

Basso, S
DRAFT EIS
215.000

For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J

Beardwell, Dr R
DRAFT EIS
294.001

Very concerned at possible selection of Wilton site

Beardwell, Dr R
DRAFT EIS
15.2

Draft EIS understimates potential problems associated with pollution of water supply to Sydney if airport sited at Wilton

Beardwell, Dr R
DRAFT EIS
1.3

An extension of services at Kingsford-Smith Airport should be adequate until turn of century

Beardwell, Dr R
DRAFT EIS
17.3

Distance to Wilton a considerable disadvantage

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
246.001

Quoted acquisition cost of Wilton site grossly understates true land value

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
14.2

Draft EIS inaccurately estimates numbers of people at Wilton and Badgerys Creek that would be affected by noise

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
14.2

Draft EIS ignores people mildly affected, and those living outside 20 ANEF contour but still feeling effects of noise

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
14.2

Draft EIS gives misleading impression that 20 ANEF contour is an impervious sound barrier

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
14.2

Surveys of community reaction to noise inadequate

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
14.2

Draft EIS fails to justify fully, assignment of certain land uses to certain noise contours

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
14.2

A low level of airport operation would still have a significant noise impact

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
14.2

Draft EIS deliberately plays down noise pollution while playing up employment potential of airport

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
14.6

Estimates of maximum level of employment inaccurate

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
246.010

Draft EIS inaccurate and omitted to consider issues in relation APPENDIX A to cost of acquisition, noise, employment, air quality, access, fauna, and television reception.

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
14.6

Multipliers largely unaltered from those applicable to Kingsford-Smith Airport

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
246.012

Draft EIS does not consider how long it might take before airport operating at full capacity

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
246.013

Recommends Final EIS deal in more balanced way with topic of employment

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
246.014

Draft EIS does not consider minimum employment levels that might result from second Sydney airport

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
17.2

Increase in air pollution would be greater in Wilton sub-region than for Sydney as a whole

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
15.3

Aircraft movement would increase pollution at Wollongong

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
15.3

Observation period for air drainage patterns too short

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
17.2

Draft EIS incorrect in stating that airport at Badgerys Creek would degrade Sydney's air quality more than airport at Wilton

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
15.3

Descriptions of wind characteristics (at Wilton) in Draft EIS are wrong

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
15.4

No allowance made for traffic associated with airport construction for Wilton site

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
15.4

Final EIS should recommend new access road and reconsider impact on Picton Road and Wilton Road

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
16.2

Present and future status of koala should be more thoroughly examined, and more consideration given to method of successfully moving Wilton colony

Bell, I & M
DRAFT EIS
14.2

Draft EIS fails to examine interference to TV reception arising from airport

Bellambi Coal
APPENDIX A
346.001

Mining of coal under airport site would not be practical

Bellambi Coal
APPENDIX A
346.002

Wilton airport would have adverse impacts on future operations of West Bellambi project

Bellambi Coal
APPENDIX A
346.003

To be competitive in the future, Bellambi needs to establish a new wash plant and surface facilities at West Bellambi - in the middle of second Sydney airport site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</th>
<th>COMMENT NO</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</th>
<th>DRAFT EIS SECTION</th>
<th>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belambi Coal Co/Combined Mining Unions South Bulli Colliery</td>
<td>346.004</td>
<td>Airport would sterilize 14% of reserves of coal in lease area</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belambi Coal Co/Combined Mining Unions South Bulli Colliery</td>
<td>346.005</td>
<td>Would significantly affect the economics of West Belambi project - reduce the life of total Bulli seam resources by 14%, and reduce accessible western reserves by 18%</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belambi Coal Co/Combined Mining Unions South Bulli Colliery</td>
<td>346.006</td>
<td>Would necessitate acquisition of new mine-surface site area</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belambi Coal Co/Combined Mining Unions South Bulli Colliery</td>
<td>346.007</td>
<td>Disagrees with the comments in Draft EIS on viability of Balgownie seam</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belambi Coal Co/Combined Mining Unions South Bulli Colliery</td>
<td>346.008</td>
<td>Company has already purchased site for off-catchment coal preparation plant</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belambi Coal Co/Combined Mining Unions South Bulli Colliery</td>
<td>346.009</td>
<td>Additional resources, to the west of the South Bulli Lease, would also be sterilized. Site would be lost with second Sydney airport development</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belambi Coal Co/Combined Mining Unions South Bulli Colliery</td>
<td>346.010</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Wilton unless certain compensatory measures are provided</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belambi Coal Co/Combined Mining Unions South Bulli Colliery</td>
<td>346.011</td>
<td>Requests rapid decision on location if company not to be seriously disadvantaged</td>
<td>PREFACE</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belshaw, LA &amp; V Kemps Creek</td>
<td>141.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergamini, D &amp; J Horsley Park</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird, N Wallacia</td>
<td>452.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird, N</td>
<td>452.002</td>
<td>Kingsford-Smith Airport adequate for Sydney's needs</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird, N</td>
<td>452.003</td>
<td>Well established use and excellent city access make expansion of Kingsford-Smith Airport most cost-effective option</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird, N</td>
<td>452.004</td>
<td>Well established use and excellent city access make expansion of Kingsford-Smith Airport most cost-effective option</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council Blacktown</td>
<td>422.001</td>
<td>Supports locating airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td>422.002</td>
<td>Indirect costs arising from acquisition outside boundary, for road purposes and so on, should be addressed</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td>422.003</td>
<td>Issue of indirect noise impacts needs to be considered, and change in noise patterns at other aerodromes likely to be upgraded, if airport were developed at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td>422.004</td>
<td>Potential sites of archaeological worth outside site boundary should be surveyed</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td>422.005</td>
<td>Net increase in employment in Sydney region appears overstated</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td>422.006</td>
<td>Local councils must play integral part in future regional planning. Department of Planning and Environment should consider future development of North-West Sector with respect to public investment</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td>422.007</td>
<td>Short-term needs of those employed for airport construction should be considered</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td>422.008</td>
<td>Acquisition and construction costs for an inter-urban rail link between airport and city would be exorbitant</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td>422.009</td>
<td>Commitment from Commonwealth to assist in upgrading existing road and rail systems is essential</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td>422.010</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not adequately address extent of mineral sterilization</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td>422.011</td>
<td>Further investigation of likely indirect impacts on vegetation in airport surrounds is required</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td>422.012</td>
<td>Further investigation of likely indirect impacts on wildlife in airport surrounds is required</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td>422.013</td>
<td>Scale and likely nature of reshaping of landscape should be addressed</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td>422.014</td>
<td>City of Blacktown presently falls outside 20 AMEF contour, but later variations in airport or further urban growth could mean need to rezone, and to introduce stringent building requirements</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
<td>DRAFT EIS SECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>422.015</td>
<td>Proposed airport would significantly contribute to provision of local employment in region</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>422.016</td>
<td>Likely cost estimates would need to include relocation of sensitive government establishments</td>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>422.017</td>
<td>Upgrading of Schofields aerodrome may be financially advantageous for Blacktown</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>422.018</td>
<td>Proximity and ease of access to Sydney region is advantageous for second airport</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>422.019</td>
<td>Draft EIS fails to address the indirect factors such as regional loss of employment</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>422.020</td>
<td>Draft EIS fails to address the indirect factors such as effects of sitting on operations of other regional airports in terms of noise, traffic, etc.</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>422.021</td>
<td>Relocation of agricultural activities could cause particular financial hardship</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>422.022</td>
<td>There might be further loss of agricultural land inside the site area, as an indirect effect of associated development attracted by the airport</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>422.023</td>
<td>Draft EIS should address cost of minimizing water pollution in South Creek</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>422.024</td>
<td>The broad-scale transport issues need to be addressed in a regional environmental plan for the whole Sydney region</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaxhorne, J</td>
<td>St John Park</td>
<td>448.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.002</td>
<td>Vast majority of Blue Mountains residents find Kingsford-Smith Airport is adequate for their travel purposes, and do not wish for an airport closer to them</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.003</td>
<td>Land and housing values affected by airport at Badgerys Creek - no prospect of compensation</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.004</td>
<td>Noise would adversely affect elderly and retired, and families</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.005</td>
<td>Air pollution would adversely affect residents</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.006</td>
<td>Noise pollution understated in Draft EIS - National Acoustics Laboratory survey does not reflect quiet environment of communities like those in the Blue Mountains</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.007</td>
<td>Draft EIS gives insufficient weighting to night-time noise annoyance - would cause loss of sleep and trauma</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.008</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not show why a twenty-four hour airport is needed</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.009</td>
<td>Noise would cause extreme annoyance to residents of Lapstone, Blaxhorne, Blackard East and Mount Riverview</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.010</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not consider noise levels below 20 ANEF which still cause annoyance, particularly at night</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.011</td>
<td>Narragandra township would be affected by noise of aircraft taking off into westerly wind</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.012</td>
<td>Inversion layer would intensify noise</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.013</td>
<td>Proximity of airport to Sydney is irrelevant, given its suggested role</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.014</td>
<td>Air quality would be affected by aircraft pollution, causing health problems</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.015</td>
<td>Pollution would also affect fauna in National Park</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.016</td>
<td>Pollution would reduce poultry production</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.017</td>
<td>Aircraft crash would create bushfire hazard - endangering life and fauna</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.018</td>
<td>Fog and thunderstorms would make Badgerys Creek site prone to accidents, and consequences more serious when aircraft cannot ditch into sea</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td>Blaxhorne Park</td>
<td>330.019</td>
<td>Emergency fuel dumping in vicinity of Badgerys Creek would create pollution and bushfire hazard</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s) of Submission</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment No</td>
<td>Summary of Comments Made in Submission</td>
<td>Draft EIS Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>330.020</td>
<td>Blue Mountains district lacks emergency facilities and infrastructure, should aircraft crash occur</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>330.021</td>
<td>Navigational aids would cause interference with TV reception</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Anti Airport Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>330.022</td>
<td>Proximity of airport to Sydney is irrelevant, given its suggested role</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonning, PR &amp; CL</td>
<td>Kemps Creek</td>
<td>161.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burg, DY</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>146.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burg, M</td>
<td>Address not supplied</td>
<td>109.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borsato, B</td>
<td>Wallacia</td>
<td>366.001</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borsato, B</td>
<td></td>
<td>366.002</td>
<td>Large number of people seriously affected</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borsato, B</td>
<td></td>
<td>366.003</td>
<td>Value of homes would drop</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borsato, B</td>
<td></td>
<td>366.004</td>
<td>Noise pollution a major concern</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borsato, B</td>
<td></td>
<td>366.005</td>
<td>Not against need for second Sydney airport</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bortolozzo, N</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>42.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boskovich, PS</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td>237.001</td>
<td>Cost of acquisition at Badgerys Creek underestimated</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boskovich, PS</td>
<td></td>
<td>237.002</td>
<td>Number of homes to be acquired at Badgerys Creek underestimated</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boskovich, PS</td>
<td></td>
<td>237.003</td>
<td>Relocation would mean loss of vocation for market gardeners and farmers</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boskovich, PS</td>
<td></td>
<td>237.004</td>
<td>Airport would bring increased traffic congestion</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boskovich, PS</td>
<td></td>
<td>237.005</td>
<td>Wilton would affect fewer people</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boskovich, PS</td>
<td></td>
<td>237.006</td>
<td>Decision for Badgerys Creek would be unjust and undemocratic</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Bay Sub-Region Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>359.001</td>
<td>In favour of second airport in Sydney region</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Bay Sub-Region Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>359.002</td>
<td>Airport should be given priority funding for construction</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Bay Sub-Region Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>359.003</td>
<td>Draft EIS gives insufficient attention to environmental impact of increasing usage of Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Bay Sub-Region Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>359.004</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not provide a master plan for Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Bay Sub-Region Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>359.005</td>
<td>Against a proposal that would increase usage of Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Bay Sub-Region Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>359.006</td>
<td>Rail access to Kingsford-Smith Airport is needed to help alleviate existing problems</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Bay Sub-Region Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>359.007</td>
<td>Congestion at Kingsford-Smith Airport a major problem</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Bay Sub-Region Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>359.008</td>
<td>Study should be conducted dealing with environmental costs attributable to Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>PREFACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Bay Sub-Region Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>359.009</td>
<td>High and low passenger figures appear inaccurate</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Bay Sub-Region Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>359.010</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not discuss transportation of fuel to second Sydney airport</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Bay Sub-Region Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>359.011</td>
<td>Although rail connection to Badgerys Creek would not reduce travelling time, it would be preferable to road access from environmental point of view</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
<td>DRAFT EIS SECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Bay Sub-Region Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>359.012</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not discuss transportation of fuel to second Sydney airport</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Independent Action Group</td>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>461.001</td>
<td>Draft EIS is not an environmental study for the development of second Sydney airport, but only a discussion of possible sites</td>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Independent Action Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>461.002</td>
<td>Draft EIS has not addressed all problems associated with new airport</td>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Independent Action Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>461.003</td>
<td>Role of second Sydney airport as secondary airport would not resolve the problems of residents around Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Independent Action Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>461.004</td>
<td>No concern expressed for people who would be affected</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Independent Action Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>461.005</td>
<td>Community Access Centre was not sufficiently publicized</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Independent Action Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>461.006</td>
<td>Public opinion has not been extensively canvassed</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, L</td>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>236.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, M</td>
<td>Mount Riverview</td>
<td>290.001</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>290.002</td>
<td>Destruction of homes on site a waste</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>290.003</td>
<td>Potential pollution of Warragamba Dam a major problem</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>290.004</td>
<td>Destruction of valuable agricultural land and associated produce would increase cost of production and hence price</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>290.005</td>
<td>Noise levels would be detrimental to livestock at the CSIRO field station</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>290.006</td>
<td>Relocating the Overseas Telecommunications Commission radio receiving station would be very costly</td>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>290.007</td>
<td>Animals at Wilton could rehabilitate themselves in ample bushland, and the Wilton flora is poor compared with that of the Blue Mountains</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>290.008</td>
<td>Suggests upgrading Richmond to take interstate traffic</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>290.009</td>
<td>At Wilton a lot of pollution from aircraft would be carried out to sea</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>290.010</td>
<td>Employment figures are debatable</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovic, J</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>33.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bray, AJ &amp; RJ</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td>221.001</td>
<td>Request to have property included in acquisition area</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgen, C</td>
<td>Blacktown</td>
<td>266.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, S</td>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>18.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, S</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>116.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchane, JV</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>60.001</td>
<td>Draft EIS well compiled, comprehensive</td>
<td>PREFACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchane, JV</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.002</td>
<td>Concerned about rights of residents to retain properties they have struggled to acquire</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchane, JV</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.003</td>
<td>Extend Kingsford-Smith Airport - second Sydney airport may never be needed</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchane, JV</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.004</td>
<td>Worry is affecting health</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchane, JV</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.005</td>
<td>Concerned about noise</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Workers Industrial Union of Australia, NSW Branch</td>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>394.001</td>
<td>Supports Wilton site</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Workers Industrial Union of Australia, NSW Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td>394.002</td>
<td>Would create continuing employment, badly needed in Illawarra region</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Workers Industrial Union of Australia, NSW Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td>394.003</td>
<td>Would not create a nuisance</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Workers Industrial Union of Australia, NSW Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td>394.004</td>
<td>Would be readily accessible</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
<td>DRAFT EIS SECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Workers Industrial Union of Australia, NSW Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td>394.005</td>
<td>Modern technology could provide adequate protection of water catchment environment</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Workers Industrial Union of Australia, NSW Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td>394.006</td>
<td>Noise would not be major problem at Wilton</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Workers Industrial Union of Australia, NSW Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td>394.007</td>
<td>Coal sterilization problem could be overcome by modern technology</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIRO</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>244.001</td>
<td>Either site would be detrimental to CSIRO’s activities, but Wilton is preferable</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIRO</td>
<td></td>
<td>244.002</td>
<td>Would lose two sites, operated by the Divisions of Animal Production and Animal Health, if Badgerys Creek chosen</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIRO</td>
<td></td>
<td>244.003</td>
<td>Noise of airport at Badgerys Creek would affect small animals</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIRO</td>
<td></td>
<td>244.004</td>
<td>Noise of airport at Badgerys Creek would affect small animals</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIRO</td>
<td></td>
<td>244.005</td>
<td>Staff buildings would be within 25-40 ANEF contours</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIRO</td>
<td></td>
<td>244.006</td>
<td>Increased pollution would have adverse effect</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIRO</td>
<td></td>
<td>244.007</td>
<td>Air pollution would affect animals in specific pathogen-free breeding unit</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIRO</td>
<td></td>
<td>244.008</td>
<td>Could maintain presence if Wilton site chosen</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIRO</td>
<td></td>
<td>244.009</td>
<td>Occupied buildings at Wilton would be within 20-25 ANEF contours</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabramatta Branch, Aust Labor Party</td>
<td>Cabramatta</td>
<td>310.001</td>
<td>Supports an airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffyn, L</td>
<td>Ludgeman</td>
<td>3.001</td>
<td>Trotting industry ideally situated at Badgerys Creek, relocation difficult</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffyn, L</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.002</td>
<td>Town water, needed for trotting establishment, available at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltex Oil (Aust) Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>256.001</td>
<td>Draft EIS is set out in impressive and rational way</td>
<td>PREFACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltex Oil (Aust) Pty Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td>256.002</td>
<td>Draft EIS omits description of mode of transport for jet fuel and cost of supply under different options, such as truck or pipeline</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltex Oil (Aust) Pty Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td>256.003</td>
<td>Draft EIS omits description of mode of transport for jet fuel and cost of supply under different options, such as truck or pipeline</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltex Oil (Aust) Pty Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td>256.004</td>
<td>Cost of pipeline to Badgerys Creek estimated at $10 million</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltex Oil (Aust) Pty Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td>256.005</td>
<td>Cost of pipeline to Wilton estimated at $19 million</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltex Oil (Aust) Pty Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td>256.006</td>
<td>No mention in Draft EIS of number of people who would move into noise-affected areas</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltex Oil (Aust) Pty Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td>256.007</td>
<td>No mention in Draft EIS of number of people who would move into noise-affected areas</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltex Oil (Aust) Pty Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td>256.008</td>
<td>Supports second Sydney airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Aero Club</td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>375.001</td>
<td>Supports airport at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Aero Club</td>
<td></td>
<td>375.002</td>
<td>Wilton site better, since it is near to Wollongong as well as to Sydney</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Aero Club</td>
<td></td>
<td>375.003</td>
<td>Wilton site better, as alternatives of rail or road transport are both available</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Aero Club</td>
<td></td>
<td>375.004</td>
<td>Wilton site closer to sea, thus reducing noise nuisance</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Aero Club</td>
<td></td>
<td>375.005</td>
<td>Greater ease of expansion at Wilton</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Aero Club</td>
<td></td>
<td>375.006</td>
<td>Wilton site cheaper to acquire</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Aero Club</td>
<td></td>
<td>375.007</td>
<td>Bankstown and Camden airports able to retain present roles</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camillin, A</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>32.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lawe, L</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbelltown City Council</td>
<td>Campbelltown</td>
<td>454.001</td>
<td>Does not feel able to form an opinion on the basis of the level of detail in the Draft EIS</td>
<td>PREFACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantrill, L</td>
<td>Silverdale</td>
<td>287.001</td>
<td>Protests at airport sitting at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantrill, L</td>
<td></td>
<td>287.002</td>
<td>Extension of Kingsford-Smith Airport should still be considered</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantrill, L</td>
<td></td>
<td>287.003</td>
<td>Figures quoted in Draft EIS underestimate people who would be affected by noise</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L
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SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION

Suggests methods by which Kingsford-Smith Airport could be made

DRAFT EIS

SECTION

Supplement

736

Suggests that a majority of people in the vicinity of

340.009

Low cost recovery for General Aviation, so why allow them to

627

Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek

15.4

263.002

Long-term costs need to be addressed in Final EIS

Property located within 30-40 ANEF contour, and should be

acquired if Badgerys Creek selected

627

Access to second Sydney airport would involve long ribbon of

Boundary should be redrawn to include safety buffer zone

8.2

661

Cost return would be greater if Kingsford-Smith Airport were

upgraded

1.3

627

Costs of access have not yet even been considered

3.1

Cavanagh, DJ

391.009

Employment figures are inaccurate

9.6

682

Cavanagh, DJ

391.010

Employment figures are inaccurate

14.6

722

Cavanagh, DJ

391.011

Cost return would be greater if Kingsford-Smith Airport were

upgraded

1.3

627

Cavanagh, DJ

391.012

Solution to congestion at Kingsford-Smith Airport would be far

er cheaper than building second Sydney airport, and social cost

would be less

1.3

627

Cavanagh, DJ

391.013

A second Sydney airport could be compared to new Brisbane

earport as example of over-supply of airport facilities

1.3

627

Cavanagh, Dr DM

Wellongong

340.001

Develops an argument for analysis of second Sydney airport

costs in association with related Kingsford-Smith Airport

costs, including the social costs

1.3

627

Cavanagh, Dr DM

340.002

Querries need and economics of second Sydney airport as opposed

to expansion at Kingsford-Smith Airport - cites 1973 report of

Joint Committee on planning Sydney airports

3.1

639

Cavanagh, Dr DM

340.003

Costs of access have not yet even been considered

15.4

742

Cavanagh, Dr DM

340.004

DRAFT EIS not adequate on social costs of access corridor

15.4

742

Cavanagh, Dr DM

340.005

Inappropriate subsidization received by General Aviation -

particularly in cost recovery area

1.4

630

Cavanagh, Dr DM

340.006

New cost recovery policy would force General Aviation to make

fuller use of the appropriate aerodromes in Sydney region

1.4

650

Cavanagh, Dr DM

340.007

Increased use of larger aircraft would reduce runway usage for

estimated passenger demand

1.2

624

Cavanagh, Dr DM

340.008

Criticizes job estimates - capital would be more efficiently

spent if Kingsford-Smith Airport were expanded

14.6

722

Cavanagh, Dr DM

340.009

Suggests that a majority of people in the vicinity of

Kingsford-Smith Airport are not troubled by noise - therefore

on a social costs basis Kingsford-Smith Airport is a better

investment

1.5

633
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHORS OF SUBMISSION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMENT NO</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</th>
<th>DRAFT EIS SECTION</th>
<th>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Any change in conservation policy in catchment area would adversely affect water quality</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of trees within Wilton site would affect soil moisture levels - erosion and siltation effects</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.015</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subsidence from coal mining would be a problem</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geological stability/earthquake threat</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of cut-and-fill in sandstone excessive</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.018</td>
<td></td>
<td>High cost of coal sterilization</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.019</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction of rail services to Wilton would not be cost or time effective</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Airport at Wilton would affect existing aerodrome facilities and airspace</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction works would contaminate water supply</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.022</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waste disposal in Wilton area expensive</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.023</td>
<td></td>
<td>Airport run-off contaminated with fuel and other pollutants would find its way into water supply</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.024</td>
<td></td>
<td>New water and sewerage facilities would be needed at great cost</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.025</td>
<td></td>
<td>Water supply might be polluted by airport sewage</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.026</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone services need upgrading</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.027</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community facilities will not be developed because of prospect of second Sydney airport</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.028</td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure for fuel supply would be expensive</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.029</td>
<td></td>
<td>There would be strong local opposition to any increase in road traffic from fuel trucks</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.030</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chance of polluting catchment with fuel during transportation</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.031</td>
<td></td>
<td>Defoliants would be used to control bird problem</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.032</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggests sound-proofing of houses would be needed in vicinity of Wilton - compensation payable</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.033</td>
<td></td>
<td>The water catchment area is virtually a national park, and such should not have been considered as a possible airport site</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, Dr DM</td>
<td>380.034</td>
<td></td>
<td>Criticizes the selection methodology</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>Forecasts based on faulty assumptions</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.002</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taxpayers’ money should not be used to subsidize General Aviation</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilton proposal would affect Sydney’s water supply</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Further runway at Kingsford-Smith Airport more effective way of solving future demand</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of General Aviation aerodromes should be considered as alternative to second Sydney Airport</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.006</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pilots are not in favour of Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.007</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site selection criteria questionable</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Why wasn’t Wilton considered in earlier studies?</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.009</td>
<td></td>
<td>Criticizes site analysis and grouping methods</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.010</td>
<td></td>
<td>If national parks ruled out, why not Wilton?</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical of costs used for both sites</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noise contours do not accurately represent noise problem, particularly at night</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical of archaeological sampling</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft EIS ignores losses and costs of an airport</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.015</td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagrees with section of Draft EIS concerning coal</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Criticizes employment figures</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poultry farms in 25 ANEF contour associated with Wilton would be affected</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pollution of Allens Creek would affect agriculture downstream</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.019</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduces other water quality issues</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil erosion would follow removal of trees from site</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of water catchment area for airport is reversal of State Government policy on use of this area</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.022</td>
<td></td>
<td>Removal of trees would change soil moisture regime and encourage evaporation</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.023</td>
<td></td>
<td>Numerous criticisms of Chapter 15, concentrating on damage to catchment and water quality</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.024</td>
<td></td>
<td>Air quality in Campbelltown and Wollongong would be worsened</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>385.025</td>
<td></td>
<td>Considers that the only practical means of access to Wilton is by private vehicle</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
<td>DRAFT EIS SUPPLEMENT SECTION</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>GFH</td>
<td>385.026</td>
<td>Impact of relocation work understated</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>GFH</td>
<td>385.027</td>
<td>Critical of section on landscape and visual quality</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>GFH</td>
<td>385.028</td>
<td>Fertilizers would contaminate water supply</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>GFH</td>
<td>385.029</td>
<td>Effect of clearing western end of long runway understated</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>GFH</td>
<td>385.030</td>
<td>Study of flora was incomplete</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>GFH</td>
<td>385.031</td>
<td>Faunal study should have encompassed areas outside airport boundary</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KE</td>
<td>GFH</td>
<td>385.032</td>
<td>Fencing of site during construction would be harmful to fauna</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.001</td>
<td>Opposes a second Sydney airport anywhere, but particularly at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.002</td>
<td>Acquisition costs of Wilton misrepresented in Draft EIS</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.003</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not mention that Wilton site is in the water catchment area for Sydney, and therefore affects three million people</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.004</td>
<td>High capital expenditure on traffic access to second Sydney airport would be necessary</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.005</td>
<td>Analysis determining need for second Sydney airport is wrong</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.006</td>
<td>General Aviation and commuter traffic increase congestion at Kingsford-Smith Airport. They should pay economic rates for use of airport. This would relieve congestion and make second Sydney airport unnecessary</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.007</td>
<td>Decline in aircraft movements affects need for second Sydney airport</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.008</td>
<td>Numbers of transit passengers will decline as hubbing is reduced at Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.009</td>
<td>Numbers of people employed in General Aviation and commuter are very small compared to major airlines</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.010</td>
<td>Draft EIS ignores specific nature of jobs within aircraft sector. There would continue to be a shortage of licensed aircraft maintenance staff</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.011</td>
<td>Building second Sydney airport would bring about chronic shortage of trained aircraft workers, with consequent safety problems</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.012</td>
<td>Only best possible employment figures are discussed in Draft EIS</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.013</td>
<td>Employment multiplier inaccurate</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.014</td>
<td>Capital returns due to upgrading Kingsford-Smith Airport better than from second Sydney airport itself</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.015</td>
<td>Impact of selection of second Sydney airport on Kingsford-Smith Airport itself</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.016</td>
<td>Noise near Kingsford-Smith Airport not objected to by residents because it results in cheap housing</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.017</td>
<td>MANS Study preferred upgrading Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.018</td>
<td>Suggests need for, and configuration of, a further runway at Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.019</td>
<td>Suggests compensating owners of residential property near Kingsford-Smith Airport and rezoning certain areas</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh, KM</td>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>389.020</td>
<td>Kingsford-Smith Airport should remain and should be upgraded</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chee, A</td>
<td>Kemps Creek</td>
<td>187.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 67, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheetham, S</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td>303.001</td>
<td>Boundary of his property is also the airport boundary - requests his property be included in acquisition area because of the excessive noise levels</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cini, A</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>125.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cini, C</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>122.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cini, M</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>126.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cini, S</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>127.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, J</td>
<td>Blacktown</td>
<td>267.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, J</td>
<td>Blacktown</td>
<td>267.002</td>
<td>Opposed to twenty-four hour operations in western suburbs</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, J</td>
<td>Blacktown</td>
<td>267.003</td>
<td>Opposed to having land values depressed</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>648A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clausmann, J</td>
<td>Kemps Creek</td>
<td>54.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 67, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coir, S</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>249.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colussi, S</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>50.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 67, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combet, J</td>
<td>Erskine Park</td>
<td>67.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMENT NO</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</th>
<th>DRAFT EIS SECTION</th>
<th>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combet, J</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>67.002</td>
<td>Concerned at effects on Horsley homestead, which has an A classification from National Trust</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combet, J</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.003</td>
<td>Adverse winds or straying planes would result in serious noise pollution at Erskine Park</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combet, J</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.004</td>
<td>Airport would result in lower land values and higher rates</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combet, J</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.005</td>
<td>Airport would have adverse effects on two high schools and a retirement village nearby</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combet, J</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.006</td>
<td>For summary of additional comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosse, R</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>129.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport Concern Association Wollongong East</td>
<td>331.001</td>
<td>Considers value of lost coal production is understated in Draft EIS</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport Concern Association</td>
<td>331.002</td>
<td>Considers planned mine surface facilities in airport site would have serviced many other coal concerns in area</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport Concern Association</td>
<td>331.003</td>
<td>Coal should be mined before airport construction is begun</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport Concern Association</td>
<td>331.004</td>
<td>Final airport design should ensure suitable land still available for West Bellambi mine</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>708</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport Concern Association</td>
<td>331.005</td>
<td>Expresses reservations about protection of water catchment area in vicinity of airport at Wilton</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport Concern Association</td>
<td>331.006</td>
<td>Rail access needed from date of opening of second Sydney airport at Wilton, otherwise patronage would be small</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport Concern Association</td>
<td>331.007</td>
<td>Draft EIS overstates benefits to Wollongong. Main employment benefits would go to Macarthur region, and for Wollongong residents access to Kingsford-Smith Airport is almost as quick as access to Wilton</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport Concern Association</td>
<td>331.008</td>
<td>Questions need for a second airport - money might be better spent upgrading Kingsford-Smith Airport, including provision of train service</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conn, Cl</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>112.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor Fares Pty Ltd, Niloc Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>384.001</td>
<td>Inaccuracies regarding Figure 14.8.1, not clearly showing topography of Wilton</td>
<td>CORRIGENDA</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor Fares Pty Ltd, Niloc Pty Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td>384.002</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not consider environmental effect on region outside airport site</td>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation for Redevelopment and Employment Wollongong East</td>
<td>332.001</td>
<td>Supports siting airport at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation for Redevelopment and Employment</td>
<td>332.002</td>
<td>Only dissenting member against Wilton was Miners' Federation</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation for Redevelopment and Employment</td>
<td>332.003</td>
<td>Concerned about sterilization of coal reserves, but considers there are ways around problem</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation for Redevelopment and Employment</td>
<td>332.004</td>
<td>Not convinced that water pollution could be contained</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation for Redevelopment and Employment</td>
<td>332.005</td>
<td>Concerned about quality of environment in Illawarra area - public relations programme required</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation for Redevelopment and Employment</td>
<td>332.006</td>
<td>Suggests additional regional planning that should be undertaken prior to establishment of airport at Wilton</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation for Redevelopment and Employment</td>
<td>332.007</td>
<td>Supports siting of airport at Wilton - particularly as it would create jobs</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrimal Branch, Aust Labor Party</td>
<td>Corrimal</td>
<td>374.001</td>
<td>Supports airport at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrimal Branch, Aust Labor Party</td>
<td></td>
<td>374.002</td>
<td>Advantages of Wilton site would include lower cost of acquisition</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrimal Branch, Aust Labor Party</td>
<td></td>
<td>374.003</td>
<td>Airport would serve Wollongong and Sydney's south-west</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrimal Branch, Aust Labor Party</td>
<td></td>
<td>374.004</td>
<td>Would enhance tourism in the region</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Government contracts should specify minimum number of local labour to be employed in construction

Would significantly contribute to economic base of Illawarra-Macarthur regions and create employment

Great community support for airport at Milton

Disagrees with Draft EIS regarding quality of coal

Effects on agriculture would be negligible

Corrimal Branch, Aust Labor Party
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SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION

Consultation should take account of the Sydney Region General Aviation Study.
Opposes second Sydney airport at Wilton.
Draft EIS is inaccurate, inconsistent, misinformation.
Claim of Draft EIS that total cost of Wilton site is only $1.8 million, because MWS30B land costs nothing, is false.
Catchment area is of a higher order than national parks, which were excluded from selection.
A tree preservation order exists within the Shire. This was ignored in Draft EIS.
Loss of trees would have disastrous effects on soil moisture and water levels in dams, and would cause soil erosion and siltation of dams and watercourses.
Wind data in Draft EIS are wrong.
If Towra Point unacceptable, then Badgerys Creek should be Airport at Wilton would interfere with air traffic in area.
Water supply would have to be upgraded to high-pressure mains.
Preservation of catchment area essential.
Breakdown of or strike in system would endanger health of three Camden.
Waste could not be dumped in catchment area and so waste disposal would be costly.
Favours Wilton site.
Sterilization of coal resources unacceptable.
Costs of cut-and-fill at Wilton are higher than at other rejected sites.
More job losses would result in short term from cessation of cut-and-fill at Wilton are higher than at other rejected sites.
There is no public rail transport system at Wilton and cost of upgrading colliery railways would not be justified.
Wilton too far from city centre.
Airport at Wilton would interfere with air traffic in area.
Preservation of catchment area essential.
Waste could not be dumped in catchment area and so waste disposal would be costly.
Spilt fuel would pollute water supply.
Entire sewage system would have to be built at cost of $80 million plus cost of treatment works.
Breakdown of or strike in system would endanger health of three million people.
Water supply would have to be upgraded to high-pressure mains system.
Cost of improving Telcocon facilities to airport would cause local towns to have lower priority for improvement.
Selection of site would result in capital drain from area.
Difficulty of supplying fuel to airport would add to cost.
Natural habitats would be destroyed.
Compensation to home owners for noise pollution would be higher in areas surrounding Wilton, because it was not suggested as a possible site in earlier studies.
Suggests development of Towra Point in preference to Kingsford-Smith Airport.
If Towra Point unacceptable, then Badgerys Creek should be developed as full-scale airport, with north-south and east-west parallel runways, and all Kingsford-Smith Airport operations transferred.
Would relieve 230,000 people around Kingsford-Smith Airport of noise and hazard.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMENT NO</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</th>
<th>DRAFT EIS SECTION</th>
<th>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dodds, DAF</td>
<td></td>
<td>308.004</td>
<td>Purchase more land at Badgerys Creek to reserve for aircraft associated activities and solve noise problem</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodds, DAF</td>
<td></td>
<td>308.005</td>
<td>Completely upgrade Western Suburbs Distributor and road system around Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffes, R</td>
<td>Merrylands</td>
<td>170.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn, DR &amp; PM</td>
<td>West St Clair</td>
<td>426.001</td>
<td>Objects to airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn, DR &amp; PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>426.002</td>
<td>In favour of Wilton site</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn, DR &amp; PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>426.003</td>
<td>Many airports to west of Sydney, but none to south</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn, DR &amp; PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>426.004</td>
<td>Noise pollution from airport at Badgerys Creek would significantly worsen the quality of life</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn, DR &amp; PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>426.005</td>
<td>Access to Wilton is very good, whereas constructing good access to Badgerys Creek would displace many people and disturb historic farming areas</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn, DR &amp; PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>426.006</td>
<td>Wilton airport would be of great economic benefit to a depressed sector of Sydney Region</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn, DR &amp; PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>426.007</td>
<td>Air pollution from airport at Badgerys Creek would significantly lessen the quality of life</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woonona Progress Association</td>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>425.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woonona Progress Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>425.002</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Wilton due to pollution of catchment</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woonona Progress Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>425.003</td>
<td>Simulate landing by B747 at Wilton, so that residents can assess the noise involved in developing an airport in area</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woonona Progress Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>425.004</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Wilton due to coal sterilization</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebe, E &amp; S, Springvale</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>106.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebe, E</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>21.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmunds, MJ</td>
<td>Emu Plains</td>
<td>387.001</td>
<td>Opposed to Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmunds, MJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>387.002</td>
<td>Fears serious impact on environment from noise</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmunds, MJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>387.003</td>
<td>Would affect recreation and tourism in the area</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmunds, MJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>387.004</td>
<td>Considers an airport on coast is the optimum, as it allows take-off and approach paths over the sea</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmunds, C</td>
<td>Silverdale</td>
<td>219.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmunds, C</td>
<td></td>
<td>219.002</td>
<td>Noise and pollution would affect residents of Silverdale</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmunds, C</td>
<td></td>
<td>219.003</td>
<td>Airport would bring radio and television interference</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmunds, C</td>
<td></td>
<td>219.004</td>
<td>Choice of Badgerys Creek site would lower property prices</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmunds, C</td>
<td></td>
<td>219.005</td>
<td>Would adversely affect the peaceful rural lifestyle</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmunds, C</td>
<td></td>
<td>219.006</td>
<td>Better solution would be to extend Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering, School of University of Sydney</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.001</td>
<td>Without airport, Fleur's site would be useful into the next century</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering, School of University of Sydney</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.002</td>
<td>Usefulness of Fleur's would cease at commencement of airport construction at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering, School of University of Sydney</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.003</td>
<td>Usefulness of Fleur's would cease when radar or any communications equipment began operation at Wilton</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering, School of University of Sydney</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.004</td>
<td>University of Sydney would seek compensation</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott, IC &amp; SA</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>14.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis, L</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>17.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L and 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, Mr &amp; Mrs</td>
<td>Kemps Creek</td>
<td>179.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Servicemen's Country Club Holdings Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Austimmer</td>
<td>75.001</td>
<td>Accepts need for second Sydney airport</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Servicemen's Country Club Holdings Pty Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.002</td>
<td>Stress need for earliest possible decision on site</td>
<td>PREFACE</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield City Council</td>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>341.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft EIS failed to give adequate information on noise effects, and compensation for property owners.

Draft EIS did not consider whether airport's employment capacity was suited to Badgerys Creek or Wilton.

Draft EIS did not give figure for jobs lost by acquisition, as compared with employment gains.

No account taken of reduction of airport employment due to technological advances.

No commitment from Commonwealth on funding of additional roads.

Supports Badgerys Creek site because main consideration should be distance from centre of Sydney's population, and Badgerys Creek ideal from this aspect.

Air pollution might be exacerbated by temperature inversions and calm wind conditions, frequently experienced at Badgerys Creek.

Further investigation of possible pollution of Prospect Reservoir by aircraft emissions.

Commitment should be made to complete Smithfield Road corridor and express routes providing link with South Western Freeway.

Low background noise levels likely to extend area of noise nuisance beyond that given in Draft EIS.

Definition of sub-region, for purposes of analysing employment and economic effects, is inadequate. Should include parts of Fairfield and Blacktown.

The economic effects of second Sydney airport, such as its capacity to generate employment, might suit the region well.

Draft EIS did not consider possibility that second Sydney airport might be expanded in the future.

Air pollution might be exacerbated by temperature inversions and calm wind conditions, frequently experienced at Badgerys Creek.

Noise problems might be exacerbated by temperature inversions, frequently experienced at Badgerys Creek. However, management of noise problems appears feasible.

Although airborne pollution from aircraft emissions and increased traffic would be experienced in City of Fairfield, management of these problems appears feasible.

Additional pollution would flow into Sydney area - meteorological effect.

Draft EIS did not mention Smithfield Road, which would provide a route to north-west.

Road network around airport would require major upgrading, and further studies are foreseen.

Rail link to airport major consideration.

Further investigation of possible pollution of Prospect Reservoir by emergency fuel dumping.

This submission also supports comments made by the Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd (submission no. 7).

For additional comments, see submission no. 264, Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers Anti Airport Committee.

Acquisition of property requested, as he is located on airport boundary.

For summary of comments, see submission no. E, Lave, L.

Supports Badgerys Creek site because main consideration should be distance from centre of Sydney's population, and Badgerys Creek ideal from this aspect.

For summary of comments, see submission nos 223, Greenup, N., 270, Wilson, B, 271, Jenkins, R and 273 Wilson, T.

For summary of comments, see submission nos 223, Greenup, N., 271, Jenkins, R and 273 Wilson, T.

For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J.
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster, BR</td>
<td>Silverdale</td>
<td>72.001</td>
<td>Against airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster, BR</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.002</td>
<td>Lovely area would be affected by noise and other pollution</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, BL</td>
<td>Greendale</td>
<td>229.001</td>
<td>Angered at uncertainty and repeatedly changing plans of last eight years for Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, BL</td>
<td></td>
<td>229.002</td>
<td>Angered at lack of compensation for properties within 25-30 ANF contour</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, BL</td>
<td></td>
<td>229.003</td>
<td>Health threat to tank water</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, BL</td>
<td></td>
<td>229.004</td>
<td>Implies Badgerys Creek too far out for airport - could only be emergency field</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, BL</td>
<td></td>
<td>229.005</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek suffers badly from fog</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, BL</td>
<td></td>
<td>229.006</td>
<td>Right of citizen to enjoy what he has worked for</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, BL</td>
<td></td>
<td>229.007</td>
<td>Property values already depressed</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French, J &amp; M</td>
<td>Cecil Park</td>
<td>49.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French, R</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>44.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French, T</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gailea, J</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>160.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaur, I</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>132.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaur, M</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>133.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauci, D</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>80.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td>Bankstown</td>
<td>396.001</td>
<td>When site for second Sydney airport is selected, it will be essential to ensure development outside airport boundary is compatible</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td></td>
<td>396.002</td>
<td>Need to define more rigorously the role envisaged for second Sydney airport</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td></td>
<td>396.003</td>
<td>Does not accept that a first stage option for a second Sydney airport is to develop a General Aviation airport</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td></td>
<td>396.004</td>
<td>Second Sydney airport at Badgerys Creek would have serious implications for General Aviation in Sydney region, owing to airspace restraints</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td></td>
<td>396.005</td>
<td>Bankstown's flying training areas would be eliminated by the airspace requirements of Badgerys Creek - Draft EIS does not clearly define where replacement areas could be located</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td></td>
<td>396.006</td>
<td>Rejects use of areas south of Camden for flying training</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td></td>
<td>396.007</td>
<td>Narrow access corridor to Camden considered to have severe implications for air safety</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td></td>
<td>396.008</td>
<td>Airport at Badgerys Creek would force closure of Hoxton Park, which would place a great burden on Bankstown</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td></td>
<td>396.009</td>
<td>Camden air traffic would be affected, particularly the gliding sector</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td></td>
<td>396.010</td>
<td>Schofields would be affected</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td></td>
<td>396.011</td>
<td>Sydney region airspace would become so complex that much General Aviation would go elsewhere. Bankstown maintenance and service operators might also be affected</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td></td>
<td>396.012</td>
<td>Accessibility to Bankstown would be constrained and unsafe</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td></td>
<td>396.013</td>
<td>Refutes notional concept of airspace in Draft EIS</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td></td>
<td>396.014</td>
<td>Airspace implications of Wilton site less than those of Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(S) of Submission</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment No</td>
<td>Summary of Comments Made in Submission</td>
<td>Draft EIS Section</td>
<td>Supplement Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>396.015</td>
<td>Second Sydney airport at Wilton would restrict General Aviation access to south coast, but this could be overcome by modifying the restricted airspace at Holsworthy</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>396.016</td>
<td>Would close parachuting operations at Wilton</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>396.017</td>
<td>Expresses concern about cost recovery implications of second Sydney airport - if initially developed as General Aviation aerodrome, would the aim be to recover cost from General Aviation?</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>396.018</td>
<td>No current demand for second Sydney airport to be developed as General Aviation aerodrome</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>396.019</td>
<td>Supports close spaced parallel runway at Kingsford-Smith Airport to increase capacity</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation Association (Aust)</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>396.020</td>
<td>Would object to transfer of commuter and General Aviation to Bankstown or to second Sydney airport</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genovese, M</td>
<td>Prairiewood</td>
<td>651.005</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.001</td>
<td>Manner in which sites were selected for short list, and factors and parameters adopted for weighting, give rise to serious doubts about methodology of Draft EIS</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.002</td>
<td>Manner in which sites were selected for short list, and factors and parameters adopted for weighting, give rise to serious doubts about methodology of Draft EIS</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.003</td>
<td>Goulburn site would be best option environmentally</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.004</td>
<td>Goulburn would have very low costs of acquisition and construction</td>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.005</td>
<td>Goulburn site would eliminate problem at existing airports of noise disturbance and risk to health</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.006</td>
<td>Goulburn site would eliminate traffic congestion on the road and in the air</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.007</td>
<td>Selection of Goulburn site would provide a viable airport with unlimited potential for expansion</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.008</td>
<td>Selection of Goulburn site would reduce the risk of accidents occurring in densely populated areas</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.009</td>
<td>Goulburn site would serve other major population centres, such as Canberra and Wollongong, and would retain access to Kingsford-Smith Airport for country residents</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.010</td>
<td>Neither of short-listed sites fulfils as satisfactorily as Goulburn, the particular requirements for airport location that Goulburn Council puts forward as being particularly important</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.011</td>
<td>The Department of Aviation failed to consult - either on the options available for access to Goulburn, or on the regional/decentralization benefits of locating an airport at Goulburn</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.012</td>
<td>The Department of Aviation should respond more fully to questions and submissions from the Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.013</td>
<td>Requests Public Inquiry as part of site selection process</td>
<td>PREFACE</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.014</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not state minimum area considered necessary before a location could be considered as a potential second airport site</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.015</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not state minimum area considered necessary before a location could be considered as a potential second airport site</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.016</td>
<td>No mention made of airport 'buffer area'</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.017</td>
<td>No mention made of airport 'buffer area'</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.018</td>
<td>A nine kilometre grid is too coarse for rigorous analysis of possible airport sites</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.019</td>
<td>What percentage of a nine kilometre square on the grid must be national park, before the whole square is designated national park?</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.020</td>
<td>There is only very limited information on design criteria for runway layouts</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.021</td>
<td>There is only very limited information on design criteria for runway layouts</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.022</td>
<td>Were the same design criteria for runway layouts used as in earlier studies, and why was not mention made of types of cut-and-fill material to be used at each site?</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>Goulburn City Council</td>
<td>459.023</td>
<td>Terrain clearance limitations queried</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of people affected by noise queried – also method of assessment of noise nuisance.

Questions justification for the criterion used in short-listing (Figure 3.2), that any potential site should be within an 80 km radius of the Sydney CBD.

There is no indication of the procedures used to identify layouts.

Asks what opportunities exist to review the site selection study.

Low wind usability will affect role of second Sydney airport.

Low wind usability will affect role of second Sydney airport.

Why would passenger movements at Kingsford-Smith Airport be limited to 11 to 12 million?

Queries many aspects of site ranking methodology and results.

raises a number of points concerning the issue of access to Goulburn, and other aspects of the Goulburn site.

Objects to Wilton site

Suggests reconsideration of MANS study recommendations for Kingsford-Smith Airport and Badgerys Creek.

Loss of water quality is main objection – considers that water treatment works unlikely to remove majority of dissolved contaminants.

Land acquisition cost does not include cost of water treatment works.

Wilton is important as natural bushland – its high ecological value established.

Wilton is important as natural bushland – its high ecological value established.

Coal reserve under proposed site could be worth billions of dollars.

Goulburn is better, and Draft EIS ranking shows Badgerys Creek as preferred site.

Access to Badgerys Creek is better, and Draft EIS ranking shows Badgerys Creek as preferred site.

Opposed to airport at Wilton.

Disputes need for second Sydney airport, as total air movements at Kingsford-Smith Airport have been declining since 1980.

Better solution to redirect commuter and General Aviation to any of smaller airports in Sydney Basin.

States that no report on Wilton had yet been prepared for the Minister by the Consultants when he announced that Wilton and Badgerys Creek were the short-listed sites.

States that the Consultants had not visited the Wilton site prior to its short-listing.

Public information programme unsatisfactory, Community Access Bus not at Wilton when commuters could attend.

Officers manning Community Access Bus unhelpful.

Acquisition of Wilton site would create only ninety jobs, and even those not for another ten years.

Disputes that quality of coal in Wilton area is poor.

More information needed on forest clearance in water catchment area to meet airport associated needs.

More details required on fuel storage, and safety measures to prevent ignition from bushfires.

Would the development of associated industry require further clearing of the catchment area?  

Draft EIS did not adequately address issue of distance to Wilton. Airline travellers, airport staff and flight crews, would experience big financial and time constraints.

Choice of Wilton as site would sterilize valuable coal reserves, resulting in the waste of natural resources and a decrease in employment prospects in region.

Very high environmental cost to Australia of locating airport at Wilton.
AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION ADDRESS COMMENT NO SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION DRAFT EIS SECTION SUPPLEMENT PAGE
Gow, Dr LP 205.016 Airport would constitute major pollution threat to Sydney's water supply, and would jeopardize all the planning, work, and forward thinking of MWSSR 15.2 736
Gow, Dr LP 205.017 Even most sophisticated water treatment works would not remove all pollutants, and some would pass into Nepean River system and thence into Sydney's water supply 15.2 736
Gow, Dr LP 205.018 If this water catchment area were polluted, there is no readily available replacement 15.2 736
Gow, Dr LP 205.019 Recent pollution of Georges River illustrates problems associated with water treatment 15.2 736
Gow, Dr LP 205.020 Wilton site is akin to a national park, and should not have been considered 3.6 640
Gow, Dr LP 205.021 Selection of Wilton site would necessitate clearing of 20 square kilometres of virgin forested land 16.1 749
Gow, Dr LP 205.022 Airport at Wilton would threaten many aboriginal sites of archaeological significance 14.3 719
Gow, Dr LP 205.023 Draft EIS misleads public by stating that Tharawal and Illawarra land councils gave conditional approval to proposal 14.4 719
Gow, Dr LP 205.024 Agrees with Draft EIS that insufficient time was set aside for negotiation with Aboriginal communities 14.4 720
Gow, Dr LP 205.025 Asks on what occasion Consultants approached Tharawal and Illawarra land councils and since they spoke with - discrepancy with views presented to Wilton Airport Resistance Committee 14.4 720
Gow, Dr LP 205.026 Average time taken by Sydney traveller to travel 97 km to Wilton would be 111 minutes 15.4 742
Gow, Dr LP 205.027 One-way taxi fare to Wilton would cost $60 to $80 15.4 742
Gow, Dr LP 205.028 International experience shows remote second airports are underutilized, and building them invites criticism for waste of public money 2.1 635
Gow, Dr LP 205.029 If Wilton were selected there would never be a second Sydney airport - it is too far, and the environmental problems are too difficult to overcome. 2.5 638
Graham, J 453.001 Opposes Wilton as site 17.1 756
Graham, J 453.002 No need for second Sydney airport. Upgrade and extend Kingsford-Smith Airport to cater for Sydney's needs 1.3 627
Graham, J 453.003 No need for second Sydney airport. Upgrade and extend Kingsford-Smith Airport to cater for Sydney's needs 1.5 633
Graham, J 453.004 If at Wilton is on water catchment land, which is needed so that future water supply may be assured 15.2 736
Graham, J 453.005 Concerned at effects on flora 16.1 749
Graham, J 453.006 Concerned at effects on fauna 16.2 751
Graham, J 453.007 Utilize Bankstown airport more fully 1.4 630
Green, RR Luddenham 335.001 Objects to Badgerys Creek 17.1 756
Green, RR 335.002 Draft EIS does not conform to the administrative procedures of APPENDIX A the Environment Protection (Impact of Proposals) Act 1974-1975 7.1 744
Green, RR 335.003 Impacts on people out of site boundary have not been addressed 9.2 674
Green, RR 335.004 Discusses objections to public information program 18.1 759
Green, RR 335.005 Suggests aerial photos used as part of house-count assessment are out of date 18.3 759
Green, RR 335.006 Cost of $12 million does not take into account fifty - house mismatch discovered March 1985. Estimate of acquisition costs at Badgerys Creek should total $75 million 9.1 668
Green, RR 335.007 Draft EIS incorrect in stating that site is not serviced by reticulated water 10.5 698
Green, RR 335.008 Airport should be sited where there are fewest people 17.2 757
Greenup, N Eaglesale 223.001 Opposed to airport at Wilton 17.1 756
Greenup, N 223.002 Adverse effects on water catchment of airport at Wilton 15.2 736
Greenup, N 223.003 Adverse effects on ecology of the area 16.1 749
Greenup, N 223.004 Adverse effects on ecology of the area 16.2 751
Greenup, N 223.005 Adverse social effects on people in the region 14.8 725
Greenup, N 223.006 Distance from Sydney would be a disadvantage of the Wilton site 15.4 742
Greenup, N 223.007 Airplanes would not want to duplicate facilities 2.4 637
Greenup, N 223.008 Difficult to justify a new airport - air movements at Kingsford-Smith Airport declining, and fuel and fare increases likely to reduce them further 1.2 624
Greenup, N 223.009 Kingsford-Smith Airport should be extended 1.3 627
Greenup, N 223.010 Severely affected areas around Kingsford-Smith Airport should be rezoned/redirected 1.3 627
Greenup, N 223.011 General Aviation should be dispersed to other airports 1.4 630
Greenway
Federal
Electorate
Council of Aust
Labor Party

Opposes expansion of Schofields, should Badgerys Creek site be
chosen

Horsley Park

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Horsley Park

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Horsley Park

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Horsley Park

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Horsley Park

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Wetherill Park

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Horsley Park

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Horsley Park

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Horsley Park

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Horsley Park

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Horsley Park

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Horsley Park

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Horsley Park

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

St Johns Park

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Kemps Creek

Protests at proposed siting of second Sydney airport at Badgerys Creek

Kemps Creek

Noise, day and night, would have serious effects, including
damage to hearing, for people within 25 ANF.P plus contours, yet
there would be no compensation

Kemps Creek

Air pollution would affect health

Kemps Creek

Few houses, if any, have been built to withstand vibration of
such magnitude

Kemps Creek

Queries wisdom of allowing nursing homes to be built in Kemps
Creek area

Kemps Creek

Since airport is to be non-commercial, industry would not
follow

Kemps Creek

Objects to second Sydney airport at Badgerys Creek

Kemps Creek

Concerned about noise at Kemps Creek

Kemps Creek

Concerned about air pollution at Kemps Creek

Kemps Creek

Airport could be sited in a national park without affecting
ecological balance

Kemps Creek

Lifestyle affected, yet no compensation for people just outside
the acquisition boundary

Blacktown

Draft EIS ignores findings of earlier studies, which indicate
option to prefer would be expansion of Kingsford-Smith Airport

Blacktown

Only justification offered in Draft EIS for rejecting a widely
spaced parallel runway (at Kingsford-Smith Airport) is that it
is not politically feasible

Blacktown

Queries need for second Sydney airport. Total aircraft
movements declining

Blacktown

Computer and General Aviation will in long term also decline

Blacktown

A complementary airport strategy, instead of a replacement
second Sydney airport, should be investigated

Blacktown

Secondary airports overseas have not been successful

Blacktown

Draft EIS study is a deliberate attempt to mislead public on
some important aspects

Blacktown

Draft EIS uses worst case for negative environmental factors
but best case for employment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS COMMENT NO</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</th>
<th>DRAFT EIS PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>No jobs would be created if site merely acquired</td>
<td>9.6 682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>No jobs would be created if site merely acquired</td>
<td>14.6 722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>Jobs would be lost from Kingsford-Smith Airport surrounds, if some airport and airport associated industries were to leave</td>
<td>9.6 682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>Jobs would be lost from Kingsford-Smith Airport surrounds, if some airport and airport associated industries were to leave</td>
<td>14.6 722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>Jobs would be lost when businesses within the acquisition area for the second Sydney airport closed down</td>
<td>9.6 682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>Jobs would be lost when businesses within the acquisition area for the second Sydney airport closed down</td>
<td>14.6 722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>Acquisition area should be larger to allow for expansion of airport</td>
<td>8.3 661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>Property would be acquired at values depressed by years of uncertainty</td>
<td>9.1 668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>Acquisition payments should reflect current market values in comparable areas not affected by uncertainty connected with second Sydney airport</td>
<td>9.1 668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>Areas severely affected by noise should be acquired</td>
<td>9.2 674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>Acquisition costs have been underestimated</td>
<td>9.1 668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>No compensation for planning blight</td>
<td>9.1 668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>No compensation for planning blight</td>
<td>14.1 713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>Acquisition payment would diminish, in real terms, over the course of time taken for settling all claims</td>
<td>9.1 668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>Concerned about expenses currently not allowable in compensation claims</td>
<td>9.1 668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>ANEF contours were based on studies of communities already living in noisy ambient conditions</td>
<td>9.2 674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>ANEF contours were based on studies of communities already living in noisy ambient conditions</td>
<td>14.2 715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>Aboriginal and European heritage was considered only for site itself</td>
<td>9.3 680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>ANEF contours did not take account of site-specific topographic features</td>
<td>9.2 674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>ANEF contours did not take account of site-specific topographic features</td>
<td>14.2 715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>Draft EIS gives insufficient weighting to impact of night-time noise</td>
<td>9.2 674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Npean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don For Planning</td>
<td>Draft EIS gives insufficient weighting to impact of night-time noise</td>
<td>14.2 715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</td>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.031</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not show why second Sydney airport should be curfew-free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.032</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not show why second Sydney airport should be curfew-free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.033</td>
<td>Development of site would destroy Aboriginal relics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.034</td>
<td>Development of site would destroy Aboriginal relics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.035</td>
<td>European heritage value given very low weighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.036</td>
<td>European heritage value given very low weighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.037</td>
<td>Economic analysis is insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.038</td>
<td>Economic analysis is insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.039</td>
<td>Queries whether both sites would have equal employment generating characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.040</td>
<td>Queries whether both sites would have equal employment generating characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.041</td>
<td>Draft EIS should not have assumed employment multipliers currently found at Kingsford-Smith Airport would apply to Badgerys Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.042</td>
<td>Draft EIS should not have assumed employment multipliers currently found at Kingsford-Smith Airport would apply to Wilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.043</td>
<td>If presence of second Sydney airport eventually influences location of a very large number of people in west and south west, it could exacerbate employment problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.044</td>
<td>Choice of Badgerys Creek site would sterilize clay/shale resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.045</td>
<td>Choice of Wilton site would sterilize coal resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.046</td>
<td>Agricultural impact likely to be broader than shown in Draft EIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.047</td>
<td>Agricultural impact likely to be broader than shown in Draft EIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.048</td>
<td>Effect on landscape generally is understated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.049</td>
<td>Effect on landscape generally is understated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.050</td>
<td>In emergency, fuel could not be dumped into sea, and so would be potential source of pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.051</td>
<td>In emergency, fuel could not be dumped into sea, and so would be potential source of pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/Don Fox Planning</td>
<td>264.052</td>
<td>Impact on fauna would not be restricted to site, as suggested by Draft EIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/DoF For Planning

264.053 Impact on fauna would not be restricted to site, as suggested by Draft EIS

16.2 751

Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/DoF For Planning

264.054 Draft EIS ignores continuing tendency of international airlines to make Melbourne their turn-around base

1.2 624

Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges Rivers AAC/DoF For Planning

264.055 Development of either site would destroy Aboriginal relics

17.2 757

Herot, HT Horsley Park

41.000 For summary of comments, see submission no. B. Love, L

* * 756

Higgins, T Eglington

59.001 Suggests using Canberra as an international airport in lieu of second Sydney airport

6.8 658

Hill, C Badgerys Creek

380.001 Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek

17.1 756

Hill, C

380.002 Relocation would mean moving so far out, in order to breed dogs, that husband would have to give up his job

9.1 668

Hill, C

380.003 If they did not relocate, air pollution would affect family's health

10.3 493

Hill, C

380.004 If they did not relocate, noise pollution would affect family's health

9.2 674

Niroto, R Horsley Park

418.000 For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J

* * 756

Hoare, HR Wilton

195.001 Issue of compensation for those outside the acquisition area

14.2 715

Hoare, HR

195.002 Better solution would be to meet increased demand by using Richmond, Kingsford-Smith Airport and other General Aviation facilities, and transfer Defence facilities elsewhere

1.3 627

Hoare, HR

195.003 Noise contours do not take into account effects of elevation on site

14.2 715

Hoare, HR

195.004 Risk to water supply from pollution

15.2 726

Hoare, HR

195.005 Potential bird hazard to aircraft

16.2 525

Hoare, HR

195.006 Better solution would be to meet increased demand by using Richmond, Kingsford-Smith Airport and other General Aviation facilities, and transfer Defence facilities elsewhere

1.4 630

Hoare, RJT & CA Wilton

233.001 Air pollution significant on local scale

15.3 739

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.002 Frequency of fog at Wilton high

15.3 739

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.003 Draft EIS did not address effects of noise-induced stress and loss of habitat on important koala colonies at site

16.2 751

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.004 Draft EIS should have considered effects of airport on platypus

16.2 751

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.005 Draft EIS did not detail methods of preventing burrowing species such as wombats from straying onto airport

16.2 751

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.006 Draft EIS did not consider effect of airport noise on bats

16.2 751

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.007 It was indefensible to exclude Somersby from short list of sites and leave Wilton in

6.5 653

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.008 Report on site ranking, referred to by Minister in September 1984, was not even written until November 1984

6.8 658

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.009 Inconsistent to exclude national parks as potential sites while including water catchment areas

3.6 640

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.010 Water Board not consulted until after September 1984

15.2 736

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.011 Protection proposed for catchment areas inadequate

15.2 736

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.012 Run-off from tarmac areas should be treated as polluted

15.2 736

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.013 Draft EIS does not address problem of containment of run-off during relocation of Mount Keira Road, and relocation of gas pipeline, transmission line and wastewater line

15.2 736

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.014 Effect of water pollution in Nepean River between Allens Creek and Camden not adequately considered

15.2 736

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.015 Wildlife study limited and may have failed to detect some species

16.2 751

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.016 No attempt to consider effect on wildlife outside airport boundary

16.2 751

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.017 Flocks of birds such as cockatoos would create extremely hazardous conditions

16.2 751

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.018 Methods of bird control not detailed - most methods, such as use of defoliants, incompatible with water catchment site

16.2 751

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.019 'Worst case' scenario would become a reality very quickly at Wilton - it at Badgerys Creek it might never occur

17.2 757

Hoare, RJT & CA

233.020 Badgerys Creek the more viable site - and disrupts a relatively small number of people

17.2 757
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMENT NO</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</th>
<th>DRAFT EIS SECTION</th>
<th>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoare, RJT &amp; CA</td>
<td>233.021</td>
<td>Airport complementary to Kingsford-Smith Airport would only need short runways, and hence could be located in area closer to Sydney, such as Holsworthy, Richmond or Schofields</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoare, RJT &amp; CA</td>
<td>233.022</td>
<td>Airport complementary to Kingsford-Smith Airport would only need short runways, and hence could be located in area closer to Sydney, such as Holsworthy, Richmond or Schofields</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoare, RJT &amp; CA</td>
<td>233.023</td>
<td>Draft EIS should have included some discussion of the search for a third London airport</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>679</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoare, RJT &amp; CA</td>
<td>233.024</td>
<td>Wilton is too far out to become a viable airport</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoare, RJT &amp; CA</td>
<td>233.025</td>
<td>Query Draft EIS projections for annual aircraft movements - little confidence placed in forecasting</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoare, RJT &amp; CA</td>
<td>233.026</td>
<td>Growth figures considered artificial, as computer services are operated in subsidized environment</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoare, RJT &amp; CA</td>
<td>233.027</td>
<td>Predictions of growth fail to take into account progress in aircraft technology, allowing bigger passenger loads</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoare, RJT &amp; CA</td>
<td>233.028</td>
<td>Use of smaller aircraft will not increase number of movements, only cost effectiveness of aircraft</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoare, RJT &amp; CA</td>
<td>233.029</td>
<td>Remoteness of Wilton site would ensure it received only small proportion of Sydney market</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoare, RJT &amp; CA</td>
<td>233.030</td>
<td>Any improvement in road system would only amplify discrepancy in travel times between Badgerys Creek and Wilton</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoare, RJT &amp; CA</td>
<td>233.031</td>
<td>Existing airports should first be utilized more fully. Using Wilton simply to supplement Kingsford-Smith Airport would be like having a parallel runway but 90 km away</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoare, RJT &amp; CA</td>
<td>233.032</td>
<td>Smaller airport complementary to Kingsford-Smith Airport could be closer to Sydney</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoare, RJT &amp; CA</td>
<td>233.033</td>
<td>Questionable whether second Sydney airport at Wilton would ever receive even 10% of the traffic of Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoare, RJT &amp; CA</td>
<td>233.034</td>
<td>More information requested on fuel storage</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>708</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan, H</td>
<td>399.001</td>
<td>Refute the air traffic forecasts for Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan, H</td>
<td>399.002</td>
<td>Concerned that acquisition payments may be insufficient to relocate at same living standard</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan, H</td>
<td>399.003</td>
<td>Choice of second Sydney airport site has been a cynical political decision that will impose the hardship and injustice of land resumption on many</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan, H</td>
<td>399.004</td>
<td>Local and State Government information was consulted prior to house purchase, but both sources proved incorrect concerning Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan, H</td>
<td>399.005</td>
<td>Sydney Region Outline Plan (1968) did not show present short-listed sites as among feasible ones for second Sydney airport</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes, G</td>
<td>248.001</td>
<td>Airport at Badgerys Creek would adversely affect lifestyle</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes, G</td>
<td>248.002</td>
<td>Would increase air pollution in Sydney, especially in the western region</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes, G</td>
<td>248.003</td>
<td>Would increase general flow of vehicular traffic in the area</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes, G</td>
<td>248.004</td>
<td>Experience of living in Chiswick gives rise to concern over twenty-four-hour operation of airport</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes, G</td>
<td>248.005</td>
<td>Twenty-five per cent of all flights would pass over his general area, creating considerable noise</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes, G</td>
<td>248.006</td>
<td>Wilton would be the better site for second Sydney airport on the basis of lower land acquisition costs</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes, G</td>
<td>248.007</td>
<td>Wilton would be the better site for second Sydney airport because it would affect fewer people</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes, G</td>
<td>248.008</td>
<td>Wilton would be the better site for second Sydney airport because less agricultural land would be lost</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoomefield, B</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood, B</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood, J</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood, T</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>Agrees with wisdom of acquiring land for future airport needs</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>Compliments Department of Aviation on very comprehensive study</td>
<td>PREFACE</td>
<td>622</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
<td>DRAFT EIS SECTION</td>
<td>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliments Commonwealth and State Governments for ending uncertainty</td>
<td>PREFACE</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fears urban blight after site is selected - a vast rural/urban slum could be created</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.006</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertainty of location of 20 ANEF contour - possibility it would include other suburbs with dense population such as the 'Parks' district</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.007</td>
<td></td>
<td>Claims quoted difference in number of people affected at Badgerys Creek and Wilton is incorrect, because much expensive housing development has occurred at Badgerys Creek since houses were counted</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Southerly-to-westerly winds and valley contours would alter position of ANEF contours</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.009</td>
<td></td>
<td>No indication ever given that area would be shared with an airport</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Areas within the 20-30 ANEF contours should be acquired on moral grounds, but sum involved could not be justified to ratepayers of Australia</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Airport would affect three schools in area</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Airport would adversely affect Fairfield District Hospital, at Horsley Park</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Airport would adversely affect Horsley homestead</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency dumping of fuel would affect water quality, especially in Prospect Reservoir</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.015</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reference in Draft EIS to risk when aircraft approaching over populated areas also applies to Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kingsford-Smith Airport redevelopment should be undertaken with imagination - no funds available if spent on Badgerys Creek acquisition</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill for Botany Bay runways could be supplied from back-loading on coastal vessels</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft EIS does not address problem of temperature inversions and their effects on noise transmission</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.019</td>
<td></td>
<td>Claims that 20 ANEF contour unreliable because of lack of input data</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Figures for employment are questioned</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in rates would be accruable to council but costs of road maintenance would not be</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.022</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blight on land values in areas</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.023</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisition cost is seriously underestimated</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.024</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reason for second Sydney airport is debatable</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.025</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commuter activity too high at Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>7.026</td>
<td></td>
<td>House population count of areas affected outside boundary are inaccurate</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
<td>DRAFT EIS SECTION</td>
<td>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>Greenfield Park</td>
<td>120.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes Federal Electorate Council of Aust Labor Party</td>
<td>Menai</td>
<td>385.001</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutton, RH</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>107.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra Natural History Society</td>
<td>Keiraville</td>
<td>325.001</td>
<td>Objects to Wilton site being developed as an airport</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra Natural History Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>325.002</td>
<td>Catchment area should be retained for purpose of water catchment - Draft EIS should consider high value of this use</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra Natural History Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>325.003</td>
<td>Removal of water catchment from protection sets undesirable precedent</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra Natural History Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>325.004</td>
<td>Airport construction would result in a deterioration in water quality, and loss of a portion of the water</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra Natural History Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>325.005</td>
<td>Cost of water treatment facility that would be necessary at Wilton, not given sufficient prominence in Draft EIS</td>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra Natural History Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>325.006</td>
<td>Airport at Wilton would seriously affect fauna, especially healthy koala communities</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra Natural History Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>325.007</td>
<td>Site of high ecological value because of its undisturbed condition, and situation as a portion of an extensive bushland area - dissection of bushland undesirable</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra Natural History Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>325.008</td>
<td>Development of Wilton would sterilize millions of dollars worth of mineral resources</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra Natural History Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>325.009</td>
<td>Site ranking was incorrect in number of ways - Badgerys Creek is far and above the most favoured site</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra Natural History Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>325.010</td>
<td>Wilton site is of greater archaeological value than Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra Natural History Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>325.011</td>
<td>Travel times too great for second airport to be located at Wilton</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra Natural History Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>325.012</td>
<td>First recommendation of MANS Study was for a second runway at Kingsford-Smith Airport. Next, it favoured a second Sydney airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irad, E</td>
<td>Kemps Creek</td>
<td>354.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 353, Fangallo, R</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italiano, M</td>
<td>Wetherill Park</td>
<td>117.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson-Hope, D</td>
<td>Springwood</td>
<td>222.001</td>
<td>Draft EIS has not addressed the alternatives of an additional runway at Kingsford-Smith Airport, or moving General Aviation to Schofields and Camden</td>
<td>PREFACE</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson-Hope, D</td>
<td></td>
<td>222.002</td>
<td>Draft EIS has not considered impacts of land resumption required for access and other airport related uses</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson-Hope, D</td>
<td></td>
<td>222.003</td>
<td>Draft EIS too lengthy, and is therefore very difficult to assess</td>
<td>PREFACE</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson-Hope, D</td>
<td></td>
<td>222.004</td>
<td>Disposal of quarantined wastes has not been addressed</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson-Hope, D</td>
<td></td>
<td>222.005</td>
<td>Disposal of quarantined wastes has not been addressed</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson-Hope, D</td>
<td></td>
<td>222.006</td>
<td>Disposal of treated sewage to Hawkesbury-Nepean River system not environmentally acceptable</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson-Hope, D</td>
<td></td>
<td>222.007</td>
<td>Disposal of treated sewage to Hawkesbury-Nepean River system not environmentally acceptable</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson-Hope, D</td>
<td></td>
<td>222.008</td>
<td>ANEF system based on urban environment and not applicable to rural area</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson-Hope, D</td>
<td></td>
<td>222.009</td>
<td>Calls for a Commission of Enquiry to handle objections to proposal at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>PREFACE</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson-Hope, D</td>
<td></td>
<td>222.010</td>
<td>Inadequate consideration given to high speed rail as alternative to air travel</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson-Hope, D</td>
<td></td>
<td>222.011</td>
<td>Draft EIS did not consider possible pollution of groundwater from sewage effluent irrigation</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins, R</td>
<td>Woolloomore</td>
<td>271.001</td>
<td>Against airport at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins, R</td>
<td></td>
<td>271.002</td>
<td>Adverse effects on water catchment of airport at Wilton</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins, R</td>
<td></td>
<td>271.003</td>
<td>Adverse effects on ecology of the area</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins, R</td>
<td></td>
<td>271.004</td>
<td>Adverse effects on ecology of the area</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jenkins, R

271.005 Airport and inevitable population growth following it would ruin rural lifestyle

271.006 Distance from Sydney would add on intolerable increase in travelling time and expense, for passengers and cargo

271.007 Connecting flights impossible to organize with present road and rail system

271.008 Coal reserve is investment in the future

271.009 Increased cost of airport due to construction in a mine subsidence area

Johnson, T

247.000 For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J

Johnston, E

194.000 For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L

Johnston, G

193.000 For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Lave, L

Kolbezen, A

262.000 For summary of comments, see submission nos 223, Greenup, N, 271, Jenkins, R, and 273, Wilson, T

Kerfoot, H

298.000 For summary of comments, in addition to those below, see submission no. 8, Lave, L

Kerfoot, H

298.001 Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek

Kerfoot, H

298.002 Effects of noise in 20 ANEF contour not believed, expects greater disturbance than indicated

Kerr, BA

218.001 Objects to siting airport at Badgerys Creek

Kerr, BA

218.002 Concern for air quality at Badgerys Creek - effect of sea breeze and calms - ideal conditions for temperature inversions, and would be aggravated by night operations

Kervroeden, J

302.001 Considers use of catchment area for Wilton airport as criminal and a political decision

Kilpatrick, C

28.000 For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L

Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo, Kuweba, Oh, Tsang & Judge

337.001 Forecasts questionable - authors argue that extrapolation of trend lines without change in variables is not rigorous enough

Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo, Kuweba, Oh, Tsang & Judge

337.002 Runway capacity work too simple

Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo, Kuweba, Oh, Tsang & Judge

337.003 Do not agree with argument that second runway at Kingsford-Smith Airport would only defer need for second Sydney airport

Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo, Kuweba, Oh, Tsang & Judge

337.004 Statement that General Aviation aerodromes have little scope for expansion is not substantiated

Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo, Kuweba, Oh, Tsang & Judge

337.005 The alternative sites are not fundamentally different

Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo, Kuweba, Oh, Tsang & Judge

337.006 Site ranking matrix methodology does not cover all the variables

Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo, Kuweba, Oh, Tsang & Judge

337.007 Discuss various deficiencies in matrix method - state that matrix is principal means of selecting Wilton and Badgerys Creek

Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo, Kuweba, Oh, Tsang & Judge

337.008 Matrix weighting not justified in Draft EIS - inconsistent and subjective

Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo, Kuweba, Oh, Tsang & Judge

337.009 Question validity of dividing sites into closer and mid-distance

Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo, Kuweba, Oh, Tsang & Judge

337.010 Heavy vehicle emissions on access routes and effects of smell on surrounding land uses not considered

Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo, Kuweba, Oh, Tsang & Judge

337.011 Heavy vehicle emissions on access routes and effects of smell on surrounding land uses not considered

Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo, Kuweba, Oh, Tsang & Judge

337.012 Dust pollution during construction not mentioned
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</th>
<th>COMMENT NO</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</th>
<th>DRAFT EIS SECTION</th>
<th>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.013</td>
<td>Relocation of and compensation to displaced population should have been quantified</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.014</td>
<td>Criticize slight nature of public participation content in production of Draft EIS</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.015</td>
<td>Criticize Draft EIS for not considering injurious affection</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.016</td>
<td>Criticize Draft EIS for not considering injurious affection</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.017</td>
<td>Consideration of effects on local development inadequate</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.018</td>
<td>Consideration of effects on local development inadequate</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.019</td>
<td>Suggest 400 Hz power to eliminate use of ancillary power units, and underground fuel lines rather than tankers to reduce noise</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.020</td>
<td>Suggest 400 Hz power to eliminate use of ancillary power units, and underground fuel lines rather than tankers to reduce noise</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.021</td>
<td>Long term economic effects on rural industry not covered in Draft EIS</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.022</td>
<td>Draft EIS preoccupied with archaeology, concerns of Aboriginal people and European heritage, to the detriment of its treatment of economic effects, agriculture, and regional planning and development</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.023</td>
<td>More detailed investigation into social and economic implications of not extracting existing coal deposits needs to be undertaken</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.024</td>
<td>Critical of treatment of clay/shale resources at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.025</td>
<td>Final EIS needs more detail of water treatment methods</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.026</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not consider water contamination by vehicle emissions</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.027</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not consider water contamination by vehicle emissions</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.028</td>
<td>Critical of lack of discussion of lead concentrations in section on air quality</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.029</td>
<td>Critical of lack of discussion of lead concentrations in section on air quality</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.030</td>
<td>Inversions need to be assessed</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.031</td>
<td>Inversions need to be assessed</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.032</td>
<td>Critical of figures used in Table 10.3.2, page 296</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.033</td>
<td>Critical of figures used in Table 15.3.2, page 477</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo- Kuwebwa, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.034</td>
<td>Effects of higher air pollution levels need to be addressed</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
<td>DRAFT EIS SECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo-Kuwewba, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.035</td>
<td>Effects of higher air pollution levels need to be addressed</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo-Kuwewba, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.036</td>
<td>Means of safeguarding air quality - such as adequate pollution monitoring - not discussed in Draft EIS</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo-Kuwewba, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.037</td>
<td>Public information programme should be restructured and should elicit and use information from the public</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo-Kuwewba, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.038</td>
<td>In their conclusions, generally critical of the whole Draft EIS</td>
<td>PREFACE</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo-Kuwewba, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.039</td>
<td>Relocation of and compensation to displaced population should have been quantified</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Young, Kikonyogo-Kuwewba, Oh, Tsang &amp; Judge</td>
<td>337.040</td>
<td>Dust pollution during construction not mentioned</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J

Knox, J

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMENT NO</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</th>
<th>DRAFT EIS SECTION</th>
<th>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Park</td>
<td>362.001</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Park</td>
<td>362.002</td>
<td>No need for second Sydney airport - reallocation of Kingsford-Smith Airport would solve problem of congestion</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.003</td>
<td>Decline of aircraft movements</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.004</td>
<td>Commuter and General Aviation to be moved out of Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.005</td>
<td>Destruction of flora a major concern</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.006</td>
<td>Destruction of faunal habitat a major concern</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.007</td>
<td>Quality of water supply could not be guaranteed and cost to purify is not accurate</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.008</td>
<td>Pollution of river system a major concern</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.009</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not state the significance of catchment area to the National Estate</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.010</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not outline effects of polluting water supply</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.011</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not consider groundwater pollution</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.012</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not state that Wilton was previously rejected on environmental grounds</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.013</td>
<td>The coal resource that would be sterilized equates to mine-employment for 300-400 men for about twenty-five years</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.014</td>
<td>Draft EIS understates significance of coal mines</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.015</td>
<td>Wilton site has several fault lines</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.016</td>
<td>Wilton site would suffer from many fogs</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.017</td>
<td>Wilton site would suffer from bird strikes</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.018</td>
<td>Wilton site would suffer from bushfire smoke</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.019</td>
<td>Cost of relocating existing facilities understated</td>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.020</td>
<td>No airline would want to duplicate facilities</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.021</td>
<td>Employment opportunities grossly overstated</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.022</td>
<td>No mention in Draft EIS that some airlines do not want another airport</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.023</td>
<td>Distance-time factor underestimated for Wilton</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.024</td>
<td>Cost of construction at Wilton exceeds that at Padgerya Creek site</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.025</td>
<td>No consideration given in Draft EIS to the question of where airport users live</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.026</td>
<td>Intending passengers would not want to use trains in preference to private vehicles</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>362.027</td>
<td>Catchment land significant to Aboriginal people</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>196.001</td>
<td>Opposed to both airport sites as they are both within catchment of Nepean River</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>196.002</td>
<td>Opposed to both airport sites as they are both within catchment of Nepean River</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>196.003</td>
<td>Under certain weather conditions, air pollution would not disperse but accumulate in the Nepean and Warragamba Valleys</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, J</td>
<td>196.004</td>
<td>Products of combustion and unburnt fuel or dumped fuel could affect people, vegetation, crops, dairy cattle, milk, etc.</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Krix, E

196.006  Noise propagation affected by weather conditions and hills
9.2  674

Krix, E

196.006  Regulations covering water quality might not be adhered to
10.2  670

Krix, E

196.007  Existing airport, if modified, would be adequate if population remains at reasonable level
1.3  627

Krix, E

196.008  Second airport is expected to bring in overseas money, but it would not give much benefit to man in the street
9.6  682

Krix, E

196.009  Money would be better spent on improving air and water quality
1.3  627

Krix, E

196.010  Health and television reception are affected by radar
9.2  674

Kyriakos, F

St Johns Park

445.006  For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J
*  *

Laird, PG

Keiraville

334.001  Objects to airport at Wilton
17.1  756

Laird, PG

334.002  Draft EIS has not proved need for second airport
1.3  627

Laird, PG

334.003  Considers Kingsford-Smith Airport should be developed further
1.3  627

Laird, PG

334.004  New General Aviation airport might be needed
1.4  630

Laird, PG

334.005  Suggests that savings in travel time and transport costs would soon account for price difference between Wilton and Badgerys Creek
17.2  757

Laird, PG

334.006  Opposes Wollongong Chamber of Commerce's support for Wilton site, which would not provide employment in near future
14.6  722

Laird, PG

334.007  Compares Wilton to situation at Montreal, where little use is made of Mirabel airport
2.1  635

Lave, L

Horsley Park

8.001  Cost of acquisition of Badgerys Creek not justified
9.1  668

Lave, L

8.002  Accepts need for selection of site for second Sydney airport
3.7  642

Lave, L

8.003  In favour of acquiring Wilton site
17.1  756

Lave, L

8.004  Kingsford-Smith Airport should be expanded and redesigned
1.3  627

Lave, L

8.005  This submission also supports comments made by the Horsley Park Protection Co-operative Ltd (submission no. 7)
*  *

Leach, A

Wilton

277.001  Gravely concerned at proposed siting of airport at Wilton
17.1  756

Leach, A

277.002  Lifestyle affected
9.2  674

Leach, A

277.003  Most sensible and feasible decision would be to extend and upgrade Kingsford-Smith Airport
1.3  627

Leach, A

277.004  Wilton is too far from Sydney
15.4  742

Leach, A

277.005  Wilton is too valuable environmentally for use as airport site
16.2  751

Leach, A

277.006  Implies choice of Wilton would involve loss of valuable coal and associated employment
15.1  728

Lebusque, M

Badgerys Creek

283.001  Opposed to airport at Badgerys Creek
17.1  756

Lebusque, M

283.002  Draft EIS does not mention that three cemeteries are located within airport site
9.5  681

Lebusque, M

283.003  Community Access Bus was not available at times when people returning from work at a late hour could attend
18.9  761

Lebusque, M

283.004  Compensation should be available to businesses in area already suffering
9.2  674

Lebusque, M

283.005  Relocation hard on older people
9.1  668

Lebusque, M

283.006  Community Access Bus should have been manned also by officers from Department of Local Government and Administrative Services
18.9  761

Lebusque, M

283.007  Should be some compensation for descendants of district's pioneers, for loss of family heritage
9.2  674

Law, D

Horsley Park

77.000  For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J
*  *

Leen, L

Badgerys Creek

125.000  For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J
*  *

Leisure Coast Tourist Assoc

Wollongong

58.001  Supports airport at Wilton
17.1  756

Leisure Coast Tourist Assoc

58.002  Would have beneficial effect on local economy, attracting employment and tourism
14.6  722

Lewin, LR

Mount Druitt

201.001  Opposed to airport at Badgerys Creek
17.1  756

Lewin, LR

201.002  Noise would affect populated areas of western Sydney, despite measures to minimize it
9.2  674

Lewin, LR

201.003  Hazardous to operate aircraft over large populated areas
8.7  645

Lewin, LR

201.004  Preferable to look for site elsewhere, or to extend Kingsford-Smith Airport
5.6  640

Lewis, A

Phoenants Nest

228.000  For summary of comments, see submission nos 223, Greenup, N, 270, Wilson, B, 271, Jenkins, R, and 273, Wilson, T
*  *

Liverpool City Council

Liverpool

458.001  Is opposed to an airport at Badgerys Creek, and endorses the submissions made by the Hawkesbury/Nepean/Georges River Anti-Airport Committee and the Badgerys Creek Anti-Airport Group
17.1  756
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION

AUTHOR(S) OF
SUBMISSION

ADDRESS

AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION

AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION

DRAFT EIS
SECTION

SUPPLEMENT
PAGE

Liverpool City Council

458.002

Disadvantages to Liverpool community from airport would outweigh advantages, and Council would suffer a loss of income

9.8

688

Liverpool City Council

458.003

Noise from airport would severely affect urban development at Penrith and St Marys as well as non-urban areas around the site

9.2

674

Liverpool City Council

458.004

Airport might require relocation of Kingswood Central Ammunitions Depot

9.8

688

Liverpool City Council

458.005

Airport would interfere with General Aviation airports in the south-west zone. Much activity would need to be relocated

8.6

663

Liverpool City Council

458.006

Airport would adversely affect property values

9.1

668

Liverpool City Council

458.007

Significant clay/shale resource would be lost if airport were eventually built

10.1

691

Liverpool City Council

458.008

Opposes the acquisition of Luddenham Showground, which an Airport might require relocation of Kingswood Central Ammunitions Depot

9.1

668

Lomas, T, A

Horsley Park

284.000

For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J

Lambard, V & V

Horsley Park

192.000

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Longley, M & R

Silverdale

368.001

Oppose airport at Badgerys Creek

17.1

756

Longley, M & R

Silverdale

368.002

Possible airport has been hanging over residents for at least fifteen years

18.9

761

Longley, M & R

Silverdale

368.003

Time of visits by Community Access Bus were inconvenient for most people

3.7

647

Longley, M & R

Silverdale

368.004

Government should spend money on social welfare and education, not on airports

1.3

627

Longley, M & R

Silverdale

368.006

Upgrading and better organization of traffic at Kingsford-Smith Airport a logical solution

1.3

627

Longley, M & R

Silverdale

368.007

Compensation to people outside boundary should be made

9.2

674

Lotorto, V

Keeps Creek

180.000

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Luddenham Agricultural & Horticultural Show Society

Luddenham

315.001

Opposes siting of an airport at Badgerys Creek

17.1

756

Luddenham Agricultural & Horticultural Show Society

Luddenham

315.002

Opposes the acquisition of Luddenham Showground, which an Airport would eventually entail

9.1

668

Lukic, R

Wetherill Park

121.000

For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J

Lumsden, P

Blaxland

312.001

Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek

17.1

756

Lumsden, P

Blaxland

312.002

Areas shown on the map as inside ANEF contours too small, not realistic

9.2

674

Lumsden, P

Blaxland

312.003

There is a lack of frankness about the aircraft noise problem at the proposed site

9.2

674

Lumsden, P

Blaxland

312.004

Wilton better alternative, as it has few people

14.8

725

Lumsden, P

Blaxland

312.005

High speed rail link would inevitably be needed

15.4

742

Lumsden, P

Blaxland

312.006

Technical staff would be recruited from all over Australia and other staff from all parts of metropolitan area, so few local employment benefits

9.6

682

Lumsden, P

Blaxland

312.007

Consider that main support for airport at Badgerys Creek comes from a group representing narrow business interests

16.6

760

Lumsden, P

Blaxland

312.008

Wilton better alternative, as acquisition costs would be much lower

17.1

756

Lynch, J

Bringelly

367.001

Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek

17.1

756

Lynch, J

Bringelly

367.002

Population affected is too numerous to site airport in area

9.1

668

Lynch, J

Bringelly

367.003

Population affected is too numerous to site airport in area

17.1

756

Lynch, J

Bringelly

367.004

Travelling time to airport is not of more importance than is disruption to people

10.4

696

Lynch, J

Bringelly

367.005

Wilton is preferable site because destruction of natural habitats is better than disrupting human life

17.2

757

Lynch, J

Bringelly

367.006

Compensation should be made to people outside boundary

9.2

674

Magri, T

St John's Park

447.000

For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J

Manning, KS

Cecil Park

356.000

For summary of comments, see submission no. 353, Pangallo, R

Manninen, P

Cecil Park

363.000

For summary of comments, see submission no. 352, Andrich, R

Mansueto, L

Horsley Park

159.000

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Mansueto, M

Horsley Park

162.000

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Marshall, R

South Penrith

450.001

Opposed to airport at Badgerys Creek

17.1

756
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMENT NO</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</th>
<th>DRAFT EIS SECTION</th>
<th>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marshall, R</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>450.002</td>
<td>Concern expressed about noise levels at Penrith</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall, R</td>
<td>Morena</td>
<td>450.003</td>
<td>Objects that the date of decision has been extended so often</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall, R</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>450.004</td>
<td>Draws attention to frequency of foogs in Badgerys Creek area</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall, R</td>
<td>Morena</td>
<td>450.005</td>
<td>Upgrade and extend Kingsford-Smith Airport, and then there would be no need for second Sydney airport</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall, R</td>
<td>Morena</td>
<td>450.006</td>
<td>Wilton site preferable to Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martignago, G</td>
<td>Morena</td>
<td>185.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, D</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>257.001</td>
<td>Opposed to development of Wilton site</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, D</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>257.002</td>
<td>Wilton is not a good site because of extra cost of landfill</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, D</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>257.003</td>
<td>Wilton is not a good site because of the risk of water pollution in a large catchment area</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, D</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>257.004</td>
<td>Wilton is an unacceptable distance from Sydney</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, D</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>257.005</td>
<td>Wilton lacks hospital facilities and any effective means of public transport in case of disaster</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, D</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>257.006</td>
<td>There would be a significant risk of adding to the incidence of serious bushfires</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, D</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>257.007</td>
<td>Environmental factors are numerous which would affect a population well beyond local residents, and should exclude development at Wilton</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, D</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>257.008</td>
<td>Ninety-five per cent of residents are against airport development at Wilton</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, D</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>257.009</td>
<td>Justify need for second Sydney airport, and decision not to expand Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, SP</td>
<td>Corinna</td>
<td>243.001</td>
<td>Supports choice of airport site at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, SP</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>243.002</td>
<td>Twenty-four hour airport needed in Sydney region</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, SP</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>243.003</td>
<td>Comments on perceived role</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, SP</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>243.004</td>
<td>Cites several advantages of Wilton: - cheaper - few people affected by acquisition - few people affected by noise - minimal effect on agriculture</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, SP</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>243.005</td>
<td>Although Wilton further from city centre than Badgerys Creek, it would easily serve south western region of Sydney</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, SP</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>243.006</td>
<td>High speed rail link and upgraded road network would aid in solving access problems from city centre</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, SP</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>243.007</td>
<td>Support voiced by major organizations</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, SP</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>243.008</td>
<td>Township of Wilton should not be adversely affected by the airport</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, SP</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>243.009</td>
<td>Urban sprawl will engulf rural communities in southern Sydney Region, whether airport is built or not</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, SP</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>243.010</td>
<td>Major employer - need for diversification in employment in the south western region</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, SP</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>243.011</td>
<td>Would stimulate tourism in region, increasing capital inflow and employment</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, SP</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>243.012</td>
<td>Widespread community support</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, SP</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>243.013</td>
<td>Suggests water protection proposals in Draft EIS could be used successfully - cites colliery system located within water catchment area</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, SP</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>243.014</td>
<td>Coal sterilization real problem, but there are ways around it</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, SP</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>243.015</td>
<td>Economic advantages outweigh environmental effects</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks, R</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>124.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>Unanderra</td>
<td>361.001</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>Unanderra</td>
<td>361.002</td>
<td>Second Sydney airport should not be located in the water catchment area</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>Unanderra</td>
<td>361.003</td>
<td>Possibility of aircraft accidents in the water catchment area</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>Unanderra</td>
<td>361.004</td>
<td>Possibility of fuel pollution in the water catchment area</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>Unanderra</td>
<td>361.005</td>
<td>Second Sydney airport located in the catchment area is contrary to the MWS&amp;DB policy of exclusion</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>Unanderra</td>
<td>361.006</td>
<td>Would set a precedent that would encourage other authorities to appeal to use the catchment area</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>Unanderra</td>
<td>361.007</td>
<td>Catchment area is virtually a national park, and this character would be adversely affected by selection as airport site</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>Unanderra</td>
<td>361.008</td>
<td>Natural reserves of the calibre of the catchment area are rare in New South Wales - it needs preservation</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
<td>DRAFT EIS SECTION</td>
<td>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.009</td>
<td>Koalas would be at risk if relocated</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.010</td>
<td>Several species of fauna have been missed in Draft EIS</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.011</td>
<td>Several species of fauna have been missed in Draft EIS</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.012</td>
<td>Koalas within the site are disease-free</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.013</td>
<td>Koalas would be at risk if relocated</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.014</td>
<td>Removal of forest would affect air quality</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.015</td>
<td>Further clearing needed for emergency access roads</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.016</td>
<td>Lopping of trees in approach path would break the natural vegetation cover and allow the introduction of exotic species</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.017</td>
<td>Base case for air pollution is incorrect - Wilton has cleaner air than Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.018</td>
<td>Noise pollution would affect the residents of Wilton</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.019</td>
<td>A second Sydney airport at Wilton would not attract patronage for a long time</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.020</td>
<td>Extensive cut-and-fill would be required at Wilton</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.021</td>
<td>No cost placed on water collection system around the airport boundary</td>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.022</td>
<td>Considering other cost factors, such as access costs, Wilton might become a marginal case on economic grounds</td>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.023</td>
<td>Job opportunities would not be the panacea for Wollongong's employment problems</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.024</td>
<td>Either site could create job opportunities</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.025</td>
<td>Jobs needed now, not in year 2000</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.026</td>
<td>Why has Bankstown a higher daily traffic rate than Kingsford-Smith Airport?</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.027</td>
<td>Why not develop other Sydney-based airports</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.028</td>
<td>With improved capacity elsewhere and more nationalized development and better management procedures at Kingsford-Smith Airport, the need for a second Sydney airport disappears</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.029</td>
<td>Higher user charges at Kingsford-Smith Airport would force operators to use other airports</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.030</td>
<td>Use Nowra for Armed Services operations and devote Richmond to civil aviation</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.031</td>
<td>Concerned at sterilization of coal reserves, if second Sydney airport at Wilton</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.032</td>
<td>Relocation of Mount Keira Road would be expensive, adding to Wilton development cost</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.033</td>
<td>River system and water catchment would be polluted by aircraft emissions</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.034</td>
<td>Flora would be affected by aircraft emissions</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.035</td>
<td>Wilton environmentally unacceptable</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.036</td>
<td>Wilton more expensive in terms of access</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.037</td>
<td>Wilton more expensive to operate and develop</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.038</td>
<td>Cheaper to acquire but more expensive in long term and in relation to water supply and natural heritage</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.039</td>
<td>Airport would have less detrimental effect on natural environment if placed in an area that is already partially degraded, and where urban growth is at all events bound to come shortly</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.040</td>
<td>If airport not constructed, Wilton would retain its rural character as long as area remains a water catchment</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.041</td>
<td>Wollongong does not need proximity of an airport to attract tourists, but better promotion of the City's unique features</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.042</td>
<td>If some other Sydney airport were enlarged to complement Kingsford-Smith Airport, passengers in transit could be catered for by a service of large helicopters</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masland, D</td>
<td>361.043</td>
<td>As an alternative, suggests siting the airport offshore, and disposing of Wollongong's industrial waste by making use of it as fill</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews, D</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews, D</td>
<td>322.001</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynell, JE &amp; LM</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynell, JE &amp; LM</td>
<td>208.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavloulis, JE &amp; LM</td>
<td>208.002</td>
<td>Residents of Rango and Yanderra would be directly under flight path</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(S) OF ADDRESS</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
<td>DRAFT EIS SECTION</td>
<td>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynall, JE &amp; R</td>
<td>Canley Vale</td>
<td>253.001</td>
<td>Object to second Sydney airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynall, JE &amp; R</td>
<td>Canley Vale</td>
<td>253.002</td>
<td>Financial burden of new airport plus infrastructure would be strain on economy</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynall, JE &amp; R</td>
<td>Canley Vale</td>
<td>253.003</td>
<td>Developing Kingsford-Smith Airport would be much more economic than second Sydney airport</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynall, JE &amp; R</td>
<td>Canley Vale</td>
<td>253.004</td>
<td>Noise-affected residents around Kingsford-Smith Airport built or bought in full knowledge that they were located close to airport</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynall, JE &amp; R</td>
<td>Canley Vale</td>
<td>253.005</td>
<td>Area around Badgerys Creek only land close to city suitable for small farming</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald, J &amp; R</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>253.006</td>
<td>Taking Army purchases of prime land into account, Commonwealth will soon create shortage of land suitable for agriculture</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald, J &amp; R</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>253.007</td>
<td>Choice of Wilton would cause much less trauma and affect far fewer people and their lifestyles</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald, J &amp; R</td>
<td>Bringley</td>
<td>253.008</td>
<td>Noise would affect Fairfield residents</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean, K</td>
<td>Bringley</td>
<td>419.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean, K</td>
<td>Bringley</td>
<td>419.002</td>
<td>Airport would destroy valued lifestyle</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean, M</td>
<td>Bringley</td>
<td>420.001</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean, M</td>
<td>Bringley</td>
<td>420.002</td>
<td>Level of noise pollution underestimated, as Badgerys Creek enjoys low background noise levels</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean, M</td>
<td>Bringley</td>
<td>420.003</td>
<td>Why is there no acquisition for people in intensive noise area outside boundaries?</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meager, B</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>15.0000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks, A</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>430.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission nos 223, Greenup, N, 270, Wilson, R, 271, Jenkins, K and 273, Wilson, T</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks, PJ</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>202.001</td>
<td>Opposes selection of a site for a second Sydney airport</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks, PJ</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>202.002</td>
<td>MWSS08 catchment area highly important as a buffer</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks, PJ</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>202.003</td>
<td>At least one additional site should have been studied</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks, PJ</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>202.004</td>
<td>Criteria for site selection should be reconsidered in light of low growth rate of NSW aviation</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks, PJ</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>202.005</td>
<td>Artificial growth in commuter and General Aviation due to subsidized operations</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks, PJ</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>202.006</td>
<td>Development of Sydney's already existing facilities and/or Richmond preferred</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks, PJ</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>202.007</td>
<td>Development of Sydney's already existing facilities and/or Richmond preferred</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks, PJ</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>202.008</td>
<td>Development of Sydney's already existing facilities and/or Richmond preferred</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks, PJ</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>202.009</td>
<td>Wilton is an area prone to major bush fires</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks, PJ</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>202.010</td>
<td>Contamination of catchment water far more difficult to avoid than Draft EIS suggests</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks, PJ</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>202.011</td>
<td>Class 'S' waters a very valuable resource. Purity would be threatened by wastes from aircraft both on site and in the air, and also from the concentration of people and motor vehicles</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks, PJ</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>202.012</td>
<td>Coal resources are not of poor quality as suggested in the Draft EIS</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks, PJ</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>202.013</td>
<td>Effects on flora would extend well beyond site boundaries</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks, PJ</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>202.014</td>
<td>Effects on fauna would extend well beyond site boundaries</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks, PJ</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>202.015</td>
<td>Value of land at Wilton greatly underestimated - no consideration of non-monetary values</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meigan, D &amp; K</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>440.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meteorology, Bureau of Melbourne</td>
<td>386.001</td>
<td>Meteorological data in Draft EIS are inadequate</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meteorology, Bureau of Melbourne</td>
<td>386.002</td>
<td>Figure 10.3.2 suggests winds were measured at Piton - leads to uncertainty in conclusions drawn from data</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meteorology, Bureau of Melbourne</td>
<td>386.003</td>
<td>Figure 10.3.2 suggests winds were measured at 9 a.m. only - leads to uncertainty in conclusions drawn from data</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meteorology, Bureau of</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meteorology, Bureau of</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>405.001</td>
<td>Opposed to Badgerys Creek site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezey, D</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td>314.001</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezey, J</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>446.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miletic, M</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>149.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills, C</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td>514.002</td>
<td>As a fourth generation resident of district, and now nearing retiring age, feels he faces impossible task relocating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills, C</td>
<td>Woona</td>
<td>514.003</td>
<td>Airport and airport associated roads, buildings and traffic would spoil many kilometres of peaceful rural land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills, C</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>514.004</td>
<td>Second Sydney airport should be sited where it would affect fewest people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills, K</td>
<td>Woona</td>
<td>240.001</td>
<td>Concerned at possible choice of Wilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills, K</td>
<td></td>
<td>240.002</td>
<td>Building airport at Wilton would involve largest single destruction of native vegetation since the nineteenth century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills, K</td>
<td></td>
<td>240.003</td>
<td>The site is situated in the Woronora catchment area and this could have serious consequences on the quality of water from this area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills, K</td>
<td></td>
<td>240.004</td>
<td>Area significant as wildlife habitat. Airport would decrease the area available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills, K</td>
<td></td>
<td>240.005</td>
<td>Relocation of powerlines, gas lines and roads would disturb greater area and destroy more vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills, K</td>
<td></td>
<td>240.006</td>
<td>Northern Welllongong would be affected by aircraft flying over at all hours of night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills, K &amp; W</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>40.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milosevic, K</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>148.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobbs, C</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>144.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffitt, M</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>128.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrant, SE</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>62.001</td>
<td>Implied criticism that too little account taken of impact on people, as opposed to that on environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrant, SE</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.002</td>
<td>Cost of land acquisition at Badgerys Creek underestimated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrant, SE</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.003</td>
<td>Access time to Badgerys Creek underestimated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrant, SE</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.004</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek site only affects 'little people' not Inghams, Boral Brick, CSIRO, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrant, SE</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.005</td>
<td>Photos displayed at Community Access Centre did not reveal extent of new housing at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrant, SE</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.006</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek flight path would extend over new hospital at Wetherill Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrant, SE</td>
<td>Picton</td>
<td>62.007</td>
<td>Officers manning Community Access Bus unhelpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, HF</td>
<td></td>
<td>241.001</td>
<td>Dissents from choice of Wilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, HF</td>
<td></td>
<td>241.002</td>
<td>Cost involved in purifying water, after airport became operational, was not adequately covered in Draft EIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, HF</td>
<td></td>
<td>241.003</td>
<td>Pollution from airport construction almost impossible to control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, HF</td>
<td></td>
<td>241.004</td>
<td>Prohibit small planes from taking off at Kingsford-Smith Airport, thus reducing congestion – use Mascot Park and Bankstown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss, RH</td>
<td>Address not supplied</td>
<td>278.001</td>
<td>Dissatisfied with choice of Badgerys Creek for airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
<td>DRAFT EIS SECTION</td>
<td>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW, M</td>
<td>Horsley</td>
<td>278.002</td>
<td>House in 50-55 ANF contour, yet apparently there would be no compensation</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW, M</td>
<td>Silverdale</td>
<td>278.003</td>
<td>Airport development would leave only a devalued property to pass on to children</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munro, B</td>
<td>Silverdale</td>
<td>369.001</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munro, B</td>
<td>Silverdale</td>
<td>369.002</td>
<td>Objects to noise</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munro, B</td>
<td>Silverdale</td>
<td>369.003</td>
<td>Air pollution would be particularly bad at Silverdale</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW Police Aero Club</td>
<td>Horsley</td>
<td>369.004</td>
<td>Concerned that many aviation and other activities would cease or be curtailed, if a second airport were developed</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW Police Aero Club</td>
<td>Horsley</td>
<td>369.005</td>
<td>Airport at Badgerys Creek would severely restrict training areas of Hoxton Park, Camden and Panatorium</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW Police Aero Club</td>
<td>Horsley</td>
<td>369.006</td>
<td>Suggested alternatives for existing aerodromes/airspace in the Badgerys Creek area are not viable</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW Police Aero Club</td>
<td>Horsley</td>
<td>369.007</td>
<td>Concern that acquiring land far in advance of construction may displace people unnecessarily</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW Police Aero Club</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>369.008</td>
<td>Town should be examined again as a possible site</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None &amp; address illegible</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>95.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None &amp; address illegible</td>
<td>Merrylands</td>
<td>35.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None &amp; address illegible</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>166.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nach, Rh</td>
<td>Bossley Park</td>
<td>178.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel, V</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>69.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks Association of NSW</td>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>436.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks Association of NSW</td>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>358.001</td>
<td>Too much land from the water catchment area would be used when all of it is required to serve a growing Sydney population</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks Association of NSW</td>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>358.002</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks Association of NSW</td>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>358.003</td>
<td>Too much land from the water catchment area would be used when all of it is required to serve a growing Sydney population</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks Association of NSW</td>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>358.004</td>
<td>How is the remaining area going to be protected from pollution due to fallout, roads, building, urban sprawl?</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks Association of NSW</td>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>358.005</td>
<td>Such large numbers of flora and fauna would be destroyed, that it could have serious consequences for endangered species</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks Association of NSW</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>358.006</td>
<td>Such large numbers of flora and fauna would be destroyed, that it could have serious consequences for endangered species</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks Association of NSW</td>
<td>Berries</td>
<td>423.000</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Wilton</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks Association of NSW</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>423.002</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Wilton due to effect on water catchment area</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newstead, WA</td>
<td>Berge</td>
<td>227.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 271, Jenkins, R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolovski, J</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>436.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble, B</td>
<td>Keppel Creek</td>
<td>165.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novokovic, M</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>444.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, E</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>236.001</td>
<td>Strongly objects to selection of Badgerys Creek site</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, E</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>236.002</td>
<td>Enormous amount of building in Badgerys Creek area during past fifteen years</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, E</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>236.003</td>
<td>MANS report recommendation ignored</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, E</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>236.004</td>
<td>Loss of rural values for many thousands of people</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, E</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>236.005</td>
<td>Market value of Badgerys Creek site underestimated</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, E</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>236.006</td>
<td>Need for compensation of noise-affected areas</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, E</td>
<td>Silverdale</td>
<td>236.007</td>
<td>Use of ANF units rather than feasible is misleading</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, T</td>
<td>Bringelly</td>
<td>232.001</td>
<td>Strongly objects to selection of Badgerys Creek site</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, T</td>
<td>Bringelly</td>
<td>232.002</td>
<td>Effect of noise at Bringelly - area is natural amphitheatre</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dene, GJ</td>
<td>Figtree</td>
<td>455.001</td>
<td>Opposes second Sydney airport at Wilton site</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dene, GJ</td>
<td>Figtree</td>
<td>455.002</td>
<td>Development of airport at Wilton site would be shortsighted in light of coming fuel crisis, present high unemployment in mining industry, and limited reserves of high quality coal in Australia</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dene, GJ</td>
<td>Figtree</td>
<td>455.003</td>
<td>Development of airport would damage flora and destroy catchment area in which further rare species may be located. Potential richness of flora in this area has not been fully investigated</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
<td>DRAFT EIS SECTION</td>
<td>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehe, GJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>455.004</td>
<td>Development of airport would damage fauna, and destroy catchment area habitat which functions as corridor between national parks. Potential richness of fauna in this area has not been fully investigated.</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehe, GJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>455.005</td>
<td>Ability of area to recover after bushfire or other disaster would be severely impaired.</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehe, GJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>455.006</td>
<td>There would be risk of pollution and contamination of catchment area by exhaust from aircraft, fuel dumping and aircraft accidents.</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehe, GJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>455.007</td>
<td>The site would be inconvenient; the distance to Wilton excessive, and upgrading of means of access would entail considerable expenditure.</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehe, GJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>455.008</td>
<td>There is a high incidence of fog and a possibility of wind shear.</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehe, GJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>455.009</td>
<td>Fuel dumping at sea would damage marine life, and have a serious effect on beaches and fishing industry in the area.</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilh, P &amp; R</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>365.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan, VS</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>379.001</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek.</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan, VS</td>
<td></td>
<td>379.002</td>
<td>Impact on flora and fauna not more important than human welfare.</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan, VS</td>
<td></td>
<td>379.003</td>
<td>Facts and figures in Draft EIS inaccurate, for instance in the count of houses.</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan, VS</td>
<td></td>
<td>379.004</td>
<td>Facts and figures in Draft EIS inaccurate, for instance concerning water supply.</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan, VS</td>
<td></td>
<td>379.005</td>
<td>Photographic displays at second Sydney airport exhibition in Sydney misrepresented sites.</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan, VS</td>
<td></td>
<td>379.006</td>
<td>Compensation should be payable to people outside boundary but within 20 ANEF contour.</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan, VS</td>
<td></td>
<td>379.007</td>
<td>Wilton site preferred.</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panetta, R &amp; A</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>191.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangallo, R</td>
<td>Cecil Park</td>
<td>353.001</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek.</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangallo, R</td>
<td></td>
<td>353.002</td>
<td>Construction of an airport would adversely affect many people who have moved into area in recent years.</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangallo, R</td>
<td></td>
<td>353.003</td>
<td>Construction of an airport would adversely affect many people who have moved into area in recent years.</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangallo, R</td>
<td></td>
<td>353.004</td>
<td>Construction of an airport would ruin a rural area.</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papan, R</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papan, T</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>19.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polina, S</td>
<td>Cabramatta</td>
<td>167.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn, R</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>172.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith City Council</td>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>429.001</td>
<td>Recognizes Badgerys Creek has some advantages over Wilton site, APPENDIX A but requests a fuller investigation of noise issue (rotation of landing strips, temperature inversions, application of ANEF system, cost of acoustically acceptable dwellings).</td>
<td>764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith City Council</td>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>429.002</td>
<td>Recognizes Badgerys Creek has some advantages over Wilton site, APPENDIX A but requests a fuller investigation of drainage issue (equality, volume, variability of discharge from site, condition of South Creek, control of windmilling during construction).</td>
<td>764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith City Council</td>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>429.003</td>
<td>Recognizes Badgerys Creek has some advantages over Wilton site, APPENDIX A but requests a fuller investigation of prospects for the creation of jobs.</td>
<td>764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith City Council</td>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>429.004</td>
<td>Recognizes Badgerys Creek has some advantages over Wilton site, APPENDIX A but requests a fuller investigation of future zoning needs for City of Penrith.</td>
<td>764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith City Council</td>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>429.005</td>
<td>Recognizes Badgerys Creek has some advantages over Wilton site, APPENDIX A but requests a fuller investigation of possible planning blight.</td>
<td>764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith City Council</td>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>429.006</td>
<td>Recognizes Badgerys Creek has some advantages over Wilton site, APPENDIX A but requests a fuller investigation of access (cost and construction details of future roads, Bargo Park Road modifications, impact on residents).</td>
<td>764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith City Council</td>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>429.007</td>
<td>Recognizes Badgerys Creek has some advantages over Wilton site, APPENDIX A but requests a fuller investigation of socio-economic impact of construction workforce.</td>
<td>764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith City Council</td>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>429.008</td>
<td>If Badgerys Creek site were chosen, then detailed layouts should form basis for further discussion.</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters, FJ &amp; J</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>297.001</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Bargo.</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters, FJ &amp; J</td>
<td></td>
<td>297.002</td>
<td>Noise levels at Bargo expected to be excessive.</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters, FJ &amp; J</td>
<td></td>
<td>297.003</td>
<td>Effects of Aircraft emissions detrimental to water supply.</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Peters, PJ & J  
326.000 For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J  
* *  
Phil, F  
286.000  
For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J  
* *  
Piva, B  
317.000 For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J  
* *  
Piva, M & P  
326.000  
For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J  
* *  
Pizzardi, E  
171.000  
For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L  
* *  
Powell, HC  
451.001  
Opposed to airport at Badgerys Creek  
17.1  
756  
Powell, HC  
451.002  
Frequency of fog in Badgerys Creek area  
10.3  
693  
Powell, HC  
451.003  
Badgerys Creek area is important supplier of agricultural produce  
9.7  
685  
Powell, HC  
451.004  
Badgerys Creek is historical district  
9.5  
681  
Powell, M  
457.001  
Kingford-Smith Airport could be upgraded at much lower cost than development of second Sydney airport, by means of a second runway and rationalization of its usage by General Aviation  
1.3  
627  
Powell, M  
457.002  
Upgrading of Kingford-Smith Airport would become necessary before second Sydney airport could become operational  
1.3  
627  
Powell, M  
457.003  
Aspects of forecasts queried - air traffic and air traffic split-up  
1.2  
624  
Powell, M  
457.004  
More detailed total costs should have been done for the two short-listed sites APPENDIX B  
767  
Powell, M  
457.005  
Queries short-listing process. Wilton and Badgerys Creek sites have both been altered since the rankings were drawn up and the decision announced, in September 1984  
6.8  
658  
Powell, M  
457.006  
Questions the weighting factors used in Draft EIS  
6.6  
654  
Powell, M  
457.007  
Acquisition cost is too low for Badgerys Creek option - improvements, relocation costs and incidental costs must be considered  
9.1  
668  
Powell, M  
457.008  
Reasoning behind location of second Sydney airport is questioned  
4.4  
645  
Powell, M  
457.009  
Reasoning behind location of second Sydney airport is questioned  
6.6  
654  
Powell, M  
457.010  
Second Sydney airport at Badgerys Creek would encroach on future urban areas  
9.8  
688  
Powell, M  
457.011  
Land-use plan based on airport would affect more people at Badgerys Creek than at Mil ton  
17.2  
757  
Powell, M  
457.012  
Questions non-curfew operations planned for second Sydney airport - queries application of ANEF system at night  
9.2  
674  
Powell, M  
457.013  
No assurances given that aspects of airport development would not be changed in future APPENDIX A  
764  
Powell, M  
457.014  
Airspace around Badgerys Creek would be seriously affected by airport development  
8.6  
663  
Powell, M  
457.015  
Prime agricultural land would be lost if airport sited at Badgerys Creek  
9.7  
685  
Powell, M  
457.016  
Construction works for access would require further resumption of land at Badgerys Creek and within inner Sydney  
10.4  
696  
Powell, M  
457.017  
Noise would be nuisance during construction - effect would be greater at Badgerys Creek  
9.2  
674  
Powell, M  
457.018  
Dust would be nuisance during construction - effect would be greater at Badgerys Creek  
17.2  
757  
Powell, M  
457.019  
Any unique flora within the Wilton site could be transplanted to nearby site  
16.1  
749  
Powell, M  
457.020  
Archaeological finds could be preserved in museums  
9.3  
680  
Powell, M  
457.021  
Considers protection of water catchment at Wilton feasible  
15.2  
736  
Powell, M  
457.022  
Several technical and educational facilities at Badgerys Creek would be removed if airport constructed there  
9.8  
688  
Powell, M  
457.023  
Capacity of Kingford-Smith Airport could be increased by better air traffic control  
1.3  
627  
Powell, M  
457.024  
Residents around an airport are at risk from terrorism and accident - argument against choosing a populous location such as Badgerys Creek  
8.7  
665  
Powell, M  
457.025  
Badgerys Creek area experiences bushfires  
8.7  
665  
Powell, M  
457.026  
No cost/benefit study has been carried out on second Sydney airport APPENDIX B  
767  
Powell, M  
457.027  
Draft EIS does not specify whether its low or its high population forecast is more likely. To which year does figure for noise-affected people apply?  
9.2  
674  
Powell, M  
457.028  
Queries multipliers used in Draft EIS to forecast employment  
9.6  
682  
Powell, M  
457.029  
Queries numbers of people that would be displaced, as forecast in Draft EIS  
9.1  
688
Noise from access roads and railways should have been addressed, not Wilton site crossed by Avon-Kemps Creek transmission line, not ANEF contours might be enlarged if allowance made for propagation of sound through air.

Airport at Badgerys Creek would sterilize 6,368 ha of land in western suburbs.

Laws of food producing land at Badgerys Creek would be wasteful and short-sighted.

Compensation would be insufficient to acquire equivalent properties elsewhere.

Heating factors are biased towards selection of Badgerys Creek and Wilton.

Holsworthy and Watanolla were excluded as possible sites, and this is deficient.

Second Sydney airport traffic patterns concentrating on weekends and holidays would cause extra social disruption, and this invalidates the reference to National Acoustics Laboratory Report.

Low background noise level at Badgerys Creek, especially at night, would increase impact of lower ANEF levels.

Noise study should have been by independent consultant.

Population affected by noise underestimated in Draft EIS due to misinterpretation of 40-ha-minimum category.

Draft EIS underestimates proportion of flights that would be at night.

Airport at Badgerys Creek would not have significant impact on Crown land.

Presumably ANEF contours take into account the topography around each site.

Draft EIS does not predict noise levels from ground running operations.

More detail needed on noise levels during construction.

Wilton site quieter than is inferred by Draft EIS.

ANEF contours might be enlarged if allowance made for temperature inversions.

ANEF contours might be enlarged if allowance made for temperature inversions.

Noise from access roads and railways should have been quantified.

Noise from access roads and railways should have been quantified.

Agrees with use of ANEF system.

Agrees with use of ANEF system.

Selection data should have been based on 20 ANEF not 25 ANEF contour.

New planning schemes for airport surrounds must take into account number of existing buildings, and impact of prohibiting certain types of new buildings.

There should be compensation for property owners within the 20 ANEF contour.

There should be compensation for property owners within the 20 ANEF contour.

Some planning changes needed to allow for road and rail corridors.

Some planning changes needed to allow for road and rail corridors.

Views of Bundangara local Aboriginal land council supported.

Electricity Commission would need to bring forward upgrading of Yass-Sydney West transmission line by ten years, and possibly modify other planned work.

Wilton site crossed by Avon-Kemps Creek transmission line, not CORRIGENDA Sydney South-Dapto transmission line.

New South Wales Department of Agriculture states as policy that agricultural land should be left in agriculture.

Frequent aircraft traffic would upset the laying regime of hens.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMENT NO</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</th>
<th>DRAFT EIS SECTION</th>
<th>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.023</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not sufficiently address the pressure put on other areas for agricultural and urban development</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.024</td>
<td>If Badgerys Creek selected, 28,000 homesites would be lost within 20 ANEF contour and further 26,000 in 20-25 ANEF contour</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.025</td>
<td>Loss of agricultural income from Badgerys Creek would be $10 million per annum, double the figure in the Draft EIS</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.026</td>
<td>No information in Draft EIS on methods of removal and disposal of green timber</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.027</td>
<td>Direct employment at airport is proportional to size, and so would be considerably less than at Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>682</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.028</td>
<td>Direct employment at airport is proportional to size, and so would be considerably less than at Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.029</td>
<td>Indirect employment at second Sydney airport would depend on airport functions, and so a freight forwarding industry should be encouraged</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>682</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.030</td>
<td>Indirect employment at second Sydney airport would depend on airport functions, and so a freight forwarding industry should be encouraged</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.031</td>
<td>Areas of local job creation, such as aircraft servicing, repair and catering, should be developed in early stages</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.032</td>
<td>Areas of local job creation, such as aircraft servicing, repair and catering, should be developed in early stages</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>682</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.033</td>
<td>Commonwealth should make ex gratia payments to councils for acquired properties, in lieu of rates</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.034</td>
<td>Commonwealth should make ex gratia payments to councils for acquired properties, in lieu of rates</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.035</td>
<td>Local councils that would be affected, are divided in opinion present for several years</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.036</td>
<td>The main benefit singled out by Councils from the development of a second airport, would be the alleviation of unemployment</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.037</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek better located with respect to existing disaster services</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.038</td>
<td>A second airport would aid in the provision of health services to country people</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.039</td>
<td>Coal underlying Badgerys Creek is not a major obstacle to development of airport</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.040</td>
<td>Concerned that Prospect Reservoir directly in flight path at Badgerys Creek - risk of pollution</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.041</td>
<td>Drainage systems for site should be designed to control a range of floods, small as well as large</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.042</td>
<td>Drainage systems for site should be designed to control a range of floods, small as well as large</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.043</td>
<td>Flood run-off co-efficients quoted in Draft EIS should not be used in actual design, as they are not sufficiently accurate</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.044</td>
<td>Flood run-off co-efficients quoted in Draft EIS should not be used in actual design, as they are not sufficiently accurate</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.045</td>
<td>Airport at Badgerys Creek would exacerbate pollution problem in Hawkesbury-Nepean unless adequate safeguards implemented</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.046</td>
<td>Dust during construction is dismissed as temporary but would be present for several years</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.047</td>
<td>Dust during construction is dismissed as temporary but would be present for several years</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.048</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not address fail-safe measures for Wilton, to ensure contaminated waters do not enter Sydney's water supply and dams</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.049</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not address possibility of release of connate salts to surface waters, and de-silting of sedimentation traps and dams</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.050</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not address possibility of release of connate salts to surface waters, and de-silting of sedimentation traps and dams</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.051</td>
<td>Use of treated sewage for irrigation preferable to discharge to surface streams</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.052</td>
<td>Use of treated sewage for irrigation preferable to discharge to surface streams</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.053</td>
<td>Polluted run-off should be prevented from entering groundwater</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.054</td>
<td>Polluted run-off should be prevented from entering groundwater</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.055</td>
<td>Suggests improved method of controlling water pollutants during construction phase</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.056</td>
<td>Suggests improved method of controlling water pollutants during construction phase</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.057</td>
<td>More detail needed on water management proposals and water quality safeguards</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td>274.058</td>
<td>More detail needed on water management proposals and water quality safeguards</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION

Draft EIS fails to include opportunity cost to community if deviation of transmission line would require 15 km of new line. Air quality would be less affected by airport at Wilton than at Badgerys Creek if airport were built in south western sector. Draft EIS does not state that airport would have significant impact on air quality within local airshed. Need to examine implications for South Western Freeway east of Badgerys Creek. Draft EIS omits air polluting effect of vehicular emissions and underestimated effect on air quality of dust during construction. Air quality would be less affected by airport at Wilton than Badgerys Creek. Airport in south western sector is marginally better than a site in north western, and considerably better than expansion of Kingsford-Smith Airport, for maintaining air quality.

State Rail Authority disputes statement that spare capacity exists between Sydney and Strathfield. Werrington-Glenlee railway no longer under consideration. State Rail Authority prefers rail link to Badgerys Creek from Glenfield rather than from St Marys. No need, on grounds of capacity, for rail link between second Sydney airport and Kingsford-Smith Airport. Cost of transport of quarantine waste a consideration in site selection.

Need to examine costs of roads and road users for both sites. Need to examine costs of roads and road users for both sites. Need to examine implications for South Western Freeway east of King Georges Road. Need to examine implications for South Western Freeway west of King Georges Road. No need, on grounds of capacity, for rail link between second Sydney airport and Kingsford-Smith Airport.

Absence of surveys of aquatic fauna a major omission in Draft EIS. Compensation would be sought from Commonwealth for loss of Crown Land at Wilton.

Saving in acquisition cost at Wilton offset by cost of perimeter canal ($40 million). Draft EIS fails to include opportunity cost to community if part of water catchment area rendered useless by second Sydney Airport site.

Views of Tharawal local Aboriginal land council supported. Deviation of transmission line would require 15 km of new construction. Petroleum for Wilton airport could conveniently be supplied by rail or pipeline. Water Act restricts felling of trees close to Cordeaux River.

Second Sydney airport at Wilton could sterilize coal resources of West Bellambi project, and would increase capitalization cost of drift and surface facilities. Absence of surveys of aquatic fauna a major omission in Draft EIS.

Not economic to extract coal before construction of airport. Extraction of some coal after construction of airport would be possible, thus reducing amount of coal sterilized.

Amount of coal sterilized could be reduced by realigning runways. Coal washery reject might prove suitable fill material for airport construction. Resumption of land for airport should be restricted to the surface, to enable underlying coal to be extracted where not hazardous.

Balgownie seam uneconomic in East Bargo sector of airport site only.

Changes and corrections suggested to Figure 15.1.2.

Corrections to statement on coal quality.

CorrigenA

**
Value of coal resources at Wilton greater than of clay/shale resources at Badgerys Creek

Recovery of coal underlying Wilton more likely to eventuate than recovery of coal at Badgerys Creek, where establishment of new mine required

Site within Metropolitan Catchment area should not be preferred over one within village of Wilton, without study of differential costs and benefits

Attention is drawn to extreme precautions needed to protect metropolitan water supply, and difficulty of doing so

Draft EIS inadequately addresses question of treatment for water discharging to Hawkesbury-Nepean system

Error in Figure 15.2.1

Waters impounded by Devines Weir are not part of Sydney water supply

Draft EIS inadequately addresses question of risks from fuel polluting water supply. International experience and possible safeguards should be considered

Treatment works might be needed to safeguard metropolitan water supply if airport at Wilton

Without safeguards, Wilton proposal is counter to National Conservation Strategy

Without safeguards, Wilton proposal is counter to National Conservation Strategy

Costs of supplying water and sewerage to development peripheral APPENDIX B

Draft EIS gives no information on user population profile, such as densities in metropolitan region and accessibility of either site for the likely user population

Draft EIS gives no information on user population profile, such as densities in metropolitan region and accessibility of either site for the likely user population

Choice of alternative runway alignment would adversely affect the Nepean College of Advanced Education

Additional costs identified in this submission, particularly those of protecting ground and surface water resources, might eliminate Wilton's marginal superiority over Somersby as choice of site

Costs of constructing and servicing for water and sewerage would be greater at Wilton than at Badgerys Creek

Choice of alternative runway alignment would adversely affect the University of Sydney's teaching and research centre at Cobbitty

Draft EIS gives no information on user population profile, such as densities in metropolitan region and accessibility of either site for the likely user population

Costs of constructing a rail link to Wilton via Appin must be listed among those wholly attributable to airport

Wilton site is of much higher significance for nature conservation than Badgerys Creek site

New proposed layout at Badgerys Creek would place Badgerys Creek Primary School within airport site

Primary schools at Bringelly, Luddenham, Horsley Park, Kemps Creek and Cobbitty, would all experience some effects of noise from Badgerys Creek

Relatively small shifts in location of 20 ANEF contours would compensate for relocation of its teaching and research facilities rendered inoperative by Badgerys Creek site

University of Sydney considers Commonwealth morally obliged to compensate for relocation of its teaching and research facilities rendered inoperative by Badgerys Creek site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMENT NO</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</th>
<th>DRAFT EIS SECTION</th>
<th>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premier's Department</td>
<td></td>
<td>274.127</td>
<td>Proposed corrections to Draft EIS. Page 236 (2nd para): Poultry Corporation</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect County Council</td>
<td>Parramatta</td>
<td>378.000</td>
<td>Preliminary letter advising of intention to male submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qantas Airways Limited</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>433.001</td>
<td>Favour selection and acquisition of Badgerys Creek site</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qantas Airways Limited</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>435.002</td>
<td>Supports the north-east - south-west runway alignment</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qantas Airways Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td>435.003</td>
<td>Considers the area allowance would be adequate</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qantas Airways Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td>435.004</td>
<td>Suggests that initially airport should be developed for General Aviation and leisure-associated traffic</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qantas Airways Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td>435.005</td>
<td>Stresses that a twenty-four hour curfew-free operation would be essential for second Sydney airport</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qantas Airways Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td>435.006</td>
<td>Appropriate land zoning must be associated with twenty-four hour airport concept</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qantas Airways Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td>435.007</td>
<td>Considers that airspace would not be a problem in the future</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qantas Airways Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td>435.008</td>
<td>Suggests Kingsford-Smith Airport should be fully developed before second Sydney airport is established - distinct need for master plan for Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qantas Airways Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td>435.009</td>
<td>Interest charges associated with purchase of second Sydney airport should not be cost-recoverable from the industry</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radojevic, T</td>
<td>St John Park</td>
<td>259.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rankin, Lm</td>
<td>Westmoreton</td>
<td>357.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 352, Andrich, R</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves, V &amp; W</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>226.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 271, Jenkins, R</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relato, G</td>
<td>Greystanes</td>
<td>198.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Airlines Association of Australia Ltd</td>
<td>Mount Waverley, Vic</td>
<td>449.001</td>
<td>In favour of second Sydney airport sited within Sydney Region, preferably at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Airlines Association of Australia Ltd</td>
<td>Mount Waverley, Vic</td>
<td>449.002</td>
<td>Argues against any attempt to extend capacity of Kingsford-Smith Airport by imposing activity stultifying regulations</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Airlines Association of Australia Ltd</td>
<td>Mount Waverley, Vic</td>
<td>449.003</td>
<td>Only development of a second airport can provide extra runway capacity required in Sydney Region</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Airlines Association of Australia Ltd</td>
<td>Mount Waverley, Vic</td>
<td>449.004</td>
<td>Not in favour of forcing commuter traffic to use second Sydney airport</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Airlines Association of Australia Ltd</td>
<td>Mount Waverley, Vic</td>
<td>449.005</td>
<td>Agrees with methodology used in selecting final two sites</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renhan, T</td>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>79.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rennie, I &amp; L</td>
<td>Cecil Park</td>
<td>48.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reppas, G</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>97.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reppas, P</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reppas, V</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>99.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigato, C</td>
<td>Kings Park</td>
<td>140.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riordan, JF</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td>102.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripepi, A</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>154.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripepi, S</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>155.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, A</td>
<td>Bringelly</td>
<td>282.001</td>
<td>Airport would adversely affect lifestyle</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, A</td>
<td>Bringelly</td>
<td>282.002</td>
<td>Noise would be major problem</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, CJ</td>
<td>Bringelly</td>
<td>276.001</td>
<td>Asks for independent study of noise footprints</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, CJ</td>
<td>Bringelly</td>
<td>276.002</td>
<td>Should consider relocating noise-sensitive people now living adjacent to the acquisition site</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, CJ</td>
<td>Bringelly</td>
<td>276.003</td>
<td>Considers Wilton preferable to Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, CJ</td>
<td>Bringelly</td>
<td>276.004</td>
<td>People desiring to be relocated from a frozen area - no development allowed - should be satisfied</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
<td>DRAFT EIS SECTION</td>
<td>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.001</td>
<td>Draft EIS inaccurate, incomplete and misleading</td>
<td>PREFACE</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.002</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not mention need to demolish church and move graves at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.003</td>
<td>Draft EIS inadequately treats effects of land acquisition for road and rail access</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.004</td>
<td>Concerned that airport traffic would increase travel time between Bringelly and Penrith</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.005</td>
<td>Draft EIS gives misleading picture of present and future pollution levels from aircraft, road traffic and industry</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.006</td>
<td>Concerned about effects on poultry and livestock especially at night</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.007</td>
<td>Dubious that impact on agriculture would be small, since McFarlie Smith Animal Husbandry Farm would become inoperable</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.008</td>
<td>Queries justice of expression, minimal visual quality, used in Draft EIS of landscapes at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.009</td>
<td>Queries total of 22,000 new jobs - requests more details</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.010</td>
<td>Points out that at all events jobs would not eventuate for many years</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.011</td>
<td>Queries need for airport to be curfew-free</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.012</td>
<td>Criticises lack of place names on Figure 1.3</td>
<td>CORRIGENDA</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.013</td>
<td>Enquires about original purpose of railway under construction at Wilton</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.014</td>
<td>Travel times to Wilton exaggerated</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.015</td>
<td>Travel times to Badgerys Creek underestimated (queries route used)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.016</td>
<td>Detrimental effect on local people if site selected, whether airport built or not</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.017</td>
<td>Asks for present noise levels at Badgerys Creek-Bringelly, especially at night</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.018</td>
<td>Misleading to say site is between Badgerys Creek and Luddenham - Badgerys Creek would disappear if airport were constructed</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.019</td>
<td>Draft EIS gives misleading impression that all properties surrounding site are of 40 ha minimum size</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.020</td>
<td>Uncertainty still prevails, as need for second Sydney airport not proven, and airport might never be built</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.021</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not address question of increased crime due to airport</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.022</td>
<td>Disputes not being affected by predicted 275,000 aircraft movements per year, even though she is outside the noise affected areas</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.023</td>
<td>Would affect local heritage</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.024</td>
<td>Those outside acquisition area would suffer most</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.025</td>
<td>Continuing uncertainty as to when airport would be developed</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.026</td>
<td>Uncertainty lowers values of properties, whether the airport is built or not</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.027</td>
<td>Figure of $32 million insufficient to acquire property at fair price</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.028</td>
<td>Residents would bear unnecessary expenses for rates and services</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.029</td>
<td>Airport would bring more pollution from noise</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.030</td>
<td>Airport would bring more pollution from traffic</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.031</td>
<td>Airport would bring more pollution from dust and erosion</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.032</td>
<td>Local hospitals could not cope with an emergency</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.033</td>
<td>Pollution from airport could affect dams and tank water</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.034</td>
<td>Aerial photos used for display do not show all development at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.035</td>
<td>Airport would bring more pollution from industry construction</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.036</td>
<td>Local fauna was not considered properly - cites various migratory birds, lizards and the long necked-turtle</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.037</td>
<td>Residents would bear expense of connecting to mains water and road access</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.038</td>
<td>New road system associated with Badgerys Creek airport would adversely affect family's commuting time to Sydney</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, JA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>65.039</td>
<td>Would Badgerys Creek primary school close if an airport were placed in Badgerys Creek area?</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, M Bringelly</td>
<td>Bringelly</td>
<td>279.001</td>
<td>Detrimental to residents to have an airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, M Bringelly</td>
<td>Bringelly</td>
<td>279.002</td>
<td>Residents would be affected by noise and pollution</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, M Bringelly</td>
<td>Bringelly</td>
<td>279.003</td>
<td>Cost of land acquisition makes Badgerys Creek unsuitable</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadnight, M Bringelly</td>
<td>Bringelly</td>
<td>279.004</td>
<td>Lack of facilities (transport, water and sewerage) makes Badgerys Creek unsuitable</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

820
Better to uproot trees at Wilton than people at Badgerys Creek

Investigation of options to rationalise traffic and expand

Kingsford-Smith Airport would not be adequate for the future

Airport at Badgerys Creek would seriously affect growing

People would be unable to obtain realistic compensation

Travel times quoted in Draft EIS incorrect
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMENT NO</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</th>
<th>DRAFT EIS SECTION</th>
<th>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scout Air Activities Base, Camden Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>254.003</td>
<td>If site were Badgerys Creek, loss of training area would force closure of Scout Air Activities Base</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scout Air Activities Base, Camden Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>254.004</td>
<td>Bidding Wing would be forced to cease operations, whether site were Badgerys Creek or Wilton</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setton, AR</td>
<td>Thirroul</td>
<td>451.001</td>
<td>Expresses concern about Wollongong City Council’s EIS supporting Wilton site</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setton, AR</td>
<td></td>
<td>451.002</td>
<td>States that natural environment of Wollongong is in a state of ecological crisis and that an international airport in area would only add to degradation of environment</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setton, AR</td>
<td></td>
<td>451.003</td>
<td>Second Sydney airport at Wilton would jeopardize water supply of Australia’s largest and seventh largest cities</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setton, AR</td>
<td></td>
<td>451.004</td>
<td>Development at Wilton would jeopardize the extraction of millions of tonnes of coal</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setton, AR</td>
<td></td>
<td>451.005</td>
<td>Mine subsidence is a problem in the area</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setton, AR</td>
<td></td>
<td>451.006</td>
<td>Residents’ choice of quiet lifestyle would be overturned</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setton, C</td>
<td>Woonona</td>
<td>327.001</td>
<td>Archaeological significance of Wilton site has not been fully investigated - value increased by geographical and geological features and by tribal boundary location</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setton, C</td>
<td></td>
<td>327.002</td>
<td>Shortcomings in predicted nature and frequency of archaeological sites in Draft EIS and in survey method used</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setton, C</td>
<td></td>
<td>327.003</td>
<td>Archaeological significance of Allens Creek site underestimated in Draft EIS</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setton, C</td>
<td></td>
<td>327.004</td>
<td>Archaeological value of Wilton site should be reassessed and, if Wilton is selected, detailed archaeological recording of site should be undertaken</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segura, P</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>288.001</td>
<td>Totally opposed to airport at Wilton, and also at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segura, P</td>
<td></td>
<td>288.002</td>
<td>Second Sydney airport not needed</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segura, P</td>
<td></td>
<td>288.003</td>
<td>Pollution of water catchment area should be a major consideration</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segura, P</td>
<td></td>
<td>288.004</td>
<td>Upgrading of Kingsford-Smith Airport would accommodate Sydney’s needs well into the next century</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seraglio, AD</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>38.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setton, AD</td>
<td>Emu Plains</td>
<td>366.001</td>
<td>Opposed to Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw, D</td>
<td>Kemps Creek</td>
<td>386.002</td>
<td>Would affect recreation and tourism in the area</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw, G</td>
<td>Fairfield West</td>
<td>159.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shephard, P</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>235.000</td>
<td>If perimeter canal and retarding basins at Wilton are only partly lined, as stated in Draft EIS, there is potential for pollution through seepage</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shephard, P</td>
<td></td>
<td>255.002</td>
<td>Water that would be lost from Sydney and Wollongong supply might be needed in future, for the growing population in these centres</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shephard, P</td>
<td></td>
<td>255.003</td>
<td>How does a scheme for an airport in the headwaters of the Nepean system fit with the State Government’s announcement of a required environmental plan for this river?</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shephard, P</td>
<td></td>
<td>255.004</td>
<td>How does a scheme for an airport in the headwaters of the Nepean system fit with the State Government’s announcement of a required environmental plan for this river?</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shephard, P</td>
<td></td>
<td>255.005</td>
<td>Proposal conflicts with National Conservation Strategy</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shephard, P</td>
<td></td>
<td>255.006</td>
<td>Proposal conflicts with National Conservation Strategy</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shephard, P</td>
<td></td>
<td>255.007</td>
<td>To increase urban boundary would be waste of rural and green belt land</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shephard, P</td>
<td></td>
<td>255.008</td>
<td>If Wilton selected, importance of protecting remainder of catchment area would be heightened - catchment has been increasingly divided in recent years by various public utilities</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simms, V</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>445.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simms, C</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>381.001</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simms, C</td>
<td></td>
<td>381.002</td>
<td>Repercussions in area around Badgerys Creek would be severe</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simms, C</td>
<td></td>
<td>381.003</td>
<td>Total compensation required for own property, business not hobby</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skybey, G</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>435.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, AP</td>
<td>Campbelltown</td>
<td>292.001</td>
<td>Pollution of Hawkesbury-Nepean River system needs further investigation with respect to a second Sydney airport</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Smith, AP
292.002 Upper Nepean is particularly susceptible to pollutants from second Sydney airport at Wilton

292.003 Treated effluent from airport industry would also be discharged into Nepean River

292.004 Selective clearing of approaches would introduce erosion problems and silting to Wallandoola Creek

292.005 Environmental problems of using water catchment land have been underestimated

292.006 Meldon-Dombarton railway line has caused problems with water run-off

292.007 How would pollution be controlled during construction?

292.008 Need more than assurances to avoid pollution of water supply

292.009 Department of Aviation's ornithologist has not visited site

292.010 Draft EIS ornithological study was cursory

292.011 Because bird strike is a real problem at airports, Wilton is very poor site from point of view of safety, as its surrounds attract birds

Smith, J
293.001 No study had been undertaken regarding environmental impacts of area outside airport boundary at Wilton

293.002 Draft EIS uninformative on specific measures for controlling bird strike while conserving bird life

293.003 A comprehensive study of bird life should be carried out at Wilton and surrounding areas

293.004 Healthy colony of koalas at Wilton should not be jeopardized

Society for Social Responsibility in Engineering
311.001 Inadequate consideration given to high speed rail in relation to Goulburn site

311.002 Access time would be as low as 42 minutes between a Sydney terminal and the Goulburn terminal

311.003 Revised site ranking analysis lifts Goulburn into a favourable position

311.004 Disagrees with statement in Draft EIS that benefits of a high speed system could equally benefit Wilton

311.005 States that practicality of gaining running rights into Sydney are quite good

311.006 Disagrees with Draft EIS statement that second Sydney airport would not by itself generate sufficient traffic to justify a high speed access system

311.007 Practicality of high speed rail systems well established in other countries

311.008 Banks and transport companies might be interested in financing cost of approx $850 million

311.009 Most important benefit would be stimulus to employment and economic activity in a decentralized growth centre

311.010 The responsible course is to resolve the issues around a high speed access system at the same time as those around a second Sydney airport

311.011 Recommends that Final EIS should be suspended until a supplementary study, or else a public enquiry, is undertaken

Sommerville, C
289.001 Opposed to airport at Badgerys Creek

289.002 Suggests a high speed rail link with Melbourne to utilize facilities at Tullamarine

South Coast Conservation Society
342.001 Opposes airport at Wilton

342.002 Airports development jeopardizes quality of water supply - contrary to MWS&D policy
South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd

342.003 Risk of aircraft accidents, or an emergency need to jettison fuel over catchment area

13.7  711

342.004 Catchment areas serve useful role as buffer for expanding urban area, and as flora and fauna reserve

14.8  725

342.005 Site is valuable as providing habitats for highly diverse fauna, healthy on-site colonies of endangered koala and of bird species requiring special protection, are particularly important

14.2  751

342.006 Flora of the site area is significant - six rare species.

16.1  749

342.007 Resource value of clean air and clean water not considered in Draft EIS

14.8  725

342.008 Off-site roads for emergency access and clearing for requirements of approach path would further damage environment

16.1  749

342.009 Risk of invasion of site-area by exotic plant species

16.1  749

342.010 Risk of invasion of site-area by feral and exotic fauna

16.2  751

342.011 Distance to Wilton too far for passengers to use regularly

17.2  757

342.012 Draft EIS should consider costs of water retention and diversion works, and MWS & DB supervisory fees, as well as acquisition costs

APPENDIX B  767

342.013 Employment for Wollongong residents would not be experienced now but decades hence, and Wollongong residents would not necessarily be favoured

14.6  722

342.014 Draft EIS should consider costs of cut-and-fill, and operating costs resulting from distance from Sydney, as well as acquisition costs

APPENDIX B  767

342.015 Tourist flow to Wollongong is not dependent on siting airport at Wilton

2.1  635

342.016 Is there any need for a second Sydney airport if, by constructing a parallel runway and reducing aircraft mix, capacity at Kingsford-Smith Airport can be increased

1.3  627

342.017 Why not force operators other than regular passenger traffic to use Bankstown, by increasing charges at Kingsford-Smith Airport

1.4  630

342.018 Give Richmond air base to civil aviation

3.6  640

342.019 Build off-shore airport off Five Islands of Illawarra - combine with disposing of waste by use as fill

3.6  640

342.020 Build airport in an area where the natural environment has already been degraded

3.6  640
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMENT NO</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</th>
<th>DRAFT EIS SECTION</th>
<th>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>342.021</td>
<td>Noise pollution would have greater impact because of rural nature of site</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>342.022</td>
<td>Site has national park potential because of undisturbed condition</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>342.023</td>
<td>Air pollution would have more serious effects because of rural nature of site</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>342.024</td>
<td>Draft EIS states that air pollution at second Sydney airport would be less than in Sydney region. Air quality at both sites is considerably better than in Sydney region - therefore proportional degradation greater</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>342.025</td>
<td>Doubts accuracy of figures regarding coal quality, and quantity that would be sterilized</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>342.026</td>
<td>Problems of subsidence and seismic movement</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>342.027</td>
<td>Costing to include sum already spent on Mount Keira Road</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>342.028</td>
<td>Aircraft pollutants would be most significant in periods of take-off and climb-out, and would be deposited in river system and catchment areas</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>342.029</td>
<td>No consideration has been given in Draft EIS to detrimental effect on flora from aircraft fuel fallout</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>342.030</td>
<td>Wilton site is environmentally unsuitable</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>342.031</td>
<td>Wilton site would be more expensive in terms of access</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>South Coast Conservation Society Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>342.032</td>
<td>Wilton site would be more expensive to operate. Although cheaper to acquire, it would work out dearer in the long run</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Action Group (S.W.A.G.) Wollongong</td>
<td>South Coast Labour Council</td>
<td>456.001</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not sufficiently address question of coal sterilization and its implications</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Labour Council</td>
<td>South Coast Labour Council</td>
<td>456.002</td>
<td>Concerned at loss of employment from coal sterilization not only under airport site, but also under induced and ancillary development that would occur</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Labour Council</td>
<td>South Coast Labour Council</td>
<td>456.003</td>
<td>Requires a number of guarantees to safeguard the continued extraction of coal</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Labour Council</td>
<td>South Coast Labour Council</td>
<td>456.004</td>
<td>Draft EIS is not satisfactory review of environmental impact in relation to the exploitation of coal resources</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Deep Action Group (S.W.A.G.) Bringelly</td>
<td>South Deep Action Group (S.W.A.G.) Bringelly</td>
<td>250.001</td>
<td>Draft EIS discloses that apart from some restricted zones, there are no existing planning controls for Badgerys Creek area, beyond normal subdivision limitations</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Action Group (S.W.A.G.)</td>
<td>South West Action Group (S.W.A.G.)</td>
<td>250.002</td>
<td>Continuance of existing zonings would allow housing to develop close to a twenty-four hour curfew-free airport</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Action Group (S.W.A.G.)</td>
<td>South West Action Group (S.W.A.G.)</td>
<td>250.003</td>
<td>Continuance of existing zonings would induce health and stress problems in next generation</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Action Group (S.W.A.G.)</td>
<td>South West Action Group (S.W.A.G.)</td>
<td>250.004</td>
<td>Tullamarine airport provides a cautionary example of encircling development around an airport</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Action Group (S.W.A.G.)</td>
<td>South West Action Group (S.W.A.G.)</td>
<td>250.005</td>
<td>Population of western suburbs predicted to increase by 0.5 million to 1 million by year 2000. Hence extremely large number of people would be affected by noise</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Action Group (S.W.A.G.)</td>
<td>South West Action Group (S.W.A.G.)</td>
<td>250.006</td>
<td>Social and economic conditions oblige young families to live in western region, with no redress from airport development</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Action Group (S.W.A.G.)</td>
<td>South West Action Group (S.W.A.G.)</td>
<td>250.007</td>
<td>No Schedule of Conditions from MARSOP applicable to Badgerys Creek, similar to that for Wilton</td>
<td>APPENDIX H</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.008</td>
<td>Although airport might create 2,200 jobs, this figure would represent only 1% share of total regional employment</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.009</td>
<td>When Commonwealth resumes rateable land, local councils have difficulty providing services, let alone jobs, for rising population</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.010</td>
<td>Twenty-four hour noise problem is understated in Draft EIS</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.011</td>
<td>Noise would affect people in every direction from airport at Badgerys Creek, whereas Kingsford-Smith Airport can schedule flights over sea</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.012</td>
<td>No serious consideration has been given to planning community facilities</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.013</td>
<td>Many lives would be lost if major tragedy occurred, as support services are thinly spread</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.014</td>
<td>Major upgrading of roads needed — would be wasted if airport not built</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.015</td>
<td>Road network and transport systems would need major upgrading, at great cost to community</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.016</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek is at least 60 km from city centre, not 48 km</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.017</td>
<td>Has not been proven that Kingsford-Smith Airport could not cope with air traffic beyond year 2000</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.018</td>
<td>Wilton would be better site for second Sydney airport because it would affect fewer people</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.019</td>
<td>Wilton would be better site for second Sydney airport because it would affect fewer people</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360.001</td>
<td>Controlled airspace requirements should be altered if Badgerys Creek or Wilton chosen. This would increase airspace above Camden</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360.002</td>
<td>Wilton is preferred site</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360.003</td>
<td>Would seek government permission to use Mittagong or old Wilton airstrip if Badgerys Creek chosen</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360.004</td>
<td>Major relocation (more than two hours' drive from Sydney) would be harmful to Club</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360.005</td>
<td>Club would welcome proposal to relocate to Figtree or Schofields</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360.006</td>
<td>Major relocation (less than two hours' drive from Sydney) would be helpful to Club</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360.007</td>
<td>Controlled airspace requirements should be altered if Badgerys Creek or Wilton chosen. This would increase airspace above Camden</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.001</td>
<td>What compensation payable for loss of business (or for relocation), when many constraints on possible relocation sites?</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.002</td>
<td>No vacant places at Catholic schools, if obliged to relocate further out</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.003</td>
<td>Uncertainty has produced health problems</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.002</td>
<td>People moved into Mascot area knowing an airport already there, but those now living in Badgerys Creek and Luddenham area came in search of rural quiet</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.003</td>
<td>A better solution would be to extend Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.004</td>
<td>Any land rezoned as industrial around Kingsford-Smith Airport increases in value but land so rezoned around Badgerys Creek would lose value</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.005</td>
<td>Luddenham has unusual features making it exceptionally good for market gardening</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.006</td>
<td>Unlike at Kingsford-Smith Airport, there is no ocean nearby to abate noise nuisance of take-off and landing</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.007</td>
<td>Cost of land acquisition very high</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
<td>DRAFT EIS SECTION</td>
<td>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sproule, HE Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td>400.001</td>
<td>Objects to Badgerys Creek site</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sproule, IJ</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td>400.002</td>
<td>The family business might not be viable if forced to move, and another suitable site would be very difficult to find</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sproule, IJ</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td>400.003</td>
<td>Feels they have been blighted - had settled at Badgerys Creek before possibility of airport was raised</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sproule, IJ</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>400.004</td>
<td>Peaceful rural lifestyle highly valued by residents</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sproule, IJ</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td>400.005</td>
<td>Should develop Kingsford-Smith Airport in preference to second Sydney airport</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sproule, IJ</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td>400.006</td>
<td>House counts within Badgerys Creek area are wrong</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stivola, P</td>
<td>Cecile Park</td>
<td>93.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone, AJ</td>
<td>Thirrmere</td>
<td>251.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission nos 223, Grewing, N, 270, Wilson, B and 273, Wilson, T</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sykes, R</td>
<td>Mount Ousley</td>
<td>230.001</td>
<td>How can an airport be built in a catchment area when people are prohibited from entry?</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sykes, R</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>230.002</td>
<td>Scientific value of Wilton airport site</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sykes, R</td>
<td>Mount Ousley</td>
<td>230.003</td>
<td>Scientific value of Wilton airport site</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sykes, R</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td>230.004</td>
<td>Critical of service provided by Community Access Bus</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sykes, R</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>230.005</td>
<td>Effect of airport and defoliants on flora, especially on endangered species</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sykes, R</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td>230.006</td>
<td>Effect of airport and defoliants on flora, especially on endangered species</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadro, AP</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>135.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagg, K &amp; M</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td>370.001</td>
<td>Opposition airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagg, K &amp; M</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td>370.002</td>
<td>Compensation/acquisition requested, as they are inside 50-40 ANEF contour</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennnape ?, P</td>
<td>Address illegible</td>
<td>94.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaken, A</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>336.001</td>
<td>Against airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaken, A</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>336.002</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not take into account role of Kingsford-Smith Airport as major international airport</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaken, A</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>336.003</td>
<td>There are already enough aerodromes in Sydney region to cater for needs</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaken, A</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>336.004</td>
<td>There are already enough aerodromes in Sydney region to cater for needs</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaken, A</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>336.005</td>
<td>Acquisition cost too low for Badgerys Creek - should be #75 million</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Bou</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>70.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments see submission no. 267, Clark J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom Australia</td>
<td>Address not supplied</td>
<td>373.001</td>
<td>Prefers Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom Australia</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>373.002</td>
<td>No relocation of existing plant would be required for Wilton site. A junction cable and some subscriber cables would need to be relocated for Badgerys Creek site</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom Australia</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>373.003</td>
<td>Vast majority of calls from Wilton to Sydney would be at trunk rates. Lower percentage of trunk calls from Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom Australia</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>373.004</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek is not beyond Commission's existing major network (as in Wilton), and a superior service could therefore be provided</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom Australia</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>373.005</td>
<td>Optical fibre cables with digital line systems would be used at either site. Satellite circuits (as implied in Draft EIS) would not be used. Badgerys Creek would need less cable and so be cheaper</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THI BS</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>395.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend, J</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>441.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments made, see submission no. 267, Clark J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trew, WH</td>
<td>Kingswood</td>
<td>254.001</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trew, WH</td>
<td>Kingswood</td>
<td>254.002</td>
<td>Noise from Badgerys Creek airport would be extreme</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trew, WH</td>
<td>Kingswood</td>
<td>254.003</td>
<td>Pollution from Badgerys Creek would be extreme as no coastal breezes to move it</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsuchi, F</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission nos B, Lave, L and 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, CM</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>188.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission nos B, Lave, L and 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, R</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>401.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, R</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>189.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMENT NO</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turner, Wb</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>190.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaak, P</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>261.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport Badgerys Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanolini, A</td>
<td>Prairiewood</td>
<td>210.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanolino, P</td>
<td>Prairiewood</td>
<td>209.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanolino, R</td>
<td>Prairiewood</td>
<td>211.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassallo, EM</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>46.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan, K</td>
<td>Blackett</td>
<td>295.001</td>
<td>Another airport in western Sydney not necessary - there are five already</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan, K</td>
<td></td>
<td>295.002</td>
<td>Too close to suburbs of Miller, Bonnyrigg, Mount Druitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan, K</td>
<td></td>
<td>295.003</td>
<td>Would create noise problem for over 3,000 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan, K</td>
<td></td>
<td>295.004</td>
<td>Would require relocation of 750 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan, K</td>
<td></td>
<td>295.005</td>
<td>Would affect the farming land of the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan, K</td>
<td></td>
<td>295.006</td>
<td>Concerned at possible adverse effect on research and technical facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan, K</td>
<td></td>
<td>295.007</td>
<td>Plane crash in Badgerys Creek area would be a major disaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan, K</td>
<td></td>
<td>295.008</td>
<td>Demand for facilities associated with airport would cause undesirably high-intensity development in the western region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan, K</td>
<td></td>
<td>295.009</td>
<td>Why not abide by recommendations of the MANS report and build a second runway at Kingsford-Smith Airport?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vella, D</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vella, F</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>174.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vella, J</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>110.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vello, M</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vello, C</td>
<td>Wetherill Park</td>
<td>176.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vello, V</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>175.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vianello, S</td>
<td>Luddenham</td>
<td>319.001</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vianello, S</td>
<td></td>
<td>319.002</td>
<td>Area needed for urban sprawl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vianello, S</td>
<td></td>
<td>319.003</td>
<td>Acquisition costs underestimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vianello, S</td>
<td></td>
<td>319.004</td>
<td>Amount of compensation not discussed in Draft EIS - but it could not match the continuing fall in land values ever since idea of second Sydney airport was first raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vianello, S</td>
<td></td>
<td>319.005</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not disclose whether airport construction would start immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viglione, JC</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>36.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker, S</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>143.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton, C</td>
<td>Bargo</td>
<td>220.001</td>
<td>Objects to airport at Wilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton, C</td>
<td></td>
<td>220.002</td>
<td>Concerned at risk to water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton, C</td>
<td></td>
<td>220.003</td>
<td>Drainage into Allens Creek would have impact on environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton, C</td>
<td></td>
<td>220.004</td>
<td>Travel time to Wilton makes it unsuitable for airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Industry Salaried Officers' Union</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>76.001</td>
<td>Astonished that serious consideration should have been given to siting second Sydney airport within the Metropolitan water Catchment area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Industry Salaried Officers' Union</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>76.002</td>
<td>Draft EIS inadequate on cost of maintaining integrity and quality of water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Industry Salaried Officers' Union</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>76.003</td>
<td>Concerned that provisions of Clean Waters Act might not be adhered to, if airport sited at Wilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Industry Salaried Officers' Union</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>76.004</td>
<td>Concerned at potential environmental damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weidmann, B</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>111.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiner &amp; Woods Poultry Products/ Woods, RA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>460.001</td>
<td>Opposes airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiner &amp; Woods Poultry Products/ Woods, RA</td>
<td></td>
<td>460.002</td>
<td>Contends that Badgerys Creek site is inferior to Wilton, in view of greater number of people and small businesses affected, and potential conflict with agricultural and possible future urban uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiner &amp; Woods Poultry Products/ Woods, RA</td>
<td></td>
<td>460.003</td>
<td>Fog would present problems at Badgerys Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiner &amp; Woods Poultry Products/ Woods, RA</td>
<td></td>
<td>460.004</td>
<td>Far more people would be adversely affected by compulsory acquisition at Badgerys Creek than at Wilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiner &amp; Woods Poultry Products/ Woods, RA</td>
<td></td>
<td>460.005</td>
<td>Decision is fifteen years too late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiner &amp; Woods Poultry Products/ Woods, RA</td>
<td></td>
<td>460.006</td>
<td>Figures for cost of acquisition are erroneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiner &amp; Woods Poultry Products/ Woods, RA</td>
<td></td>
<td>460.007</td>
<td>Concerned at scale of compensation, as set out in Draft EIS, to be paid for items such as poultry sheds, and other improvements to properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiner &amp; Woods Poultry Products/ Woods, RA</td>
<td></td>
<td>460.008</td>
<td>Considers market value would not be reasonable compensation to poultry farmers or others engaged in intensive farming activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiner &amp; Woods Poultry Products/ Woods, RA</td>
<td></td>
<td>460.009</td>
<td>Concerned that land might be unnecessarily resumed if airport development did not proceed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiner &amp; Woods Poultry Products/ Woods, RA</td>
<td></td>
<td>460.010</td>
<td>Far more people would be adversely affected by noise at Badgerys Creek than at Wilton, and future growth in the region would increase this impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalan, J</td>
<td>Blaxland</td>
<td>301.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalan, J</td>
<td></td>
<td>301.002</td>
<td>Against airport at Badgerys Creek on grounds of air pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalan, J</td>
<td></td>
<td>301.003</td>
<td>Against airport at Badgerys Creek on grounds of water pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, D</td>
<td>Wetherill Park</td>
<td>88.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, MA</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>424.001</td>
<td>Protests against airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>424.002</td>
<td>Parallel runway at Kingsford-Smith Airport should have been allowed for in planning stage, so second airport would not have been needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>424.003</td>
<td>Suggests second Sydney airport more appropriate at Wilton - much less disruption for people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>424.004</td>
<td>Contends that acquisition cost at Badgerys Creek was understated in Draft EIS, and this undermines credibility of entire document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>424.005</td>
<td>Acquisition at Badgerys Creek involves over 750 residents at cost of 480 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>424.006</td>
<td>Twelve questions submitted covering the topic of land acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, R</td>
<td>Fairfield Heights</td>
<td>318.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, B</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>270.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Wilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, B</td>
<td></td>
<td>270.002</td>
<td>Residents value peaceful rural lifestyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, B</td>
<td></td>
<td>270.003</td>
<td>Development of an airport would bring noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, B</td>
<td></td>
<td>270.004</td>
<td>Development of an airport would bring pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, B</td>
<td></td>
<td>270.005</td>
<td>Population growth that would occur in region would result in greater pollution, ecological and social problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, DM</td>
<td>Horsley Park</td>
<td>115.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, T</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>273.001</td>
<td>Opposed to airport at Wilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, T</td>
<td></td>
<td>273.002</td>
<td>Wide variety of airport pollutants could not be prevented from contaminating Sydney’s water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>338.001</td>
<td>Considers that little attention was paid to its previous submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>338.002</td>
<td>States that two different sets of figures for aircraft movements were supplied to Wilton Airport Resistance Committee by the Department of Aviation - requests inclusion of most recent date in Supplement to Draft EIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions the choice of Wilton as best mid-distance site, considers Somersby as a contender

No report on Wilton before Minister's announcement of September 1984

Contends that water catchment should have been assigned high environmental rating, given that national parks were excluded from consideration on this basis

MWBASP not approached before September 1984

APPENDIX H

Earth bank and canal proposed for airport would not adequately contain polluted water

Draft EIS does not consider pollution from the relocation of other services affected by the airport, such as transmission lines, roads and pipelines

Water pollution in Nepean River assessed on basis of inaccurate flow rates - flow at Allens Creek far less than at Camden

Draft EIS does not consider air pollution in local context

Meteorological data in Draft EIS deficient

Wildlife surveys were not comprehensive - out of season wildlife, trapping methods, limited range of sites for bird surveys

Bird control methods would be incompatible with the water catchment controls

Koalas would be affected by noise - healthy communities of koalas off-site not considered in Draft EIS

Draft EIS does not consider platypus

No reference to burrowing animals getting under airport fence

Draft EIS does not consider worst case employment, which would arise if Wilton were to be simply a General Aviation airport

Local noise problems of twenty-four hour airport not addressed

Criticises ANEF system as applied in non-urban areas

Impact of noise greater in semi-rural area with quiet lifestyle

Public amenities in reservoir areas would be affected by noise - impact on Campbelltown and Wollongong populations

Fuel storage not addressed adequately, particularly the risk during a bushfire

Area around Wilton not suitable for preferred regional development

Wilton area would be blighted

Fuel storage not addressed adequately, particularly the risk during a bushfire

Would sterilize coal reserves worth $10,000 million

Suggests that there has been a decline in airport usage at Kingsford-Smith Airport because of cost recovery bias - reduce usage by small aircraft, by policy of full cost recovery
No discussion in Draft EIS of alternatives to reduce the problem of noise at Kingsford-Smith Airport

Compares Draft EIS forecasts with MAN Study - general criticism of forecasts - requests inclusion of base data in Supplement and consideration of effect of larger carriers

General criticism of role of second Sydney airport - suggests a smaller airport closer to city centre would be more appropriate. Wilton would not attract adequate number of passengers

Argues that travel time quoted for Wilton is not representative of actual situation

Compares Draft EIS forecasts with MAN Study - general criticism of forecasts - requests inclusion of base data in Supplement and consideration of effect of larger carriers

Argues initial acquisition cost differences between sites is irrelevant. Introduces arguments with respect to travel time costs and cost of development, value of unspoilt Crown land, cost of subsidy of uneconomic airport

General discussion on comparison of Wilton and Badgerys Creek - feels there is bias in Draft EIS toward Wilton

Pollution of catchment from fire retardants and fuel in the event of a plane crash

Wilton would be world's most remote airport - not viable on international experience

Would disturb pristine eco-systems

Surface water would discharge into Class S' waterways

Could lead to pollution of Sydney's water supply

Site would be expensive to develop because of amount of cut-and-fill needed

Site would be expensive to develop as it is in an area of mine subsidence and seismic activity

Site would be expensive to develop because of need to upgrade transport links to Sydney

Site would be expensive to develop because of infrastructure requirements

Site would be expensive to operate because of long travel times

Site would be expensive to operate because of necessity of disposing of waste, well away from site

Site would be expensive to operate because of necessity for precautions against water pollution

Site would be expensive to operate because of necessity for precautions against air pollution

Site would be expensive to develop because of necessity of relocation of transmission line

Site would be expensive to develop because of requirement to relocate transmission line

Site would be expensive to develop because of necessity of run-off controls necessary, during construction and operation

Site would be expensive to develop because of amount of cut-and-fill needed

Site would be expensive to develop because of necessity of run-off controls necessary, during construction and operation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMENT NO</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</th>
<th>DRAFT EIS SECTION</th>
<th>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Gow, LP &amp; Balia, JR</td>
<td>338.054</td>
<td>Site would be expensive to operate because of necessity for precautions against exotic disease organisms entering water supply</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Gow, LP &amp; Balia, JR</td>
<td>338.055</td>
<td>Site would be expensive to operate because of precautions against exotic disease organisms entering water supply</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Gow, LP &amp; Balia, JR</td>
<td>338.056</td>
<td>Site would be expensive to operate because of need to police against trespass into catchment area</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Gow, LP &amp; Balia, JR</td>
<td>338.057</td>
<td>Site would be expensive to operate because of necessity for precautions against exotic flora invading catchment</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Gow, LP &amp; Balia, JR</td>
<td>338.058</td>
<td>Site would be expensive to operate because of necessity for precautions against exotic fauna invading catchment</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Gow, LP &amp; Balia, JR</td>
<td>338.059</td>
<td>Site would be expensive to operate because of necessity for precautions during periods of high fire danger - area is prone to bushfires</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Gow, LP &amp; Balia, JR</td>
<td>338.060</td>
<td>Site would be expensive to operate because of precautions needed against bird strike</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Gow, LP &amp; Balia, JR</td>
<td>338.061</td>
<td>Aboriginal sites in district not fully explored or documented, for instance in airport surrounds and infrastructure routes</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Gow, LP &amp; Balia, JR</td>
<td>338.062</td>
<td>High incidence of fog, hail and lightning</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Gow, LP &amp; Balia, JR</td>
<td>338.063</td>
<td>Unfavourable wind patterns</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Gow, LP &amp; Balia, JR</td>
<td>338.064</td>
<td>North-south runway only feasible at great cost</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>708</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Gow, LP &amp; Balia, JR</td>
<td>338.065</td>
<td>Proposal runs counter to National Conservation Strategy</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Gow, LP &amp; Balia, JR</td>
<td>338.066</td>
<td>Conflict with statutory requirements of NSW Government</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Gow, LP &amp; Balia, JR</td>
<td>338.067</td>
<td>Would be contrary to Water Board policy</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Environmental Management</td>
<td>338.068</td>
<td>Draft EIS at fault in considering only worst case (heaviest use of second Sydney airport). Wilton would be far greater economic liability than Badgerys Creek at low volumes of traffic</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Environmental Management</td>
<td>338.069</td>
<td>Estimates of noise in Draft EIS very conservative</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Environmental Management</td>
<td>338.070</td>
<td>Draft EIS at fault in not concentrating on the more significant impacts, applying sensitivity tests - this led to error in short-listing Wilton</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Environmental Management</td>
<td>338.071</td>
<td>No report and almost no on-site work on Wilton before Minister's announcement. Analysis in Draft EIS insufficient to justify elimination of some sites from short-listing</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Environmental Management</td>
<td>338.072</td>
<td>Wilton site of value to the National Estate - undisturbed catchments of high scientific value</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton Airport Resistance Committee/Environmental Management</td>
<td>338.073</td>
<td>Errors in short-listing process, most importantly heavier weighting of social environmental effects than of natural environmental effects - conservation status of ecological systems should be considered</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR-ID</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
<td>DRAFT EIS SECTION</td>
<td>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft EIS contains no consideration of value of clean water supply in resource terms rather than monetary</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft EIS should have considered operating costs that varied between sites as well as acquisition costs and variations in economic viability of airport</td>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact of water contamination at Badgerys Creek far less significant than at Wilton - very stringent run-off controls and discharge treatment would be necessary at Wilton. Badgerys Creek water already degraded - mitigation feasible</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecological implications of altered moisture regime downstream of airport boundaries</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk of fire retardant chemicals and fuel polluting catchment in event of plane crash</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Precautions required to prevent exotic disease organisms entering water supply</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecological implications of altered moisture regime downstream of airport boundaries</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental effects of relocating power line and other infrastructure not discussed in Draft EIS</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft EIS does not discuss rare and endangered species of plants at Wilton. Vegetation at Badgerys Creek already very much disturbed</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fire hazard in Wilton area high</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faunal study does not discuss rare and endangered species known to occur in Wilton area</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft EIS misinterprets attitude of Tharawal Aboriginal land council</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requests detailed study of capacity of Wilton and Badgerys Creek to attract passengers - economic viability</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft EIS inconsistent on assessment of quality of coal - Bellando Coal Company development plans</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft EIS overestimates value of agricultural production that would be lost at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Queries need for second Sydney airport. Strategies to increase life of Kingsford-Smith Airport available, such as peak-pricing policy to reduce General Aviation congestion, larger craft, flights bypassing Sydney, and other modes of travel</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Period of delay before construction would be longest at site furthest from Sydney</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social disruption at Badgerys Creek overstated - delay between land acquisition and construction would depend on relocation of many residents and through natural mortality</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive effects of employment generation greater at Badgerys Creek than at Wilton</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT NO</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE IN SUBMISSION</td>
<td>DRAFT EIS SECTION</td>
<td>SUPPLEMENT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisbey, D &amp; M</td>
<td>Silverdale</td>
<td>73.001</td>
<td>Against airport at Badgerys Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisbey, D &amp; M</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.002</td>
<td>Plenty of scope for extension of Kingsford-Smith Airport</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisbey, D &amp; M</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.003</td>
<td>Airport would not benefit lagging business in the area</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willi Creek &amp;</td>
<td>Turrella</td>
<td>66.001</td>
<td>Draft EIS inadequately addresses problems of moving passengers between Kingsford-Smith Airport and</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardwell Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>second Sydney Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft EIS inadequately addresses problems of moving passengers between Kingsford-Smith Airport and</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willi Creek &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.002</td>
<td>second Sydney Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardwell Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demands of freight transport might necessitate construction of airport-to-airport freeway</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.003</td>
<td>Demands of freight transport might necessitate construction of airport-to-airport freeway</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willi Creek &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.004</td>
<td>Airport-to-airport freeway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardwell Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demands of freight transport might necessitate construction of airport-to-airport freeway</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.005</td>
<td>Fuel requirements of second Sydney airport would add to pressure to construct freeway</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willi Creek &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.006</td>
<td>Fuel requirements of second Sydney airport would add to pressure to construct freeway</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardwell Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposes comprehensive rail link with no further development of roads. Fuel should be transported by</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.007</td>
<td>pipeline or rail only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willi Creek &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.008</td>
<td>Proposes comprehensive rail link with no further development of roads. Fuel should be transported by</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardwell Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pipeline or rail only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.009</td>
<td>Supports concept of second Sydney airport</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willi Creek &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opposes any associated development adversely affecting Willi Creek Valley</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardwell Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.010</td>
<td>Opposes any associated development adversely affecting Willi Creek Valley</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.011</td>
<td>Opposes any associated development adversely affecting Willi Creek Valley</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willi Creek &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supports concept of second Sydney airport</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardwell Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opposes any associated development adversely affecting Willi Creek Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.012</td>
<td>Supports concept of second Sydney airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong Chamber of</td>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>349.001</td>
<td>Expresses strong support for Wilton proposal</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce &amp; Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong Chamber of</td>
<td></td>
<td>349.002</td>
<td>Acceptable travel time, taking into account the planned construction of the Southern Freeway</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce &amp; Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong Chamber of</td>
<td></td>
<td>349.003</td>
<td>Impacts of noise pollution minimal</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce &amp; Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong Chamber of</td>
<td></td>
<td>349.004</td>
<td>Flight paths in the main within uninhabited tracts of catchment area</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce &amp; Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong Chamber of</td>
<td></td>
<td>349.005</td>
<td>Wilton easily serviced from Sydney, Wollongong and Campbelltown</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce &amp; Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong Chamber of</td>
<td></td>
<td>349.006</td>
<td>Acquisition costs nil</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce &amp; Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong Chamber of</td>
<td></td>
<td>349.007</td>
<td>Employment and flow-on effects would be very beneficial to Wollongong area</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce &amp; Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td>Wollongong East</td>
<td>432.001</td>
<td>Supports development of Wilton site</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>432.002</td>
<td>Conflict between mining interest and airport, but most of coal could still be extracted</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>432.003</td>
<td>Badgerys Creek Airport would sterilize large potential urban growth area</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>432.004</td>
<td>Wilton would provide great economic stimulus and improve employment opportunities</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>432.005</td>
<td>Lower cost of acquiring Wilton compensates for additional cost of accessibility</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>432.006</td>
<td>Airport at Wilton would not interfere with other airspace</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td>432.007</td>
<td>Air quality would not be affected to any marked degree</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td>432.008</td>
<td>Water quality would not be affected</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td>432.009</td>
<td>Dual-purpose management strategy for controlling both water and ecology should be adopted</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td>432.010</td>
<td>Dual-purpose management strategy for controlling both water and ecology should be adopted</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td>432.011</td>
<td>Dual-purpose management strategy for controlling both water and ecology should be adopted</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td>432.012</td>
<td>More people would be affected by noise at Badgerys Creek site than at Wilton</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td>432.013</td>
<td>Aircraft noise not issue for residents at Wollongong</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td>432.014</td>
<td>Although Wilton is further from Sydney than Badgerys Creek, Wilton is nearer Wollongong and other urban areas such as Goulburn, Canberra</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td>432.015</td>
<td>Aboriginal land council not opposed to Wilton site</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td>432.016</td>
<td>Airport would provide employment for Wollongong and Campbelltown regions</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td>432.017</td>
<td>Area of approximately 2000 hectares of relatively flat land available at Wilton</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td>432.018</td>
<td>Site satisfies MANS criteria for accessibility</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td>432.019</td>
<td>Wilton site would require extensive cut-and-fill, but extra fill (slag and coal wash) is available locally</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td>432.020</td>
<td>Clear flight paths in all directions</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council</td>
<td>432.021</td>
<td>Acquisition costs minimal</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council/Airport Task Force</td>
<td>432.022</td>
<td>Speedy acquisition process</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council/Airport Task Force</td>
<td>432.023</td>
<td>Coal mining presents problem, but measures could be taken to avoid subsidence</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council/Airport Task Force</td>
<td>432.024</td>
<td>Region offers most of required infrastructure and resources (available residential land, transport routes, workforce)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council/Airport Task Force</td>
<td>432.025</td>
<td>Skilled labour available locally for design and construction</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council/Airport Task Force</td>
<td>432.026</td>
<td>International airport would increase tourism in region</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council/Airport Task Force</td>
<td>432.027</td>
<td>Meteorological data show fogs are not severe</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council/Airport Task Force</td>
<td>432.028</td>
<td>Airport accessible from F5 Freeway</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council/Airport Task Force</td>
<td>432.029</td>
<td>Maldon-Dombarton railway could provide direct high-speed rail link to Sydney and Wollongong</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council/Airport Task Force</td>
<td>432.030</td>
<td>Strict water control measures would be needed, but MWS&amp;DB concludes that problems are surmountable</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council/Airport Task Force</td>
<td>432.031</td>
<td>Few, if any, people affected by noise, if airport sited at Wilton</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council/Airport Task Force</td>
<td>432.032</td>
<td>Reduction in adverse effects experienced by suburbs near Kingsford-Smith Airport would be beneficial</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council/Airport Task Force</td>
<td>432.033</td>
<td>It would be necessary to develop all remaining sectors within Sydney Region by year 2011 in order to accommodate the increase in population</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council/Airport Task Force</td>
<td>432.034</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not acknowledge that second Sydney airport at Badgerys Creek would affect the ultimate capacity for development of the Sydney Region</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council/Airport Task Force</td>
<td>432.035</td>
<td>Draft EIS does not acknowledge that second Sydney airport at Wilton would affect the ultimate capacity for development of the Sydney Region</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong City Council/Airport Task Force</td>
<td>432.036</td>
<td>Development of preferred runway alignment at Badgerys Creek would result in noise effects over approximately 245 hectares of brisquilly growth sector (third priority sector)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment No

736

245.009

Pressure on environment of region would increase through

• Object to Wilton site

Integrated forward planning by local, regional and State

Prospects for allocation to the Bel Iambi Coal Company Pty Ltd

Limiting working under the airport to solids would not

Recommends application of environmental protection principles

Wolongong

736

728

For summary of comments, see submission no. 8, Lave, L

Panel and pillar mining would reduce subsidence risk

adequately, but would still delay construction of airport until

year 2020, and would increase costs of production

Wollongong

432.048

Sterilising coal under airport would reduce life of Bulli seam

by ten years – this would be uneconomic for the Bellambi Coal

Company Pty Ltd

Wollongong

432.046

Current programme of extraction would preclude construction of

airport for 30-40 years

Wollongong

432.045

Limiting working under the airport to solids would not

significantly reduce the loss of coal sterilized

Wollongong

432.047

Panel and pillar mining would reduce subsidence risk

Yacchenello, AV

Horsley Park

34.000

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Yacchenello, U

Horsley Park

145.000

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Young, C

Horsley Park

280.000

For summary of comments, see submission no. B, Lave, L

Young, Dr A

Wollongong

245.001

Factual material in Draft EIS is of high standard

Young, Dr A

Wollongong

245.002

Adverse effects of fuel were dumped over Metropolitan Water

Catchment dams.

Young, Dr A

Wollongong

245.003

Draft EIS does not discuss polluting effects resulting from

localised cold air flows

Young, Dr A

Wollongong

245.004

Inevitably some siltation of actual water catchment strems

would occur during construction

Young, Dr A

Wollongong

245.005

Only first flush of stormwater could be controlled. Proposed

treatment not adequate for pollutants such as oils, pesticides

Young, Dr A

Wollongong

245.006

Would not be possible to meet at all times the standards

required by Clean Waters Act Class 'S' and 'P' water

Young, Dr A

Wollongong

245.007

Draft EIS does not consider adequately effects of re-routing

330kV powerline

Young, Dr A

Wollongong

245.008

No indication of impact of constructing suitable road

connection to South Western Freeway

Young, Dr A

Wollongong

245.009

Approach flight path over Royal National Park detrimental to

quiet enjoyment

Young, Dr A

Wollongong

245.010

Draft EIS does not comment on potential effects of major

bushfires on airport

Zammit, T

St Johns Park

474.000

For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J

Zatschler, E & A

Oak Flats

392.001

Object to Wilton site
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zatschler, E &amp; K</td>
<td></td>
<td>393.002</td>
<td>The use of water catchment area as site for airport would be thin edge of wedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zatschler, E &amp; K</td>
<td></td>
<td>393.003</td>
<td>Future demand for water as well as airport facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zatschler, E &amp; K</td>
<td></td>
<td>393.004</td>
<td>Coal sterilization issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zatschler, E &amp; K</td>
<td></td>
<td>393.005</td>
<td>Destruction of natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zivkovic, H</td>
<td>St Johns Park</td>
<td>442.000</td>
<td>For summary of comments, see submission no. 267, Clark, J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For comment reference, see model proforma
** See APPENDIX 2
This appendix comprises amendments to the Draft EIS to correct errors or omissions identified during the ten-week public comment period. Amendments have been identified which relate to:

- text
- figures.

The amendments which have been identified are set out below.

A2.1 AMENDMENTS TO TEXT

One submission made a number of comments (274.020, 274.093 and 274.127) relating to amendments to the text. These are included below.

Page 22

'... about 2 km of 330 kV transmission line forming part of the Sydney South to Dapto supply service, ...'

should read,

'... about 2 km of the 330 kV Avon-Kemps Creek transmission line, ...'

Page 236

'Owing to increasing transport costs, it is also desirable for farms to be close to the hatchery, feed mill and processing plant (100 km is the maximum recommended distance for the transport of poultry to processing plants).

The Premier's Department has indicated that the wording of this should be changed to indicate that:

'Poultry processors do not want to travel more than 25 km due to increased costs.'

Page 238

'Milk production is regulated by a quota system to limit supply, but growers must also produce ...'

should read,

'Milk production is regulated by a quota system and growers must produce ...'

Page 244

'Similarly, the NSW Dairy Corporation might not allow a producer to transfer his quota to a property further away from Sydney ...'

should read,
'Similarly, a producer might not be able to transfer his quota to a property further away from Sydney ...'

Page 348

'Part of the Sydney South to Dapto 330 kV steel tower transmission line ...

should read,

'Part of the Avon-Kemps Creek 330 kV steel tower transmission line ...

Page 440

'This seam is considered uneconomic for mining purposes within the proposed site.'

should read,

'This seam is considered uneconomic for mining purposes within the East Bargo sector of the proposed site.'

Page 440

The reference to 'Coal Development Area No. 3'

should read

'Area set aside for potential future development' to accord with the revised wording of Figure 15.1.2 on page 441 (see below - amendments to Figures)

Page 446

'... was the preferred choice over all other sites in the Wilton area was because it overlies an area of poor quality coal and therefore minimizes the potential for coal sterilization.'

The Premier's Department advises that this statement needs to be qualified by the following:

'... for coal sterilization. However, it is not possible to predict the quality of coal contracts at the turn of the century and it might be desirable to selectively mine the area to obtain coal for blending to produce a marketable product.'

Page 506

'... the Sydney West - Avon 330 kV transmission line'

should read

'... the Kemps Creek - Avon 330 kV transmission line.'

A2.2 AMENDMENTS TO FIGURES

Three submissions made five comments (65.012, 274.092, 274.099, 274.100 and 384.001) which relate to three figures contained in the Draft EIS.
Figure 1.3 (Page 51)

One submission criticized this figure because it omitted place names.

The purpose of this figure was to provide a schematic representation of the constraints to urban development within the Sydney region. This map is a stylized version of a map prepared at 1:150,000 scale by the Department of Environment and Planning using information from a variety of sources. It does not purport to be a precise delineation, hence to put place names on the map could be misleading.

The map contains physical information such as rivers and bays. This information has been proportionally scaled down and is sufficient to indicate the relative geographic location of the mapped features.

Figures 14.8.1 (Page 431)

One comment was that the figure is inaccurate as it does not correctly indicate topographically difficult or unstable land.

This map is a stylized version of a map prepared at 1:150,000 scale by the Department of Environment and Planning using the best available information at the time of its compilation. Figure 14.8.1 has been reduced in scale and is reproduced at about 1:500,000. It should not be used by property owners as a means of interpreting the constraints which might or might not apply to particular parcels of land. It should be noted that the scaled distance between the blue hatching on the map represents about 500 m in distance, and hence the map is not intended to give precise and detailed information in respect of individual properties.

The Department of Environment and Planning is currently preparing a Regional Environmental Study for the Macarthur Region. This study will examine the urban capability of the region based on more recent information relating to land capability and topographic constraints. This information is based on more advanced mapping techniques than were used to prepare the data for Figure 14.8.1 and is likely to provide some detailed information.

Figure 15.1.2 (Page 441)

One comment indicated that Figure 15.1.2 of the Draft EIS should be revised and amended to include updated and additional information.

Figure A2.1 has been revised and amended in accordance with the comments. 'Coal Development Area No. 4 (Bargo)' has been retitled 'Area Set Aside for Potential Future Development.'

It has not been possible to extend the proposed coal mining area boundary due to the size and scale of the figure. However, the source from which this information can be obtained is added to the figure.

The proposed West Bellambi pit top site has been included on the revised figure.
Figure 15.2.1 (Page 459)

One submission made two comments about details shown on Figure 15.2.1 of the Draft EIS relating to the classification of the Nepean River within the Devines Weir Inner Catchment area and the inference that the Devines Weir Inner Catchment is part of Sydney's water supply system.

Figure A2.2 has been amended to show the correct classifications of the Nepean River within the Devines Weir Inner Catchment.

A note has been added to the illustration to indicate the Devines Weir Inner Catchment is not part of the Sydney water supply system.
Proposed airport site

Metropolitan Catchment
(Section 55, MWS & DB Act, 1924)

Devines Weir Inner Catchment area
(Section 55, MWS & DB Act, 1924)

Class S – Specially protected waters

Class P – Protected waters

Class C – Controlled

Figure A2.2
UPPER NEPEAN RIVER SCHEME – PART OF SYDNEY’S WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM
APPENDIX 3 — LATE SUBMISSIONS

As stated in the Introduction, thirteen submissions were received by the Department of Aviation after 6 September and therefore too late to be included in either the computer listing or the detailed analysis of submissions. These were examined after the responses to the other submissions had been completed and a brief description of their contents is given below.

Overseas Telecommunications Commission

- OTC receiver station will not be technically obsolete at time airport built;
- Claim that relocation will be necessary without airport not supported by data;
- EIS does not state that airport would make receiver station unworkable;
- Supplement should contain quantitative data relating to electromagnetic interference.

Response

The Draft EIS acknowledges (page 258) that the OTC station is to be upgraded 'by a more technically advanced system'.

The Draft EIS states (page 260) 'the long-term future of these sensitive facilities in their present locations is very uncertain, in the context of continued metropolitan growth and technological change.' This statement is believed correct. It is acknowledged that the receiver station in its present location would be incompatible with the airport. Quantifiable data relevant to the time of operation of the airport is not readily available due to the uncertainties of airport planning and technological advances.

Frank Arkell, M.P. for Wollongong

- Supports Wilton
- Numerous points related to regional economic considerations, timetable for development, protection of the catchment area and concern at the effects on mining activity. All these points have been covered in responses to other submissions.
- High quality road and rail links to Wollongong needed.

Response

Airport access links would in the first instance be directed towards Sydney. Connections to Wollongong would be developed as appropriate to the level of demand.

Australian Federation of Air Pilots

- Considerable development desirable at Kingsford-Smith Airport.
- Prefers Badgerys Creek to Wilton because of distance from city.
Prefers north/south alignment at Badgerys Creek because of distant terrain conflict.
Cross wind runway needed.

**Response**

The north/south alignment at Badgerys Creek was rejected because of its excess noise impact compared with the north-east/south-west direction. There is high ground to the south-west of the airport but 1.6% approach surfaces are available for more than 15 km from the runway threshold and this is considered more than adequate.

The pilots' suggestion of a cross wind runway is based on a 10 knot cross wind tolerance for aircraft when the runway is wet. This is a very conservative figure as most commercial aircraft have a higher cross wind tolerance than this.

However, even if this criterion was accepted the usability of either site without a cross runway would be in excess of 99.5% which is considered adequate for a second airport.

**R.J.T. and C.A. Hoare**

Twelve submissions were received and attached together as submission number 233. Two additional late submissions were received which did not raise any issues not previously covered.

**Fairfield City Council**

Fairfield Council's submission was number 341. An additional late submission was received comprising a copy of the submission of the Horsley Park Protection Cooperative to Fairfield Council. Two points not covered previously were:

- Allegations of 'sneaky' and 'snide' conduct by Department of Aviation in the maps used in the Draft EIS;
- Claims that some existing houses in the Horsley Park area are not shown on the aerial photograph.

**Response**

The map bases used in the Draft EIS were not drawn by Department of Aviation or Kinhill Stearns but were simply available maps of the area chosen for their clarity and suitability of scale.

The aerial photograph was taken in September 1984 and would not show houses constructed since that date.

**Wollongong City Council**

Wollongong Council's submission was number 432. A late addition was received from the Council advising that the potential impact of an airport at Wilton on the coal mining activity was more severe than originally realised. The Council also supports the comments of the Bellambi Coal Company Pty Limited (submission no. 346).

**Wollondilly Shire Council**

Favours upgrading of Kingsford-Smith Airport.
National Trust of Australia

. Urges further environmental studies of both sites before a decision is taken.
. Opposes both sites.
. Claims Draft EIS contains no assessment of effects on avifauna at either site.
. Other points related to historic buildings, land use planning and protection of water quality covered in previous responses.

Response

The need for further environmental studies is not accepted.

Chapters 11.2 and 16.2 of the Draft EIS contain assessments of the importance of avifauna at the two sites.

Prospect County Council

. Not opposed to either site.
. Stresses need for early decision and consultation.
. Would be necessary to change route of proposed 132 kV transmission line if Badgerys Creek chosen.

Response

Consultation would be undertaken with all relevant bodies including Prospect Council as soon as appropriate after a site decision is known.

Upper Blue Mountains Conservation Society/Lower Blue Mountains Conservation Society

Contains many points on environmental and social issues, several very similar to those made by the Blue Mountains Anti-Airport Committee (submission no. 330). No new issues were raised.

Corrimal and District Chamber of Commerce

Supports Wilton.

Illawarra Region of Councils

. Supports Wilton.
. Supports Wollongong Council's concerns for protection of the water supply, management of the ecology of the catchment area, protecton of existing jobs and consideration for the effects on Wilton residents.

Illawarra Regional Information Service

Supports Wilton.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glossary Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft movement</td>
<td>a landing or take-off of an aircraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airshed</td>
<td>drainage of air mass over a defined geographic area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angle of draw</td>
<td>specified angle limiting the extent of underground mining so as to provide protection to a specific surface feature or boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-grade</td>
<td>(of a road intersection) having the intersecting roads on the same level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authigenic</td>
<td>(of minerals) formed in situ, during or after deposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B horizon</td>
<td>the middle layer of soil, lying between the topsoil and the originating material; the subsoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel sandstone</td>
<td>sandstone formed from a bed of sand deposited in a stream bed or some other channel eroded into the underlying bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-pair passenger demand</td>
<td>demand for seats on aircraft between any given pair of cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forb</td>
<td>any herbaceous plant which is not a grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glide slope</td>
<td>an electronic navigation facility providing vertical guidance for aircraft during approach and landing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross margin</td>
<td>the gross return from an enterprise less variable costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundside</td>
<td>of that part of a journey which is made on land, not in the air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbing</td>
<td>the designation of selected airports for the collection and distribution of an airline's passengers making intermediate stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlining</td>
<td>changing from one airline carrier to another on the same journey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laminite</td>
<td>a series of sedimentary beds made up of individual units that show a regular vertical pattern of changing grain size of the sediments comprising the bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithosol</td>
<td>surface rock without soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localizer</td>
<td>a directional radio beacon which guides an aircraft during approach and landing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwall</td>
<td>method of mining coal in which the whole seam is removed leaving no pillars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedal</td>
<td>(of soil) having a structure that includes natural aggregates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picrite</td>
<td>an igneous rock consisting principally of ferromagnesian minerals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisolithic</td>
<td>(of sedimentary rock) built of round concretions 2 mm or more in diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point bar</td>
<td>a bank of sand or gravel deposited on the inner side of a river meander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propagule</td>
<td>a part of a plant, such as a seed or cutting, capable of forming a new plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenance terrain</td>
<td>the parent rock from which the fragments of a sediment are formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartzose sandstone</td>
<td>a sandstone composed of at least 90% silica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silcrete</td>
<td>a compacted subsoil cemented with silica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swale</td>
<td>a depression or marshy place in the ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal passenger</td>
<td>a passenger who joins or leaves an aircraft at an airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touch-and-go training flights</td>
<td>a landing followed immediately by a take-off without stopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understorey</td>
<td>the lower layer of trees in a forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind shear</td>
<td>a change of wind speed with height</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Concise Oxford Dictionary may be consulted for definitions of any terms not listed in this glossary.
ABBREVIATIONS

ANEF  Australian Noise Exposure Forecast
CSPR  two closely spaced parallel runways with a cross-wind runway
d    day(s)
dB    decibel(s)
DSE   dry sheep equivalent
DWSPR two double widely spaced parallel runways with a pair of cross-wind runways
EIS   Environmental Impact Statement
h    hour(s)
ha   hectare(s)
L    litre(s)
m    metre(s)
MANS  Major Airport Needs of Sydney
MJ    megajoule(s)
MM    Modified Mercallie scale (followed by roman numeral)
Mt    megatonne(s)
MV    megavolt(s)
MWS&DB Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board
NA    not applicable
NEF   Noise Exposure Forecast
pphm  parts per hundred million
ppm   parts per million
R    right
RPT   regular public transport (scheduled airline and commuter services)
S. A. N. I. T. Y Sydney's Airport Needs in the Year 2000
SR    single runway
WSPR  two widely spaced parallel runways with a cross-wind runway