

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
Aboriginal cultural heritage			
1.	Adequacy of characterisation of aboriginal heritage values	184, 344, 354, 378	See Expert Report of Ricky Feldman on Aboriginal Cultural Heritage (section 4.3).
2.	Concerns about disturbance of two registered sites	106, 167, 434	See Expert Report of Ricky Feldman on Aboriginal Cultural Heritage (section 4.3).
3.	Concerns about possible impact in sensitive areas eg near waterways	312, 469	See Expert Report of Ricky Feldman on Aboriginal Cultural Heritage (section 4.3).
Air quality			
4.	Adequacy of air quality modelling approach and background data used, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the need to take project monitoring data into account ultrafine particles should be assessed monitoring data from Footscray does not reflect conditions in other areas 	94, 95, 98, 158, 160, 169, 195, 196, 200, 217, 278, 282, 284, 285, 286, 288, 289, 299, 300, 314, 340, 346, 349, 351, 355, 358, 378, 400, 401, 404, 405, 411, 428, 432, 434, 444, 458, 462, 464, 467, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 504	See Expert Report of Frank Fler on Air Quality (sections 4.2 and 5). See also Project Note 7 in response to IAC requests LD2-K to LD2-T in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017
5.	Need to assess air quality on additional surface roads	280, 343, 378, 432, 458, 464	See Expert Report of Frank Fler on Air Quality (sections 4.2 and 5).
6.	Adequacy of emission standards for motor	158, 195, 326, 340, 343, 346, 351, 374, 400, 403, 422, 432,	See Expert Report of Frank Fler Air Quality (sections 4.2 and 5).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	vehicle emissions	457, 458, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 504	
7.	Adequacy of existing air quality standards, particularly in relation to particulate matter and long-term exposure	95, 105, 160, 165, 195, 196, 200, 230, 282, 284, 285, 299, 300, 314, 326, 342, 403, 409, 412, 427, 430, 432, 434, 454, 457, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 499, 504	See Expert Report of Frank Fleer on Air Quality (sections 4.2 and 5).
8.	Adequacy of the response to exceedances of intervention levels	80, 158, 289, 368, 454, 458	Ambient air quality must be monitored for five years after opening of the freeway (AQP4), and the results made publically available. In-tunnel air quality and ventilation emissions are to be monitored during operation against AQP3, SEPP (AQM) and the EPA discharge licence and the results made publically available. In the event that these requirements are not met, AQP5 requires remedial action to be taken. This will be undertaken in consultation with the EPA as the agency responsible for environmental regulation.
9.	Appropriate design & performance of ventilation structure and the need for filtration equipment	71, 81, 83, 94, 95, 96, 105, 107, 109, 119, 144, 151, 158, 160, 165, 171, 178, 183, 195, 196, 198, 200, 205, 214, 215, 217, 220, 228, 230, 249, 251, 278, 279, 282, 284, 285, 286, 288, 293, 297, 299, 300, 314, 326, 337, 340, 342, 349, 351,	See Expert Report of Frank Fleer on Air Quality (sections 4.2 and 5).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
		353, 362, 368, 371, 378, 383, 390, 400, 403, 405, 406, 414, 427, 432, 434, 437, 439, 454, 458, 462, 465, 467, 470, 477, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 487, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494	
10.	Concerns about existing air quality and pollution, including arguing that additional emissions should not be allowed, given existing air quality	3, 33, 62, 63, 73, 79, 81, 86, 88, 92, 93, 95, 96, 100, 101, 104, 106, 113, 118, 125, 129, 134, 140, 143, 151, 160, 165, 168, 169, 170, 178, 195, 196, 198, 200, 201, 206, 213, 214, 215, 218, 221, 230, 233, 243, 249, 254, 256, 275, 282, 283, 284, 285, 289, 297, 299, 300, 303, 314, 316, 319, 323, 335, 346, 348, 352, 353, 359, 366, 374, 378, 382, 383, 384, 403, 406, 431, 432, 434, 445, 454, 458, 474, 475, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 502	See Expert Report of Frank Fleer on Air Quality (section 4.2). See also the Expert Report of Jackie Wright on Human Health (section 4.3).
11.	Concerns about the impact of emissions during operation on nearby land	14, 18, 19, 24, 61, 62, 63, 72, 79, 86, 88, 105, 113, 128, 129, 130, 132, 137, 140, 143, 145, 151, 152, 155, 158, 160, 162, 164, 175, 184, 189, 194, 200,	See Expert Report of Frank Fleer on Air Quality (section 4.2). See also the Expert Report of Jackie Wright on Human Health (section 4.3).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
		209, 211, 212, 213, 215, 217, 270, 274, 281, 282, 284, 285, 286, 290, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 303, 305, 314, 319, 322, 326, 329, 330, 331, 336, 337, 339, 340, 344, 345, 346, 348, 351, 352, 354, 357, 363, 364, 365, 369, 372, 373, 374, 375, 378, 385, 387, 399, 400, 401, 403, 404, 406, 408, 412, 413, 418, 421, 428, 430, 431, 432, 437, 445, 446, 454, 458, 475, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 496, 502, 504	
12.	Concerns about air quality impacts in the veloway	155, 221, 250, 272, 283, 430, 432, 445, 446, 449, 454	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 7.4.3).
13.	Concerns about air quality monitoring and requests for the project to undertake further or ongoing local monitoring including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - retaining the monitoring station at Donald McLean Reserve - along Millers Road and Geelong Road - monitoring PM10 and PM 2.5 particles and ultrafine particles - making monitoring data publically 	7, 80, 143, 155, 165, 169, 170, 178, 180, 198, 214, 215, 217, 220, 225, 230, 249, 256, 270, 279, 288, 289, 293, 297, 326, 334, 337, 339, 340, 343, 346, 348, 351, 352, 355, 358, 362, 368, 378, 383, 399, 400, 403, 406, 409, 417, 418, 419, 421, 428, 434, 458, 470, 475, 477, 499	See Expert Report of Frank Flear on Air Quality (section 4.2).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	available		
14.	Concerns about construction emissions (including odour and dust)	7, 21, 92, 114, 115, 116, 123, 132, 133, 180, 182, 184, 192, 229, 279, 324, 326, 333, 339, 340, 346, 351, 368, 378, 399, 419, 434, 443, 445, 467, 475, 499	See Expert Report of Frank Fleer on Air Quality (sections 4.2 and 5). These issues will also be addressed in the Construction Environmental Management Plan to be prepared for the project as required by EMP2. This is to be prepared in consultation with relevant Councils, the EPA and relevant agencies.
15.	Concerns about impacts on air quality in public open spaces	10, 17, 65, 95, 160, 169, 200, 217, 279, 282, 284, 285, 286, 288, 293, 299, 300, 314, 339, 346, 383, 407, 450, 458, 467	See Expert Report of Frank Fleer on Air Quality (section 4.2).
16.	Concerns about predicted impacts on air quality along surface roads	3, 4, 29, 40, 57, 65, 95, 100, 103, 108, 118, 119, 136, 165, 168, 177, 179, 187, 195, 196, 202, 203, 206, 217, 220, 283, 289, 301, 309, 322, 326, 336, 362, 368, 372, 432, 449, 454, 460, 478, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494	See Expert Report of Frank Fleer on Air Quality (sections 4.2 and 5).
17.	Concerns about predicted impacts on air quality from ventilation stacks	7, 10, 71, 83, 86, 98, 195, 196, 217, 279, 286, 288, 293, 307, 326, 346, 348, 390, 432, 434, 458, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493,	See Expert Report of Frank Fleer on Air Quality (sections 4.2 and 5).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
		494	
18.	Concerns about predicted in tunnel air quality	270, 346, 348, 368, 405, 429, 432, 470	See Expert Report of Frank Fler on Air Quality (section 4.2).
Business and land acquisition			
19.	Concerns about business acquisition process	333, 386, 389	<p>The property acquisition process is set out in detail in the EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 5.11).</p> <p>Land will be acquired and compensation provided in accordance with the provisions of the <i>Major Transport Projects Facilitation Act 2009</i> (MTPFA) and the <i>Land Acquisition and Compensation Act 1986</i> (LACA).</p> <p>See also Statement of Natalie Lawlor on Business (section 3).</p>
20.	Concerns about communication with affected businesses	264, 360, 378, 389, 392	<p>As part of the Communications and Community Engagement Plan a Business Involvement Plan will be prepared and implemented in accordance with EPR BP5. This Plan requires councils and affected stakeholders to be consulted on progress of construction activities and the implementation of procedures for mitigating impacts and resolving any issues that arise relating to the delivery of the project.</p> <p>See also the Statement of Natalie Lawlor on Business (section 3).</p>
21.	Concerns about disruption to business access during construction	7, 78, 154, 172, 180, 264, 320, 333, 339, 352, 353, 360, 389, 414, 415, 431, 434, 443, 447	<p>It is a requirement of EPR BP2 that amenity for, and access to, potentially impacted businesses and commercial facilities must be protected where practicable, with any reduction in the level of access, amenity or function to be minimised to the duration necessary to carry out relevant construction works.</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			<p>The project team will take the concerns on disruption to business access and suggested resolutions and will pass them on to Project Co for consideration during the detailed design phase and in preparation of environmental management documents required by the EPRs including the Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>The Traffic Management Plan that will be prepared under TP3 must minimise disruption to traffic to the extent practicable, prevent construction-related parking on local roads or public car parks and reinstate access as soon as possible.</p>
22.	Direct or indirect impact on business viability through project design / acquisition	158, 189, 234, 320, 326, 333, 352, 367, 378, 389, 392, 414, 434, 450, 455, 460, 466	<p>For those businesses needing to be acquired for the project, EPR BP9 requires the minimisation (to the extent practicable) of disruption to businesses as a result of the acquisition of land, and working with business and land owners to try and reach an agreement on terms of possession. Early and ongoing engagement has been undertaken with impacted businesses and will continue in the lead up to and during the acquisition process.</p> <p>In relation to businesses that may be indirectly impacted, indirect impacts are addressed by other EPRs, including BP1, BP2, BP3, BP5, TP1 and TP3. These EPRs provide for compensation for physical damage, protection of business access and amenity, screening at the boundary of construction sites, mitigation of impacts on community and private recreation facilities, consultation on the progress of construction activities, the optimisation of works design and the preparation of a Traffic Management Plan to minimise disruption to the extent practicable.</p>
23.	Gourmet Pawprints concerned about impact of tolls on small business, and added	55	The Traffic Management Plan that will be prepared under EPR TP3 must minimise disruption to traffic to the extent practicable, prevent

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	costs associated with delays in traffic		<p>construction-related parking on local roads or public car parks and reinstate access as soon as possible. Refer to Technical report M Business, for the assessment of tolls on businesses. The tolling structure is a matter under consideration by the Victorian Government and is not a matter for consideration under the EES Scoping Requirements for the EES.</p> <p>See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport.</p> <p>See also the Expert Report of Tim Veitch on Transport Modelling (section 6.3).</p>
24.	Concerned about impact on tourism/Scienceworks and about the Business Impact Assessment failing to assess real or perceived impacts business/property values	378	<p>See Technical Report M <i>Business</i> (section 6.4.3.1) which identifies potential construction impacts. These impacts will be managed pursuant to EPRs BP2 to BP5 and AQP6 which require protection of business access and amenity, screening at the boundary of construction sites, mitigation of impacts on community and private recreation facilities, consultation on the progress of construction activities and maintenance of air quality standards during construction. Property values were not a matter for consideration in the EES Scoping Requirements and were not assessed as part of the EES.</p> <p>See also the Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Surface Noise and Vibration (section 4.3).</p>
25.	CitiPower is concerned about impacts to its electricity customers	360	<p>As referred to in the submission, the State, Project Co and CPB John Holland Joint Venture have been working collaboratively with CitiPower on the proposed design and impacts on CitiPower's electricity assets. This cooperation will continue throughout detailed design and construction.</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			EPRs BP6 and BP7 apply specific obligations in relation to protecting and minimising impacts on utility assets.
26.	<p>Concerns surrounding impacts arising from the construction of the tunnel:</p> <p>CC Containers is concerned about the impacts of construction on the operation and health of business and employees. Makes a number of specific requests for monitoring and assistance</p> <p>Foodbank Victoria is concerned about impacts to volunteer force and associated costs. Requests compensation, or relocation and all costs borne by WDA.</p>	7, 180	<p>These businesses were consulted as part of the EES preparation and the impacts on these businesses form part of the business impact assessment in Technical Report M <i>Business</i>. Engagement has been undertaken with both parties and will continue in the lead up to the construction process. Foodbank and CC Containers are recognised stakeholders to be incorporated into the Business Involvement Plan (EPR BP5).</p> <p>It is a requirement of EPR BP2 that amenity for, and access to, potentially impacted businesses and commercial facilities must be protected where practicable, with any reduction in the level of access, amenity or function to be minimised to the duration necessary to carry out relevant construction works.</p> <p>Affected stakeholders are to be consulted on progress of construction activities in accordance with the Business Involvement Plan required under EPR BP5. This Plan requires councils and affected stakeholders to be consulted on progress of construction activities and the implementation of procedures for mitigating impacts and resolving any issues that arise relating to the delivery of the project.</p> <p>See also the Expert Report of Jackie Wright on Human Health (section 4.3).</p> <p>See also the Expert Report of Andrew Kalitsis on Contaminated Soil and Spoil Management (section 4.3).</p>
27.	CVCV Land Co No 17 Pty Ltd, owns land - 2	386	This property would be acquired for the WGTP. Discussions have

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	Watson Street, South Kingsville - proposed for redevelopment affected by WGTP (inside project boundary). Queries whether land will be acquired, otherwise intend to redevelop.		already been held with this property owner about the acquisition of the property and discussions held with the Victorian Planning Authority and the Hobsons Bay CC regarding the Precinct 15 planning scheme amendment C88 and the WGTP. C88 as exhibited identifies the property as required for the WGTP, however the land remains part of the Precinct 15 area.
28.	Concerns of business operators in New Street (Shane Breen - business unnamed) and in Blackshaws Road (Inspirational Health & Fitness Pty Ltd) surrounding off street parking restrictions, increased traffic, and impacted access required 24 hours.	163, 447	<p>The project team will take the concerns on disruption to business access and suggested resolutions and will pass them on to Project Co for consideration during the detailed design phase and in preparation of the environmental management documents required by the EPRs, including the Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>Specific EPRs address traffic, amenity and access impacts on businesses. It is a requirement of EPR BP2 that amenity for, and access to, potentially impacted businesses and commercial facilities must be protected where practicable, with any reduction in the level of access, amenity or function to be minimised to the duration necessary to carry out relevant construction works.</p> <p>The Traffic Management Plan that will be prepared under TP3 must minimise disruption to traffic to the extent practicable, prevent construction-related parking on local roads or public car parks and reinstate access as soon as possible.</p> <p>Affected stakeholders will be consulted on progress of construction activities in accordance with the Business Involvement Plan required under EPR BP5. This Plan requires councils and affected stakeholders to be consulted on progress of construction activities and the implementation of procedures for mitigating impacts and resolving any issues that arise relating to the delivery of the project.</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
29.	<p>Docklands Cotton Mills area:</p> <p>Concerns from business owners in Docklands Cotton Mills (including videography and creative businesses) about noise disruptions to sound recording for videography/photography studios, loss of amenity, parking and pollution from increase in traffic.</p> <p>The 'Dream Factory' at 90-96 Maribyrnong St is similarly concerned about access, visual, air and noise impacts.</p>	189, 443, 466, 450	<p>See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Surface Noise and Vibration (section 4.3).</p> <p>See Expert Report of Frank Fleer on Air Quality (section 4.2).</p> <p>Specific EPRs address traffic, amenity and access impacts on businesses. It is a requirement of EPR BP2 that amenity for, and access to, potentially impacted businesses and commercial facilities must be protected where practicable, with any reduction in the level of access, amenity or function to be minimised to the duration necessary to carry out relevant construction works.</p> <p>The Traffic Management Plan that will be prepared under TP3 must minimise disruption to traffic to the extent practicable, prevent construction-related parking on local roads or public car parks and reinstate access as soon as possible.</p> <p>Affected stakeholders will be consulted on progress of construction activities in accordance with the Business Involvement Plan required under EPR BP5. This Plan requires councils and affected stakeholders to be consulted on progress of construction activities and the implementation of procedures for mitigating impacts and resolving any issues that arise relating to the delivery of the project.</p> <p>The project team will take the concerns on disruption to business access and suggested resolutions and will pass them on to Project Co for consideration during the detailed design phase and in preparation of the environmental management documents required by the EPRs.</p>
30.	Ashe Morgan, owner of Harbour Town Melbourne in Docklands, concerns include	415	Maintaining access to Harbour Town will be important during construction of the WGTP. Any disruptions to access during the

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	<p>WGTP proposal to occupy their property during construction and operation.</p> <p>Concerned about impact of Shared Use Bridge on Harbour Town’s proposal for a showroom off Footscray Road.</p>		<p>construction phase would be communicated with the parties using the access so as to minimise the impact as required under the communications strategy to be prepared for the project (EPR BP2 and TP3).</p> <p>See also the EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 5.11).</p> <p>Impacts to businesses arising from land acquisition or occupation will be assessed and compensation provided in accordance with the MTPFA and LACA.</p>
31.	<p>Kindred Studios, located at the corner of Harris and Whitehall St, concerned about elevated structures impacting café access and sales, as well as general customer and tenant access to building.</p> <p>Trirampage Pty Ltd concerned about lack of access to site (8-14 Howard St) impacting business</p>	172, 414	<p>Specific EPRs address any impacts on businesses from changed access. It is a requirement of EPR BP2 that amenity for, and access to, potentially impacted businesses and commercial facilities must be protected where practicable, with any reduction in the level of access, amenity or function to be minimised to the duration necessary to carry out relevant construction works.</p> <p>The Traffic Management Plan that will be prepared under EPR TP3 must minimise disruption to traffic to the extent practicable, prevent construction-related parking on local roads or public car parks and reinstate access as soon as possible.</p> <p>Affected stakeholders will be consulted on progress of construction activities in accordance with the Business Involvement Plan required under EPR BP5.</p> <p>The project team will take the concerns on disruption to business access and suggested resolutions and will pass them on to Project Co for consideration during the detailed design phase and in preparation of the environmental management documents required by the EPRs.</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
32.	<p>V & A Perin Corporation, owners of Lot 16, 107A Whitehall St, concerned that they will not be able to re-lease the premises when the current tenant leaves at the end of 2017 due to access restriction, construction vehicles, noise, pollution and dust. Open to leasing office and warehouse space for operations while construction underway.</p> <p>Jucon Holdings Pty Ltd, 21 Youell St, concerned about compulsory acquisition of three lots and car parking spaces (one owned by Jucon) resulting in loss of access/egress points including for heavy vehicle deliveries at eastern end of property.</p>	234, 320	<p>Specific EPRs address traffic, amenity and access impacts on businesses. It is a requirement of EPR BP2 that amenity for, and access to, potentially impacted businesses and commercial facilities must be protected where practicable, with any reduction in the level of access, amenity or function to be minimised to the duration necessary to carry out relevant construction works.</p> <p>The Traffic Management Plan that will be prepared under EPR TP3 must minimise disruption to traffic to the extent practicable, prevent construction-related parking on local roads or public car parks and reinstate access as soon as possible.</p> <p>Affected stakeholders will be consulted on progress of construction activities in accordance with the Business Involvement Plan required under EPR BP5. This Plan requires councils and affected stakeholders to be consulted on progress of construction activities and the implementation of procedures for mitigating impacts and resolving any issues that arise relating to the delivery of the project.</p> <p>Concerns about noise, pollution and dust will also be addressed in the Construction Environmental Management Plan to be prepared for the project as required by EMP2. This is to be prepared in consultation with relevant Councils, the EPA and relevant agencies.</p> <p>The business premises of Jucon Holdings and V and A Perin Corporation are not directly required for acquisition purposes. Part of the common property to their properties will be affected and a carpark of Jucon Holdings Pty Ltd will be required for which compensation will be paid in accordance with legislative requirements.</p> <p>The project team will take the concerns on disruption to business</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			access and preferred or alternative solutions suggested by the business owner will be raised with Project Co for consideration during the detailed design phase and in preparation of the environmental management documents required by the EPRs.
Contaminated soil and spoil management			
33.	Concern about potential contamination of fresh food business from proximity to large quantities of contaminated and uncontaminated spoil near the northern portal site	78, 389	Technical Report M <i>Business</i> (section 7.4) assessed concerns surrounding airborne particles generated during excavation of the northern tunnel portal. See also the Expert Report of Andrew Kalitsis on Contaminated Soil and Spoil Management (section 4.3).
34.	Concerns about accuracy of assessment of existing soil contamination	158, 368, 378, 434	See Expert Report of Andrew Kalitsis on Contaminated Soil and Spoil Management (section 4.3).
35.	Concerns about approach to management of spoil	106, 123, 158, 326, 344, 368, 378, 434, 454	See Expert Report of Andrew Kalitsis on Contaminated Soil and Spoil Management (sections 4.3 and 5). See also Project Note 2 in response to IAC request 41 in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017.
36.	Concerns about approach to the reuse of spoil	368, 434	See Expert Report of Andrew Kalitsis on Contaminated Soil and Spoil Management (sections 4.3 and 5). See also Project Note 13 in response to IAC request DM1-E in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017 Further detail in relation to the reuse of spoil is being provided in response to IAC's request SH1-B of 18 July 2017.

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
Ecology			
37.	Adequacy of characterisation of existing ecological values - native biodiversity	17, 203, 303, 311, 326	See Expert Report of Cameron Miller on Ecology (section 7.6).
38.	Concerns about effects on fauna and flora in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moonee Ponds Creek • Stony Creek Reserve • Kororoit Creek • Maribyrnong River 	17, 93, 161, 167, 184, 203, 206, 278, 303, 326, 337, 341, 344, 345, 354, 356, 368, 441	See Expert Report of Cameron Miller on Ecology (section 7.6).
39.	Concerns about general impacts on Stony Creek	398, 434, 439, 442, 472, 478, 495	See Expert Report of Cameron Miller on Ecology (section 7.6).
40.	Concerns about loss of native vegetation (including through shading)	17, 106, 147, 158, 161, 167, 203, 326, 337, 356, 368, 378, 422, 441, 442	See Expert Report of Cameron Miller on Ecology (section 7.6). See also Project Note 12 in response to IAC requests 51 and 52 in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017.
41.	Concerns about loss of planted trees and canopy cover	123, 133, 158, 184, 203, 206, 326, 337, 338, 340, 346, 351, 368, 378, 407, 419, 442, 454	See Expert Report of Cameron Miller on Ecology (section 7.6). See also Expert Report of Dieter Lim on Landscape (section 4.3).
Environmental Management Framework			
42.	Adequacy of EPRs and suggestions for additional EPRs (general)	17, 95, 114, 115, 116, 158, 176, 185, 326, 343, 368, 378,	The EPRs have been developed to manage environmental issues relevant to the project. They form part of a number of regulatory

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
		441	controls which will govern the detailed design, construction and operation phases of the project and are to be read in conjunction with the Development and Urban Design Plans and the draft planning scheme amendment for the project. They will apply in addition to all relevant environmental laws and all regulatory approvals required for the project. The adequacy and wording of the EPRs will be considered in detail through the IAC hearing process.
43.	Comment on governance arrangements / roles and responsibilities, particularly responsibility for enforcement	158, 184, 213, 326, 344, 354, 368, 392, 419, 434, 499	See Submissions on Behalf of Western Distributor Authority - Part A. See also Project Note 9 in response to IAC requests 47 and 48 in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017
44.	Concerns about approach to environmental plans including Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMP)	106, 158, 326, 361, 368, 378	The Project's approach to environmental plans and CEMP is set out in Chapter 8 of the EES Main Report Volume 1. See also submissions on Behalf of Western Distributor Authority - Part A.
Greenhouse gas			
45.	Concerns about approach to sustainability in design and ISCA commitment	106, 146, 169, 184	See Expert Report of Will Symons on Greenhouse Gas (section 4.3).
46.	Concerns about levels of greenhouse gas emissions from construction	26, 145, 162, 294, 504	A comprehensive assessment of greenhouse gas emissions from construction, and the project's approach to managing emissions is set out Technical Report Q <i>Greenhouse gas</i> .
47.	Concerns about levels of greenhouse gas emissions from operations	26, 27, 29, 162, 190, 203, 221, 223, 245, 247, 248, 294, 325,	A comprehensive assessment of greenhouse gas emissions from operations, and the project's approach to managing emissions is set

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
		326, 327, 337, 357, 374, 387, 416, 420, 430, 486, 502, 504	out Technical Report Q <i>Greenhouse gas</i> . See also the Expert Report of Will Symons on Greenhouse Gas (section 4.3).
48.	Concerns about heat island effect	326, 378, 454, 486	Urban heat island effects were not a matter for consideration in the EES Scoping Requirements and were not assessed as part of the EES. The Project will be constructed in areas that are already heavily urbanised. See also the Expert Report of Jackie Wright on Human Health (section 4.3, page 16).
49.	Greenhouse gas assessment methodology challenged	184, 190, 223, 326, 357, 374, 422, 430, 504	See Expert Report of Will Symons on Greenhouse Gas (section 4.3).
Ground movement			
50.	Concern about subsidence from groundwater drawdown	29, 278	See Expert Report of Trevor O'Shannessy on Ground Movement (section 4.3).
51.	Concerns about how condition surveys will be undertaken	278	See Expert Report of Trevor O'Shannessy on Ground Movement (section 4.3).
52.	Concerns about impact of ground movement on property and assets	92, 123, 255, 278, 326	See Expert Report of Trevor O'Shannessy on Ground Movement (section 4.3). Further detail in relation ground movement is being provided in response to IAC's request SH1-D of 18 July 2017.

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
Groundwater			
53.	Adequacy of characterisation of groundwater contamination	184, 368	See Expert Report of Jonathan Medd on Groundwater (section 4.3). See also Project Note 14 in response to IAC request SH1-C in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017.
54.	Concerns about groundwater management and disposal during construction	29, 278, 326, 368, 434, 442	See Expert Report of Jonathan Medd on Groundwater (section 4.3).
55.	Concerns about groundwater management and disposal during operations	368, 429	See Expert Report of Jonathan Medd on Groundwater (section 4.3).
56.	Concerns about impacts on groundwater dependant waterways and ecosystems	29, 158, 368	See Expert Report of Jonathan Medd on Groundwater (section 4.3). See also the Expert Report of Cameron Miller on Ecology (section 7.6).
57.	Concerns about project design for management of existing groundwater contamination	184, 368, 434	See Expert Report of Jonathan Medd on Groundwater (section 4.3).
Historical heritage			
58.	Adequacy of characterisation of historical heritage values	184	See Expert Report of Kate Gray on Historical Heritage (Appendix C, section 2.1).
59.	Concerns about adequacy of mitigation and management measures	184, 312	See Expert Report of Kate Gray on Historical Heritage (Appendix C, section 2.1 for general response and 3.0, 4.0 and 5.0 for specific issues and heritage places).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
60.	Concerns about impacts on heritage places and buildings, including from traffic and vibration	6, 158, 166, 184, 189, 210, 378, 434, 442, 448	See Expert Report of Kate Gray on Historical Heritage (Appendix C). See also the Expert Report of John Heilig on Vibration and Regenerated Noise (section 8). See also the Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Surface Noise and Vibration (section 4.3).
61.	Concerns about impacts on maritime heritage sites and shipwrecks	184, 312, 434	See Expert Report of Kate Gray on Historical Heritage (Appendix C, sections 5.1 and 5.3).
Human Health			
62.	Adequacy of human health methodology and modelling	71, 83, 158, 169, 190, 270, 278, 326, 340, 346, 349, 351, 364, 378, 401, 403, 405, 432, 449, 458, 477	See Expert Report of Jackie Wright on Human Health (sections 4.3 and 5). See also Project Note 6 in response to IAC requests LD1-A to LD1-T in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017.
63.	Concerned about health impacts during construction	124, 182, 339	See Expert Report of Jackie Wright on Human Health (section 4.3, page 10).
64.	Concerns about air quality impacts at sensitive locations, including concerns about a lack of protective measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emma McLean Kindergarten • Donald McLean Reserve • Other schools and childcare 	4, 57, 65, 95, 98, 105, 119, 139, 143, 151, 171, 183, 213, 215, 217, 225, 230, 268, 270, 279, 286, 288, 297, 305, 307, 314, 326, 336, 339, 340, 346, 348, 349, 351, 352, 353, 372, 374, 399, 400, 401, 403, 406, 407, 409, 428, 432, 439, 446,	See Expert Report of Jackie Wright on Human Health (section 4.3, pages 10-11).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	facilities	458, 470, 478, 496	
65.	Concerns about health and safety of children due to trucks on suburban streets	56, 192, 293, 406, 408, 432	See Expert Report of Jackie Wright on Human Health (section 4.3, page 11).
66.	Concerns about change in health risks including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> as a result of traffic emissions exposure to and particulates impacts on pre-existing health problems 	3, 7, 23, 52, 57, 62, 65, 71, 73, 81, 82, 83, 88, 96, 98, 104, 111, 119, 129, 143, 144, 147, 151, 152, 155, 156, 157, 166, 168, 169, 171, 175, 192, 215, 226, 228, 229, 232, 233, 245, 256, 279, 288, 293, 326, 337, 340, 343,346, 348, 349, 351, 362, 366, 372, 375, 378, 380, 385, 390, 406, 412, 413, 416, 432, 434, 443, 446, 449, 450, 458, 467, 475	See Expert Report of Jackie Wright on Human Health (section 4.3, pages 11-13).
67.	Concerns about types of population impacted, such as children, people with pre-existing health problems and the elderly	4, 34, 57, 62, 65, 86, 98, 122, 134, 139, 151, 168, 171, 198, 215, 225, 249, 288, 293, 319, 334, 337, 339, 340, 351, 352, 353, 359, 399, 400, 406, 432, 454, 470, 478, 496	See Expert Report of Jackie Wright on Human Health (section 4.3, pages 13-15).
68.	Existing human health (prevalence of key conditions such as respiratory conditions) and concern about impact on these health conditions	34, 45, 81, 88, 93, 101, 105, 162, 165, 178, 183, 198, 201, 202, 205, 215, 218, 220, 221, 230, 249, 250, 251, 277, 279, 288, 289, 298, 301, 314, 319,	See Expert Report of Jackie Wright on Human Health (section 4.3, pages 15-16).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
		339, 340, 343, 346, 349, 351, 362, 366, 374, 375, 403, 404, 418, 432, 453, 454, 455, 457, 458, 465, 467, 470, 475, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494	
Key approvals			
69.	Adequacy of PSA / Incorporated Document	158, 184, 190, 346, 378	See Expert Report of Michael Barlow on Strategic Planning (section 4). See also Submissions on Behalf of Western Distributor Authority - Part A.
Land use planning			
70.	Concern about impact on utility services including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the above ground powerlines along Fogarty Avenue - the impact on Dock Area Zone Substation - the impact on high pressure pipelines and fuel lines - realignment of power supply along Wurundjeri Way 	71, 106, 146, 185, 213, 278, 338, 360, 378	Relocation of utilities are standard activities in developing urban areas. Any works undertaken in the vicinity of, or requiring the displacement of, any of these assets would be brought to the attention of the asset owner at the earliest possible time. Realignment, protection or planned disruptions would be discussed and undertaken to the satisfaction of the asset owners/operators and works would be carried out to appropriate standards and regulations. EPRs BP6 and BP7 apply specific obligations for protecting and minimising impacts on utility assets.

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
71.	Concerned that an easement will now pass over the back of the site approved for a townhouse development.	159	See Statement of Natalie Lawlor on Business (section 3).
72.	Concerns about impact of acquisition of government and public land	123, 158, 190, 378	See also the EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 5.11). The acquisition of land is necessary for delivery of any major transport project. In the case of the project, this will be minimised to the extent practicable necessary to deliver the project design. All regulatory requirements will be observed in the acquisition of land and payment of compensation for interests acquired.
73.	Concerns about land use impact assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - land use change has not been incorporated - focus is on construction impacts rather than operational ones - assessment corridor is too narrow - needs to clarify land to be temporary acquired - compensation for loss of open space 	405, 434	Technical Report K <i>Land use planning</i> discusses impacts from both construction and operations (section 5.3, 6.3 and 7.3). As discussed in Technical Report K <i>Land use planning</i> (section 3.2.1), the study area for the land use planning assessment focused on land directly within the project corridor rather than the wider area as the key purpose of the assessment is to identify the direct land use and built form impacts. Strategic redevelopment sites have also been considered where there may be a relationship with between the site and the project. EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 5.11) sets out properties to be permanently acquired, strata acquisition (below ground) and properties to be temporarily occupied during construction. Technical Report K <i>Land use planning</i> discusses impacts from land acquisition (sections 5.3.3, 6.3.3 and 7.3.3). Information on the land acquisition/ occupation and compensation processes is set out in EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 5.11) and

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			Technical Report K <i>Land use planning</i> (section 4.2.1).
74.	Concerns about impacts of the project property values	8, 19, 73, 114, 115, 116, 124, 143, 144, 151, 172, 182, 184, 192, 234, 278, 281, 301, 343, 378, 383, 443	Property values were not a matter for consideration in the EES Scoping Requirements and were not assessed as part of the EES.
75.	Concerns about strata acquisition and requests for compensation for living above the tunnel	124, 278, 342, 390, 427	The MTPFA and LACA statutory regimes specifically provide for strata acquisition. Any strata titles required will be acquired and compensation will be provided in accordance with the statutory controls in these Acts.
76.	Project not compatible with urban renewal areas including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E-Gate • Arden MacCauley • Precinct 15 	5, 17, 40, 52, 82, 114, 115, 116, 117, 147, 148, 184, 185, 190, 208, 223, 227, 229, 244, 293, 301, 303, 345, 361, 364, 370, 371, 374, 387, 406, 409, 412, 434, 435, 441, 444, 471, 486	See Expert Report of Michael Barlow on Strategic Planning (section 3).
77.	Project not consistent with strategic planning policies, including council policy and plans for Moonee Ponds Creek and Stony Creek	17, 58, 60, 64, 79, 103, 114, 115, 116, 121, 147, 158, 161, 189, 190, 208, 223, 342, 344, 345, 354, 364, 374, 378, 387, 402, 411, 426, 427, 430, 441, 444, 457, 471, 499	<p>A comprehensive review of relevant strategic planning policies was carried out for the EES, including as part of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Report K <i>Land use planning</i> • Explanatory Report (Attachment IV) <p>Relevant EPRs require that the Project be implemented in consultation with relevant councils and/or having regard to local policies and strategies, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMP2 Environmental Management Plans

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BP4 Impacts on operation of community, private recreation and council facilities • EP3 Reinstatement • EP6 Landscaping Plan • SWP9 Bank stability • SWP10 Waterway modifications
78.	Request for acquisition (general)	101, 133, 177, 178, 270, 405,	EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 5.11) sets out properties to be permanently acquired, strata acquisition (below ground) and properties to be temporarily occupied during construction. Technical Report K <i>Land use planning</i> discusses impacts from land acquisition (sections 5.3.3, 6.3.3 and 7.3.3). Acquisition of additional properties is not required for the project.
79.	Raises acquisition specifically for Hyde St residents	80, 91,146, 192, 278, 283, 342, 403, 427, 439, 458, 461, 473	The submission of VicRoads (473) on potential acquisition of Hyde Street properties is noted.
80.	Request for compensation	92, 124, 166, 172, 182, 278, 378, 389, 434, 467	See also the EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 5.11). Compensation for occupation and acquisition of land will be assessed and provided in accordance with the statutory provisions of the MTPFA and LACA. Other environmental impacts will be addressed in accordance with the finalised Environmental Management Framework and EPRs.
81.	Concerned about safety issues related to the Mobil Terminal site	192	The Mobil Yarraville Terminal on the intersection of Hyde Street and Francis Street is a recognised major hazard facility. Project Co will be contractually required to have a Health and Safety Management Plan that must address the approach to safety and safety management including hazard identification and risk analysis and

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			assessment.
82.	Submission from businesses at 107-109 Whitehall St, concerned about loss of car parking, impact to access and acquisition of land leading to lack of interest in their complex.	182, 234, 389	Specific EPRs address traffic and access impacts on businesses. It is a requirement of EPR BP2 that access to potentially impacted businesses and commercial facilities must be protected where practicable, with any reduction in the level of access, amenity or function to be minimised to the duration necessary to carry out relevant construction works.
83.	Precinct 15 - concerned that Precinct 15 is only referred to as a 'potential urban renewal area' within the EES. Notes that it has been a long-standing policy directive of HBCC and should be identified as an urban renewal area.	411	See Expert Report of Michael Barlow on Strategic Planning (section 3).
84.	Hobsons Bay City Council raises concerns about West Gate Golf Course, suggests compensation	378	The impacts on the West Gate Golf Course are assessed in Technical Report K <i>Land use planning</i> (section 5.3). The concerns of the submitted on the course are addressed in this section. Works beyond the existing road reserve will be minimised as much as possible, to reduce adverse impacts on the golf course. See also the EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 5.11). Any compensation due will be assessed and provided in accordance with the statutory provisions of the MTPFA and LACA.
85.	Leadwest raises concerns about West Gate Golf Course, suggests player transfer scheme to allow members to play at other	434	A player transfer scheme is not proposed as part of this project and would be a matter for the Golf Course management.

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	courses		
86.	Project detrimentally impacts on the existing and proposed land uses of the western side of Maribyrnong River, and degrades the waterfront in proximity to the Dream Factory	189	The impacts on land uses are assessed in Technical Report K <i>Land Use Planning</i> (section 7.3). The related concerns of this submitter about visual impacts, noise and air quality impacts are addressed in the relevant sections of this table.
87.	Port of Melbourne – argues that the detailed design of the project should adopt a planning horizon consistent with the 50 year lease for the Port of Melbourne and consider the Port Development Strategy and Rail Access Strategy (to be prepared)	392	The project has been designed and would be constructed to have an asset life of up to 100 years. Further detail in relation to the Port of Melbourne is being provided in response to IAC's requests 20 and 21 of 18 July 2017.
Landscape and visual			
88.	Concerns about adequacy of landscape assessment and characterisation of existing landscape setting Maribyrnong City Council raises multiple inadequacies in the assessment, including of panoramic perspectives, river corridor, and lack of shadow assessment	61, 158, 184, 185, 203, 312, 378	The EES landscape and visual assessment (Technical Report N <i>Landscape and visual</i>) was prepared in accordance with the Scoping Requirements. The methodology for the landscape and visual assessment was developed with input from the Technical Reference Group (TRG). A 3D model has been developed by the Project Co and will be available to the IAC and other parties for viewing at the panel hearing, and for the generation of still images. This model will provide views of the project from various points. See also the Expert Report of Roger Wood on Urban Design (section 4.3).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
89.	Concerned about the adequacy of the Aboricultural Assessment including inaccuracies in tree numbers	203	See Expert Report of Cameron Miller on Ecology (section 7.6.4).
90.	<p>Adequacy of landscaping plans and replacement plantings, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that the plan is insufficient and does not adequately address concerns; • requests for more detailed plans around landscape reinstatement plans; • requests for additional vegetation; and • concerns about visual impact. 	143, 158, 160, 177, 184, 190, 200, 203, 215, 217, 282, 284, 285, 286, 289, 299, 300, 312, 314, 326, 343, 346, 378, 401, 403, 407, 434, 441, 442, 444, 495, 499	<p>The landscape plans provided in the EES Map Book provide a concept level description of the location and type of planting to be provided by the project. This concept would be further refined during detailed design in accordance with EPR EP6 which requires a Landscape Plan to be prepared for the project and developed in consultation with the relevant Council with regard to local polices and plans.</p> <p>EPR EP6 requires the reinstatement of trees to consider the contribution that the replacement trees can make to the creation of habitat corridors and linkages where practicable.</p> <p>See also the Expert Report of Dieter Lim (sections 4.3 and 5).</p>
91.	Concerns about tree loss in Yarraville Gardens	442	<p>See Expert Report of Kate Gray on Historic Heritage (Appendix C, section 4.1).</p> <p>See also the Expert Report of Cameron Miller on Ecology (section 7.6.7).</p> <p>See also the Expert Report of Jonathan Medd on Groundwater (section 4.3).</p>
92.	Request that all trees in West Gate Tunnel Project area over 2m are protected	343	The project has been design to minimise the impacts on vegetation where possible. EPR EP1 and EP2 support this approach during the detailed design phase and require measures to be detailed within the CEMP and implemented to avoid and minimise impacts on vegetation, but it is not possible for all trees over 2m in height to be

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			protected.
93.	Request for higher trees than tube-stock trees	499	See Expert Report of Dieter Lim on Landscape (section 4.3).
94.	Concerns about loss of indigenous plants and requests there be a focus on replanting Indigenous Sheoaks in Spotswood	215	See Expert Report of Cameron Miler on Ecology (section 7.4). See Expert Report of Dieter Lim on Landscape (section 4.3). EPR EP6 requires the Landscape Plan prepared for the project to be developed in accordance with the relevant Council with regard to local policies and strategies.
95.	The Greening the West project requirements should be taken into consideration and adhered to	203, 326	A Landscape Plan must be prepared in accordance with EPR EP6 that has regard to local policies and strategies. Greening the West Strategic Plan is specifically referenced in EP6 as a local policy and strategy that will be had regard to.
96.	Requests local spaces be designed in consultation with councils and communities to fit local needs. Specifically suggests lost strip of land at WLJ Crofts Reserve be offset with vegetation planting.	190	The detailed development of the Project is required under EPR LVP1 to maximise opportunities for enhancement of public amenity, open space and facilities, in consultation with relevant stakeholders. The Landscape Plan to be prepared in accordance with EPR EP6 must be developed in consultation with relevant councils.
97.	Concern about lack of replacement trees and green space in Spotswood	286	See Expert Report of Dieter Lim on Landscape (section 4.3). See Expert Report of Cameron Miler on Ecology (section 7.6). EPR EP6 requires the Landscape Plan prepared for the project to be developed in accordance with the relevant Council with regard to local policies and strategies.

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
98.	Concerns about lack of landscaping plans for West Melbourne	444	See Expert Report of Roger Wood on Urban Design (section 4.3).
99.	Request that mature trees be planted along the Hyde Street Ramp (particularly near the Emma McLean Kindergarten)	217, 401	See Expert Report of Dieter Lim on Landscaping (section 4.3).
100.	Concerns about damage to planting along Kororoit Creek	441	See Expert Report of Cameron Miller on Ecology (section 7.6.8).
101.	Concerns about design elements and urban design treatments (eg. design of noise walls) including requests for design/art on noise barriers	61, 133, 186, 190, 378, 409, 439, 458, 475	See Expert Report of Roger Wood on Urban Design (section 4.3). Further detail in relation to design elements is being provided in response to IAC's requests 37, 38 and 39 of 18 July 2017.
102.	Concern about removal of specific tree between 9 Vernier Street, Spotswood and the existing noise wall	133	Specific details of individual tree removal will be confirmed as part of detailed design. The project has been design to minimise the impacts on vegetation where possible. EPR EP1 and EP2 supports this approach during the detailed design phase and requires measures to be detailed within the CEMP and implemented to avoid and minimise impacts on vegetation.
103.	Requests for landscaping as air pollution mitigation along the West Gate Freeway	458	The replacement tree numbers are significantly in excess of the tree numbers proposed to be removed. EES Vol 1, 5.13 outlines the tree replacement strategy, noting the project commitment to replace removed trees at a minimum of 3:1 ratio across the project corridor.
104.	Concerns about visual impacts associated with project lighting, including light spill	106, 133	Light spill is addressed by EPR LVP3 which requires detailed design to minimise light spillage to protect the amenity of adjacent land uses to the extent practicable. The CEMP must also include

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			<p>requirements and methods to minimise light spillage, to the extent practicable, during construction.</p> <p>See also Project Notes 20 and 21 in response to IAC requests 34 and 35 in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017</p>
105.	<p>Concerns about visual impacts from open space areas including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donald McLean Reserve; • Yarraville Gardens; and • Waterfront areas (Footscray) and waterways) 	123, 326, 391, 404, 407, 422, 441	See Expert Report of Dr Pallavi Mandke (section 5.2).
106.	<p>Concerns about visual impacts of bridges and elevated structures, including at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maribyrnong River • Moonee Ponds Creek • Footscray Road • Wurundjeri Way 	9, 14, 21, 40, 158, 162, 184, 189, 190, 192, 208, 227, 272, 304, 312, 326, 329, 341, 343, 344, 345, 354, 364, 374, 391, 414, 422, 434, 444, 451, 454, 469, 471	See Expert Report of Roger Wood on Urban Design (section 4.3).
107.	Concerns about graffiti	471	<p>See Expert Report of Roger Wood on Urban Design (section 4.3).</p> <p>Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) initiatives will be developed and incorporated in detailed design as a requirement of EPR SP1.</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
108.	Concerns about visual impacts of ventilation structures, including at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yarraville Gardens • Mclvor Reserve • Hamner Reserve 	158, 350, 378	See Expert Report of Roger Wood on Urban Design (section 4.3).
109.	Concerns about overshadowing and the reflectivity of the ventilation structure with regard to sun glare	343, 378	See Expert Report of Michael Barlow on Strategic Planning (Appendix C). See Expert Report of Roger Wood on Urban Design (section 4.3).
110.	Hobsons Bay City Council raises that the EES does not sufficiently acknowledge loss of vegetation	378	The level detail provided in the EES (Vol 2 Chapter 12.5, Vol 3 Chapter 19.5, Vol 4 Chapter 26.5 and Technical Report F <i>Ecology</i>) on the extent, type and location of vegetation impacted by the project is consistent with the Scoping Requirements for the project.
111.	Hobsons Bay City Council raises that the EES is missing viewpoints of E-Gate and Dynon urban renewal areas	378	A 3D model has been developed by the Project Co and will be available to the IAC and other parties for viewing at the panel hearing, and for the generation of still images. This model will provide views of the project from various points.
112.	Concerns that landscape can only be classified as an industrial setting due to construction of CityLink by Vic Government and TransUrban in 1996	312	This is not a matter within the scope of the IAC's consideration.
Legal and procedural issues			

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
113.	<p>Concerns about the community engagement process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community engagement process contained misleading and contradictory information Email-based survey was biased and weighted to positive feedback Contradictory information at information session The change in project name and scope has meant there is considerable confusion in the community about the objectives and the technical claims of the project under assessment Offensive comment made at Altona North information session 	<p>13, 22, 34, 65, 73, 103, 124, 141, 144, 156, 161, 162, 176, 192, 213, 278, 287, 296, 326, 344, 350, 354, 361, 362, 364, 367, 374, 378, 389,390, 434, 449, 452, 457, 461, 462, 503</p>	<p>The Western Distributor Authority has worked with communities, local government and industry, throughout the design and development of the project.</p> <p>A comprehensive program of stakeholder and community engagement was integrated into the design of the project from the start and has influenced each stage of the design development and preparation of the EES. The engagement principles and approach underpin all program activities and seeks to provide consistent and accurate communications across all project phases.</p> <p>The Western Distributor Authority have undertaken a range of engagement activities to obtain stakeholder and community feedback.</p> <p>The consultation engagement undertaken throughout the project and a detailed summary of the issues raised and responded to, is provided in EES Attachment III Stakeholder and community engagement report.</p> <p>The project name change, which occurred early April 2017, was accompanied by an announcement of the revised project design (the design which was taken to the EES) and an intensive round of public consultation: 10 community information sessions were held over 16 days, with over 1500 people attending.</p> <p>The EES was publically exhibited for six weeks including online and print publications available at 14 community facilities. During the exhibition phase 13 information sessions were held in the project area to provide opportunities for the residents, stakeholders and the wider community to view the EES and talk to specialists about the</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			<p>project, including the opportunities to clarify project information.</p> <p>See also Submissions on Behalf of Western Distributor Authority - Part A (paragraphs 97-101).</p>
114.	Letters of complaint have not been adequately responded to	374	<p>The Western Distributor Authority has enquiries and complaints protocols in place to respond to communications.</p> <p>Every effort has been made to ensure the concerns expressed in the formal submission by this submitter are addressed and responded to as part of the IAC process.</p>
115.	<p>Argues that project breaches <i>Transport Integration Act 2010</i> (TIA) as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> no updated transport plan has been prepared under section 63 of the TIA the project is not consistent with the objectives and principles of the TIA 	184, 190, 232, 326,372, 388, 420, 422, 430, 486	<p>An updated transport plan under section 63 of the TIA is not a precondition for the preparation, assessment, construction or operation of the Project.</p> <p>An assessment of the project against the objectives and principles of the TIA has been carried out and is set out in section 9.4 of the EES. See also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submissions on Behalf of Western Distributor Authority - Part A Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 5.8) Expert Report of Will Symons on Greenhouse Gas (section 4.3)
116.	Concern about Maribyrnong River not receiving same treatment as Yarra River with recent Yarra Protection Act	34	This is not a matter within the scope of the IAC's consideration.

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
117.	Concern that the project is being rushed and hasn't allowed for due consideration of other solutions	9, 192, 272, 327, 366, 435, 444, 462	The assessment of alternative projects is not within the scope of the IAC's consideration. See Submissions on Behalf of Western Distributor Authority - Part A (paragraphs 86-95).
118.	Concerns about relying on Port of Melbourne lease documents for assumptions in EES	158	Further detail in relation to the Port of Melbourne is being provided in response to IAC's request 21 of 18 July 2017.
119.	Comment about exhibition / submission process including the limited time available to review the documents	182, 225, 296, 361, 366, 374, 390, 401, 405, 434, 437	The EES documents were placed on exhibition for a total of 6 weeks or 30 business days. This is the normal exhibition period for an EES, is in accordance with the Minister for Planning's declaration of December 2015 (public) and within the 20 to 30 business day period recommended by the Ministerial Guidelines. Thirteen public information sessions were held during the exhibition period so people could talk directly with the experts who prepared the EES to help them understand the content.
120.	Requested electronic EES on the day of release, didn't receive it until 13 June 2017	361	The EES was publically exhibited for six weeks including online and print publications available at 14 community facilities. The EES was exhibited online and available for download and USBs containing complete sets of the EES were available to be picked up at each community facility, including the North Melbourne library.
121.	JJ Tunnel Cleaning was a late exclusion from the required delivery packages to be met by	429	This is not a matter within the scope of the IAC's consideration.

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	tenderers		
122.	<p>Concerns about conflict of interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project was assessed against its own set of objectives • Transurban has a vested interest in the project outcomes • Pro-project bias on the part of the EES authors 	326, 405, 457, 499	<p>The purpose of the IAC process is to provide an independent assessment of the effects of the Project. The EES Technical Reports that underpin the EES were prepared by technical specialists who are experts in their field.</p> <p>The key Traffic and Transport and Air Quality reports have been peer reviewed. The peer review statements are included in the exhibited EES.</p> <p>Many of the report authors will provide further expert evidence to the IAC. This evidence is, as is the EES itself, subject to independent scrutiny and cross examination.</p>
123.	<p>Concerns about quality of EES documentation including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents lack rigour, particularly the modelling • Assumptions in the EES are inaccurate or incorrect • EES provides no confidence to local residents • The length of the EES is inappropriate 	106, 182, 185, 187, 188, 190, 195, 213, 216, 232, 270, 312, 326, 328, 344, 354, 374, 405, 418, 419, 422, 442, 462, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494	<p><u>Rigour of the EES documents</u></p> <p>The EES Technical Reports that underpin the EES were prepared by technical specialists who are experts in their field.</p> <p>The project’s Technical Reference Group (TRG) composed of members from government agencies and authorities provided detailed review and comment on all elements of the EES documentation.</p> <p>Many of the report authors will provide further expert evidence to the IAC. This evidence is, as is the EES itself, subject to independent scrutiny and cross examination.</p> <p><u>Length of the EES</u></p> <p>The EES was structured to provide accessible information to a range of audiences (refer EES Vol 1, Figure 1-5)</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Summary report provided a high level summary of the EES process and outcomes in an easy to read format • The main volumes provided a comprehensive overview of the project, the assessment process, the potential impacts and proposed mitigation. Volumes 2-4 set out the project's effects by location, to assist readers with identifying effects relevant to their location. • The Technical reports and Attachments provide highly detailed information from specialists to enable scrutiny of the methodology and findings of the 17 specialist areas assessed • The EES Map Book and Development and Urban Design Plans provided detailed maps and drawings of the project design and urban design concepts across the key components.
124.	<p>EES contains conflicting information about the treatment of the rear of 107-109 Whitehall St</p> <p>Concerned about subdivision of their property due to acquisition and land tax trust concessions</p>	182	This issue is addressed and responded to as part of issue 82.
125.	Pg 144 of the EES inaccurately states 'separation' between vehicles and trams, when in fact it is 'only' 'tram lanes'	328	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 10.3.2).
126.	Concerns that Scoping Requirements are not met	184, 344, 354	The Western Distributor Authority considers that all Scoping Requirements are addressed by the EES. For further detail Refer

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			Chapter 9 Meeting our obligations, Main Report Volume 1.
127.	<p>Requests for nominated point of contact during project construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests for on call support during project • Construction compound will be adjacent to Yarraville Soccer Club's car park, requests telephone contact • Requests regular consultation with the Altona North Cricket Club throughout the project 	123, 339, 419, 471, 499	<p>EPR SP2 requires a Communications and Community Engagement Plan to be developed by Project Co in consultation with the relevant councils. The Plan will contain detailed protocols for engaging with impacted stakeholders throughout construction.</p> <p>It will be a specific requirements of the Business Involvement Plan prepared under BP5 that the plan include procedures in relation to environmental management or delivery of the Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • through which the community can provide comment or feedback. • to resolve any issues or disputes between parties. <p>The plan will identify affected stakeholders with interfaces to the project and the process by which these interfaces will be managed.</p>
128.	Request for financial support to carry out strategic planning work and a financial contribution to offset the impacts of the WGT on the Footscray Wharf environs	158	<p>Project Co will work closely with affected Councils throughout the detailed design phase to minimise localised impacts and to achieve good outcomes for communities.</p> <p>The provision of financial assistance is a matter that will be considered by the Victorian Government outside of the EES process.</p>
129.	Suggests that the project should be decided by taking it to an election (similar to East-West link)	66, 153	This is not a matter within the scope of the IAC's consideration.
130.	Requests that Dr Denison review the Human Health Impact Assessment prior to hearing	158	Dr Denison has reviewed Technical Report J: Human Health and her identification of key issues, and associated request for information from the proponent, was published by the IAC on 18 July, 2017.

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
131.	Bus Association - wants clarification and expert review for their specific issues	176	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 10.3).
132.	Concerned that project has proceeded to Stage 4 of Market-Led Proposal Guidelines without completing EES process	405	The Victorian Government's assessment of Transurban's proposal is being undertaken in accordance with the Market-led Proposals Guideline. Assessment of the proposal against the Market-led Proposals Guideline is not within the scope of the IAC's consideration.
Noise and vibration			
133.	Adequacy of adopted project noise objectives during operation, including night time noise limits	17, 106, 213, 264, 265, 289, 326, 343, 361, 366, 378, 406, 419, 428, 457, 471, 499	See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3). See also Project Note 4 in response to IAC requests DM1-D in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017.
134.	Concern about vibration from traffic and elevated sections of the road	92, 179, 281, 292, 301, 349	The vibration levels generated by smooth roads are generally well below the threshold of perception at nearby sensitive receptors. See Technical Report H <i>Noise and Vibration</i> (Executive Summary, page vi).
135.	Concern about vibration impacts from construction activities	92, 124, 133, 192, 222, 292, 312	See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3).
136.	Concerns about approach to mitigating construction noise and adopted project	7, 58, 151, 156, 158, 186, 214, 240, 324, 326, 329, 334, 339,	See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	noise objectives (including requests for mitigation)	361 368, 378, 391, 403, 434, 444, 458, 470	
137.	Concerns about existing background noise levels	11, 20, 53, 72, 79, 92, 104, 106, 113, 118, 134, 140, 160, 165, 168, 169, 200, 230, 251, 282, 284, 285, 299, 300, 312, 314, 316, 326, 378, 382, 403, 459, 475, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494	Technical Report H Surface Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment for the Project (Technical Report H) included noise and vibration measurement to establish existing conditions representative of the project area.
138.	Concerns about construction noise	7, 20, 21, 114, 115, 116, 123, 124, 132, 133, 135, 160, 182, 183, 192, 200, 213, 240, 279, 282, 284, 285, 293, 299, 300, 326, 329, 339, 344, 352, 354, 355, 358, 378, 391, 400, 417, 419, 434, 443, 444, 451, 458, 466, 467, 470, 499	See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3).
139.	Concerns about noise impacts from elevated sections of the road, including on-and off-ramps, particularly the Hyde Street ramps.	80, 158, 189, 231, 292, 303, 326, 329, 334, 340, 344, 346, 351, 354, 364, 378, 389, 391, 399, 407, 434, 451, 455, 459, 460	See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3).
140.	Concerns about noise from new elevated roads in Docklands and West Melbourne	6, 8, 9, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 74, 131, 132, 136, 149, 156, 179, 185, 190, 302, 329, 361,	See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
		412, 413, 444, 451, 460, 471	
141.	Concerns about noise impacts in residential areas and from increased traffic on local roads	6, 8, 9, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 29, 58, 72, 73, 79, 92, 103, 104, 107, 113, 118, 122, 128, 130, 131, 132, 136, 140, 149, 160, 162, 168, 175, 177, 179, 181, 183, 184, 192, 195, 198, 200, 202, 203, 205, 206, 208, 211, 212, 213, 214, 220, 227, 230, 231, 232, 240, 245, 246, 249, 251, 256, 265, 266, 274, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 288, 289, 290, 297, 299, 300, 301, 310, 312, 314, 316, 322, 324, 325, 326, 331, 337, 343, 344, 345, 346, 348, 349, 352, 353, 354, 355, 358, 362, 363, 364, 372, 375, 378, 382, 383, 391, 400, 404, 406, 412, 417, 418, 419, 434, 445, 446, 453, 458, 459, 467, 475, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494	See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3). See also Project Note 4 in response to IAC requests DM1-D in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017.
142.	Concerns about noise impacts in urban renewal areas	18, 158, 160, 184, 190, 200, 282, 284, 285, 299, 300, 314, 344, 354	See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
143.	Concerns about noise impacts on public open space (including approach to noise mitigation) including the noise at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the new 3ha park near the southern portal Donald McLean Reserve 	10, 17, 114, 115, 116, 123, 131, 148, 158, 160, 177, 183, 184, 200, 208, 213, 231, 264, 282, 284, 285, 299, 300, 314, 326, 339, 343, 344, 345, 348, 354, 371, 378, 389, 391, 398, 400, 404, 407, 417, 426, 434, 439, 458, 467, 469	See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3).
144.	Concern about noise impacts on businesses	7, 182, 189, 210, 264, 320, 289, 443, 448, 450, 455, 466	See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3).
145.	Concerns about noise impacts on Emma McLean Kindergarten	334, 340, 346, 351, 399	See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3).
146.	Concerns about noise from the project considers there is a need for the project to do ongoing local monitoring including at Millers Road and Geelong Road	11, 143, 183, 205, 220, 256, 297, 343, 344, 354, 368, 371, 378, 417, 428, 457, 470	See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3, page 11).
147.	Concerns about engine braking noise	179, 231, 292, 316, 326, 419, 499	See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3).
148.	Open graded asphalt should be used to minimise road noise	326, 400, 458	See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3).
149.	Concerns about predicted noise from ventilation structures	7, 418	See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3). Further detail in relation to noise from ventilation structures is being

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			provided in response to IAC's request DM1-J of 18 July 2017.
150.	<p>Concerns about the approach to noise mitigation (noise barriers and other measures), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> on residential streets such as New Street, Geelong Road and Millers Road along the West Gate Freeway 	6, 8, 9, 11, 16, 18, 19, 21, 20, 22, 24, 27, 40, 53, 58, 71, 74, 80, 103, 106, 126, 138, 143, 149, 151, 156, 158, 160, 165, 169, 177, 183, 185, 186, 190, 198, 200, 204, 205, 210, 213, 215, 220, 240, 251, 264, 265, 278, 279, 282, 284, 285, 289, 292, 299, 300, 303, 312, 314, 315, 323, 326, 329, 339, 342, 343, 344, 346, 354, 355, 358, 361, 362, 378, 383, 384, 389, 391, 399, 400, 403, 404, 406, 411, 413, 422, 426, 427, 434, 439, 444, 458, 459, 471, 475, 487, 499	See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3).
151.	Support for proposed noise mitigation measures	308, 367, 393	No response required.
152.	Concerns about timing of construction works causing noise disturbance (eg. night works)	198, 232, 249, 326, 390, 400, 418, 419, 434, 499	See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3).
153.	Noise modelling methodology challenged, including addressing multi-storey properties	8, 9, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 74, 80, 103, 149, 190, 213, 289, 326, 329, 343, 344, 348, 354, 361, 378, 400, 439, 444, 451, 458,	See Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (sections 4.3 and 5).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
		467	
Project rationale, benefits or alternatives (general)			
154.	Argues that the project should be required to use locally produced materials and provide employment for locals wherever possible	106, 213, 378	<p>Project Co will be required to perform its obligations in relation to design and construction in compliance with the Victorian Industry Participation Policy (VIPP).</p> <p>The VIPP specifies requirements for local content in terms of material and labour used on the Project.</p> <p>The Victorian Government has publically stated that the project will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create 6,000 new jobs, including 500 apprentices, up to 150 jobs for former auto workers, and around 400 jobs in Melbourne’s west • Be built using 93 per cent local content, with around 92 per cent local steel • Have a minimum of 89 per cent local content in the design and construction of the tunnel, road works and elevated structures • Require 82% local content in the supply and installation of the electronic Lane Use Management System • Ensure 10% of hours worked on the project will be provided by Victorian apprentices, trainees or engineering cadets
155.	Concerns about stated benefits of project	1, 12, 23, 25, 28, 29, 35, 44, 70, 141, 158, 162, 167, 184, 217, 221, 232, 233, 263, 272, 276, 279, 301, 326, 357, 366,	<p>Details of the benefits of the project and the strategic transport needs it addresses are provided in the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EES Executive summary – page ES-11

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
		367, 369, 371, 387, 388, 405, 408, 416, 422, 429	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 2.5) Submissions on Behalf of Western Distributor Authority - Part A Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 6) Western Distributor Business Case
156.	Concerns about market led proposal	5, 6, 14, 24, 26, 27, 28, 30, 33, 40, 42, 44, 47, 55, 75, 79, 85, 104, 106, 125, 127, 128, 129, 137, 142, 145, 157, 162, 164, 169, 174, 179, 184, 206, 215, 216, 218, 223, 233, 237, 241, 253, 259, 260, 267, 269, 270, 272, 273, 275, 276, 277, 286, 287, 291, 293, 295, 297, 302, 303, 306, 307, 313, 327, 352, 357, 361, 364, 371, 372, 374, 387, 396, 398, 402, 405, 408, 410, 412, 416, 426, 440, 444, 453, 454, 457, 469, 472, 496, 501, 502	<p>The Victorian Government's assessment of Transurban's proposal is being undertaken in accordance with the Market-led Proposals Guideline.</p> <p>Assessment of the proposal against the Market-led Proposals Guideline is not within the scope of the IAC's consideration.</p>
157.	<p>Opposed to tolls/toll road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about changes to Citylink tolls Concerned that Transurban is benefiting 	43, 46, 48, 49, 55, 69, 143, 150, 170, 177, 178, 187, 188, 198, 201, 220, 245, 261, 289, 326, 353, 355, 358, 364, 374, 380, 388	The commercial terms between the state government and toll road operator are not within the scope of the IAC's consideration.

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	from tolls		
158.	General support for the project and its benefits	13, 46, 89, 112, 123, 146, 148, 150, 158, 176, 190, 219, 278, 293, 317, 323, 376, 381, 399, 445, 446, 461, 473, 477	No response required.
159.	Croft Infrastructure Designs submitted alternatives that were part of the Market-Led Proposal Scheme in 2016	396	This is not a matter within the scope of the IAC's consideration.
160.	Prefer money was invested in freight rail, particularly the Port-Rail shuttle system.	1, 10, 14, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 49, 50, 51, 54, 55, 62, 68, 75, 84, 85, 86, 97, 104, 113, 118, 120, 121, 125, 129, 132, 142, 145, 147, 157, 162, 164, 169, 170, 171, 174, 179, 184, 190, 203, 206, 207, 221, 223, 227, 229, 231, 232, 233, 235, 238, 239, 241, 242, 244, 248, 250, 254, 256, 259, 260, 262, 267, 269, 271, 272, 273, 276, 277, 283, 286, 287, 290, 291, 294, 297, 303, 304, 306, 310, 311, 318, 319, 323, 326, 327, 331, 335, 341, 349, 352, 357, 363, 364, 366, 369, 372, 373, 374, 380, 384, 387, 388, 394, 395, 402, 408, 409, 413,	This is not a matter within the scope of the IAC's consideration. See Submissions on Behalf of Western Distributor Authority - Part A (paragraphs 86-95).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
		416, 417, 422, 425, 426, 430, 434, 436, 437, 440, 443, 444, 454, 455, 457, 469, 470, 472, 476, 479, 486, 489, 500, 501, 502	
161.	Prefer money was invested in public transport improvements including the Melbourne Metro 2 project	24, 26, 29, 30, 32, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 50, 70, 85, 88, 90, 93, 97, 98, 104, 113, 118, 120, 125, 127, 142, 145, 155, 157, 162, 164, 169, 171, 174, 187, 188, 190, 195, 203, 206, 216, 218, 221, 228, 229, 232, 233, 239, 241, 244, 245, 248, 252, 254, 258, 259, 269, 271, 272, 277, 286, 287, 290, 291, 294, 295, 302, 307, 313, 322, 326, 327, 331, 335, 337, 341, 349, 352, 357, 364, 366, 371, 372, 373, 374, 379, 380, 384, 388, 394, 402, 408, 409, 412, 413, 417, 419, 422, 425, 426, 430, 433, 434, 436, 440, 443, 444, 453, 454, 455, 457, 458, 469, 475, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 499, 500, 501, 502	This is not a matter within the scope of the IAC's consideration. See Submissions on Behalf of Western Distributor Authority - Part A (paragraphs 86-95).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
162.	Preference for alternative corridor, including the West Gate Distributor or the western section of the East-West Link and the Eddington alignment	72, 141, 142, 152, 153, 158, 174, 257, 296, 297, 301, 311, 316, 364, 385, 426, 434, 446, 468, 486	This is not a matter within the scope of the IAC's consideration. See Submissions on Behalf of Western Distributor Authority - Part A (paragraphs 86-95).
163.	Seeks completion of a road connection from Paramount Road in Tottenham to the West Gate Freeway	158,	The creation of a "Paramount Road corridor" is not a matter within the scope of the IAC's consideration. See also Report of John Kiriakidis (section 10, page 139).
164.	Request review of West Gate Bridge, including adding emergency, bus and taxi lanes.	419, 499	VicRoads has overall responsibility for the operation and management of the West Gate Bridge. Future reviews and or improvements would be undertaken in accordance with Australian Standards as well as VicRoad's policies and strategies.
165.	Support the Greens alternate transport proposals	76, 331	This is not a matter within the scope of the IAC's consideration. See Submissions on Behalf of Western Distributor Authority - Part A (paragraphs 86-95).
166.	View that overall project is not justified or will not be effective.	6, 9, 10, 17, 25, 33, 37, 41, 47, 69, 72, 82, 84, 93, 97, 114, 115, 116, 132, 142, 145, 152, 170, 171, 174, 184, 190, 207, 215, 223, 226, 229, 231, 232, 237, 238, 242, 244, 245, 261, 268, 270, 276, 283, 291, 294, 295, 297, 302, 303, 327, 329, 335, 337, 344, 349, 354, 357, 363, 364, 374, 390, 394, 395,	A detailed overview of the benefits of the project and the strategic transport needs it addresses are provided in the following sections of the EES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive summary – page ES-11 • EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 2.5)

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
		398, 402, 408, 416, 418, 422, 426, 428, 430, 437, 453, 454, 460, 462, 470, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 500, 501, 502	
Social			
167.	Concerns about impact on sporting clubs and recreational facilities	6, 10, 95, 103, 106, 114, 115, 116, 123, 161, 167, 169, 231, 273, 286, 311, 315, 339, 342, 344, 345, 346, 349, 350, 354, 357, 371, 378, 391, 425, 427, 430, 434, 441, 458	See Expert Report of Dr Pallavi Mandke on Social (section 5.1, page 4).
168.	Concerns about impacts on community facilities and open spaces	17, 123, 203, 228, 278, 326, 334, 336, 339, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 348, 349, 352, 353, 354, 378, 399, 419, 427, 434, 439, 441, 450, 475, 478, 499	See Expert Report of Dr Pallavi Mandke on Social (section 5.1, page 4).
169.	Concerns about long-term protection and maintenance of new public open space	106, 158, 167, 203, 326, 337, 343, 344, 354, 434	A final project operating area (lease area) has not been determined at this stage of the project's planning phase. Once agreed, the protection and maintenance of any assets located outside the agreed lease area would be subject to agreement with the relevant land manager or owner. This approach is consistent with other large scale major road projects within Victoria. See also the Expert Report of Dr Pallavi Mandke on Social

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			(section 5.1, pages 4-6).
170.	Concerns about loss of connectivity and access by project design	6, 17, 22, 95, 139, 140, 151, 165, 170, 182, 183, 208, 221, 225, 263, 272, 281, 283, 303, 326, 370, 378, 403, 422, 434, 438	See Expert Report of Dr Pallavi Mandke on Social (section 5.1). See also the Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 7 and section 10).
171.	Concerns about suitability of new public open spaces	10, 17, 162, 167, 184, 206, 208, 283, 326, 336, 344, 354, 378, 411, 434, 446, 467, 495	See Expert Report of Dr Pallavi Mandke on Social (section 5.1). See also the Expert Report of Dieter Lim on Landscape (section 4.3).
172.	General concern that the project would impact on the amenity of the community	18, 74, 114, 115, 116, 117, 148, 151, 156, 169, 175, 182, 183, 184, 190, 192, 199, 213, 214, 221, 226, 227, 230, 262, 263, 266, 270, 275, 281, 310, 314, 326, 336, 338, 339, 340, 342, 343, 346, 351, 352, 353, 361, 371, 374, 377, 378, 380, 383, 387, 391, 402, 406, 409, 414, 422, 425, 426, 427, 430, 436, 441, 442, 443, 444, 448, 450, 454, 462, 467, 469, 470, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494	See Expert Report of Dr Pallavi Mandke on Social (section 5.1). See also the Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3). See also the Expert Report of Frank Fler on Air Quality (section 4.2).
173.	Proposal for new public open space, including converting current industrial land	106, 197, 203, 217, 230, 283, 286, 312, 326, 337, 340, 344,	See Expert Report of Dr Pallavi Mandke on Social (section 5.1).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	next to Hyde Street and Simcock Avenue to new open space.	346, 351, 354, 372, 378, 434, 441, 444, 467	
174.	Yarraville Soccer Club is concerned that project noise, air and access during construction impacts will lead to a loss of membership and revenue.	339	<p>See Expert Report of Dr Pallavi Mandke on Social (section 5.1).</p> <p>See also the Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Airborne Noise (section 4.3).</p> <p>See also the Expert Report of Frank Fler on Air Quality (section 4.2).</p> <p>The Traffic Management Plan that will be prepared under TP3 must minimise disruption to traffic to the extent practicable, prevent construction-related parking on local roads or public car parks and reinstate access to open space and community facilities as soon as possible.</p>
175.	Suggests that practice nets in WLJ Crofts Reserve should be relocated	123	The impacts on users of recreational facilities (including Crofts Reserve) are required to be minimised to the extent practicable under EPR LPP2. Access to, amenity and function are also to be maintained to the extent practicable in consultation with the land manager.
Surface water			
176.	Concern about the impact of the project on the health and amenity of the Maribyrnong River	34, 380, 422	See Expert Report of Melanie Collett on Surface Water (section 4.3).
177.	Concerns about project impacts on water	106, 184, 344, 354, 368, 378,	See Expert Report of Melanie Collett on Surface Water (section 4.3).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	quality	434	
178.	Concerns about design changes to waterway form and bank stability including the number of piers in waterways	17, 184, 344, 354, 368, 422, 434, 441	See Expert Report of Melanie Collett on Surface Water (section 4.3).
179.	Concerns about management of operational run-off including proposed wetlands and impacts on water quality	106, 138, 368, 378, 434	See Expert Report of Melanie Collett on Surface Water (section 4.3).
180.	Concerns about predicted impacts on hydrology & flooding	123, 138, 182, 184, 199, 317, 326, 378, 434, 441, 454	See Expert Report of Melanie Collett on Surface Water (section 4.3).
181.	Concerns about suitability of retarding basin design and functionality	182, 343, 378, 380, 434, 454	See Expert Report of Melanie Collett on Surface Water (section 4.3). See also the Expert Report of Dieter Lim on Landscape (section 4.3).
182.	Existing surface water conditions - concerns about accuracy of results	368	See Expert Report of Melanie Collett on Surface Water (section 4.3)
183.	Request for drainage asset condition assessments prior to and after construction	378	See Expert Report of Melanie Collett on Surface Water (section 4.3)
184.	Request for WSUD in design	84, 378	See Expert Report of Melanie Collett on Surface Water (section 4.3).
Traffic and transport			
185.	Concerns about ability for project to achieve adequate transport network function and performance (including intersections):	1, 5, 10, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 33, 35, 40, 60, 67, 72, 73, 78, 106, 128, 138, 141, 148, 158, 170, 171, 177, 180, 181, 183, 185,	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport. See also the Expert Report of Tim Veitch on Transport Modelling (section 6.3).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Displacement of trucks from Maribryngong to Hobsons Bay Congestion will limit emergency vehicle access (on freeway or surrounding roads) CBD and/or Docklands will be unable to deal with the increased traffic 	187, 190, 195, 203, 213, 214, 217, 223a, 227, 241, 245, 249, 260, 263, 266, 272, 273, 275, 281, 290, 296, 303, 306, 307, 313, 317, 320, 322, 326, 348, 357, 364, 365, 366, 367, 370, 371, 378, 385, 387, 390, 394, 395, 398, 402, 403, 406, 409, 415, 422, 425, 430, 431, 433, 434, 437, 449, 460, 473	<p>See also Project Notes 15 and 16 in response to IAC requests 4 and 5 in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017.</p> <p>Further detail in relation to network function is being provided in response to IAC's requests 1, 7, 8 and 21 of 18 July 2017.</p>
186.	<p>Project transport objectives are not appropriate or would not be met including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposition to building more freeways/roads, which will only cause more congestion - would prefer investment in public transport. Opposes feeding more traffic into the inner city. The benefits will be non-existent minimal and/or short-lived The project only moves traffic problems from one area to another. 	35, 36, 38, 42, 50, 51, 62, 64, 86, 110, 114, 115, 116, 137, 141, 142, 148, 158, 162, 164, 169, 170, 173, 179, 184, 195, 206, 221, 223, 237, 244, 253, 256, 257, 258, 259, 261, 266, 272, 276, 281, 283, 286, 289, 290, 291, 301, 303, 306, 308, 309, 310, 311, 317, 322, 326, 330, 331, 338, 352, 356, 357, 361, 364, 367, 374, 375, 377, 378, 381, 384, 387, 388, 392, 402, 409, 415, 422, 423, 426, 430, 443, 457, 458, 463, 467, 486, 503	<p>See Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport.</p> <p>See also the Expert Report of Tim Veitch on Transport Modelling (section 6.3).</p>
187.	Other upgrades are also needed to achieve project objectives, particularly for freight transport, including the Bolte Bridge	317, 366, 367, 378	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 10).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	connection		
188.	Concerns about connectivity and access between West Melbourne, Docklands and E-Gate, including pedestrian and cycle links across the new Wurundjeri Way extension.	6, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 40, 66, 74, 114, 115, 116, 148, 149, 184, 185, 208, 227, 263, 310, 318, 361, 415, 444, 460	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (sections 7 and 10). Further detail in relation to connectivity between West Melbourne, Docklands and E-Gate is being provided in response to IAC's requests 25-27 of 18 July 2017.
189.	Concern about adequate car parking during construction, particularly at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yarraville Glory Football Club • On Harris Street 	339, 350, 389, 414, 450	The Traffic Management Plan that is required to be prepared under TP3 requires the provision of suitable parking arrangements to accommodate the construction workforce, preventing construction related parking on local roads or use of public car parks.
190.	Concerned that the project will preclude a right hand turn into Pearl River Road from Footscray Road	415	The project would not preclude the right hand turn.
191.	Concerns about construction traffic impacts including haulage routes and transport of spoil	7, 10, 23, 29, 33, 46, 62, 73, 110, 114, 115, 116, 123, 135, 148, 160, 169, 180, 181, 185, 198, 200, 205, 217, 229, 282, 284, 285, 286, 289, 293, 299, 300, 307, 314, 324, 326, 337, 339, 378, 381, 389, 392, 397, 400, 403, 411, 414, 415, 426, 430, 434, 454, 458, 478	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 9). See also Project Notes 11, 18 and 19 in response to IAC requests 13, 11 and 12 in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017. Further detail in relation to connectivity between West Melbourne, Docklands and E-Gate is being provided in response to IAC's requests 10, 14 and 15 of 18 July 2017.
192.	The proposed construction compound at the northern end of Hall Street and the use	334, 340, 351, 378	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 10).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	of Hall street as a construction traffic route, is not supported due to the impacts on the Emma McLean Kindergarten		
193.	Concerned that construction traffic from the 221 (and 111-151) Whitehall Street sites will negatively impact access to business on Somerville Road	7, 78, 180	<p>Specific EPRs address traffic, amenity and access impacts on businesses. It is a requirement of EPR BP2 that amenity for, and access to, potentially impacted businesses and commercial facilities must be protected where practicable, with any reduction in the level of access, amenity or function to be minimised to the duration necessary to carry out relevant construction works.</p> <p>The Traffic Management Plan that will be prepared under TP3 must minimise disruption to traffic to the extent practicable, prevent construction-related parking on local roads or public car parks and reinstate access as soon as possible. Affected stakeholders will be consulted on progress of construction activities under EPR BP5.</p> <p>The specific concerns of this submitter will be provided to Project Co to be addressed in detailed design and in preparation of environmental management documents required by the EPRs including the Traffic Management Plan.</p>
194.	Asks for an 'anti-idling' policy for trucks during construction.	217, 286, 334, 340, 346, 351	<p>The CEMP to be prepared for the project as required by EPR EMP2 would identify measures to avoid and minimise impacts from construction vehicles, including trucks. This may include policies around idling if considered appropriate.</p> <p>See also the approach to construction noise generally as discussed in the Expert Report of Matthew Stead on Surface Noise and Vibration (section 4.3)</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
195.	Concerned that left-in and left-out access to E-Gate construction compound will result in construction trucks circling through Waterfront City to head north	415	<p>EPR TP3 requires traffic management plans to be prepared prior to construction which would confirm the exact access and egress details of the construction compounds.</p> <p>WDA does not support the use of the Waterfront City for the purposes of construction routes.</p>
196.	Concerned that construction traffic does not impact on Precinct 15 construction activities	411	<p>Specific EPRs address traffic, amenity and access impacts on businesses from construction traffic. It is a requirement of BP2 that amenity for, and access to, potentially impacted businesses and commercial facilities must be protected where practicable, with any reduction in the level of access, amenity or function to be minimised to the duration necessary to carry out relevant construction works.</p> <p>The Traffic Management Plan that will be prepared under EPR TP3 must minimise disruption to traffic to the extent practicable, prevent construction-related parking on local roads or public car parks and reinstate access as soon as possible. Affected stakeholders will be consulted on progress of construction activities under EPR BP5.</p> <p>The specific concerns of this submitter will be provided to Project Co to be addressed in detailed design and in preparation of environmental management documents required by the EPRs including the Traffic Management Plan.</p>
197.	Request for alternative access to be used to E-Gate construction compound	397	<p>The potential construction traffic routes and construction compounds for the port, CityLink and city connections component of the project are shown in EES Main Report Volume 4 (section 25.5, Figure 25-5). These are noted as indicative construction compounds and potential haulage routes.</p> <p>The exact access and egress details of the construction compounds</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			<p>would be confirmed within the Traffic Management Plan to be prepared by the Project Co prior to construction.</p> <p>The specific concerns of this submitter will be provided to Project Co to be addressed in detailed design and in preparation of environmental management documents required by the EPRs including the Traffic Management Plan.</p>
198.	Request for alternative access to be used to construction compound (not New Street)	135, 160, 200, 217, 282, 284, 285, 299, 300, 314, 326, 346, 418	<p>See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 9).</p> <p>See also Project Note 19 in response to IAC request 12 in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017.</p> <p>The potential construction traffic routes and construction compounds for the port, CityLink and city connections component of the project are shown in Vol 4, section 25.5 (Figure 25-5). These are noted as indicative construction compounds and potential haulage routes.</p> <p>The exact access and egress details of the construction compounds would be confirmed within the Traffic Management Plan to be prepared by the Project Co prior to construction.</p> <p>The specific concerns of these submitter will be provided to Project Co to be addressed in detailed design and in preparation of environmental management documents required by the EPRs including the Traffic Management Plan.</p>
199.	<p>Concerns about the Wurundjeri Way extension, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> compromising the development of the E-Gate 	16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 40, 66, 148, 149, 329, 370, 435, 444, 451	<p>Further detail in relation to the Wurundjeri Way extension is being provided in response to IAC's requests 25-27 of 18 July 2017.</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the visual impact on the Mission to Seaman building in Docklands seeking the extension be lowered 		
200.	<p>Concerns about impacts on public transport services including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> requests for bus lanes on local roads such as Millers Road and/or the West Gate Freeway concerns that increased traffic and/or changes to signalling will cause public transport delays 	1, 35, 106, 114, 115, 116, 121, 130, 143, 148, 155, 167, 169, 176, 183, 184, 198, 208, 209, 213, 214, 215, 220, 227, 232, 244, 249, 256, 297, 303, 328, 345, 348, 349, 352, 355, 357, 358, 359, 364, 378, 381, 383, 384, 400, 406, 409, 434, 438, 445, 457, 470, 474, 475, 503	<p>See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (sections 6 and 10). See also the Expert Report of Tim Veitch on Transport Modelling (section 6.3).</p>
201.	<p>Concerns about traffic changes in North and West Melbourne as a result of the project, including increased truck numbers and pedestrian safety</p>	1, 5, 6, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 27, 33, 38, 40, 49, 52, 58, 64, 66, 70, 74, 75, 79, 82, 84, 87, 93, 103, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120, 121, 129, 132, 136, 147, 148, 156, 169, 175, 179, 181, 184, 203, 206, 208, 209, 211, 212, 223, 224, 227, 229, 231, 232, 233, 245, 266, 272, 276, 280, 286, 291, 303, 304, 309, 312, 332, 335, 338, 344, 345, 346, 347, 354, 357, 364, 369, 371, 373, 374, 379, 380, 381, 385, 388, 394, 412, 413, 423, 424, 425,	<p>See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (sections 6, 7 and 10). See also the Expert Report of Tim Veitch on Transport Modelling (section 6.3). Further detail in relation to traffic changes in West Melbourne is being provided in response to IAC's requests 8, 22, 23 and 24 of 18 July 2017.</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
		426, 435, 437, 438, 444, 449, 451, 463, 472, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 503	
202.	Concerns about traffic changes on local streets as a result of the project, including increased truck numbers and pedestrian safety	15, 35, 82, 90, 91, 95, 102, 104, 107, 108, 111, 118, 125, 128, 129, 132, 137, 146, 152, 160, 162, 163, 166, 167, 169, 170, 171, 174, 175, 177, 178, 181, 185, 191, 192, 198, 199, 200, 201, 203, 205, 211, 213, 217, 218, 220, 221, 223, 225, 226, 228, 251, 252, 258, 266, 270, 278, 280, 281, 282, 284, 285, 286, 288, 289, 293, 298, 299, 300, 301, 303, 312, 314, 326, 331, 336, 337, 338, 340, 346, 349, 351, 357, 361, 363, 365, 371, 372, 373, 375, 377, 378, 381, 382, 390, 398, 400, 401, 403, 407, 408, 417, 418, 422, 434, 445, 446, 458, 461, 462, 468, 474, 475, 478, 502	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (sections 6 and 7). See also the Expert Report of Tim Veitch on Transport Modelling (section 6.3).
203.	Concerns about traffic changes in Blackshaws Road as a result of the project, including increased truck numbers and pedestrian safety	88, 106, 110, 123, 139, 151, 153, 160, 163, 165, 170, 171, 178, 181, 183, 198, 200, 205, 213, 214, 215, 220, 272, 277, 279, 280, 282, 284, 285, 289,	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (sections 6 and 7). See also the Expert Report of Tim Veitch on Transport Modelling (section 6.3).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
		293, 299, 300, 314, 316, 336, 346, 348, 352, 353, 362, 372, 375, 384, 398, 403, 405, 406, 418, 445, 458, 468, 470, 502	
204.	<p>Concerns about traffic changes in Millers Road as a result of the project and increased truck numbers, particularly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ability to turn onto Millers Road from side streets • Pedestrian safety 	3, 4, 35, 42, 56, 57, 63, 65, 88, 91, 100, 101, 106, 110, 119, 130, 134, 139, 140, 141, 143, 151, 152, 153, 155, 158, 160, 163, 167, 168, 170, 171, 178, 183, 194, 195, 198, 200, 202, 205, 213, 214, 215, 219, 220, 225, 246, 256, 258, 272, 274, 277, 279, 280, 282, 284, 285, 289, 293, 296, 297, 299, 300, 314, 316, 326, 336, 338, 346, 348, 352, 353, 359, 362, 363, 365, 371, 372, 373, 375, 378, 382, 384, 403, 405, 406, 418, 434, 458, 468, 470, 473, 474, 475, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 496, 502	<p>See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (sections 6, 7 and 10).</p> <p>See also the Expert Report of Tim Veitch on Transport Modelling (section 6.3).</p>
205.	Concerned that increased traffic will cause congestion and adversely impact public transport for the Melbourne Biomedical Precinct and the Parkville National Employment cluster	438	EPR TP4 requires measures to be developed and implemented to minimise to the extent practicable disruption to railway lines, tram and bus routes in consultation with VicTrack, Yarra rams and Metro Trains Melbourne.

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
206.	Concerned about traffic impacts on the Digital Harbour Precinct	185	The traffic impacts have been assessed as part of the EES Technical Report A Transport, Part 2 (Appendix D) refer Figure D30 and Figure D44).
207.	Operational and safety concerns about the Simcock Avenue / Hyde Street intersection and along Douglas Parade	378, 381	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 6 and section 10).
208.	Request for local area traffic management works, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic management measures to prevent Severn Street being used as a direct link between Francis Street and Somerville Road Signalising the intersection of the Sims Street loop and Footscray Road Pedestrian crossings and traffic management measures on Williamstown Road 	95, 166, 181, 188, 191, 198, 219, 225, 247, 305, 317, 334, 350, 362, 364, 367, 372, 381, 411, 424, 434, 473	EPR TP2 requires that traffic to be monitored (in streets selected in consultation with the relevant council) during construction and for up to two years after construction is complete. Required local traffic management works will be implemented in consultation with the relevant councils. It is planned that the Sim Street loop onto Footscray Road will be signalised as part of the project.
209.	Concerns about proposed tolling structure, including submissions seeking either no tolls, or that tolls either be removed or added to encourage trucks and other traffic to use the West Gate Freeway and tunnels rather than local roads	43, 46, 48, 49, 69, 143, 146, 150, 158, 163, 170, 177, 178, 187, 188, 198, 201 208, 213, 220, 230, 232, 245, 261, 277, 279, 293, 315, 316, 317, 343, 345, 348, 352, 353, 362, 364, 367, 375, 381, 383, 400, 403, 434, 449, 454, 456, 457	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 10). See also Project Note 1 in response to IAC request 19 in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017. See also Expert Report of Tim Veitch on Transport Modelling (section 6.3).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
210.	Concerns about truck bans and tolling impacting truck route options or efficiency of truck logistics	91, 125, 247, 272, 279, 321, 348, 367, 375, 378	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 10). See also Project Note 1 in response to IAC request 19 in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017. Further detail in relation to truck curfews is being provided in response to IAC's request 18 of 18 July 2017.
211.	Concerns that "rat running" will still occur as traffic (particularly trucks) use local roads to avoid paying tolls on the freeway	23, 29, 33, 35, 40, 74, 77, 80, 93, 110, 118, 128, 129, 130, 139, 140, 146, 152, 155, 170, 171, 179, 181, 195, 205, 216, 220, 233, 245, 249, 252, 256, 272, 275, 276, 279, 286, 289, 293, 297, 298, 301, 305, 307, 308, 312, 315, 322, 326, 330, 336, 342, 344, 346, 348, 352, 353, 354, 359, 374, 375, 378, 383, 384, 385, 390, 405, 408, 418, 419, 427, 431, 434, 445, 454, 458, 462, 468, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 499	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 6). EPR TP2 requires that traffic to be monitored (in streets selected in consultation with the relevant council) during construction and for up to two years after construction is complete. Required local traffic management works will be implemented in consultation with the relevant councils.
212.	The project makes the Heavy Goods Vehicle B-Double route along Melbourne Road redundant.	146	Williamstown Road / Melbourne Road is not identified as a VicRoads over dimensional route. However, it is noted that Williamstown Road is designed and regulated to carry B-double vehicles.
213.	Concerns about Port access, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • seeking that the MacKenzie Road 	158, 366, 367	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 10). See also the Expert Report of Tim Veitch on Transport Modelling

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	<p>off ramps not be constructed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> seeking that MacKenzie Road off ramps be 'port trucks only' 		<p>(section 6.3.1.9 and 10).</p> <p>Further detail in relation to Port access being provided in response to IAC's request 2 of 18 July 2017.</p>
214.	The Dynon Road connection should not be built as the effects cannot be managed	184	<p>See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (sections 10).</p> <p>Further detail in relation to Dynon Road is being provided in response to IAC's requests 22 to 24 of 18 July 2017.</p>
215.	<p>Request that additional truck bans be considered, including on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Millers Road Hudson Road Williamstown Road Blackshaws Road Mason Street Simcock Avenue New Street Kororoit Creek Road The Avenue Francis Street 	<p>15, 56, 59, 80, 91, 95, 99, 105, 106, 107, 109, 134, 139, 143, 146, 151, 155, 160, 163, 165, 166, 169, 170, 177, 178, 181, 183, 195, 198, 200, 201, 205, 213, 215, 220, 225, 228, 230, 241, 245, 249, 256, 270, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 288, 289, 293, 296, 297, 299, 300, 301, 305, 314, 315, 326, 334, 340, 342, 346, 348, 351, 352, 355, 358, 371, 372, 378, 383, 384, 400, 403, 406, 409, 417, 418, 419, 427, 434, 439, 445, 458, 461, 470, 475, 478, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 497, 499</p>	<p>The EES TIA considers traffic management measures on Blackshaws Road and Hudsons Road. This could include truck bans, curfews or other physical constraints on trucks.</p> <p>For east-west roads, it is noted that the model is not forecasting unacceptable truck movements as a result of the project. However, EPR TP2 requires traffic monitoring in selected streets up to two years after construction is complete. Considering the outcomes of the monitoring, local area traffic management works could be implemented in consultation with the local relevant Councils.</p> <p>In relation to north-south movements (Millers Road and Williamstown Road), these are primary arterial roads with a primary role and function to collect and distribute traffic (including trucks) between the arterial road network and the West Gate Freeway.</p>
216.	Seeks that trucks travelling to and from the Spotswood Industrial Precinct are exempt	378	Trucks travelling to and from the Spotswood Industrial Precinct would be not be exempt from the Francis Street trucks bans. Trucks

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	from the proposed Francis Street truck ban, so that they can continue to access the Freeway ramps at Melbourne/Williamstown Road		would be expected to use the Whitehall-Footscray-CityLink route to travel east. For westbound movements, the Project's new Hyde Street ramps provide the preferred connection to the West Gate Freeway.
217.	Suggest using Grieve Parade or tolling strategy to reduce additional traffic flows on Millers Road	3, 4, 57, 65, 100, 101, 134, 166, 170, 225, 249, 256, 283, 289, 337, 371, 372, 378, 389, 399, 434, 468, 473, 475	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (sections 10). See also Project Note 1 in response to IAC request 19 in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017.
218.	Support the implementation of new truck bans but concerned about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensuring the bans are implemented enforcement 	59, 77, 80, 99, 104, 107, 109, 122, 158, 162, 173, 228, 270, 272, 278, 279, 283, 313, 326, 364, 385, 393, 398, 426, 434, 445, 454, 458, 478, 487, 497	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 10). See also the Expert Report of Tim Veitch on Transport Modelling (section 6.3). EPR TP2 requires that traffic to be monitored (in streets selected in consultation with the relevant council) during construction and for up to two years after construction is complete. Required local traffic management works will be implemented in consultation with the relevant councils.
219.	Seeks ongoing monitoring and/or trigger points for intervention if traffic monitoring of Hudsons Road indicates problems	217	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 10). EPR TP2 requires that traffic to be monitored (in streets selected in consultation with the relevant council) during construction and for up to two years after construction is complete. Required local traffic management works will be implemented in consultation with the relevant councils.
220.	Transport modelling methodology and predictions challenged including because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the geographical extent of 	69, 72, 80, 95, 132, 148, 158, 160, 163, 169, 170, 176, 184, 186, 188, 190, 192, 195, 200,	See Expert Report of Tim Veitch on Transport Modelling (sections 6.3 and 7). See also the Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	<p>modelling is too limited as traffic changes in surrounding suburbs are not included</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the timeframe for modelling should be extended 	206, 213, 223, 227, 231, 236, 262, 263, 276, 282, 284, 285, 286, 289, 291, 299, 300, 308, 312, 314, 318, 326, 344, 348, 352, 354, 357, 371, 374, 375, 378, 387, 389, 392, 402, 405, 409, 410, 422, 426, 430, 473, 486, 503	<p>6.3).</p> <p>Further detail in relation to the design of the West Gate Tunnel Project is being provided in response to IAC's request 21 of 18 July 2017.</p>
221.	The modelling has not properly allowed for traffic from changing land use, particularly future development sites (such as Bradmills and Precinct 15).	160, 170, 200,205, 213, 206, 282, 284, 285, 286, 289, 299, 300, 314, 348, 352, 406,503	<p>See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 6 and section 10).</p> <p>See Expert Report of Tim Veitch on Transport Modelling (section 6.3.1.8).</p> <p>See also Technical Report A <i>Transport</i> (Table 3.3)</p>
222.	The modelling has not properly allowed for induced demand.	38, 286, 387,	<p>See Expert Report of Tim Veitch on Transport Modelling (section 6.3.1.5).</p> <p>Refer also to EES Technical Report A: <i>Transport</i> (Appendix G, Strategic Modelling Summary 1.2.4 Induced Travel Demand).</p>
223.	The modelling relies on assumed truck bans that have not been committed to, particularly on Hudson and Blackshaws Roads.	163, 169, 213, 286, 378,	The traffic model is forecasting a material change in truck volumes on Blackshaws Road and Hudsons Road. The project is proposing mitigation to redistribute undesirable truck volumes on these streets back onto the freeway network. The form of mitigation would need to be determined by VicRoads and local Council if the forecast truck volumes eventuate. Mitigation may include truck bans, or curfews or other physical constraints.
224.	Transport safety and concerns about the design being safe, including risks to cyclist &	3, 4, 52, 56, 65, 67, 78, 82, 95, 106, 108, 111, 113, 114, 115,	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (sections 7 and 10).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	<p>pedestrian safety from traffic changes, particularly in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hall Street and the Hyde Street off-ramps • Simcock Avenue • Accessing Altona Gate Shopping Centre 	<p>116, 119, 130, 134, 139, 147, 148, 151, 155, 166, 169, 171, 178, 179, 181, 183, 184, 190, 198, 203, 209, 213, 214, 215, 220, 221, 223, 225, 229, 234, 249, 250, 256, 259, 270, 272, 273, 279, 280, 281, 286, 289, 296, 297, 303, 305, 308, 309, 314, 317, 322, 326, 328, 332, 343, 348, 350, 352, 353, 362, 372, 374, 378, 381, 382, 383, 397, 400, 403, 406, 407, 412, 421, 431, 441, 444, 445, 446, 453, 456, 458, 470, 473, 474, 475, 478, 496, 499</p>	
225.	Concerns about approach to placarded loads and OD routes, particularly on Hyde Street and the Hyde Street ramps	91, 231, 326, 403, 434, 458, 498	<p>See Expert Report of Tim Veitch on Transport Modelling (section 6.3.1.12).</p> <p>See also the EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 3.8.1, section 5.4.7 and Table 7-12).</p>
226.	Support the new components of the pedestrian and cycling network	32, 93, 104, 280, 283, 305, 317, 376, 434, 441, 446, 449, 461	No response required.
227.	Concerns about design of the pedestrian and cycling network, including the proposed veloway and the need to fully connect the existing network	67, 158, 162, 184, 185, 190, 208, 221, 227, 229, 280, 288, 289, 296, 311, 317, 326, 329, 332, 343, 344, 345, 348, 354, 362, 364, 378, 380, 384, 406,	<p>See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 7).</p> <p>See also Project Note 21 in response to IAC request 35 in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017.</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
		414, 415, 430, 434, 441, 445, 451, 454, 456, 469	
228.	Concerned that the only pedestrian access from West Melbourne to Docklands is the compromised access along Dudley Street - improvements are needed.	185	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Traffic and Transport (section 7 and section 10.2).
229.	Concerns about the safety of the cycle routes including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the veloway • seeking paths separated from traffic • routes should be adequately lit 	67, 169, 184, 190, 213, 250, 272, 303, 317, 350, 362, 374, 378, 412, 441, 444, 453, 458, 456	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 7). See also Project Note 21 in response to IAC request 35 in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017..
230.	Concerned that the project does not take account of, or encourage, new technologies such as autonomous vehicles and/or electric and hybrid powered vehicles, including suggestions that government introduce legislation for green technology in vehicles	12, 62, 146, 377, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494	See Expert Report of Tim Veitch on Transport Modelling (section 6.3.1.14).
Urban design			
231.	Adequacy of urban design vision and principles	131, 263, 326, 392, 456, 469	EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 6.3) describes the urban design vision and principles for the project, and outlines the process of development. Details of the application of the urban design concept are presented

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			in EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 6.6.4). The urban design will be further refined during detailed design in accordance with the vision and guiding principles as required by EPR LVP1.
232.	Concern about integration with existing environment, including Maribyrnong waterfront, Footscray Road and Moonee Ponds Creek	184, 469	<p>See Expert Report of Roger Wood on Urban Design (section 4.3). EES Vol 1, Chapter 6 provides an overview of urban design solutions that are proposed to integrate proposed infrastructure with the existing urban form and natural assets at Maribyrnong River and Moonee Ponds Creek.</p> <p>EPR LVP1 includes a requirement that detailed design must maximise opportunities for enhancement of public amenity, open space and facilities, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, particularly in regard to Maribyrnong River and Moonee Ponds Creek.</p>
233.	Concerned that the EES is vague and artists impressions do not provide accurate details	126, 469	<p>See Expert Report of Roger Wood on Urban Design (section 4.3). EES Vol 1, Chapter 6 provides a conceptual urban design response that will undergo further design development and resolution in the detailed design phase.</p>
234.	Concerns about approach and concept for landscaping	18, 19, 34, 71, 74, 106, 123, 126, 138, 158, 161, 167, 184, 378, 469	<p>EES Vol 1, 6.6.2 describes the landscape response for the project, noting that the environmental context and landscape character for the project corridor has been a key consideration in developing the urban design concept for the project. The landscape plans provided in the EES Map Book provides a concept level description of the location and type of planting to be provided by the project.</p> <p>This concept would be refined during detailed design in accordance</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			with EPR EP6 which requires a Landscape Plan to be prepared for the project and developed in consultation with the relevant Council with regard to local polices and plans. See also the Expert Report of Dieter Lim on Landscape (section 4.3).
235.	Concerns about design of bridges and elevated structures including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wurundjeri Way extension - Dynon Road connections - Moonee Ponds Creek crossings - Maribyrnong River crossings - Footscray Road elevated structure - Veloway 	16, 17, 19, 21, 34, 103, 138, 148, 158, 184, 217, 227, 283, 303, 326, 344, 354, 391, 401, 441, 442, 444, 469	See Expert Report of Roger Wood on Urban Design (section 4.3). Specific design detailed relevant to project structures, features and elements are provided in section 6.6.4 of EES Vol 1.
236.	Concerns about design of elements such as noise barriers including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - design and location of noise barriers - overshadowing - driver safety - vandalism - vegetation 	61, 71, 133, 138, 183, 184, 317, 352	EES Vol 1, 6.6.4 outlines the urban design concept for the proposed noise barriers. See also the Expert Report of Roger Wood on Urban Design (section 4.3). See also Project Note 24 in response to IAC request 39 in its Preliminary Issues and Further Information request of 18 July 2017 Further detail in relation to design elements is being provided in response to IAC's requests 37, 38 and 40 of 18 July 2017.
237.	Concerns about design of ventilation structures	158, 190, 442, 469	See Expert Report of Roger Wood on Urban Design (section 4.3).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
238.	Concerns about overall urban design	158, 184, 347, 352, 353, 462, 467, 469	<p>The urban design for the project was developed taking into account a range of aspects including traffic, engineering and road design, land ownership and geotechnical factors. EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 6.6) outlines the key cultural and landscape responses that have generated the overarching urban design language and palette constituting the urban design response for the project.</p> <p>EPR LVP1 requires that detailed design minimise to the extent practicable landscape and visual impacts, and maximise opportunities for enhancement of public amenity, open space and facilities, in consultation with relevant stakeholders.</p>
239.	Port of Melbourne suggests that they be involved in the interface areas with the Port to maximise urban design of public open space, and in particular areas within the Port Environs and on land areas that would be handed back to Port of Melbourne	392	<p>It is a requirement of EPR LVP1 that relevant stakeholders be consulted with on opportunities for enhancement of public amenity, open space and facilities.</p> <p>The submitter's desire to be involved in relation to interface areas will be provided to Project Co to be addressed during detailed design and in preparation of environmental management documents required by the EPRs including the Traffic Management Plan.</p>
240.	Approach to landscaping - argues that consultation with HBCC is required to identify locations, timing, maintenance and ongoing responsibilities. Also raises importance of HBCC local policies and plans.	378	EPR EP6 requires a Landscape Plan to be prepared for the project and developed in consultation with the relevant Council with regard to local polices and plans.
241.	Concerned about further graffiti on noise walls (lives near existing noise walls for Williamstown Rd ramp)	61	See Expert Report of Roger Wood on Urban Design (section 4.3).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
242.	Maribyrnong City Council raises several concerns about impacts on public open space, wetlands, Maribyrnong River	158	See Expert Report of Roger Wood on Urban Design (section 4.3). See also the Expert Report of Cameron Miller on Ecology (section 7.6). EPR EP6 requires that the Landscape Plan to be prepared for the project be developed in consultation with the relevant Council with regard to local polices and plans.
Vibration and regenerated noise			
243.	Concerned about safety issues associated with blasting	124	The CEMP to be prepared for the project would identify specific activities and risks including controls and mitigation measures to be implemented. This would include measures around safety issues associated with blasting. The EPRs include specific controls on blast vibration (NVP12) and overpressure (NVP13).
244.	Concerns about extent of impact and length of time a property will be impacted	278, 342, 390, 427	See Expert Report of John Heilig on Vibration and Regenerated Noise (section 8).
245.	Concerns about impact of vibration and regenerated noise on amenity, and how this would be addressed	2, 124, 353	See Expert Report of John Heilig on Vibration and Regenerated Noise (section 8).
246.	Concerns about impact of vibration and regenerated noise on property and assets	2, 124, 222, 278, 349, 390, 439	See Expert Report of John Heilig on Vibration and Regenerated Noise (section 8).
Suggestions for design alternatives			
247.	Request for a dedicated on/off ramp to Somerville Road via "Paramount Road	352, 348, 358, 445, 400, 406, 289, 205, 470, 183, 158, 434,	The creation of a "Paramount Road corridor" is not a matter within

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	corridor" (at Tottenham Parade, Cemetery Road, Cawley Road)	198, 355, 378, 423	the scope of the IAC's consideration. See also Expert Report of John Kiriakidis (section 10, page 139).
248.	Request for improved Grieve Parade <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dedicated on/off ramp with direct links to Somerville Rd • Additional links to Western Ring Road and the Princes Freeway 	195, 289, 470, 183, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 378, 352, 445, 205, 143, 198	EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 3.7.2) outlines why westbound ramps at the Grieve Parade interchange were not considered feasible. Levels of service at the Grieve Parade intersection are discussed in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 11.6.1) • The Traffic and Transport Review Statement (section 6.7.4.2)
249.	Request project not include the widening of the West Gate Freeway <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If widening does occur, request it take place within current boundary to minimise impacts to residents to the south west of Spotswood 	346, 340, 351	ESS Main Report Volume 1 (section 2.3.1) 'Inadequate transport capacity on the M1 corridor' provides the justification for the widening of the WGF. EES Main Report Volume 2 (section 14.1) discusses the impacts of the project on surrounding land use, highlighting the majority of works for this project component are located within the existing road reserve.
250.	Request better connections for Precinct 15 and the Bradmill precinct <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On / off ramps for Precinct 15 and Bradmills site • New north-south connection under Freeway linking Precinct 15 and the Bradmills precinct 	352, 106, 203, 434, 378	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 7 and section 10). See also the Expert Report of Dr Pallavi Mandke on Social (section 5.1, page 6). There is insufficient carriageway between Millers Road and Williamstown Road to accommodate a new on/ off ramp interchange for the Precinct 15 or Bradmills sites. A preferred separation distance between interchanges is 1.5 km to achieve required traffic performance levels. In addition, the location of the

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			<p>southern westbound portal precludes further consideration of this design option.</p> <p>It is a requirement of EPR LPP3 that the project not preclude the possibility of a future road connection between Precinct 15 and the Bradmill Precinct.</p>
251.	Request for improvements to crossings of Millers Road and Blackshaws Road	143, 352, 355, 358, 372, 475	A number of proposals to improve crossings of Millers and Blackshaws Road are currently under consideration by the WDA and VicRoads.
252.	Request for a new access/egress to 21 Youell Street connecting to Lyons Street	234	<p>It is a requirement of EPR BP2 that amenity for, and access to, potentially impacted businesses and commercial facilities must be protected where practicable, with any reduction in the level of access, amenity or function to be minimised to the duration necessary to carry out relevant construction works.</p> <p>The specific request of this submitter will be provided to Project Co to be addressed in detailed design and in preparation of environmental management documents required by the EPRs including the Traffic Management Plan.</p>
253.	Request all ramps be enclosed to minimise noise and provide protection from diesel fumes and other pollutants	346	Enclosing all ramps is not considered to be feasible. Fully enclosed ramps would result in potentially significant impacts that have not been assessed through the EES.
254.	Remove or alter Hyde Street ramps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to build off-ramps from the WGF, before the West Gate Bridge 	104, 125, 171, 228, 446, 478, 384, 472, 326, 158, 283, 401, 430	<p>EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 3.8) discusses at length the justification for the Hyde St ramps and the options assessment that was undertaken during the design development.</p> <p>Land-use impacts on the surrounding area from the Hyde St ramps</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			are discussed in EES Main Report Volume 2 (section 14.1.6).
255.	Design changes to improve traffic impacts on Douglas Parade and Hyde Street (localised congestion), e.g. Intersection treatments, parking and local access consideration, truck curfews.	378	EPRs TP1, TP2 and TP3 require Project Co to work closely with local Councils throughout detailed design, construction and operation, including implementing local traffic management works in consultation with relevant councils.
256.	Provide Doherty's Road access to the freeway and Western Ring Road with additional connection ramps	106, 289, 434, 378	There is an existing arterial road connection from Doherty's Road to the M80. Any proposal to improve connectivity at Doherty's Road is a matter for VicRoads and is outside the scope of the Project.
257.	Alternative river crossings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Connect Footscray Road to the Princes Highway at West Footscray (via Shepherd Bridge) b. Connect Dynon Road to the Western Highway in Footscray c. Bridge from Werribee to Brighton d. Duplicate the Bolte Bridge e. Duplicate the West Gate Bridge f. Tunnel under Footscray connecting to the Western Ring Road 	446, 158, 304, 498	The suggested alternatives are not within the scope of the IAC's consideration. See Submissions on Behalf of Western Distributor Authority - Part A (paragraphs 86-95).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
258.	Replace Maribyrnong River bridge with a tunnel	184, 34, 292, 304, 443, 455, 466	EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 3.8.2) includes a detailed summary of why moving the northern portal to the east of the river is not a feasible design option capable of meeting the project objectives.
259.	Alter alignment design of Maribyrnong River bridges and/or MacKenzie Road ramps	184, 210, 158, 189, 443, 466	EES Main Report Volume 1 (section 5.6.1) provides a list of requirements that have informed the design and alignment of the Maribyrnong River crossings.
260.	Remove Dynon Road connection	66, 184, 303, 356,	Further detail in relation to Dynon Road is being provided in response to IAC's requests 22 to 24 of 18 July 2017.
261.	Remove or lower Wurundjeri Way extension	66, 16, 149, 184, 303, 329, 364, 370, 409, 415, 444	Further detail in relation to the Wurundjeri Way extension is being provided in response to IAC's request 25 to 27 of 18 July 2017.
262.	Alter alignment of Wurundjeri Way extension <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New ramp should link Footscray Road and Spencer St 	148, 329, 409	Further detail in relation to the Wurundjeri Way extension is being provided in response to IAC's requests 25 to 27 of 18 July 2017.
263.	Include early works for a connection between Docklands and North Melbourne station (see submission for detailed outline) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build crossing from Railway Place to North Melbourne Station, extending over Regional Rail track and the new elevated extension of Wurundjeri Way 	415	See Expert Report of Michael Barlow on Strategic Planning (Appendix D).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
264.	Create a port facility further away from the city	247	This is not a matter within the scope of the IAC's consideration. Further detail in relation to port capacity is being provided in response to IAC's request 20 of 18 July 2017.
265.	<p>Alternatives/changes to Footscray Road elevated structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Tunnel under Footscray Road b. Widen existing Footscray Rd bridge over Moonee Ponds Creek (instead of additional crossing) c. Widen Footscray Road to 8 or 10 lanes instead of an elevated structure d. Reduce number of lanes on Footscray Road (at ground level) e. Viaduct structures over Moonee Ponds Creek should be relocated to the west of Citylink, away from the creek f. Outbound traffic to use Footscray Road and inbound to use Dynon Road 	74, 184, 312, 317, 344,354, 433, 444	<p>WDA responds to the suggested changes to Footscray elevated structure as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A tunnel under Footscray Road would not achieve the project objectives as it would limit access to the Port. b. The existing Footscray Road Bridge is being widened as part of the Footscray Road connection. It is not possible to widen this bridge to allow for the connection to Dynon Road/Wurundjeri Way without needing to acquire significant portions of the E-Gate site. c. This would result in a freeway connection (via the tunnel) joining an arterial road and then re-joining a freeway with CityLink. This is not a good transport network solution and would result in mixing through traffic with Port traffic on Footscray Road impacting performance. See also the discussion on Footscray Road in the Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 10, page 135) d. VicRoads has already consented, as part of the Project, to a reduction in the through carriageway width of Footscray Road to accommodate the elevated viaduct structures and to maintain width in the outer separator on the north side for planting of trees. e. Relocating the ramps to the west of CityLink would have a significant impact on the rail lines in this area. f. Splitting the road usage would create an unbalanced

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
			interchange and network where increases in traffic would occur in one direction. This would potentially overload sections of the network resulting in congestion.
266.	<p>Alternative port access options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Appleton Dock Road - reconfigure connection b. Use an alternative to MacKenzie Road ramps c. Have a port off-ramp via Dock Link Road d. New connections between viaduct and Appleton Dock Road e. Stage port access maps only after Coode Road closed 	184, 158, 283, 434	<p>WDA responds to the suggested alternative port access options as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A number of arrangements were investigated for the Appleton Dock ramp with the proposed being the most desirable. It removes potential weaving on the exit ramp as well as providing the most efficient connection into Appleton Dock for trucks by removing slow right turning traffic movements. b. The MacKenzie Road ramps provide direct access to the Port from a freeway standard road. They enable the removal of trucks from the local and arterial road network, freeing up space for local residents and businesses. This is the most efficient arrangement compared to an interchange at Dock Link Road c. The Dock Link Road connection was investigated and determined not to be suitable. The design would create a weave on the exit ramp and would result in a significant number of trucks u-turning on Footscray Road once Coode Road was closed. d. Any additional connections from the viaduct to Appleton Dock Road would unlikely be as efficient and effective as the proposed McKenzie Road arrangements. e. The West Gate Tunnel Project is forecast to open in 2022, and it is expected that Coode Road will be closed before then. Further detail in relation to the closure of Coode Road is being provided in response to IAC's request 1 of 18 July 2017.

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
267.	Alter CityLink connection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce footprint of connection 	184	See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 10.2, page 137).
268.	<p>Alternatives to improve commercial transport routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. No metering for the truck priority lane on the eastbound entry ramp to Grieve Parade be metered b. No metering for the eastbound entry ramp from Millers Road c. No metering for the Appleton Dock westbound ramp being metered d. Proposes the eastbound entry ramp from Millers Road have an additional lane added for heavy vehicles and buses e. Change the westbound ramp intersections from Hyde Street so that the shared crossing is at the T intersection where visibility is greatest f. Further planning with respect to Footscray Road, Sims Street, Dynon Road and McKenzie Road, particularly regarding access points 	367, 381	<p>WDA responds to the suggested alternatives to improve commercial transport routes as follows:</p> <p>Proposed changes a-d are under further consideration and review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. The current design optimises the safety and functionality of the intersection for all road users. f. Design refinements will be considered during the detailed design phase of the project. g. The Hyde Street ramps are the designated route for over height and placarded vehicles who are unable to use the tunnel. h. The Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will address the detailed planning required to mitigate construction congestion issues. Prior to commencing construction, the construction contractor is required to prepare a CEMP in accordance with the project’s EPRs (refer to EES Chapter 8 for more detail). i. All bridges between the M80 interchange and Williamstown Road are being strengthened to 75% SM1600 (refer to EES Volume 1, section 5.4.8 for more detail).

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> g. An alternative route for trucks carrying hazardous or dangerous material, or who are otherwise unable to use the tunnel, be identified h. Further planning to address construction congestion issues for Footscray and McKenzie Road i. Upgrades to access routes, including the Princes Hwy, to WGF for HPFV vehicles 		
269.	<p>Request for additional / changed shared use path:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Alternative to veloway (eg north side of structure or at ground level) b. Widen veloway c. Improve shared path access to new open space at southern portal eg a lower train line or a pedestrian cycle bridge d. additional cycle path from Williamstown to Douglas Parade / Hyde St e. Connect the bike path to the proposed Melbourne City bicycle highway (sky bike project B1 	441, 446, 67, 472, 184, 151, 378, 444, 414, 434, 449,	<p>See Expert Report of John Kiriakidis on Transport (section 7 and section 10).</p> <p>The design of the veloway will be further considered during the detailed design phase which would seek to optimise design and operational performance.</p> <p>The project team will take the consideration and suggestions on improved pedestrian connectivity and shared use path access and will pass them on to Project Co for consideration during the detailed design phase and in preparation of environmental management documents required by the EPRs. EPR TP1 supports this approach and requires the optimisation of pedestrian movements, bicycle connectivity and shared use path networks.</p>

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	<p>veloway)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> f. Move SUP crossing Footscray Road east to align with Hawke Street g. Extend SUP on northern side of Footscray Road to connect to Dudley and La Trobe Streets h. Widen Dynon Road SUP i. Improve pedestrian crossings at on/off ramps j. Move the cycleway to the northern side of Footscray Road and continue to the city k. Relocate elevated path near Yarraville Gardens to run along the south side of the Gardens, down Somerville Rd and turn left onto Whitehall St to connect to elevated crossing l. Build a ground level path along Harris St m. Relocate the SUP on Harris St the northern side so to avoid removing significant trees and reduce visual impacts on gardens n. Build a bike bridge into Barbara 		

West Gate Tunnel Project - EES Submissions Response

This table is an initial response to issues raised in the public submissions as at the date of the document and will be updated during the course of the hearing. It is made subject to the further submissions of WDA including its formal right of reply to the IAC.

No.	Issue	Submissions raising this issue	Response
	<p>Beyer Reserve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="331 416 779 517">o. Provide a path at WGF connecting the state government land to the west of Beevers St <li data-bbox="331 544 808 644">p. upgrade to Federation Trail west of Millers Road be full reconstruction in concrete <li data-bbox="331 667 815 799">q. design modification to the location of the Footscray Road Shared Use Bridge to avoid impacts at Harbour Town Melbourne 		