

COMBINED STATE & COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT COMMENTS – KIPT Smith Bay EIS – More information required / Issues raised

During the consultation period the Addendum to the EIS was circulated to a number of SA Government departments that were deemed relevant and the Commonwealth Department of the Environment and Energy. Please find below a table providing issues raised that require points of clarification and/or additional information to enable a comprehensive assessment of the KIPT Smith Bay proposal, prior to assessment of the proposal.

#	Topic / Issue	Addendum Section / Reference	Description of issue raised	Requirement for applicant in Response Document	A/B/C
Commonwealth DoEE					
			No comment on the Addendum / proposed changes		
EPA					
1	Noise – terrestrial		The EPA advises that construction noise from the activity will now vary from the original proposal, but the construction noise requirements under the <i>Environment Protection (Noise) Policy 2007</i> for the proposal will not change.	For noting	C
2	Water Quality		The EPA considers it likely that the potential water quality impacts would be significantly reduced as a result of the redesign of the wharf and the removal of the need to dredge. The EPA considers that any potential water quality impacts that may still result during construction and operation of the jetty could be adequately managed to not significantly affect the abalone farm.	For noting	C
3	Water Quality		The EPA notes that whilst impact to water quality impacts have been addressed with the amendment in design, there are still other matters raised in the EPA's comments on the EIS that need addressing.	For noting	C
4	Dredging		The EPA notes that dredging is no longer proposed to be undertaken and advises that any future capital dredging would require an EPA referral under the Planning and Design Code and the <i>Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) Regulations 2017</i> .	For noting	C

Key: A – Required B – Recommended C – Editorial /Minor/ For Noting

#	Topic / Issue	Addendum Section / Reference	Description of issue raised	Requirement for applicant in Response Document	A/B/C
5	Pile driving - impacts on marine water quality		<p>The EPA notes that the Addendum has removed mitigation measures that were proposed in the EIS. In section 14.4.3 of the EIS the following specific mitigation measure for piling activities was included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>'Evaluating alternative piling methodologies that have lower noise emissions'</i> <p>Section 18.4.5 of the EIS the following was stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>'Low-noise-impact techniques such as suction piling or vibro-piling should be used in preference to impact piling where possible.'</i> <p>The EPA raises concern that the two proposed mitigations methods have not been included in section 4.8.1 of the Addendum.</p>	The EPA is of the opinion that these measures are still relevant and should be included in the Addendum.	B
6	Piling – impacts on marine water quality		The EPA review of the Addendum and advice is based upon the assumption that all drill cuttings would be retained on the construction barge for subsequent land disposal (should any rock drilling be required to install the piles). The EPA advises that this mitigation measure should form a commitment from KIPT or a condition of approval.	For noting	C
7	Piling -impacts on cetaceans		<p>The EPA is concerned about potential impacts of pile driving on cetaceans.</p> <p>It is stated in the Addendum that construction of the deck, including piling, is expected to take 309 days, but <i>'the use of two piling rigs would reduce the total duration of piling.'</i></p> <p>The EPA advises that shortening the piling period by using two piling rigs, thereby being able to avoid months when cetaceans are likely to be present, could result in a more effective risk mitigation strategy than restricting the total piles/blows per day, which would extend the duration of piling activity.</p>	Consider use of two piling rigs as the preferred option over restricting piles/blows per day.	B
8	Piling - risk mitigation		There is inconsistency with the Addendum, which states that if use of multiple rigs is not possible due to 'logistical reasons', the proponent is confident that risk can be mitigated. However the risk assessment includes multiple mitigation measures in the one assessment category,	Review risk mitigation measures in relation to pile driving options.	B

Key: A – Required B – Recommended C – Editorial /Minor/ For Noting

#	Topic / Issue	Addendum Section / Reference	Description of issue raised	Requirement for applicant in Response Document	A/B/C
			<p>which reflect the overall residual risk. If any mitigation measures are removed then the risk should change.</p> <p>The EPA considers that unless all risk mitigation measures listed in each category of the risk assessment are undertaken then the risk assessment is not accurately reflecting residual risk.</p>		
DEW					
1			The open wharf design largely ameliorates DEW's original, primary concerns with the project that of potentially significant impacts on the nearshore intertidal and marine environment that would have resulted from a solid causeway, along with the construction and management issues around that.		C
PIRSA					
1	First port of call	multiple	Should this port be intended to be a future first port of call, KIPT needs to discuss the matter with the Australian Government regarding design requirements that need to be met for first point of entry (FPOE) ports.	For noting	C
2	Reduction of substratum without the causeway reduced risk	<p>4.7.1 POTENTIAL RISKS</p> <p>4.7.3 CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>AND MARINE- Construction of the causeway</p>	<p>While the risk of exotic marine pests establishing is reduced through less surface area without the causeway, there will still be establishment risk on the pillions. Encouraging indigenous fauna and flora to colonise the pillions should reduce establishment risk on the built structures. Shipping movement itself presents a risk of introduction of exotic marine pests, albeit to be managed through vessel ballast water and biofouling measures to be detailed in the Marine Pest Management/Biosecurity Plan. Hence it is not strictly correct to say the following (underlined):</p> <p><i><u>'The revised design removes the risks associated with importing rock material and dredging, and would not introduce any additional risks to the biosecurity status of Kangaroo Island'</u></i></p>	For noting / editorial change	C
3	Incorrect sentence	4.4.2	<p>"The decision to redesign the in-sea infrastructure, to remove the necessity for any dredging activities and to remove the causeway, would address all of the concerns raised by Yumbah"</p> <p>This sentence is not accurate; there are remaining concerns particularly with regard to the risks from biofouling / ballast water due to increased shipping in close proximity to Yumbah.</p>	Should be reworded to reflect the residual risks after no dredging	C

Key: A – Required B – Recommended C – Editorial /Minor/ For Noting

KIPT Smith Bay Addendum to EIS – State & Commonwealth Government comments

#	Topic / Issue	Addendum Section / Reference	Description of issue raised	Requirement for applicant in Response Document	A/B/C
DPTI (Transport)					
			No comment on the Addendum / proposed changes		
AAR					
			No comment on the Addendum / proposed changes		
DTTI					
			No comment on the Addendum / proposed changes		

Key: A – Required B – Recommended C – Editorial /Minor/ For Noting