

Meeting Minutes

Project:	Sapphire to Woolgoolga Upgrade Project	Reference:	1093.40.GE
Location:	Woolgoolga Bowling Club, Board Room	Date:	19 December 2006

Present: Apology: Copy: Name:

SAPPHIRE TO WOOLGOOLGA NORTHERN CFG (Woolgoolga Bypass)

			Graham Ashton
✓			Rebecca Pickering (proxy)
		✓	Parvinder Lalli
		✓	Kashmir Singh Gill (proxy)
		✓	Bhupinder Singh Lalli (proxy)
			Tony Johnson
			John Shipway (proxy)
		✓	Paul Norton
✓			Ron Gray
✓			Margaret Murphy
		✓	Richard Casey (Proxy)
✓			Steven Moody
	✓		Phillip Pearce
		✓	Des Saunders
✓			Bruce Scanlon
		✓	Satpal Singh Gill
		✓	Paramjeet Singh Bhatti
		✓	Rashmere Bhatti
	✓		Robert Forrest

PROJECT TEAM

✓			Chris Clark	RTA
✓			Adam Cameron	RTA
✓			Bob Higgins	RTA
✓			Tim Paterson	Connell Wagner
✓			Barry Hancock	Connell Wagner
✓			Lucia Coletta	Connell Wagner

✓		Andrew Smith	JMS Consulting
✓		Denise Wilson	Id Planning
Recorded By: Lucia Coletta			Total Pages: 19
Subject: Sapphire to Woolgoolga Northern Community Focus Group Meeting No 21			

Details:

Action By/Date:

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Denise Wilson (DW) opened the meeting at 5.50 pm.
- 1.2 Apologies received from Phillip Pearce, Robert Forrest
- 1.3 DW explained that the purpose of the meeting was to continue with Barry Hancock's (BH) presentation of the concept design of the project, then to go through the minutes of the previous meetings

2 Concept Design

- 2.1 BH recapped regarding the southern section of the Woolgoolga bypass that had been presented in the last CFG meeting- beginning at the south Woolgoolga Interchange and moving onto Unwins Road
- 2.2 Steve Moody (SM): What is the size of the cutting? (referring to a large cutting to the north of Unwins Road)
- 2.3 BH: There are two benches in the cutting- benches are generally put in at 10m intervals. It is about 22m high
- 2.4 Bruce Scanlon (BS): Is there an incline from Hearn's Lake Road to Grays Road?
- 2.5 BH: There is an incline of about 1-2%. It then hits a bit of a crest then declines
- 2.6 Bob Higgins (RH): The incline- is that due to the need for clearance for an underpass?
- 2.7 BH: There is a property underpass with a clearance of 3.5m. With this incline, it (the new highway) would be 4.5-5m above the existing ground level
- 2.8 RH: What type of rock is it at this point?
- 2.9 BH: Sedimentary rock that is partially metamorphosed – known as Argillite.
- 2.10 RH: It is conservatively sloped?
- 2.11 BH: Yes, we can stand the batter up, but the steeper it is, the greater the chance there is of isolated rockfalls
- 2.12 BS: What is the batter angle?
- 2.13 BH: It is a 2:1 slope- an angle of about 22.5°
- 2.14 CC: This cutting is subject to further consideration as to whether the cutting could be stood up
- 2.15 BH: It is a balancing act between the integrity of the rock and the safety factor of isolated rock falls

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.16 SM: As he has mentioned in the last CFG, he is concerned about micro-climate changes. Has anything come out in the past few weeks from the subconsultant?
- 2.17 TP: Alan Hartley has not been available in the past couple of weeks
- 2.18 SM: I am concerned that the cuttings would introduce the south-westerly winds
- 2.19 BH: There is a wider cross-section of the cutting in the EA as part of the urban design. Although it looks large here, it actually follows closely the existing natural slope, and only looks like a small nick, rather than a major cut.
- 2.20 BH moved further north on the map, looking at the Grays Road overbridge
- 2.21 SM: Could more details be provided on the crossing at Woolgoolga Creek Road.
- 2.22 BH: He has his team looking at the crossing, due to what SM had said at the previous CFG meeting. It is a long deviation of Woolgoolga Creek Road- approximately 400m as we have to get over the proposed highway. It is being looked at to see how the impact can be reduced
- 2.23 SM: Is it possible to meet the Project Team on site?
- 2.24 BH: Sure, if CC is happy with that?
- 2.25 CC: We can arrange a meeting in the new year
- 2.26 BH: Woolgoolga Creek Road is on a ridgeline, however, to the north, is a floodplain which limits the depth of the cutting for the highway, and Woolgoolga Creek Road has to pass over the highway
- 2.27 SM: There is a significant area on the floodplain that gets flooded. How would run off from the road be managed. Also due to the elevation of the road above ground level, what would the noise footprint be? What would the impact be on the properties to the west of Woolgoolga Creek Road- like Freemans Road? The residences already have noise coming through from the existing Pacific Highway. What would be done to reduce the noise footprint?
- 2.28 BH: The green on the plans indicate where the highway is elevated via a fill. In terms of the noise footprint and measures to reduce this, the noise assessment would be taken into account. At Woolgoolga Creek, the road would be bridged over the creek, removing some of the indicated green on the plan. We are confident that the 1:100 ARI level can be attained comfortably across Woolgoolga Creek.
- 2.29 SM: What mitigation measures would be put into place during construction to mitigate impacts on the creek
- 2.30 RH: There would be a series of sedimentation basins
- 2.31 BH: You would be surprised how little earthworks there is in the vicinity of Woolgoolga Creek Road. There would be a four span bridge over Woolgoolga Creek, which would be about 70-80m
- 2.32 BS: What is a four span bridge?
- 2.33 BH: A bridge that has four spans to bridge the creek- as there is more than one channel
- 2.34 BS: What about culverts?
- 2.35 RH: The EA would show the detailed design criteria that would be complied with in

CC to arrange on-site meeting with SM and BH in the new year (2007)

Details:

Action By/Date:

regards to water and flood management

- 2.36 BH: Relief culverts are being looked at in regards to the flooding overflow
- 2.37 BS: Has channelling been looked at for a 1: 100 year flood?
- 2.38 Ron Gray (RG): The floodplain around Woolgoolga Creek floods
- 2.39 BH: Secondary channel of Woolgoolga Creek then a higher floodplain
- 2.40 RG: Flat back at Woolgoolga Creek Road, back in 1967/68, there was 8 inches in 48 hours, more recently there was 24 inches in 36 hours. Water did not rise to any great level along that flat.
- 2.41 BH: We can calculate the flood levels and provide for additional culverts if required.
- 2.42 SM: What provisions are there for wildlife corridors near Woolgoolga Creek Road?
- 2.43 BH: The bridge over Woolgoolga Creek Road would be 7-8m above the existing ground level providing opportunities for fauna movement under the bridge
- 2.44 RH: There are combination structures that cater for both drainage and fauna movement
- 2.45 SM: What about noise mitigation within the area- the area is flat and doesn't have a cutting to provide any acoustic shielding, and it is slightly elevated from the ground
- 2.46 TP: Other Pacific Highway upgrades have utilised the same technique of raising the highway across a floodplain.
- 2.47 SM: The existing noise footprint at that point extends further than what it is around that spot
- 2.48 BH: Acoustic measures are still being developed. North of Woolgoolga Creek, there is a ridgeline, the proposal is tucked on the western side of the ridge to provide some acoustic shielding. There would be fill on the left hand side (west of the highway) and cut on the right hand side (east of the highway)
- 2.49 BH moved onto the next plan (northern section of the bypass). Newman's Road Underpass
- 2.50 SM: There are a number of watercourses in this area. He believes they are fed from high ground on the left. There are dams which feed blueberry farms
- 2.51 BH: Culverts would be used so that the natural flow of the watercourse is unimpeded.
- 2.52 SM: Not sure if they are all creek lines-some could be subsurface.
- 2.53 RG: There is a gully in the vicinity
- 2.54 BH: Culverts would be put in place to retain the natural water flow. The information on the dams and springs would be taken on board
- 2.55 TP: Pumping would occur underneath the width of the road.
- 2.56 BH: Underpass for Newman's Road could be either be an underpass arch or a single-span bridge
- 2.57 RH: Would there be a major culvert before Newman's Road?
- 2.58 BH: Yes it was looked at whether the culvert could become the bridge, but the

Details:

Action By/Date:

distance was too great, and it would result in two bridges

- 2.59 BS: Has Newman's Road been relocated near the bridge crossing?
- 2.60 BH: Yes, slightly to the south at this point
- 2.61 SM: What mitigation measures would be used to manage stormwater off the highway, how would you prevent it from entering agricultural properties?
- 2.62 BH: RTA's Water management policy incorporates best practice techniques. All runoff would be collected in erosion control / sedimentation basins (white octagons on the plans provide indicative locations). Bark Hut Road is a large cutting and erosion control basins would be placed on either side of the cutting- most cuttings would have erosion control basins.
- 2.63 BS: In regards to the ponding- what happens after a storm event?
- 2.64 BH: there are a number of measures, such as a first flush system but the ponds are also designed to address a 1:10 year rain event
- 2.65 RH: There are also valves on the ponds, so it can be decanted off. Settlement process- sediment falls to the bottom of the pond, the grease and oil remain on top.
- 2.66 BS: How would it stop oil and grease when there is a heavy rainfall?
- 2.67 RH: Let water out of the ponds via the valve. The valve is at the bottom of the pond- so the grease and oil remain in the pond
- 2.68 BS: What about the sediments?
- 2.69 TP: The valve would be placed high enough to avoid the sediment, but below the level of the grease and oil.
- 2.70 BS: What is the frequency that the ponds are cleared?
- 2.71 BH: approximately every 6 months or after a major storm event
- 2.72 RH: RTA ensures that the ponds are designed correctly and adequately
- 2.73 Margaret Murphy (MM): North of Bark Hut Road, in the fill, there is a dam used by farmers- how would they get their water? It is an organic farm off Palmer Road- what would happen to run-off from the highway?
- 2.74 BH: There is a gully on the western side of the highway, so would need to provide a culvert or pipe to ensure that the watercourse is unimpeded
- 2.75 TP: there would be a culvert under the fill area to draw the water off the highway into the sedimentation basin
- 2.76 BS: Yes but the organic farmers near highways would be de-classified due to the highway?
- 2.77 BH: He wasn't aware of that that was the case
- 2.78 RH: No- it was not correct, there were other highways where organic properties were nearby and they had not been de-classified
- 2.79 BS: It is a point that needs to be clarified
- 2.80 TP: It is part of the Agricultural assessment being undertaken
- 2.81 BH: Bark Hut and Palmer Road- there is a minor alteration for a T-section and to

Ag assessment to address whether an organic property

Details:

Action By/Date:
would be de-registered if near
the highway

separate Palmer road from the proposed highway

- 2.82 SM: What is the height distance between Bark Hut Road and the new Highway?
- 2.83 BH: About 10m above the highway, it is similar to Greys Road
- 2.84 BS: Bark Hut Road was realigned?
- 2.85 BH: Yes, slightly to the south at the Palmer Road intersection.
- 2.86 BS: What about the properties to the west of the highway at Bark Hut Road
- 2.87 CC: There are some properties which have already been purchased by the RTA under the hardship provisions of the Preferred Route Policy.
- 2.88 MM: What about the dam north of Bark Hut Road? To the east of the highway- under the green fill. What happens to it?
- 2.89 BH: That property would be acquired and the dam released
- 2.90 MM: There are other farms that rely on that dam
- 2.91 RH: There would be negotiations with the owners
- 2.92 TP: Is it being used as an agricultural dam?
- 2.93 MM: Only a small farmer- agricultural consultant wasn't interested in talking to him
- 2.94 BH: We can take down the name and chase it up
- 2.95 MM: I can't remember their name off the top of my head
- 2.96 BS: Stated name of person
- 2.97 DW advised that the person's name would not be recorded in the minutes to retain that individual's privacy
- 2.98 BH: moved up to where the proposal enters State Forest.
- 2.99 BS: The dotted line is the proposed boundary?
- 2.100 BH: Yes, it is the preliminary boundary.
- 2.101 BS: There are some blueberries to the west of the highway that would be removed
- 2.102 CC: The proposal does impact on some blueberries
- 2.103 MM: What noise mitigation measures would be used where the road is in fill?
- 2.104 BH: It depends on the outcomes of the noise report
- 2.105 RH: It is worth going through the steps taken to reduce noise impacts: the grade of the road is minimised which reduces engine noise, and then the pavement surface is looked at to reduce tyre noise. Noise monitoring is then undertaken to predict the noise levels, and to determine whether mitigation measures are required. If required, noise mitigation measures may include road surfacing, noise walls, noise mounds, house treatments or a combination of these.
- 2.106 MM: But the road is so much higher and the pavement surface is not the whole solution
- 2.107 RH: We look at where the development is and as a last resort look at individual

Details:

Action By/Date:

house treatments

- 2.108 CC: We go through the process to see what measures could be put in place to minimise any noise impacts
- 2.109 MM: Would individual properties be looked at?
- 2.110 CC: The noise assessment will get down to the individual property level.
- 2.111 MM: Individual house treatments- consisting of double-glazing and air-conditioning. Some people don't want that- they have moved here to live outdoors- what mitigation measures would be put in place?
- 2.112 CC: There is a step process which is undertaken- we put the design as low as possible to use the cutting as some acoustic shielding, other measures would include noise mounds and barriers. RTA are mindful that some people do not want air conditioning and double glazing
- 2.113 RH: Look at the highway at Nabiac- we lowered the road, put it in a cutting where possible and erected noise walls. The pavement surface is asphalt which reduces tyre noise. North of Nabiac, there is some noise treatment and in some areas, individual house treatments. Where appropriate, noise mounds and barriers have been used.
- 2.114 MM: The area where the bypass is going through is not an urban area
- 2.115 RH: The EA would describe the proposed noise mitigation measures
- 2.116 MM: House treatment is undertaken early, the owner signs an agreement. If it hasn't worked, where does that person stand?
- 2.117 RH: There is a process we go through where we get experts to assess the situation. What the potential impacts are before the road is built. We can wait and see what the impacts are after the road is constructed, or we can look at installing the house treatments before the road is constructed. There is no onus on the landowner to accept the mitigation treatments prior to the road being opened.
- 2.118 DW: Understands that this is an important issue but would like to move on
- 2.119 SM: He has his Chamber of Commerce hat on now in regards to the tourism industry. Noise mitigation is paramount. Concerned about the impact of noise would have on the future growth of the area. RTA are aware from discussions with Council that they have an urban plan. Increase noise levels would reduce the quality of life in the area. The area relies on tourism- there is no other industry to rely on. There may only be one or two houses there at the moment, but Council is encouraging the growth of those leafy suburbs.
- 2.120 RH: Understands the CFG members and other residents along other sections of the Pacific Highway's concerns.
- 2.121 BS: But the noise comes from trucks travelling through here. Lives 2km from the highway, but can still hear the traffic at night- the exhaust from braking. Barriers are not going to stop that
- 2.122 RH: A high proportion of road noise is formed by the interaction of tyres and road. In Nabiac- the residents can see a difference before and after the installation of low noise pavement. In regards to the exhaust, the design was cut in as much as possible. New trucks coming out are governed by the Design Rules- changes to that

Details:

Action By/Date:

should see an improvement in the situation.

2.123 BS: Trucks can be modified and the trucks following the rules can't be relied on

2.124 CC: The design of the proposal would reduce the braking noise. On the existing highway, the trucks use their exhaust brakes. On the dual-carriageway proposal, the trucks can choose their travel speed - they don't have to brake to keep in one stream of traffic

2.125 BS: Is the highway at Bark Hut Road on an incline?

2.126 BH: yes, incline of 4%

2.127 BS: Isn't the incline a bit severe?

2.128 BH: No, the width of the highway incorporates 3% crossfall drainage, . The grade of the highway at Bark Hut Road is only 4%.

2.129 MM: 4% to go near Bark Hut Road, then the highway declines again

2.130 BS: 4% grade to Bark Hut Road- the trucks would be able to do that quite comfortably. The residences on the terrain are spread out

2.131 CC: The noise model incorporates the grade of the road. Your concerns will be addressed as part of the noise assessment. The road would be assessed in regards to the guidelines

2.132 MM: What are the noise guideline levels for a new road?

2.133 CC: 50dB during the night and 55dB during the day

2.134 TP: The assessment takes into account the existing and proposed roads, the grade of the highway, the speed of the traffic.

2.135 BS: Would there be an increase in noise?

2.136 TP: Yes, particularly in rural areas where background ambient noise could be as low as 30dBA

2.137 BH: continued with the design presentation- going through the State Forest

2.138 SM: There was a statement made in the PA report about rest areas

2.139 BH: Getting to the rest areas, the new dual carriageway highway approaches the existing highway. Arrawarra Interchanges: rest area locations- for the northbound traffic- would be just before the off ramps, for southbound traffic, the location is still being looked at.

2.140 SM: Chamber of Commerce is concerned by a statement in the PA report that the rest areas could be upgraded to service centres it would alter the character of business centre at Woolgoolga. The service centre scheme has not been discussed before. There are service stations on existing highway. If people can get fuel and food there, why come into Woolgoolga? Another issue is the amount of litter on the highway- people stop at fast food places, eat and then throw their wrappers out of the window. The RFS does a big clean up once a year- they clean 3 truck loads of rubbish a year. If it becomes a service centre- it will present a problem to the Chamber of Commerce. The interchange also presents a situation where there would be a lot of braking and accelerating. It is quite close to Arrawarra Beach Road and Arrawarra, so the noise generated at the interchange could be an issue

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.141 BH: The Arrawarra Interchange is being looked at to see if it could become simpler
- 2.142 TP: The proposal is not for a service centre- only a rest area. These types of location become of interest for things such as service centres, however it is land development, and would be subject to the appropriate approval process
- 2.143 RH: RTA are currently looking at the whole of the Pacific Highway to look at a strategy for service centres- the Coffs Harbour / Woolgoolga area is one of the areas being looked at.
- 2.144 SM: Why would you have a service centre near a business centre- why is it only a few kilometres near a business centre?
- 2.145 RH: Near Taree, the residents see it as an entry statement. Kempsey are looking at a service centre. The main issue of bypasses of towns is "will the traffic still come into town". Karuah had a loss of traffic and Bulahdelah is now experiencing it. They are issues that have to be worked through in the EA
- 2.146 TP: In the Hume Highway upgrade in the 1980's- the service centre was supported as it would offset employment loss due to bypassing of towns. However every situation was different. It is not part of this proposal. It, if it eventuated, would be subject to the appropriate approvals process.
- 2.147 BS: It is in the PA report
- 2.148 TP: It is not included as part of the proposal in the PA report
- 2.149 BS: Then rule it out due to other businesses in the area
- 2.150 TP: it is not included as part of the proposal in the PA report
- 2.151 BS: It has not been ruled out
- 2.152 BS: Repeated above statement
- 2.153 CC: It is not included as part of the proposal
- 2.154 RH: Needs to be a service centre somewhere- where it goes hasn't been determined. This does not form part of the Project Application Report.
- 2.155 SM: I am also concerned because the rest areas were announced after the route selection process.
- 2.156 BS: It has been ruled out by TP
- 2.157 TP: Only said that it had been ruled out of the proposal
- 2.158 SM: It should have been spun out before the route selection
- 2.159 RH: Not being spun out, the design is evolving. DoP, CHCC all stakeholders in any service centre.
- 2.160 BS: The Mayor says that council has no input into the process
- 2.161 BH: continued with the presentation- at the Arrawarra Interchange, the dual carriageways merge back into one- is the point of connection between this project and Woolgoolga to Wells Crossing project.
- 2.162 BS: North off-ramp diverges to the left and then comes to a T-intersection
- 2.163 BH: This is common with most interchanges

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.164 BS: Traffic getting off at 110km/hr- it will cause accidents
- 2.165 BH: It will be signposted as an off-ramp
- 2.166 RG: Not 110km/hr?
- 2.167 BH: No. Off-ramp traffic speed approximately 80-90km/hr. Service road continues north to tie into North Corindi
- 2.168 BS: The north on-ramp is only temporary?
- 2.169 TP: May alter in the Woolgoolga to Wells Crossing project
- 2.170 BS: Would there also be a new service road?
- 2.171 BH: No
- 2.172 SM: Has the Project Team had discussions with the Fire Management in Coffs Harbour? Is concerned about the access onto and off the highway at key locations. A fire management plan should be drafted. If there are barriers on the side of the road, how would emergency vehicles have access to off-road? There would be limitations for getting off-road
- 2.173 TP: There hasn't been any meetings in recent months, but a meeting in January with Fire Management, Council and Forests NSW is anticipated
- 2.174 BS: Would you just talk to management or would you talk to the firefighters?
- 2.175 TP: They would converse with the nominated representative
- 2.176 SM: Concerned about fire access
- 2.177 BS: It was raised at the last meeting
- 2.178 Meeting adjourned at 7.05pm for dinner.

3 Minutes from Previous Meetings

- 3.1 DW: Any changes to be made to the 27 November 2006 minutes?
- 3.2 BS: He didn't get a hardcopy of the minutes
- 3.3 AS: You are on the email list- if you are on the email list, then a hardcopy isn't sent out
- 3.4 BS: Is there any drama in doing both?
- 3.5 AS: No it can be done
- 3.6 BS: Fire access- what would the height of Unwins road be?
- 3.7 BH: It had been indicated earlier that meetings with Emergency Services would occur. Height levels would be no less than 3.5m
- 3.8 BS: what about the weight-fire trucks could be up to 13-14 tonnes
- 3.9 CC: The road would be designed to a local road standard.
- 3.10 Alterations to Minutes dated 27 November 2006:
- 3.11 Item 1.9- "It wasn't on the charter that meetings would be held on Monday nights- either you don't know or you don't care" becomes "It was in the charter that meetings

In issuing Minutes, both a softcopy and a hardcopy is to be sent to BS

Details:

Action By/Date:

would be held on a Tuesday or Wednesday night, either you don't know or you don't care"

- 3.12 Item 2.3: " Part 3A has been repealed" becomes "Part 3 has been repealed", "The Pacific Highway is going to be made into Major Infrastructure" becomes "The Pacific Highway is going to be made into Critical Infrastructure"
- 3.13 Item 2.93: "2 axles" becomes "3 axles"
- 3.14 BS raised issue with Item 2.201 "Agreed that the slide may not be specific enough" thought that it had been agreed that the slide was incorrect. TP did not agree with that statement indicating that he never said the slide was incorrect. DW indicated that the Minutes would remain as they were printed.
- 3.15 Item 3.69 "Sacrifice of forested area- could an underpass be put in to minimise the impact?" becomes " Could Woolgoolga Creek road be realigned to reduce the impact?"
- 3.16 DW: Minutes are endorsed by the CFG members – thank you
-
- 3.17 Alterations to Minutes dated 16 August 2006
- 3.18 Item 3.69 "This has not been an issue on any other highway project that he is aware of" becomes "No, this has not been an issue on any other highway project that he is aware of"
- 3.19 Item 3.159: "Consultation- a two-way flow of information between an organisation and other stakeholders" becomes " Consultation- a two-way flow of information between the RTA and other stakeholders"
- 3.20 Action Item 13 in Summary of Meeting's Actions: "CC to advise before next CFG..." to become "CC to advise within 2 weeks..."
- 3.21 DW: Minutes are endorsed by the CFG members- thank you
-
- 3.22 Alterations to Minutes dated 13 June 2006
- 3.23 Issues raised: The use of the word "Notes" which had appeared on the Minutes had been altered to "Minutes" within a day (27 of June 06) of being made aware of the error
- 3.24 Issues raised: Use of the Apology column- only the people who have made an apology should be indicated in that column. This was the process that had been adopted since the 16 August 2006 CFG meeting
- 3.25 Item 2.1: "DW requested that the minutes be discussed..." becomes "DW stated that the minutes be discussed..."
- 3.26 Item 2.2: " Bruce Scanlon (BS) indicated that it had been 12 months..." Becomes "Bruce Scanlon (BS) indicated that it had been more than 12 months..."
- 3.27 Item 2.6: "BS mentioned that the CFG had previously requested that information be provided prior to the meeting" becomes "BS mentioned that the CFG had previously requested that information and the Project Team agreed that it would be provided prior to the meeting"
- 3.28 Item 2.7 (insertion of new Item 2.8): BS: Could have and should have been sent to the CFG members that week
- 3.29 Item 3.66: "the presentation information had not been provided to the CFG prior to

Details:

Action By/Date:

-
- the meeting, this was not the first time that the CFG had requested it. Also, why are the reports not completed when the field investigations were completed in February-March 2006?" becomes " the presentation information had not been provided to the CFG prior to the meeting, this was not the first time that the CFG had requested it and the Project Team agreed to supply the information prior to the meeting. Also why are the reports not completed when the field investigations were completed in February- March 2006 and some in mid 2005?"
- 3.30 Item 3.174 (addition at end of comment) "What confidence can we have in the RTA figures?"
- 3.31 Item 5.13 "Could they get an update? Provide it at the next meeting?" becomes "Could they get an update? Provide it prior to the next meeting?"
- 3.32 DW: Minutes are endorsed by the CFG members- thank you
-
- 3.33 Alterations to Minutes dated 10 May 2005
- 3.34 Item 2.49: "There had been things said by CFG members and denied at a later stage" becomes "There had been things said by the RTA to CFG members and denied at a later stage"
- 3.35 Item 2.52 "All that was needed was a tape recorder on the table and a background mike" becomes "All that was needed was a tape recorder on the table and a boundary mike"
- 3.36 Item 2.63: "He hadn't said there were gross inaccuracies" becomes "No-one said there were gross inaccuracies"
- 3.37 Item 2.143: " She found responses seemed to ambiguous, not clear and contradictory..." becomes "She found responses by the Project Team seemed to be ambiguous, not clear and contradictory"
- 3.38 Item 3.94: "TP & JS: Was BS suggesting there was a probity issue?" becomes "JS: Was BS suggesting there was a probity issue?" (Insertion of new 3.95 item) TP agreed with this statement.
- 3.39 DW: Minutes are endorsed by the CFG members- thank you
-
- 3.40 Action List from 27 November 2006
- 3.41 Item 7: BS: When were the emails received? AS said that he passed it on to DW
- 3.42 AS: Didn't receive any email. Indicated that he had said if he had received anything he would pass it on. Hadn't received an email from BS since 2005
- 3.43 Item 8: MM: definition of consultation and presentation. The Action Items mention that you presented to the Chamber of Commerce- in the PA report you say that you consulted with them
- 3.44 CC: The meetings with the Chamber of Commerce were not only presentations- there were question and answer sections where the Chamber could provide input
- 3.45 SM: The report also states the impact of businesses- the assessment (referring to Table 5.1 of the PA report) was not discussed with the Chamber of Commerce. Those issues were not discussed with the Chamber of Commerce and they did not agree to the level of impact being low, medium or high. For the impact on businesses there was no specific consultation period- no discussions. Assessment not discussed with the Chamber of Commerce

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.46 CC: It is the Project Team's assessment- but he does take the point
- 3.47 MM: Report says consultation – people reading the report assumes that it has been undertaken- the report is deceptive
- 3.48 CC: It is not intended to be deceptive
- 3.49 MM: Doesn't appear to be the case
- 3.50 CC: Chamber of Commerce- business impacts. Project Team consulted the Chamber of Commerce on the project. They had not gone back to the Chamber of Commerce to get agreement of the assessment
- 3.51 TP: The approach taken in the assessment was a standard approach utilised in these assessment. The assessment did not include all the issues included in the Table, however it incorporated the input from the Chamber of Commerce from consultation. Experts were brought in to assess the issue- however he was not certain what consultation was undertaken in the course of that assessment
- 3.52 SM: What activities were undertaken? This should be an Action Item
- 3.53 TP: I am afraid we may not be able to help you- the person who undertook the assessment has left our employ and is overseas somewhere. However I would be happy to search through the project files
- 3.54 SM: Couldn't recall any discussions with a specialist and he attends most of the meetings- they hadn't been consulted
- 3.55 MM: Not sure when the assessment was undertaken, but it was never raised as an issue

A list of meetings with the Chamber to be provided

-
- 3.56 Business Arising: 16 August 2006
 - 3.57 MM: Did CC advise how many properties were impacted?
 - 3.58 CC: Yes it is in the Actions Arising Items from that Meeting (Item No 10)
-
- 3.59 Business Arising: 13 June 2006
 - 3.60 BS: IN the Minutes, CC said that construction would begin in 2008/2009. In the Minister's release, he said that tenders would be called in 2009/2010. Why is there a discrepancy?
 - 3.61 CC: It was a best estimate of the time. I believe the Minister's release came out on the 22 June (after the meeting).
 - 3.62 BS: What would be the start date if tenders called in 2009/2010?
 - 3.63 CC: The timeframe depends on many factors but the delivery of projects is generally about 12 months from tender to the start of the construction- that is a typical timeframe
 - 3.64 RH: Can't be specific about a timeframe- it depends on finance available, priorities of both governments etc.
 - 3.65 SM: What would be your best guess estimate? We would appreciate ongoing updates
 - 3.66 RH: He could give a best estimate- but it would only be an indicative estimate. It is a lot of money and it is both the state and federal government's decision. But it would

Details:

Action By/Date:

only be an indicative estimate- he doesn't want the Project Team to be taken to task over it

- 3.67 BS: Was not taking them to task on the issue
- 3.68 RH: The project approval is the aim of the Project Team at this stage- it is what they are progressing for. They will update where possible
- 3.69 BS: In item 3.31 CT was meant to provide a response to CHCC's 15 recommendations
- 3.70 CC: That was given with the Action Items from that meeting
- 3.71 MM: Yes it was given
- 3.72 BS: 3.61 Summary of information to be provided before meetings- have covered off this issue
- 3.73 BS: 3.95: "Was a noise assessment undertaken for flora/fauna"
- 3.74 DW: That item was addressed under Action item 9
- 3.75 BS Item 3.145: There was the difference in the counts between RTA and WAR surveys- but I am willing to move on
- 3.76 CC: There was a good correlation between the RTA data and the WAR survey- the figures were similar
- 3.77 MM: (referring to the WAR 20 issues): Diesel fumes in rainwater tanks and fine particle pollution
- 3.78 CC: Monitoring work is being undertaken on the highway. Report is being prepared
- 3.79 SM: Could you please clarify what could be done to reduce it's impact, there is a concern as there is a great dependence on rainwater tanks. What could be done to capture any pollutants off the roof?
- 3.80 CC: Treatment of air pollution in rainwater tanks could include first flush systems- there are a number of options available.
- 3.81 SM: It would be rolled into the mitigation measures? Lead is no longer put in petrol so they say it isn't an issue, but there are some Sydney Councils who have rainwater tank policies that say that the water is not drinkable
- 3.82 RH: Doesn't understand the linkage between lead and not being potable water- there are other pollutants. There is no lead in fuel.
- 3.83 SM: But there are Sydney Councils that say that rainwater tank water is not drinkable
- 3.84 DW: If we could go to MM's question on what investigations were being undertaken
- 3.85 TP: Air quality monitoring is currently being conducted- they are assessing PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ the monitoring would be able to detect the two. It is in a location near the highway.
- 3.86 MM: Where is the site?
- 3.87 TP: At Korora
- 3.88 BS: There are three particulate categories- PM_{10-5.0}, PM_{5-2.5} and PM_{2.5-1.0}. Most dangerous of the three is the PM_{2.5-1.0} – and that is not being assessed. You breathe

Details:

Action By/Date:

it into your lungs and passes right through into your blood stream

3.89 DW: Could we get a response to the question?

3.90 TP: It is accepted practice to monitor PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀. He can only respond to what has been done

3.91 BS: CSIRO has tested PM_{10-5.0}, PM_{5-2.5} and there has been no significant impact on children's health. However for particulates under 2.5 microns, there is an impact on the health of children.

3.92 TP: We can talk to DEC to find out what particulates should be tested, as they are the governing authority.

3.93 MM: (referring back to the WAR issues)-ASS and Dieldrin soils it states that there are no registered contaminated sites- doesn't know that there is a register of such sites

Talk to DEC about the size of particulates that should be captured in monitoring (before next CFG)

3.94 TP: There is a two pronged assessment undertaken- obtain existing data from DPI and CHCC in relation to contaminated sites and ASS sites. Then as part of the geo-technical studies, have targeted field studies

3.95 MM: So they did go out on site?

3.96 TP: Yes

3.97 10 May 05 Actions Arising- no issues were raised due to length of time elapsing since Minutes were issued.

4. CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PRESENTATION

4.1 TP: In the past few weeks since we have met, the Pacific Highway has been classed as a Critical Infrastructure project- it listed all the projects which are still at the planning phase

4.2 RH: There were 13 projects listed

4.3 TP: There are no merit appeals under Critical Infrastructure- once the Minister makes a determination, there are no appeals by either the proponent or an objector on merit grounds. The process for approval is the same as when the project was a Part 3A project

4.4 SM: Before the Critical Infrastructure declaration- what difference would there be from then to now in regards to the documents required and the depth of the investigations? Will it alter the studies undertaken to date? In regards to the EA, would it be the same as a non Critical Infrastructure project?

4.5 TP: Yes, he believes that is correct

4.6 SM: So there is no difference in the studies undertaken to the Project Team?

4.7 TP: No, he believes that there are other projects where the change to Critical Infrastructure would constitute a large difference, but not in this case.

4.8 BS: What about the Acts that don't have to be complied with?

4.9 TP: In relation to the EA submitted under the EP& A Act 1979- most of the other Acts- there is no need to undertake a separate process in order to gain a license or permit.

Details:

Action By/Date:

The notable exception is the POEO (Protection of the Environment Operations) Act 1997. Although it is true that a separate license/permit process does not have to be gone through, it does not change RTA's stand to comply with the intent of those processes

- 4.10 CC: Seeking a license or permit- RTA would still work with the agencies to put in place mitigation and environmental safety measures
- 4.11 BS: There are a number of building control Acts in that list. When everyone sat down at the VMS- they made a decision based on the fact that the Acts would have to be complied with
- 4.12 RH: You are assuming that the RTA wouldn't comply with those Acts. Consultation with those agencies has been undertaken. The requirements for the EA sent out by the DoP have been put together in consultations with those agencies. When the EA is submitted to DoP, they will go back to those agencies to assess whether the EA has addressed all the issues before it goes on display
- 4.13 TP: Agreed with the above statement
- 4.14 BS: But it isn't legal anymore
- 4.15 TP: It was a government decision to change the process with approvals under the Acts- the Project Team is only complying with it
- 4.16 BS: But the VMS was based on those Acts being put into force
- 4.17 DW: All we can do is restate the answer which RH gave earlier (4.12)
- 4.18 RH: DoP assesses the adequacy of the proposal- the onus is on the RTA to ensure that the other Acts have been complied with.
- 4.19 MM: Option E was developed...
- 4.20 SM: in consultation with the RTA and Council. The 2nd VMS was looking at Option C1 and Option E.
- 4.21 MM: If the VMS was being undertaken under those circumstances, then the process was flawed
- 4.22 RH: The process was not flawed
- 4.23 MM: The RTA would undertake to comply with the Act, but if the VMS was flawed, how can the community believe that?
- 4.24 RH: The VMS was not flawed. DoP undertakes the assessment and the adequacy of the EA. If they are not happy with the amount of information in the EA- they will return it to the RTA and ask us to re-do it before it gets put on public display
- 4.25 BS: By the time it gets to that stage- it is in the political arena. The decision has already been made
- 4.26 TP: No this isn't the determination, it is only the adequacy check process
- 4.27 BS: Have asked to get the noise readings undertaken in the area- but can't get them. AS has advised that the only way that we can get these readings is under the Freedom of Information Act. Why do they have to go through that process when they are in the CFG?
- 4.28 CC: Noise monitoring is only the initial stage of the process- the report has not been

Details:

Action By/Date:

finalised. The monitoring is incorporated into the noise assessment report. The modelling, impact and mitigation measures include a whole range of issues. The report will show a mitigated noise assessment- It would not be appropriate to look at one section in isolation

4.29 BS: He is not looking for the report- all he wants is the current background noise readings

4.30 RH: It will be provided with mitigation measures in a complete package

4.31 DW: The RTA has indicated that it is not going to provide the noise monitoring data

4.32 BS: Why not?

4.33 RH: We will provide a complete package

4.34 SM: With the PA report- they were only given 2 weeks to look at it. The CFG wants a reasonable amount of time to assess the information- for people with technical backgrounds to review the reports. But they need more than 28 days to review the EA and all the technical papers.

4.35 BS: At past meetings, they had required information be given prior to the CFG meeting. Instead they get to the door on the night of the meeting, get given something and have 3 seconds to assess the information

4.36 RH: All I am saying is that the noise report is incomplete- it consists of monitoring, analysis and mitigation measures

4.37 DW: As I see the situation- request has been put by the CFG members for information on noise monitoring to be released, the RTA has indicated that it would not be provided until the whole report was available for release. The option available to the CFG members is to seek that information under the Freedom of Information Act- she understands that being on the CFG is unpaid, and members are attending them during their non-work period.

4.38 BS: Don't want the report- wants just the noise monitoring information

4.39 RH: Appreciated what SM was saying, and will see what can be done to assist that situation. But the report was still being prepared.

4.40 BS: The minutes of the past meeting were a bit brief- could a more comprehensive set of Minutes be produced in future?

4.41LC: Have to understand that everyone talks at normal speed in these meetings- I can only write at one speed.

4.42 MM: When would the work start (ie. time during the days)- construction which would begin generating noise?

4.43 RH: It will be on a website set up during the construction period. It will be in the conditions of approval of the project- it will have to remain within those hours, however if work has to be undertaken outside of those hours, then they would have to go through a process to get approval for that. If you look at other conditions of consent, you will get an idea of the times

4.44 MM: Easier for you to find than us Bob

4.45 TP: The time is generally 7am to 6pm

4.46 MM: The large tree-munchers at the Bonville work begins earlier

Conditions for consent?

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 4.47 TP: There would be a process which has to be gone through to get DEC approval for noise during construction outside of those hours
- 4.48 MM: Does the community get consulted about this?
- 4.49 TP: Yes, that would also be a condition of consent
- 4.50 BS: At Nabitac, the RTA refused signage to be put up at the entry of the town
- 4.51RH: The project was at Cooperook- the signs that are erected have to be consistent with RTA standards. Special treatments were however, put in place along the highway
- 4.52 BS: At Woolgoolga, would there be signs showing how to access the Town Centre?
- 4.53RH: These are issues which are raised at EA stage. DoP also requests and approves these signs.
- 4.54 BS: In August 03, there was a group of leading Medical Professionals who wrote to the newspaper against the proposed upgrade due to pollution. Was the RTA aware of it? Has it been taken into account?
- 4.55 CC: From memory, I believe that it was relating to the Coffs Harbour section, and not to the Sapphire to Woolgoolga section
- 4.56 RH: All submissions that were made were considered. Was the Medical Practitioners letter a submission or did they go through the media?
- 4.57CC: Not sure if it was a submission or if it went through the media. We do monitor the media- but he couldn't provide an answer to that
- 4.58MM: If the medical practitioners do have an issue, then could they get in touch with the RTA?
- 4.59 TP: The Project Team welcome submissions all the time
- 4.60 CC: There is an issue with the Minutes being released within 2 weeks of the CFG meeting- in the spirit of Christmas, we are asking for a dispensation
- 4.61 DW: The minutes would be issued at the end of January
- 4.62 SM: When would the next meeting be?
- 4.63 CC: When the EA goes on display
- 4.64 MM: What is the CFG involvement in the EA process?
- 4.65 CC: The EA would be released in a similar fashion to the PA report- it would be distributed and about 2 weeks later, a CFG meeting would be held and it would be discussed. This is the reason why the Minutes were addressed in this meeting, to clear the decks and have as much time as possible to address the EA in the next meeting.
- 4.66 MM: 2 weeks is not enough time to digest the EA. We don't receive copies of the technical reports
- 4.67 DW: Can the EA and the technical papers be made available to the CFG members?
- 4.68 CC: Yes, would you prefer it in hardcopy or softcopy?
- 4.69 Either format was acceptable to the CFG members
- 4.70 DW thanked the CFG members for their time and the meeting closed at 9.05pm.

Details:

Action By/Date:

Next Meeting: To be held when the EA is displayed

Summary of Meeting's Actions
• CC to arrange on-site meeting with SM and BH in the new year (2007) <i>(Item Number 2.25)</i>
• Agricultural assessment to address whether an organic property would be de-registered if near the highway <i>(Item Number 2.80)</i>
• In issuing Minutes, both a softcopy and a hardcopy is to be sent to people with email addresses <i>(Item Number 3.5)</i>
• List of meetings with the Chamber to be provided? <i>(Item Number 3.52)</i>
• Talk to DEC about the size of particulates that should be captured in monitoring (before next CFG) <i>(Item Number 3.91)</i>
• Provide a sample of Conditions of Consent? <i>(Item Number 4.44)</i>