

MEMORANDUM

TO: Hinchinbrook Shire Council – Development and Regulatory Services

FROM: Gilvear Planning

DATE: 29 April 2024

SUBJECT: VA:LA MCUW23\0005, RC23\0016, OPW23\0007 - Submission Response

Table 1 outlines our understanding of the submissions made in respect to the above application and the applicant's response to the issues raised. Table 2 summarises the main matters raised in submissions received and provides an overview of how many times that issue was raised. There were a total of 81 submissions properly made and 4 late submissions. Most submissions were from adjoining neighbours and local community members who raised issues in respect of the development as follows:

Table 1: Summary of issue raised and response.

SUBMISSION ISSUE	RESPONSE
Lack of consultation	
- No consultation. - Consultation that occurred was too little too late. - Information provided during consultation meeting was confusing. - Inappropriate placement of Public Notice signs.	Community consultation undertaken in relation to the MFEP BESS, has exceeded the legislative requirements. In addition to the mandatory public notification period, several community meetings have been held (18th December 2023, 6th January 2024 and 23 March 2024) in relation to the MFEP BESS proposal. Project details were shared/explained during these organised community meetings. It is also noted that the developer and landowners were present at these meetings and made themselves available to answer any questions. Residents received information from the project team, via mail. Letter correspondence provided an overview of the proposal as well as providing additional contact details for people to use, should they have further questions/concerns. The application was publicly notified between 10th January 2024 and 16th February 2024. The public notification period was originally due to conclude on 30th January 2024 – however, a decision was made to extend the public notice period until 16th February 2024, to allow

	additional time for members of the public to consider the application material and lodge a submission. Initial concerns raised in relation to the placement of public notice signs were rectified as soon as practical to ensure the concerns of the public were appropriately addressed. Following the relocation of some signage, no further complaints were made. Engagement with the Mount Fox community is continuing – with Mount Fox Energy Park recently announcing the Community Initiatives from the MFEP Wind Farm and BESS. The funds available for the BESS component of the project are as follows: - \$30k/year community benefit fund; and - \$15k/year ecology benefit fund. Please note, that this may be subject to change following community feedback.
Amenity Impacts	
- Noise pollution (constant hum from built infrastructure). - Impacts on the visual amenity: - o transformation into an industrial park/area. - o Adding to the visual impact that is already there as a result of the Switching Station. - Detracts from the existing rural lifestyle and character (described as tranquil).	Potential amenity impacts are addressed in the application. Further technical assessment and studies will be undertaken to ensure that the proposed MFEP BESS does not result in negative amenity impacts relating to noise and/or visual impacts. It is noted that since lodgement of the application, a noise assessment has been undertaken for development proposed and confirms that the predicted noise levels from the BESS fall below the applicable noise criterion (pursuant to the Environmental Protection (Noise) Policy 2019) at nearby sensitive receptors. Air and odour related impacts are not considered to result from development proposed. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that where impacts to air are likely to occur within proximity to the facility, resulting from traffic deliveries creating dust during construction, these impacts will be managed appropriately. A Construction Environment Management Plan will be prepared to ensure that impacts are managed appropriately. Additionally, it is noted that a Noise Assessment Report has also been prepared to identify/understand the operational noise impacts. Construction noise requirements will be maintained as per Councils requirements. Visual impacts resulting from the proposed development are not likely to occur, given that the proposed BESS will be sufficiently screened from view. The areas between the proposed BESS and neighbouring

	properties (with the closest dwelling being over 1.5km away) are heavily vegetated.
Social Impacts	
- Negative impact on property values/marketability. - Impacts on the health of the population – due to contamination of water sources, pollution, etc. - Impacts on the future generations: - o no longer able to enjoy the tranquillity of this area. - o Will have to deal/live with the impacts from proposed development. - Disruptions to the learning environment – resulting from noise pollution. - Added stress on residents/farmers. - Won't generate 300 local jobs.	Pursuant to Section 45 of the Planning Act 2017, a person's personal circumstances, financial or otherwise is not considered to be a relevant matter in which an assessment manager is to take into consideration when assessing an impact assessable application. In considering this, concerns raised in submissions regarding land devaluation are not relevant and should not inform Councils assessment of the application. Other social impacts raised are based off speculated impacts/incidents. While consideration may be given to these types of perceived/potential impacts, it is submitted that most identified impacts will be mitigated through further detailed design and conditions imposed which require management plans and strategies will be implemented to ensure that all potential impacts are appropriately mitigated and/or minimised. The BESS will require approximate 40 individuals during construction and suitable construction management plans will be created to ensure the impact to neighbouring properties is minimised. A complaints management plan will also be created to ensure grievances are captured and addressed accordingly in a transparent manner.
Cultural Heritage	
- Lack of cultural heritage surveys undertaken to inform the project. - Impacts to cultural heritage (art, artefacts, story lines) Impacts to totems (owls, eagles, wallabies, bats)	Extensive engagement with Gugu Badhun has been undertaken. Gugu Badhun have agreed to and signed a Cultural Heritage Agreement and negotiation protocol for the proposed MFEP Wind Farm and BESS. A cultural heritage survey of the BESS site has been completed.
Incompatibility with the Rural Zone	

- Development will degrade the ability for rural land uses to co-exist and thrive. - Development is inconsistent with the Rural Zone / Character. - Development footprint will be fenced off and will not be available to use for future grazing. - Concerns that the MCU will permit additional industrial uses to be developed within the subject lots. - This area has escaped transition to cane and more intensive agriculture – remains largely in tact.	Demonstrated compliance with the Strategic Intent, Purpose and Overall Outcomes of the Rural Zone is included within the application package. The proposed MFEP BESS is expected to be established within a very small portion of the defined project site. The remainder of the site will remain available to be used for agricultural/rural purposes. It is noted that although the subject land is zoned Rural, the area has also been identified as being suitable for the establishment of other renewable energy projects – more specifically a solar farm/s. The subject site is located within the Solar Energy Development Precinct, pursuant to Council's Local Planning Scheme. While the proposal is not for Solar energy and/or infrastructure, the proposed MFEP BESS will help to facilitate/support future renewable energy projects, which is considered to be consistent with the intent of the Solar Energy Development Precinct. The present state of the subject site is not suitable in supporting the predominant agricultural land use (cattle grazing), given the extensive weed infestation that exists within the site. In considering this, the proposal will facilitate better land management practices and ultimately will support the transition back to good quality agricultural farm land.
--	--

Fire risk associated with a BESS

- Increased risk of fire/s – it is noted that the fire rating for Mt Fox is moderate to high, in the dry season. - Fire events will result in the release of harmful chemicals, pollutants – pose a significant environmental risk. - Increased risk of environmental contamination because of fire (i.e. contaminated runoff into waterways, toxic smoke). - Battery technology is prone to	With the new battery technology, fires are an extremely unlikely occurrence, and if they occur, are unlikely to spread. Testing shows that gasses from a Megapack fire are similar to those of a typical structure fire: hydrogen, carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide and methane. Only trace amounts of acid gasses are released during a fire. These gasses, such as hydrogen fluoride, come from burning plastics, not battery cells. The concentrations are small enough that they are quickly diluted upon contact with the air, meaning there is no negative impact to air quality in the surrounding area. The Tesla Megapack has been designed to prevent battery fires and be resilient if they occur. They contain hardware and software safety features that are designed and tested to help prevent system errors during its lifetime and, if they do occur, prevent them from escalating. The Megapacks are also remotely monitored 24/7 allowing for early detection, diagnosis and troubleshooting well before a fire event occurring.
---	---

fault/explosion/fire/thermal runaway. - No capacity or resourcing within the local fire brigade to combat a battery fire. Local fire brigade are volunteers and not trained for these types of fires.	Extract from Tesla Impact Report shows battery fire risk below 0.001% In line with CFA guidelines on Renewable Energy Facilities, although water is not required on a BESS fire, MF BESS will have over 500,000l of static water tanks and hydrants within the site. This water can be used for a fire at the facility but also to help the rural fire brigade to battle bushfires in the area outside the facility. In addition to the CFA requirements MF BESS will have thermal cameras located for early detection of bushfires around the facility, again assisting the rural fire brigade in early detection of bushfires. Following the VBB fire, Tesla have implemented procedural, firmware and hardware changes as a result of the incident. Most notably though, the battery cell chemistry changed after VBB and the updated configuration demonstrates significantly different properties and propensity to fire when compared to other chemistries. Tesla Megapacks now utilise Lithium Iron Phosphate (LFP) as the cathode material. LFP offers enhanced safety compared to other lithium-ion technologies. One key safety feature is its stable thermal and chemical properties. LFP batteries exhibit high resilience during oxygen loss, a situation that can lead to exothermic reactions in other lithium cells. This resilience makes the cells less prone to ignition in case of mishandling, especially during the charging process. Additionally, LFP batteries do not decompose at high temperatures, further contributing to their safety. Effective pre-incident planning is also undertaken prior to construction and operations. MFEP shall consult with QFES to develop a suitable Emergency Response Plan. These plans will provide information on the technical characteristics of the project and recommended firefighting strategies for each stage of the project, such that in the unlikely event of a fire the department shall be fully briefed on recommended strategies to manage associated risks. QFES are currently reviewing the Bushfire Management Plan for the development and are referring to the CFA guidelines on BESS facilities which outline the recommended infrastructure and controls to effectively manage fire risk. MFEP will continue to work with the QFES to ensure they are reasonably satisfied on the plans and the facility design.
Environmental Impacts	
- Clearing of vegetation will result in significant environmental impacts, for example:	Extensive environmental assessments were undertaken and informed the design/location of the proposed MFEP BESS. The proposed MFEP BESS has been suitably located and design to ensure that

○ Loss of/negative impacts on critical habitat for endangered and vulnerable species. ○ Loss of/negative impacts on endangered and vulnerable species. ○ Soil disturbance, erosion and run-off. ○ Loss of/reduction in some of the last remaining intact forests. ○ Loss of existing carbon uptake and storage (forests). ○ Geological features will be destroyed as a result of infrastructure (roads). - The operation of the BESS will also result in the abovementioned environmental impacts. - Close proximity to WTWHA – which is also likely to be impacted. - Lack of environmental assessment material included in the application.	environmental impacts are reduced. Further information in relation to how environmental impacts will either be mitigated or reduced is included in the application package. Subject to assessment by the State the State have issued an approval for vegetation clearing (SARA Reference: 2311-37720 SRA). All known and/or potential environmental impacts were considered/informed SARA's assessment of the proposal. WTMA is not a relevant interest. EPBC is separate process and is currently being considered. Additional/supporting environmental reporting (prepared by 4 Elements Consulting) has been provided and details the key environmental features across the site, as well as providing information on the potential/likelihood of environmental impact/s.
---	--

Water Impacts

- Project site is located within proximity to Michael Creek watershed and Yellori Creek. Main water supply for the local	The location and layout have been informed through detailed flora and fauna assessments. Run-off is managed through Stormwater Management Plans, as is typical of any development.
--	---

community. A number of registered bores that take from Michael Creek. - Development will significantly impact existing water supply/water sources (Michael Creek, Yellori Creek, nearby watercourses, springs, bores, groundwater) – impacts are likely to result from: - o Contaminated water run-off into waterbodies – exacerbated during flood/high rainfall events. - o Contaminants are likely to include harmful chemicals/substances used to operate the BESS and/or harmful chemicals/substances that get released during a fire event. - Downstream impacts are likely – these are the headwaters for the Burdekin River and Douglas River. - Existing topography has not been appropriately reflected/considered in the application. - Water sources are already limited – additional use of water to support development proposed will further	Fluid leaks are retained internally within the Megapack units. In addition, natural water flows are diverted around the facility and catchment basins are installed to capture any water run off within the facility. An Overarching Erosion and Sediment Control Plan has been created via a RPEQ registered consultant in accordance with the Best Practice Erosion and Sediment Control (BPSEC) guidelines for Australia. This plan provides a clear framework for the BESS project. Along with the Vegetation Management Plan and Rehabilitation Management Plan, these plans will assist to control the removal of topsoils and vegetation that can cause unnecessary erosion during construction and operations. Prior to construction a BESS Construction Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (CESCP) and drawings are created to manage water runoff and erosion based off final designs. During construction high frequency monitoring of the sediment and erosion control measures across the site will be undertaken to monitor their effectiveness and corrected where required. Details of this are included in the OSECP provided. In addition the project will be undertaking monitoring of creeks for turbidity and quality within the project vicinity to detect any issues early. The water quality monitoring is an integral part of ensuring the sediment and erosion measures are effective. The BESS area during construction and operations will be designed so that water runoff flows into a catchment basin. Discharge from the sediment basins will be monitored and Table 11 in the OSECP outlines typical discharge criteria from the sediment basins. A performance assessment report for the basin following rainfall is to be undertaken in accordance with the template provided in the (OSECP). In the highly unlikely event of a fire, water is not recommended to be used as means to extinguish the fire, further reducing any run-off risk. The chemicals that are released into the air in an event of a fire (as per table 1 below) are low risk to existing waterways that are located over 150m away and predominantly upwind of the BESS site. Table 1 – Result from Tesla's 3rd party testing on the emissions produced during fires and normal operation of a BESS facility. The testing demonstrated that toxic cases usually associated with Lithium batteries were not vented from the Megapacks.
--	--

reduce the availability of water for local residents/farmers.

Table 2 Products of Combustion: UL 9540A Module Level Testing

Gas Name	Chemical Structure	Measurement Peak (ppm)	Detection Method
Carbon Monoxide	CO	204.84	FTIR
Carbon Dioxide	CO ₂	6720.62	FTIR
Methane	CH ₄	67.83	FTIR
Acetylene	C ₂ H ₂	17.11	FTIR
Ethene	C ₂ H ₄	Not Detected	FTIR
Ethane	C ₂ H ₆	Not Detected	FTIR
Propane	C ₃ H ₈	Not Detected	FTIR
Butane	C ₃ H ₄	Not Detected	FTIR
Pentane	C ₃ H ₆	Not Detected	FTIR
Benzene	C ₆ H ₆	9.01	FTIR
Hexane	C ₇ H ₁₄	Not Detected	FTIR
Hydrofluoric Acid	HF	Not Detected	FTIR
Hydrogen Chloride	HCL	Not Detected	FTIR
Hydrogen Cyanide	HCN	Not Detected	FTIR
Hydrogen	H ₂	446	Hydrogen Sensor
Total Hydrocarbons	(Propane Equivalent)	246.53	FID

Pursuant to the Environmental Protection Act 1994, Mount Fox Energy Park has a general environmental duty of care to ensure that no activity that causes or is likely to cause environmental harm, is carried out, unless measures to prevent or minimise the harm have been taken.

Environmental impacts formed part of Councils assessment of the application and where appropriate, can be conditioned to comply.

Separation of Applications – reduces the efficacy of the BESS as a stand alone development.

- Environmental efficacy of the BESS may be lost/reduced – where the BESS is proposed in advance of/separate to the Wind Farm.
- Potential for the BESS to operate/function as not originally intended – that being for a genuinely ‘green’ solution.
- Risk that the Wind Farm won’t be built and therefore the potential for

The original Wind Farm approval includes a BESS. However, due to the changes to the Regulation in late 2022, separation of the BESS was necessary as the State is not the relevant Assessment Manager.

As with any development, no guarantee that any of it will be constructed, as it is still subject to Financial decisions etc.

The MFEP BESS is intended to be used for the purposes outlined within the application package.

This is not a relevant matter.

the BESS to operate on a model akin to energy trading is likely.	
Location of development	
- There are more suitable locations to establish these types of development – in already degraded/cleared areas. - Development should be strategically located to ensure all potential impact are reduced/mitigated. - Located outside of a REZ. - Unacceptable location given the distance from emergency services.	The proposed MFEP BESS has been strategically located to ensure/allow for connection into existing major electricity services infrastructure. The MFEP BESS is within proximity/connects into the recently constructed Guybal Munjan Switching Station, which forms part of the Kidston Clean Energy Hub. The Kidston Clean Energy Hub is expected to connect to the Queensland grid via a 275kV electricity transmission line and switching stations, collectively referred to as the Genex Kidston Connection Project. Kidston Clean Energy Hub will also support the Far North Qld Renewable Energy Zone (REZ), identified in the recently released QLD REZ Roadmap. The Far North Qld REZ is expected to install 500-700MW of generation. Various technical assessments/field work was undertaken to ensure that the proposed location of the MFEP BESS was appropriate and would result in minimal impacts.
Traffic	
- Impacts to local roads resulting from congestion / wear and tear. - Increased risk of incidents resulting from increased use of roads. - New access will require additional vegetation clearing.	Where necessary, upgrades to existing local roads will be undertaken to ensure that development does not result in further degradation and/or safety issues. For Mt Fox BESS, majority of deliveries will be made through Hidden Valley to minimise the impact on the Mt Fox community and the Mt Fox Road. To facilitate these deliveries and further remove work off the Mt Fox Road, MF BESS will be upgrading an existing farm access track off Ewan Road for 5km to further reduce the projects impacts. A Traffic Management Plan and Traffic Impact Assessment will be undertaken prior to construction to adequately identify the required road upgrades and management requirements to the satisfaction of Hinchinbrook and Charters Towers Council. Extensive survey work has already been undertaken to date of the proposed route due to the requirements of Stage 2 the wind farm.

	Some minor deliveries and LV access will be via Knuckledown Road with the Operational facility access expected to be via the Knuckledown Road due to minimal traffic requirements. Road use to be restricted from Ingham during construction. Use of minibus service to be considered to reduce road usage from Ingham.
--	---

Table 2 - Submissions Review.

Submission		Submission Issue / Number of times raised											Notes
Overarching Issue		Lack of consultation	Amenity Impacts	Social Impacts	Cultural Heritage	Incompatibility with the Rural Zone	Fire risk associated with a BESS	Environmental Impacts	Water Impacts	Separation of Applications – reduces the efficacy of the BESS as a stand alone development.	Strategic Placement of Development	Traffic	
		- No consultation. - Consultation that occurred was too little too late. - Information provided during consultation meeting was confusing. - Inappropriate placement of Public Notice signs.	- Noise pollution (constant hum from built infrastructure). - Impacts on the visual amenity: - o transformation into an industrial park/area. - o Adding to the visual impact that is already there as a result of the Switching Station. - Detracts from the existing rural lifestyle and character (described as tranquil).	- Negative impact on property values/marketability. - Impacts on the health of the population – due to contamination of water sources, pollution, etc. - Impacts on the future generations: - o no longer able to enjoy the tranquillity of this area. - o Will have to deal/live with the impacts from proposed development. - Disruptions to the learning environment – resulting from noise pollution. - Added stress on residents/farmers. - Won't generate 300 local jobs.	- Lack of cultural heritage surveys undertaken to inform the project. - Impacts to cultural heritage (art, artefacts, story lines) - Impacts to totems (owls, eagles, wallabies, bats)	- Development will degrade the ability for rural land uses to co-exist and thrive. - Development is inconsistent with the Rural Zone / Character. - Development footprint will be fenced off and will not be available to use for future grazing. - Concerns that the MCU will permit additional industrial uses to be development within the subject lots. - This area has escaped transition to cane and more intensive agriculture – remains largely in tact.	- Increased risk of fire/s – it is noted that the fire rating for Mt Fox is moderate to high, in the dry season. - Fire events will result in the release of harmful chemicals, pollutants – pose a significant environmental risk. - Increased risk of environmental contamination because of fire (i.e. contaminated runoff into waterways, toxic smoke). - Battery technology is prone to fault/explosion/fire/thermal runaway. - No capacity or resourcing within the local fire brigade to combat a battery fire. Local fire brigade are volunteers and not trained for these types of fires.	- Clearing of vegetation will result in significant environmental impacts, for example: - o Loss of/negative impacts on critical habitat for endangered and vulnerable species. - o Loss of/negative impacts on endangered and vulnerable species. - o Soil disturbance, erosion and run-off. - o Loss of/reduction in some of the last remaining intact forests. - o Loss of existing carbon uptake and storage (forests). - o Geological features will be destroyed as a result of infrastructure (roads). - The operation of the BESS will also result in the abovementioned environmental impacts. - Close proximity to WTWHA – which is also likely to be impacted. - Lack of environmental assessment material included in the application.	- Project site is located within proximity to Michael Creek watershed and Yellori Creek. Main water supply for the local community. A number of registered bores that take from Michael Creek. - Development will significantly impact existing water supply/water sources (Michael Creek, Yellori Creek, nearby watercourses, springs, bores, groundwater) – impacts are likely to result from: - o Contaminated water run-off into waterbodies – exacerbated during flood/high rainfall events. - o Contaminants are likely to include harmful chemicals/substances used to operate the BESS and/or harmful chemicals/substances that get released during a fire event. - Downstream impacts are likely – these are the headwaters for the Burdekin River and Douglas River. - Existing topography has not been appropriately reflected/considered in the application. - Water sources are already limited – additional use of water to support development proposed will further reduce the availability of water for local residents/farmers.	- Environmental efficacy of the BESS may be lost/reduced – where the BESS is proposed in advance of/separate to the Wind Farm. - Potential for the BESS to operate/function as not originally intended – that being for a genuinely 'green' solution. - Risk that the Wind Farm won't be built and therefore the potential for the BESS to operate on a model akin to energy trading is likely.	- There are more suitable locations to establish these types of development – in already degraded/cleared areas. - Development should be strategically located to ensure all potential impact are reduced/mitigated. - Located outside of a REZ. - Unacceptable location given the distance from emergency services.	- Impacts to local roads resulting from congestion / wear and tear. - Increased risk of incidents resulting from increased use of roads. - New access will require additional vegetation clearing.	
1	Jeff & Cathy Glindermann	1	1										Adjoining property owners (1811 Mt Fox Road)
2	Jeff & Cathy Glindermann (2)					1	1	1	1	1			Adjoining property owners (1811 Mt Fox Road)
3	Andrew Morgan										1		Manager for Tully SIIP Scheme (Water Planner)
4	Anne Osbourne			1	1			1					Reference was made to the submissions prepared for the Upper Burdekin Wind Farm (which was attached to this submission).
5	Anne Quinlivan	1		1				1			1		
6	Anonymous	1			1		1	1					
7	Belinda Zullo	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	owns a residence at 2127 Mount Fox Road, Mount Fox
8	Benjamin Zullo	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	owns a residence at 2127 Mount Fox Road, Mount Fox
9	Bill Stinson			1				1					
10	Bodil Conroy												Submission focussed on MF WF.
11	Brandie Becke		1				1	1	1			1	2069 Milky Pine Road Mount Fox Queensland 4850 local resident
12	Brett Kendrick		1				1	1					capella resident
13	Britt and Len Schneider (1)			1		1	1	1	1				Local resident
14	Britt and Len Schneider (2)												Same submission with attachments added

15	Britt and Len Schneider (3)												Two additional maps depicting the project site and mapped watercourses.
16	Buzz Provera		1	1									
17	Carol-Ann O'Brien							1					
18	Catherine Abraham	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	
19	Constance Glindeemann		1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	Lives at 1923 Mt Fox Road.
20	Danielle Christie							1					
21	David McDonald					1	1	1	1				
22	Dr Alison Bee		1				1	1	1			1	
23	Dr Michael Seebeck	1				1	1	1	1		1	1	Request Councillor Brown be excluded from voting due to conflict of interest.
24	Errol Turner & Kim Armstrong	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	Local residents
25	Filippo Parisi	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	
26	Geoff Spanner	1				1	1	1	1		1	1	Wildlife Documentary Production Request Councillor Brown be excluded from voting due to conflict of interest.
27	Giovanna & Owen Melvin	1				1	1	1	1		1	1	
28	Giovanna Field							1					Process of industrialisation in this area undermines the purpose of the renewable energy projects. Councillor voting conflict of interest need to be considered.
29	Helen Keough			1		1		1					
30	Ian & Coralie McClintock	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	
31	Jane Osmond	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	Ingham resident
32	Jeanie Zonta	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	
33	Jennifer Gale	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	
34	Jim Stone	1				1	1	1	1		1	1	
35	John Buttigieg	1				1	1	1	1		1	1	
36	John Wood						1		1				
37	Johnathan Fenn	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	Local resident
38	Josephine Agostinelli	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	
39	Judith King							1	1				
40	Karen McLeod							1			1		
41	Kerry Barry		1	1			1	1	1			1	Resident of 2067 Milky Pine Road.
42	Kevin Cox										1		
43	Kim Armstrong & Errol Turner (2)												requested an extension of time
44	Kim Armstrong & Errol Turner												requested an extension of time
45	Lennon James		1	1									Mount Fox local resident
46	Margret and Greg Watts (2)	1		1			1		1		1		
47	Margret and Greg Watts												same submission with the attached PN sign.
48	Margaret Bell			1		1	1	1	1				
49	Maria Bertocchi	1				1	1	1	1		1	1	
50	maria bradley	1						1			1		
51	Marie Hubert	1	1	1			1	1	1				

52	Michael Creek Valley Action Group	1	1				1	1	1		1	1	
53	Nicole Kruger	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	
54	Paola Nunez							1					
55	Paola Torti	1					1	1			1		
56	Patricia Balderstone	1						1					
57	Patricia O'Brien		1					1			1		
58	Patricia O'Brien (2)												Same as above
59	Paul Cooper							1			1		
60	Petition (1)		1	1		1	1	1	1				9 signatures.
61	Petition (2)		1	1		1	1	1	1				32 Signatures.
62	PEtition (3)		1	1		1	1	1	1				Approx. 363 Signatures.
63	Phil Emms	1				1	1	1	1		1	1	
64	Pi Fernando Chitty	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	
65	Piero Bertocchi		1					1					
66	Rainforest Reserve Australia (Steven Nowakowski)	1				1	1	1	1		1	1	
67	Raymond Toscano	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	
68	Rosemarie Watts (2)	1	1	1			1	1	1		1		
69	Rosemarie Watts (2)	1		1					1		1		
70	Salvatore Zullo	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	
71	Sandra Gurney	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	
72	Scott, Julie, Harry and Billy Moschella	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	
73	Sharon Blythman	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	
74	Sue Vetma	1						1					
75	Sylvia Parisi	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	
76	Therese Murray	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	
77	Tom and Wendy Ward	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	
78	Trevor Kyle		1	1		1	1	1	1		1		
79	Warrgamay Aboriginal Tribal Council (2)	1			1			1	1				
80	Warrgamay Aboriginal Tribal Council												Same as above.
81	Wayne Broome	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	Ingham resident
	Late Submissions												
82	Jennifer Van Rooyen	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	Late Submission
83	Lisa Donnelly		1				1	1	1				Late Submission.
84	Petition (4)		1	1		1	1	1	1				Late Submission. 111 Submissions.
85	Rose Pryzibilla												Late Submission – cannot be considered and is not applicable to the BESS.