

Meeting Notes

Project:	Sapphire to Woolgoolga Upgrade Project	Reference:	1093.40.GE
Location:	Woolgoolga Bowling Club, Cinema Room, Boundary Street, Woolgoolga	Date:	11 March 2003

Present: Apology: Copy: Name:

NORTHERN CFG (Woolgoolga Area)			
✓			Graham Ashton
✓			John Beales
	✓		Mark Beard
✓			Gregory Benson
	✓		Jasmer Bhatti
✓			Ron Gray
✓			Karrena Joass
✓			Kevin Knott
✓			Steven Moody
✓			Phillip Pearce
✓			Des Saunders
✓			Bruce Scanlon
	✓		John Tozer
	✓		Manjit Sidhu
	✓		Robert Watson
✓			John Langhorn
✓			Pam Stone
	✓		Coffs Harbour & District Local Aboriginal Land Council
	✓		Yarrawarra Aboriginal Corporation
	✓		Sapphire/Moonee observer
PROJECT TEAM			
✓			Chris Clark RTA
✓			Bob Higgins RTA

✓			Tim Paterson	Connell Wagner
✓			Rosemary Russell	Connell Wagner
	✓		Barry Hancock	Connell Wagner
✓			Andrew Smith	Pramax Communications
✓			Bill Wood	Coffs Harbour City Council
	✓		Rick Bennell	Coffs Harbour City Council
✓			George Stulle	Coffs Harbour City Council
✓			Jo Gardner	Planning NSW
Recorded By: Pramax Communications				Total Pages: 14
Subject: Community Focus Group Meeting No 10 (Woolgoolga area)				

Details:

Action By/Date:

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Andrew Smith opened the meeting at 5.55pm.
- 1.2 **Apologies:** Apologies were received from CFG members Mark Beard, Jasmer Bhatti, John Tozer, Robert Watson and Phil Price.

2. MATTERS ARISING

- 2.1 Andrew Smith welcomed Pam Stone, replacement for former CFG member Roslyn Dunbar-Wells.
- 2.2 Pam Stone told the group she was a psychologist who was closely involved with the disabled community and those with mental health problems. A keen environmentalist, she was also interested in the social and noise impacts of the proposal. She lived in Woolgoolga Creek Road and part of her property was within Option C. She said she represented the people in that area and also had a lot of contact in the Country Club Estate through friends and Church and social contact. She also had a commitment to negotiation, discussion and communication.
- 2.3 Andrew Smith said an item left off the agenda was feedback from the bus trip of the bypass and upgrade options. He asked for an indication of how many members wanted bus information packages. Eight members raised their hands. Andrew invited members to comment on the trip.
- 2.4 A number of CFG members said they thought the bus trip was worthwhile. Many however expressed disappointment that more time was spent on inspecting routes in the southern section than in the northern section. Generally, members felt more stops should have been made on critical parts of the northern routes, including Freemans Road, Holloways Road, Bark Hut Road, Diamond Head Drive, where Options C and B rejoin the existing highway and critical sections of the proposed upgrade of the existing highway.
- 2.5 George Stulle (CHCC) agreed the itinerary for the bus trip could have been more

Details:

Action By/Date:

flexible and open to change on the day.

- 2.6 Other CFG members pointed out that being in two buses also meant that relevant commentary regarding the options was not shared. It would have been better for the participants to get out of the buses and share information.
- 2.7 One CFG member asked whether it would be possible for Council to organise another bus trip to inspect just the northern section.
- 2.8 Cr Bill Wood (CHCC) said he would see if this was possible.

3. NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

- 3.1 Andrew Smith indicated an unedited copy of the verbatim notes of the previous meeting had been provided to one CFG member who had responded with his comments within three days. He read the comments:
 - 1) Page 7, first paragraph. "That indicates it would affect Country Club." Should read, "That indicates it both directly and indirectly affects Country Club."
 - 2) George Stulle is referred to several times as Councillor. He is a Council staff member.
 - 3) Item 6.2. First paragraph on page 32. "...they don't get drafted by the meeting." Should read, "...they don't get drafted BEFORE the meeting."
 - 4) Page 35, first line, "...this meeting." Should read, "...the next meeting."
- 3.2 There were no objections to those amendments.
- 3.3 Andrew Smith asked if there were any other amendments.
- 3.4 CFG member referred to Page 4, Matters Arising, 3.27, and asked if there were any recent figures regarding traffic since the opening of the Yelgun Expressway.
- 3.5 Bob Higgins (RTA) indicated a short presentation would be made later in the meeting.
- 3.6 CFG member referred to Page 3, 3.30, regarding indigenous sites and concerns. He said an additional indigenous site had been identified just to the east of Mary's Waterhole near Option A at a workshop he had attended at Council on 20 February. Would that be clarified tonight?
- 3.7 Chris Clark (RTA) responded that there was a scarred tree that had a strong association with Mary's Waterhole in the Aboriginal culture for that whole area.
- 3.8 Another CFG member asked where the tree was because he had been involved in logging in that area.
- 3.9 Chris Clark: I don't know the site in detail.
- 3.10 CFG member said the issue of the site had been raised at the workshop because they were exploring opportunities of going either side of Mary's Waterhole. The site presented another barrier or issue.
- 3.11 Chris Clark: The main constraint in relation to the road around Mary's Waterhole is the topography. East of Mary's Waterhole you run into some very steep terrain. That saddle in the ridge to the west of Mary's Waterhole is about the best crossing point.
- 3.12 CFG member referred to an action against the final "Matters Arising" on page 5 and asked if the size of the residential development had been re-checked.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.13 Tim Paterson (Connell Wagner) said a review of the new expected urban zones had been carried out in November including vacant lots in the Country Club Estate, particularly the urban investigation areas south of the existing residential area to the west of the highway, as well as others.
- 3.14 CFG member: What were the results of that?
- 3.15 Tim Paterson said most future developments had been anticipated in the traffic generation work that had been done. There had been some additional inclusions but not significant.
- 3.16 CFG member said he was aware of preliminary planning for a 400-lot development accessed through Sandy Beach Estate, north of Sandy Beach, east of the highway.
- 3.17 Chris Clark: Was that in an existing zoned area?
- 3.18 CFG member: *A 2A area.*
- 3.19 Tim Paterson said the consultants had worked with Council's strategic planners in collating the traffic generation figures and some of the areas considered were quite large.
- 3.20 A CFG member referred to Page 6, Item 4.21 regarding guidelines for providing climbing lanes and asked if the guidelines had been described.
- 3.21 Chris Clark: From my recollection, what was stated in the Notes was fairly accurate.
- 3.22 CFG member: Did you describe the stage? What speed?
- 3.23 Chris Clark: Not in detail. They are guidelines which are not mandatory but do give us some guidance.
- 3.24 CFG member referred to Page 15, Item 5.22 – Coastal Ridge Way:. The month would have been up on the 12th December. In which case, is it wrapped up?
- 3.25 Bob Higgins responded that one meeting had been held regarding the option since it was presented to the Steering Committee in October. There also was another meeting to be held this week. He had been of the understanding that all that had to be done was work out the connection between Option A and the southern section. But there had been a request to look at further refinements. The Steering Committee had also asked that social and other factors associated with it also be examined. It took time to do those things.
- 3.26 CFG member: Can we ask when? It was November and now it is March.
- 3.27 Bob Higgins responded that it could be April or May. What has happened is that people have asked us to do further checks on it and they take time.
- 3.28 Another CFG member: But isn't that an amazing statement to make? You are the road builders, you have got the experience and the background and the facilities. It's amazing that you would examine a line on a map suggested by non-experts, and that you would have even considered doing a line on the map, even with minor amendments to improve it.
- 3.29 Bob Higgins said the original proposal had been called the People's Choice. It had been looked at and discounted for a variety of reasons. A further adjustment had been made to the proposal. From the momentum of the issue, it was felt they (the Project Team) had to do a lot more work on it – the longitudinal alignment; the horizontal alignment; adjusting the vertical alignment to balance the earthworks all the

Details:

Action By/Date:

way through; work out the size of the cuts and fills; work out whether to have tunnels or not; look at in detail. It takes a long time.

- 3.30 CFG member: It seems you have the knowledge and experience. Would you not use that to ensure that the Coastal Ridge Way was in the best possible route if it is going to be considered at all?
- 3.31 Bob Higgins responded that Qantum was used but they had to set up the model for it to operate and that took time.
- 3.32 CFG member: A quick and unconsidered assessment would be criticised; and a thorough and time-consuming assessment, which is what is happening at the moment, is also being criticised.
- 3.33 Bob Higgins: That is a fair comment. The same thing came out in the Peoples Choice Corridor. They (the proponents) were demanding an answer within weeks. I think we came out within a month with the assessment that we had done.
- 3.34 CFG member: You will always get criticised by these people no matter what you do. What if another group of people started making a noise and wanting you to look at things?
- 3.35 CFG member: I think it is fair that we were asked to put in a comment and it was fairly considered, or is being fairly considered by the Project Team, and we don't have the resources. I spent a day with Wilson Dale doing it by hand, drawing angles and distances and trying to calculate earthworks. We don't have the resources that the Project Team has, to come up with the necessary information to look at the viability of these things, so it is reasonable that the Project Team would take additional time to validate the suggestion.
- 3.36 Bob Higgins: I would not use the word 'validate'. I think what we are here to do is to say, "someone has put something up – what does it mean, and what are the implications". So that we can make an informed comment to the community.
- 3.37 CFG member: Between October and now, if you still can't make informed comment, there's something wrong with the process.
- 3.38 Cr Bill Wood said there was a need to hold dialogue and provide feedback on the option and it all took time.
- 3.39 Bob Higgins said the results of the investigations would come out in a report that was being put together.
- 3.40 CFG member: I think we will cut to the chase. The original statement was that it was going to be ready in a month. It might be ready April/May. I would like to have the information now, but if it is not available, it is not available.
- 3.41 Bob Higgins indicated that investigating the Coastal Ridge Way meant that other investigations or activities had to be delayed while it was being examined. There was only a certain number of resources.
- 3.42 CFG member referred to 3.25 and 3.26 – extra B doubles on the highway – and asked if there were figures for the total amount, as opposed to the extra?
- 3.43 Chris Clark indicated he had a short presentation to make that would deal with this.
- 3.44 CFG member referred to Page 13, Item 4.126, Connell Wagner's Indigenous Heritage Consultant. *What has come out of that?*

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.45 Chris Clark said there had been further liaison with the indigenous community. As part of that, they had been encouraged to continue to come to CFG meetings. They had said they would do so if they possibly could but apparently were unable to make it tonight.
- 3.46 CFG member queried whether the Sapphire-Moonee CFG had met since the group's last meeting and whether the notes from their meeting had been circulated to the Woolgoolga group members.
- 3.47 Andrew Smith confirmed that the minutes had been circulated. It would be checked whether a copy had been sent to that CFG member.
- 3.48 CFG member referred to Item 7.13 and asked when the group would be told that Steering Committee meetings would be open to members?
- 3.49 Cr Bill Wood: The Steering Committee resolved that it would be more productive if Council liaise with CFG members and that has not happened because there has not been a subsequent Steering Committee meeting and I think there is one due next Thursday.
- 3.50 CFG member: When you say "liaise" with community focus group members, does that mean they won't be attending Steering Committee meetings?
- 3.51 Cr Bill Wood: That's right, but Council will be liaising with CFG members after the Steering Committee meetings.
- 3.52 Discussion followed on the matter including that the issue was yet to be discussed fully or adopted by Council.
- 3.53 Jo Gardner (PlanningNSW) indicated the Steering Committee had discussed the matter but an outcome had not been resolved. The meeting had been cut short due to the travel commitments of some representatives. The matter would be carried forward to the next meeting of the Steering Committee.
- 3.54 CFG member asked could CFG representatives know when it was resolved?
- 3.55 CFG member: For the purpose of the record, I would like my personal dissatisfaction noted. Mark Ferguson said something about the meeting forming a strong opinion that there would be representatives at least, attending the Steering Committee meetings. I don't know how other members feel, but I am disappointed at being excluded from something I'm able to make a positive contribution to.
- 3.56 Another CFG member: My impression was that as observers we would not be contributing to discussion at the meeting. As observers you pick up the full flow of the debate and who is the dominant figure in the Steering Committee meetings. I am quite happy to sit in the corner. I think it would be unwieldy if every second person in the CFG was commenting. The Councillors, who have heavy loads already, have to have another meeting to brief people, which is ridiculous.
- 3.57 Another CFG member: I would much rather be the liaison then between Council staff and Councillors than any CFG member here.
- 3.58 Andrew Smith said it had been indicated that the matter would be dealt with at the next Steering Committee meeting and asked if the Notes could now be accepted with the amendments discussed. (Agreement from members).
- 3.59 Andrew Smith asked if there were other matters members would like to raise before moving on to the Project Update.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.60 CFG member: At the beginning of the presentation last time, I asked if costs of the various Options were going to be passed on to us. We were told it would be addressed in a meeting. They were not. I subsequently found out the cost of the four Options by reading a newspaper. At the last meeting we again asked for costs of the four Options. I was told they would be covered in the presentations at the time, and I tried to raise it again at the end of the meeting ... The costs are now out. I was under the impression they were going to be told in the meeting.
- 3.61 Tim Paterson: My recollection was that we were expressly not going to address costs until all the costs come out.
- 3.62 Andrew Smith: *Any other matters?*
- 3.63 CFG member referred to a previous suggestion that Jas Benning be approached as a replacement for Paramjit Sidhu. He said had tried to raise it at subsequent meetings but they had run out of time.
- 3.64 Andrew Smith indicated he believed the issue had come up after a replacement had already been engaged for Paramjit Sidhu but would check on that.
- 3.65 CFG member said he had spoken to Jas Benning and he was happy to be a member of the CFG. He said he believed the replacement had attended one meeting but none since.
- 3.66 Andrew Smith indicated he would action it as an item to be examined.

Pramax to contact Manjit Sidhu (who had agreed to be the replacement for Paramjit) regarding his future participation in the CFG

4. PROJECT UPDATE

4.1 Summary of submissions on route options exhibition

4.2 Chris Clark said the submissions and Comment Forms were being collated. More than 1000 comment forms and 250 written submissions had been received to date. The aim was to identify the issues raised, try to address them, provide feedback to those who had raised them and also address them through the workshops that would be held for the project. The major issues identified had been in regard to the costings of the Options, the ecological assessment of areas and their impacts on the Options, design issues, and assessments made in regard to projected traffic volumes.

4.3 Andrew Smith asked if there were any "Issues Arising".

4.4 Issues Arising

4.5 CFG member queried how long it would be before final information on the submissions would be available?

4.6 Chris Clark indicated more detailed information would be available for the CFG's next meeting. A project team meeting would be held tomorrow to look at the progress from here on.

4.7 Update on Traffic Volumes

Overhead: Location of Vehicle Movement Counts

4.8 Chris Clark indicated data had been collected from a number of locations – Nabic and Port Macquarie, which had permanent traffic counters; Yelgun, which was not a

Attach copies of overheads to Notes.

Details:

Action By/Date:

permanent traffic counter but had been used to provide an idea of what the volumes were on the new Yelgun/Chinderah project; Bolivia just south of Tenterfield on the New England Highway; and Moree on the Newell Highway.

Overhead: Vehicle Classification System AUSTRROADS January 1994

Light vehicles – 1 and 2

Heavy vehicles – 3 to 12

- 4.9 CFG member: The limits of those B-doubles. There is a limit isn't there?
- 4.10 Bob Higgins responded that most of the roads around New South Wales could be used by 19 metre B-doubles and always had been. With the opening of the Yelgun/Chinderah bypass, the Burringbar Range had been taken out and an assessment of the road made it viable for 25-metre B-doubles. 25-metre B-doubles were using the New England and the Newell Highway as well. A normal 25-metre B-double normally carried about one and a half times a semi-trailer. Because of that, B-doubles had to meet much more stringent requirements. They were a much safer vehicle, could 'track' better and were more stable going around curves.

Overhead: Daily Movements Averaged over Weekly Periods (all vehicles; all heavy vehicles; 5 & 6 axle semi-trailers; B-doubles)

- 4.11 Chris Clark said the overhead showed figures 'before' and 'after' the opening of the Yelgun/Chinderah project. They showed there was an increase, but not huge, in total vehicle numbers and an increase in heavy vehicle numbers at the three locations on the Pacific Highway. Heavy vehicles at Nabitac had increased from about 15% of total daily traffic movements before the opening of Yelgun/Chinderah to about 18% after the opening. Port Macquarie showed 14% before the opening to 18% afterwards and Yelgun, about 12-15%. The figures were consistent with figures obtained north of Woolgoolga which indicated that heavy vehicles represented about 15% of traffic movements on the highway following the opening of the Yelgun/Chinderah project. Correspondingly, there had been a nominal decrease in heavy vehicle traffic volumes on the Newell Highway at Moree and New England Highway at Bolivia because of the transfer of heavy vehicles across to the Pacific Highway, particularly from the New England Highway.
- 4.12 CFG member asked why the figures showed a dramatic increase in the total figures at Yelgun?
- 4.13 Chris Clark: Prior to the opening of the project, the traffic split between the old existing highway and the coast road through the Tweed villages.
- 4.14 CFG member: What are the actual daily numbers on the graph there?
- 4.15 Chris Clark: The next graph will show us.

Overhead: Daily Movements Averaged over Weekly Periods (all heavy vehicles; 5 & 6 axle semi-trailers; B-doubles)

	Before	After
Nabitac: Heavy	1550	1800
Semi-trailers	950	1000
B-doubles	50	200

- 4.16 Chris Clark: You will notice 200 B-doubles is reasonably consistent from Nabitac to Port Macquarie, and drops off to 150 at Yelgun. Again, the total of heavy vehicles and

Details:

Action By/Date:

the conventional semi-trailers is consistent between Nabitac and Port Macquarie, but does drop off as you get further north because the B-doubles and semis are servicing the towns.

- 4.17 CFG member: Has the RTA noticed any transfer by the operators from conventional vehicles to B-doubles because of efficiencies?
- 4.18 Chris Clark: Not directly. I think it will be inevitable as the trucking companies upgrade their fleets. 2 B-doubles carry the same amount as 3 semi-trailers. There may well be a drop-off in the number of conventional semi-trailers but that could take at least a year.
- 4.19 One CFG member said it had been forecast that the number of B-doubles was expected to double over the next 15 years. Discussion followed on the probability of that increase and the need for the RTA to continue to monitor trends.
- 4.20 One CFG member said a recent road accident, which had partially blocked the highway for a couple of hours at night, had highlighted for him the number of heavy vehicles on the Pacific Highway and the increased noise at night compared to during the day when most movements were by light vehicles.
- 4.21 Bob Higgins responded that he also had counted 20 semis to a normal vehicle on a section of the highway at night but during the day the numbers had been reversed.
- 4.22 CFG member: From a noise point of view, the noise is more noticeable at night and that is when most of the vehicles are heavy rather than during the day.
- 4.23 Chris Clark: To sum up, the increase in heavy vehicles on the highway after the opening has been 150 B-doubles and 100 semis.
- 4.24 CFG member: An average of one every six minutes increase? Ten an hour?
- 4.25 Chris Clark: Yes.
- 4.26 CFG member: That is just the increase?
- 4.27 Chris Clark: The numbers of about 14/15/18% being heavy vehicles is still fairly consistent.

5. VALUE MANAGEMENT STUDY

5.1 Value Management Agenda

- 5.2 Tim Paterson said the aim of this agenda item was to provide a view of where the Value Management Study fitted into the overall assessment process and to look at Multi Criteria Analysis assessment, which was a technique used in assessing options and contributing to the selection of a preferred corridor. There was an Australian Standard that detailed what Value Management was about and how it was conducted.

Overhead: Agenda for a 2-day structured workshop.

- 5.3 Tim Paterson ran through the various points on the overhead. The aim of the workshop would be to carry out a comparative evaluation of the Options against a set of criteria. The workshop would culminate in drawing together the conclusions. A significant Action Plan was developed as there were always challenges or loose ends that needed to be tidied up. The workshop was an important part of the process but not the only step in the comparative assessment.
- 5.4 **Presentation on Multi-Criteria Analysis**

Attach copies of overheads to Notes

Details:

Action By/Date:

Overhead: Multi-Criteria Analysis

- 5.5 Tim Paterson said the focus of Multi-Criteria Analysis was on the relative advantages and disadvantages of Options. It was used widely in major infrastructure and development projects in Australia and overseas. It recognised that project decisions should be influenced by numerous factors including many non-monetary or intangible considerations and was consistent with the NSW *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act* which mandated that all 'environmental' issues were taken into account. The assessment factors or criteria were predefined and agreed upon.
- 5.6 A CFG member asked for an indication of something that would fall into the assessment category criteria.
- 5.7 Tim Paterson: Here is a set of typical criteria or assessment factors:

Overhead: Typical Assessment Factors for Highway Route Selection

- 5.8 Assessment factors included landscape and visual; air quality; flooding and drainage; traffic noise (construction and operation), transport efficiency – travel time, safety, vehicle operation; cost and road user benefits; biodiversity impacts – flora and fauna; buildability / constructability / road user delay; heritage sites / places – Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal; socio-economic effects – eg, property take, land use, community disruption, social activity, lifestyle; agriculture impacts; business implications (including passing trade); accessibility and traffic impacts; water quality.
- 5.9 A CFG member asked what the benchmarks were as far as being acceptable, unacceptable or a target.
- 5.10 Tim Paterson responded that it was not so much as what was "acceptable" or "unacceptable"; it was more a question of how a particular Option would perform in respect of all these types of criteria. The answer would not be "yes/no", "good/bad", it was going to be some sort of comparison. The Working Papers would contribute to the process of rating or comparing the Options to those criteria.
- 5.11 A CFG member asked if the criteria all carried equal weighting or was additional weighting given to any of them?
- 5.12 Tim Paterson responded that that was something the Value Management Workshop would need to consider.
- 5.13 A CFG member asked how the results of the Value Management process would be weighted in the overall decision regarding the Options when it involved perhaps a layman's approach compared to the results of the scientific investigations which sat behind the Working Papers?
- 5.14 Tim Paterson responded that part of the project was the consideration of the specialist advice that had been provided. The question was, how do you bring the criteria into play? There were different techniques for assessing the different outcomes.
- 5.15 CFG member: This is not the first time. You have been confronted with this on a number of occasions.
- 5.16 Bob Higgins indicated that the Value Management process was just one of a number of inputs into any decision. Expertise would be drawn across the spectrum from government agencies to community interest groups to ensure all issues were on the table and that the group came up with a "considered consensus". Community feedback also would be an important input along with the assessment work by the

Details:

Action By/Date:

various experts.

- 5.17 A CFG member: Who is the poor devil that makes the final decision?
- 5.18 Tim Paterson responded that the ratings were compiled. The techniques could be simply consensus-building through to explicit weight-analysis type methods. Sensitivity testing could be used to look at the variables in the equation. There certainly would be a number of those.

Overhead: (second page of Multi Criteria Analysis)

- 5.19 Tim Paterson indicated the VMS was but one forum in the assessment process. All of the information would be captured in a route selection report – the comparative analysis; the data; and the community feedback information. Final advice of the preferred project eventually rested with the Minister for Roads and the proposal would then be subject to an EIS. The current target was about July for an announcement of a Preferred Option.
- 5.20 CFG member: Is mid-July a preferred Option or Options?
- 5.21 Tim Paterson: Typically it is 'Option' singular.
- 5.22 CFG member: Coffs Harbour had two.
- 5.23 Tim Paterson: There are now three. With Coffs Harbour it is at a much more strategic level. Coffs Harbour had two and, after the Peer Review, the Coastal Ridge Way. Here we have four, or four and a half.
- 5.24 Bob Higgins responded that Coffs Harbour was not at the same stage but ultimately would come to a point where a preferred outcome would be identified.

Overhead: M.C.A. Example

- 5.25 Tim Paterson presented this overhead, which contained a tabulated example for comparing/rating the various options.
- 5.26 CFG member: Has the RTA been involved in recent years in building a bypass which could have the same impact on a relatively large population which this one does?
- 5.27 Tim Paterson responded that there were many development proposals, bypasses, deviations of all forms, with important implications for communities.
- 5.28 Discussion followed on other bypasses and their relative socio-economic impacts compared to the "uniqueness" of the Sapphire to Woolgoolga project.
- 5.29 **Selection of CFG representatives to participate in VM study**

Overhead: Attendees at Value Management Workshop for Moonee to Woolgoolga Section

- 5.30 Chris Clark said at its last few meetings the Steering Committee had discussed the composition of the VMS participants. The participants would be comprised of:
- A representative of the three organisations on the Steering Committee.
- Local government 4. (Council would decide who those representatives would be)
- State government agencies: 4. (The representative would have to bring issues from other government agencies as well, to keep numbers down.)
- Emergency Services: 1.

Details:

Action By/Date:

Community: 11. (Comprised of: Indigenous community (2 - one primarily representing the more legalistic side and one representing Gumbala Elders); Business community (2); General community (4); Environmental interests (1); Road users (2).

RTA Project Team: 4.

Connell Wagner Project Team: 4.

Facilitator plus assistant: 2.

Total: 31 participants plus Facilitator and his assistant.

- 5.31 Chris Clark said facilitators for such workshops were accredited and needed to go through an accreditation process. The facilitator had done numerous VM Workshops. The group now needed to address the selection of its three members for the VM Workshop. It was preferred that the group itself identified its nominees.
- 5.32 After discussion, five members indicated interest. One then withdrew. Following further discussion, the group agreed to take a vote by writing their preferred nominees on paper. After counting, three representatives were elected to be the VM representatives.
- 5.33 A CFG member asked what would happen if one of the elected representatives could not attend? Could the fourth CFG member take their place?
- 5.34 Andrew Smith responded that this was reasonable and the fourth nominee agreed to be a reserve.
- 5.35 Chris Clark indicated the three elected representatives would be sent a formal invitation and could contact any member of the Project Team if they had any questions.
- 5.36 A CFG member asked if he could have access to a set of drawings on the route options used on the bus trip?
- 5.37 Chris Clark responded that he would arrange a meeting shortly with the member.

6. FORTHCOMING ACTIVITIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Progress on investigations in southern section of strategy area

Attach copies of overheads

Coastal Ridge Way

Route evaluation and route selection process

- 6.1 Tim Paterson indicated that investigations that were being carried out on the southern section included socio-economic issues; biodiversity issues; strategic assessment; urban design and landscape issues.
- 6.2 CFG member: When are you going to get community views on the Coastal Ridge Way?
- 6.3 Tim Paterson: We have been getting the views.
- 6.4 CFG member: There has been no publication of the route. How can you be getting community views if they don't know?
- 6.5 Andrew Smith indicated that supporters of the Coastal Ridge Way had held a display at Park Beach Plaza and had obtained several thousand extra comment forms to hand out at the display.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 6.6 CFG member: Seeking support.
- 6.7 Bob Higgins responded that the results of the investigations into the Coastal Ridge Way, the Inner Corridor and the concepts for an upgrade of the existing highway in the southern section would all be brought together. At an appropriate stage, the information would be presented to the community – possibly about May.
- 6.8 CFG member: I was concerned that it has not gone through the process.
- 6.9 Tim Paterson: You are right. It has not been put out as an Option. Neither has the Bypass Corridor. None of them have been put out as concepts or scenarios. ... So if they are going to go out, it would be in a similar fashion with some studies to sit behind them.
- 6.10 CFG member: And then the community's views?
- 6.11 Tim Paterson responded yes and then an announcement of the preferred Option at the end of the year.
- 6.12 CFG member asked if there would be further community feedback sought mid-year following the release of information on the Options in the southern section.
- 6.13 Tim Paterson responded yes.

7. OTHER ISSUES

- 7.1 **Procedure for placing Notes of CFG Meetings on Website**
- 7.2 Andrew Smith indicated there had been discussions with the groups regarding the timing of the posting of the Notes from meetings on the web site. Once Notes were provided to members, they previously were posted on the web site as well to enable the general community to be able to read them. However, the CFGs had been deliberating on whether the notes should be posted as "drafts" until the Notes were adopted at the following meeting (and any amendments made) and then posted as "final". Feedback from the other groups had been that the process that had operated previously should continue.
- 7.3 Discussion followed on the merits of maintaining the previous practice or adopting a new method. The group decided the previous practice of posting the Notes on the web site after they had been provided to members should be maintained. Any amendments would be recorded in the Notes of the following meeting before they were accepted.
- 7.4 **Media Release from this Meeting**
- 7.5 Chris Clark indicated a media release would be unlikely to occur because all State Government departments were in "caretaker mode" until after the election.
- 7.6 Some CFG members suggested that a media release on the Value Management Workshop and the participation by CFG members would be worthwhile.
- 7.7 CFG member: It would be very interesting and educational for the general public to know about Value Management exercises because you have this feeling that it is all going to be down to dollars. The presentation that you gave shows balance and taking into account a lot of things. This could only be a good thing.
- 7.8 Discussion followed on the difficulties of putting out a press release.
- 7.9 Bob Higgins: I think we as public servants have to step back in this period up until the

Details:

Action By/Date:

election. It is a requirement upon us. ... We can ask.

- 7.10 Another CFG member asked if, during presentations, it could be clarified what was sensitive and what was not.
- 7.11 Andrew Smith indicated that the meeting Notes would reflect the comment from the CFG that they believed promoting the VMS was a desirable thing for the media release but the RTA's and PlanningNSW's hands were tied by being in caretaker mode.
- 7.12 CFG member: So I cannot tell my neighbours?
- 7.13 Tim Paterson: There was nothing confidential tonight.
- 7.14 A CFG member indicated he had read through all the Working Papers and had some comments on them.
- 7.15 Chris Clark said a copy of the comments had been provided to him at the start of the meeting and there had not been a chance to look at it. He suggested that, once the items had been examined, he would arrange a meeting with the CFG member to go through them. That was the process that had been adopted with other people who had made detailed written submissions. The concerns raised and the responses to them would feed in to the selection process.

8. NEXT CFG MEETING

- 8.1 Andrew Smith said a date for the next meeting had not been set. It would be some time after the VM Workshop.
- 8.2 Bob Higgins said he had an issue to raise and that was that bus tours being offered in the newspaper of the route options were being handled by individuals and had not been endorsed by the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee was not supplying or being asked to supply any information.
- 8.3 A CFG member said he wanted to raise a point in relation to the next meeting. The group's meetings started early but did not finish early. If meetings were held more frequently, perhaps the necessary business could be done more quickly?
- 8.4 Another CFG member asked how long after the VM Workshop would the information from it be available? If it was fairly soon, perhaps a meeting could be held towards the end of April.
- 8.5 Tim Paterson said there would be an Action Plan arising from the workshop and what was on it would be the most useful item to come back to the group. He suggested that the information coming from the submissions might be the next prompt for a meeting.

9. CLOSE OF MEETING

Meeting closed at 9.00 pm.

Next Meeting: To Be Advised