

Meeting Notes

Project:	Sapphire to Woolgoolga Upgrade Project	Reference:	1093.40.GE
Location:	Woolgoolga Bowling Club, Board Room	Date:	12 March 2003

Present: Apology: Copy: Name:

NORTHERN CFG (Sapphire/Moonee Area)			
	✓		Keith Adams
✓			Peter Loxley
✓			Jim Browne
✓			Vincent Brooker
	✓		Steve Clemesha
✓			Ray Faggotter
✓			Jill Heris
	✓		Peter Lubans
	✓		Ernie Armstrong (proxy)
	✓		Tammy Mills-Thom
	✓		Shinichi Otani
✓			Phil Price
✓			Colin South
✓			Coffs Harbour & District Local Aboriginal Land Council (Mark Flanders)
	✓		Yarrawarra Aboriginal Corporation
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	PlanningNSW
Recorded By: Pramax Communications				Total Pages: 16
Subject: Community Focus Group Meeting No 10 (Sapphire/Moonee section)				

Details:

Action By/Date:

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Andrew Smith opened the meeting at 6.00 pm.

1.2 **No apologies**

2. NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

2.1 Andrew Smith: *Are there any comments or amendments?*

2.2 CFG member referred to *Page 3, Copy of Powerpoint Presentation to be attached to meeting notes and indicated he did not get the attachment.*

Copy of Powerpoint Presentation to be provided to CFG member.

2.3 Andrew Smith indicated the Notes were accepted as read. He said under Agenda item No.6 for tonight's meeting was 'Procedure for placing Notes of CFG Meetings on Website'. There had been discussion with the other two groups as to whether or not correct procedure was being followed by placing the Minutes on the website as soon as possible and then making amendments at the following meeting. The other groups had agreed that the current practice should continue. If the group was happy to concur with that, the item would not be dealt with later in the meeting. (Agreed)

3. MATTERS ARISING

3.1 Observers at Steering Committee Meetings

3.2 Andrew Smith asked Cr Bill Wood to comment on the item.

3.3 Cr Bill Wood (CHCC) said the matter had been discussed by the Steering Committee but not resolved. It would be addressed by the Steering Committee at its next meeting on March 20.

3.4 A number of CFG members said they did not believe there was any point in having observers at the meetings. They would be worried that someone could attend who had their own "agenda" and yet gave the message that they were representing the views of whole communities or groups. There was a need for trust in the process.

3.5 One CFG member asked if they could receive the Notes from Steering Committee meetings?

3.6 Cr Bill Wood: *That is a worthwhile suggestion.*

3.7 Andrew Smith asked if there were any other "Matters Arising? He asked for feedback on the bus tour of the bypass options and a show of hands from those who took part. (Three raised their hands)

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.8 The CFG members responded that they thought it was a worthwhile exercise. One said they knew there were some people who were upset because they had requested a few changes to the itinerary and were told that they were unable to squeeze that in the time but the trip ended earlier than scheduled. Others said it was an opportunity to view the terrain where the routes might go. They were concerned about some of the newspaper articles regarding it. The buses were supposed to stop at the roundabout and discuss the highway going through Woolgoolga and were not able to stop there because there were protestors. It would have been difficult to have a discussion there with protestors in the background. They were concerned that there was not discussion about the existing highway upgrade all the way through.
- 3.9 Cr Bill Wood indicated that, as a result of feedback from the Woolgoolga CFG regarding lack of time to have a sufficiently good enough look at the northern section, he had sent a fax suggesting Council consider running another tour of just the northern section.
- 3.10 One CFG member said he had maps to show him where B, C, and D went but the Coastal Ridge Way was a bit nebulous.
- 3.11 Chris Clark (RTA): *Did you get a copy of the handouts that were provided with the bus trip?* (Members indicated "no").
- 3.12 Andrew Smith indicated more copies would be provided to members who wanted them. (It was noted that 6 copies were required).
- 3.13 A CFG member said a lot of time was spent on the southern section. She said it would have been beneficial when the buses stopped to have shared information and heard what everybody on the other bus was saying.
- 3.14 Andrew Smith said that same point had been raised by the other groups.
- 3.15 The CFG member asked if the handouts would actually show where the Coastal Ridge Way joined up with Option A?
- 3.16 A CFG member said the bus trip provided good knowledge of where the routes could go. There was however confusion concerning Mary's Waterhole. The Land Council was not really worried about where the bypass would go. Its main issue was that it could affect the cultural heritage of indigenous people.
- 3.17 Chris Clark responded that the information pack did show the link of the Coastal Ridge Way with Option A. Bus trips being organised by a local candidate were not connected to or endorsed by the Steering Committee.
- 3.18 One CFG member said he thought it was a good idea that an opportunity was being provided to others to have a look at the route options.
- 3.19 Chris Clark said he concurred with what the member said: *The bus trip for the local candidate is being purely and simply organised by that candidate ... without any reference back to us at all. It would not be appropriate for the RTA or Council to invite themselves along on the trip.*
- 3.20 Cr Bill Wood: *We would not want to be involved in what is political.*
- 3.21 Andrew Smith invited the Land Council representative to provide some information about himself. He said new members were usually given an opportunity to introduce themselves.

Copies of information package to be provided.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.22 The CFG member said he was the Cultural Heritage Officer with the Coffs Harbour Aboriginal Land Council and he represented it here tonight. He said he had a concern as to where the bypass would go. He would like to see it up and running. His main concern was Mary's Waterhole, which was a very significant site to the local Gumbala people. When he went on the bus tour he was informed that the bypass would come to 600 metres from the waterhole. The Land Council had put in a submission last year. Dave Kennedy was the co-ordinator of the Coffs Harbour Aboriginal Land Council at the time. He had put in a recommendation that it be at least 1km or 1.5km away from Mary's Waterhole. In view of that, if the bypass was less than a kilometre it would be far too close and could seriously impact the site. There were other cultural sites to do with the Coastal Ridge Way bypass that was proposed for going over to the west of Red Hill. It was felt that wherever the bypass went through or over the ridge lines, that was impacting on story lines where people used to walk. *We don't walk through swamps; we walk along ridge lines. Because of the impact of farming, etc, we know that a lot of our sites have been heavily damaged. We still know that our people used to walk those ridgeways and that will impact on our story line ridges. Mary's Waterhole was a very significant place to our people, especially the women. I could say a lot about Mary's Waterhole, but I am a man, so I can't. So we hope to get a representative from Yarrawarra, Marg Lardner or Cheryl Perkins, to address the problems of Mary's Waterhole. I can talk about it, but I am not allowed to, because it is women's business. I just would like to say that there is a great concern about Mary's Waterhole because of the bypass going too close to there.*
- 3.23 Andrew Smith: *I assume there will be direct liaison, Chris?*
- 3.24 Chris Clark indicated there had been direct liaison with the Yarrawarra community and the Elders and such liaison would continue. There would be discussions about the workshops to be held. A representative of the indigenous community would be involved with that. He said he was happy to talk to the representative later on about any concerns and issues and the process from here.

4. PROJECT UPDATE

4.1 Summary of submissions on route options exhibition

- 4.2 Chris Clark: indicated that 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 and noise impacts. Of the more than 1200 submissions and comment forms received, there were only about 12 which had identified specific areas of concern rather than just general statements of support or opposition to various Options.
- 4.3 A CFG member queried whether it was too late for someone to provide a written submission. She said many people had not realised where the Coastal Ridge Way might go and how close it might be to them until a few days before the advertised closing date for submissions.
- 4.4 Chris Clark indicated submissions would be received at any time. As far as submissions that would be able to be used for input into the selection process and the VMS, those were really needed by Friday. If they couldn't be organised by then, it was important to keep in mind that all submissions would be part of

Details:

Action By/Date:

information in the selection process.

- 4.5 Cr Bill Wood asked if it would be worthwhile to put in some brief comments before Friday so they could be included and then follow up with something more detailed.
- 4.6 CFG member: *That is a real point and I agree with you. Until I saw it (the Coastal Ridge Way), I didn't have any idea of where it joined up.*
- 4.7 Other CFG member: *We had no idea.*
- 4.8 Another CFG member said he took the point of why the political bus tour could not be impinged upon by Council or the RTA but asked would it be possible to have a virtual tour that could be put on the website?
- 4.9 Rosemary Russell (Connell Wagner): *Like real estate agents with houses?*
- 4.10 CFG member: *Yes. Perhaps a small amount of text to explain, with pictures, etc.*
- 4.11 Tim Paterson: *It is a feasible thing to do but the problem is getting it done in the time frame.*
- 4.12 Chris Clark: *It is certainly a suggestion that is worthwhile considering and we will take it on board. If that is not possible, we will be putting out the results of our investigations into the Coastal Ridge Way, hopefully about May this year. There is still some work to be done on that.*
- 4.13 Andrew Smith: *There still is lots of opportunity for community response. More information that is going to go out. This last information is not the end of community input and community feedback on that Option.*
- 4.14 Tim Paterson said the Coastal Ridge Way had not been available for the community-at-large to see. It was still being tweaked.
- 4.15 A CFG member: *Coastal Ridge Way can't really run unless Option A goes ahead?*
- 4.16 Chris Clark indicated that it would still be possible to link the Coastal Ridge Way back on the Pacific Highway somewhere in the vicinity of the Bucca Road intersection.
- 4.17 CFG member: *If the Coastal Ridge Way can't run, is there any chance of the Glenreagh far west getting a run?*
- 4.18 Chris Clark: *It has already been assessed and the cost and traffic estimates generated. It's not feasible.*
- 4.19 CFG member: *What is the cost of the Coastal Ridge Way?*
- 4.20 Chris Clark: *We have not costed the Coastal Ridge Way so we are not in a position to say. We have done some costings on the Orara Way.*
- 4.21 Tim Paterson indicated it had been reported on last year and, for the reasons Chris Clark had mentioned, it had been dismissed from further consideration.
- 4.22 CFG member: *I understand that, but the Coastal Ridge Way is coming in more expensive than that.*
- 4.23 Tim Paterson: *We are still developing the Coastal Ridge Way in terms of its design and then we will prepare costings but we have not done that at this point in time.*
- 4.24 **Update on Traffic Volumes**

Details:

Action By/Date:

Overhead presentation by Chris Clark

Attach overheads to Notes

4.25 Before beginning his overhead presentation, Chris Clark indicated that he wanted to provide some information about traffic counts. Any traffic count was simply a snapshot of the traffic on the road at the time the count was taken. Traffic counts varied from day to day, month to month, and year to year. The latest information indicated more B-doubles on the highway than when it was measured just after the opening of the Yelgun/Chinderah project. There were one hundred B-doubles at that time and now there were somewhat more. The fact that traffic figures changed and were growing was the way traffic figures worked.

Overhead: Location of Vehicle Movement Counts

4.26 Chris Clark indicated he had figures from three recording places on the Pacific Highway – Nabitac, south of Port Macquarie and Yelgun/Chinderah – where a break-up had been obtained of the traffic movements. Yelgun was not a permanent traffic counter but had been used to provide an idea of what the volumes were on the new Yelgun/Chinderah project. Figures also had been obtained from Bolivia, south of Tenterfield on the New England Highway, and north of Moree on the Newell Highway.

Overhead: Vehicle Classification System – AUSTRROADS: January 1994

4.27 Chris Clark gave a quick breakdown of how the RTA classifies heavy vehicles and light vehicles. Heavy vehicles were buses, tray-top trucks, vans, etc, semi-trailers and B-doubles; light vehicles were cars, utilities, cars with trailers, etc.

Overhead: Daily movements averaged over weekly periods

4.28 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. The figures were taken in November and December last year so there was some degree of seasonal fluctuation. The figure at Yelgun showed a significant increase but was a distortion due to the fact that, prior to the opening of the Yelgun/Chinderah project, the traffic split between the old existing highway and the coast road through the Tweed villages.

4.29 CFG member: *Chris, the time of taking the raw data here. Was that over a full 24-hour period for each of the days in the week?*

4.30 Chris Clark: *Yes, all of these are permanent stations – one month of data in each of those – except for Yelgun which is only about a week's worth of data. There is therefore less reliability on the Yelgun figures.*

4.31 The CFG member queried whether the permanent stations and traffic counters

Details:

Action By/Date:

were the strips that could be seen across roads?

4.32 Chris Clark: Yes.

4.33 The CFG member: *And that distinguishes a big truck from a small car?*

4.34 Chris Clark responded that it distinguished between heavy and light axles.

4.35 The CFG member: *So it detects a different pressure for heavy and light vehicles?*

4.36 George Stulle (CHCC): *Not the pressure but difference in spacing between the axles. It gauges whether it is a semi trailer or a car. The time of the pulses.*

4.37 CFG member: *How would it do that if a big truck is going fast, compared to a slow, small car?*

4.38 Chris Clark: *The sensors in the road are set distances apart. By measuring the time of the first axle to go from one sensor to another, the computer determines the speed of the vehicle.*

4.39 CFG member: *The physics are important because I want to get around this.*

4.40 Tim Paterson: *They are called 'classification counts' because they distinguish the different categories of vehicle over the 24-hour period.*

4.41 George Stulle: *The data is not just the category but the speed of the vehicle and also the time.*

4.42 CFG member: *So three variables – distance between first and second; distance between first and second axle; and different speeds; which could affect the times. You could end up with different timing.*

4.43 George Stulle: *The first lot of hits on the device gives you the speed.*

4.44 CFG member: *Got it.*

4.45 Another CFG member queried whether there was a breakdown on times of day?

4.46 Chris Clark: *Yes, on the permanent stations.*

4.47 CFG member: *Have you got that breakdown? Would it be fair to say that most of the heavy vehicles travel at night?*

4.48 Chris Clark: *I don't know if that is fair. The proportion of heavy vehicles on the road at night compared to day is very high.*

4.49 The CFG member indicated that, if he travelled between Coffs and Moonee during the day, he might count three semis travelling south but if he did the same trip after 8.30 at night, he would count anything up to 23. The reason was that was the way trucks operated. They loaded in Brisbane in the morning, headed for Sydney, and this was half way. They arrived here about 8.30 at night. The reverse also was true. There were a lot of arguments about trucks and their noise impacts. But there really was a set period of time when their impact was greater and that was about a 3-hour block from about 7.30pm-10.30pm.

4.50 Another CFG member: *But they do run all night, and that is the main concern - 7pm to 6am.*

4.51 CFG member responded that people's concerns about sharing the road with semis; cowboys and tail-gating was not as big a problem during the day as it was at night.

Details:

Action By/Date:

He indicated he had a heavy vehicle licence and wanted to make another point – many people did not have an appreciation of how their own driving habits might impact on other road users. *If you pull on to the highway in front of a semi that is doing 100, and you sit at 70 because you are going from the shops down to Hoys Road, you are going to cause a major problem for that semi. People fail to understand the semi driver has a job to do and is working under these conditions and you don't have a perception of what his job is about, you should be driving taking into account the other drivers as well. A lot of the problem people have with semis revolves around that issue.*

- 4.52 Another CFG member said Roberts Hill seemed the logical way to go. Would the road infrastructure be improved around that area? How would that affect the Orara Valley? What if vehicles started to head out the Orara Way?
- 4.53 Chris Clark responded that part of the investigations concerned traffic analysis to identify how much traffic each of the Options would attract and how many heavy vehicles they would attract. One of the concerns was, because of the steep terrain and the grades involved, some of the Options might not be attractive to trucks and they might want to continue to use the existing highway or one of the other roads.
- 4.54 The CFG member said with the new Coramba Bridge, he believed the Orara Way would be used a lot more.
- 4.55 Chris Clark: *One of the objectives of the Pacific Highway Program is to make it more attractive and alternative routes less attractive. It provides people with a high standard road that is attractive to heavy vehicles and takes them off the alternative roads.*
- 4.56 A CFG member asked what the feedback had been from trucking companies?
- 4.57 Chris Clark responded that an in-depth submission had been received from a heavy vehicle industry representative who had spoken to a number of the trucking companies that had depots in Coffs Harbour. Their issues included safety, transport efficiency, ensuring that grades were minimised because of their effect on transport efficiency and suggestions as to how roads were configured. It had included a survey of the transport companies that had depots based in Coffs Harbour area so it might not be representative of total freight movement on the highway. Of the number of semi-trailers and B-doubles that they operated, about one-third serviced Coffs Harbour – they came to Coffs Harbour, loaded, off-loaded, and travelled back or they loaded, off-loaded, and continued on.
- 4.58 CFG member: *So they have got to come into Coffs Harbour?*
- 4.59 Chris Clark: *Depends where their depot is. The break-up of the information we got from Lindsays was that they have about 50 B-doubles, semi-trailers. About half of those service Coffs Harbour and go back out again.*
- 4.60 CFG member: *The bus companies obviously would have to come to Coffs Harbour too.*
- 4.61 Chris Clark: *I don't think any bus companies would come through Coffs Harbour without stopping somewhere.*
- 4.62 Another CFG member suggested that since Coffs Harbour was a city, a lot of trucks would have to service it. A percentage of the heavy vehicle movements would therefore be local traffic.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 4.63 Another CFG member: *How big a percentage?*
- 4.64 Chris Clark: *That's what we are trying to find out at the moment. ... We are trying to get a handle on the total proportion of heavy vehicles that need to come into Coffs Harbour.*

Overhead: Daily Movements Averaged over Weekly Periods

- 4.65 Chris Clark indicated that, in general terms, there had been an increase at Nabitac of about 150 B-doubles since Yelgun/Chinderah; about 180 at Port Macquarie; and about 120 at Yelgun. On top of that, there also was an increase of about 100 semis at each of those locations.
- 4.66 CFG member: *How much is just natural increase because there are more B-doubles on the road anyway? That is the hard thing to measure, isn't it?*
- 4.67 Chris Clark: *You can infer from the traffic figures a series of things but if you are talking about 150 vehicles at Port Macquarie, and again about 150 at Nabitac, we are showing on the average a decrease of about 50 on the New England.*
- 4.68 CFG member: *So there are more B-doubles.*
- 4.69 Another CFG member responded that there were more B-doubles but they were also diverting from the Newell and New England Highways to the Pacific Highway.
- 4.70 Chris Clark agreed there was a transfer on to the Pacific Highway but there was also an increase in B-doubles because they were a more efficient way of moving freight. As transport companies upgraded their fleets, there would be an increase in B-doubles on the road. That might or might not increase the amount of heavy vehicles on the road because B-doubles could carry more freight than semis.
- 4.71 A CFG member suggested the size of truck stops were a problem because the B-doubles were bigger and rest areas were often full.
- 4.72 Chris Clark: *We are aware of the demands associated with B-doubles and the truck stops. That is an ongoing part of the upgrade work that we need to think about.*
- 4.73 Andrew Smith suggested the meeting skip to Item 5 on the agenda concerning forthcoming activities and investigations with the southern section and asked Tim Paterson to provide a summary. Item 4 on the Value Management Study would be dealt with after the break.

5. FORTHCOMING ACTIVITIES/INVESTIGATION

- 5.1 **Progress on investigations in southern section of strategy area, Coastal Ridge Way and route evaluation and route selection process**
- 5.2 Tim Paterson indicated that investigations into the southern section of the strategy had been on hold pending the completion of Council's Peer Review. One of the key issues that had emerged was a requirement that the Coastal Ridge Way be subject to further review by the Steering Committee and that had been progressed over the last couple of months. It was being considered in conjunction with the Inner Bypass Corridor and the use of the existing highway corridor as the long-term highway corridor options for Coffs Harbour. The location and the form of the CRW were still being worked on and there was a final workshop tomorrow with its proponents. Cost estimates would be developed and a number of other issues including biodiversity, flora and fauna and socio-economic implications would be

Details:

Action By/Date:

examined. It was being investigated in parallel with the ongoing investigations of the Inner Bypass and existing highway. There would be a substantial community information release about May/June this year.

- 5.3 CFG member: *Is air quality being looked at?*
- 5.4 Tim Paterson: *No, not at this stage.*
- 5.5 The CFG member responded that he and his wife noticed the air quality was not as pristine as it used to be and other people would notice it too.
- 5.6 Tim Paterson agreed. Everything suggested that, with the development and continued activity on the North Coast, the number of vehicles, heavy and light, would increase over time. However, it was not proposed for the southern section investigations to look at air quality. The investigations were primarily a planning study to look at the corridor options and whether additional land or corridors needed to be reserved for that. The southern section had a 20-year time horizon. However in the Sapphire to Woolgoolga section, once a preferred option was reached, a range of issues would be examined, one of which was definitely an air quality assessment, climate and the multitude of conditions that influenced it, and what would be the change over the life of the project.
- 5.7 The CFG member said he had written to the Minister for Roads and the Minister for the Environment regarding the issue. The Minister for the Environment had referred the matter to the Minister for Roads. Air quality was a concern because this was where the bulk of the people were and where there were big plans for development. The cost of respiratory problems because of the decreasing quality of air were reasons for taking the highway further west. It would cost more to go further west – ecology issues, and billions of dollars.
- 5.8 Tim Paterson responded that air quality would be part of the assessment for Sapphire to Woolgoolga. It was a statutory requirement. It would assess such characteristics as carbon monoxides, nitrogens and ozone against parameters set by world bodies and ANZECC.
- 5.9 One CFG member asked if there had been further meetings of the Coffs CFG.
- 5.10 Andrew Smith indicated the group had held its second meeting about two weeks ago since reconvening after the Peer Review
- 5.11 Another CFG member commented that air quality was different in the Orara Valley. It had its own environment. On the coast the ocean breezes tended to clear the air but in the valley it took a long time to clear the air because it was closed at one end.
- 5.12 Another CFG member: *The other thing is, when you knock down 15 kilometres of trees to put a road in, what happens to air quality?*
- 5.13 Another CFG member: *There is smog in the Bucca Valley – we get smogs at Christmas sometimes.*
- 5.14 One CFG member asked if there was any feedback from the Woolgoolga CFG meeting held the night before.
- 5.15 Andrew Smith responded that he had spoken to one of the members regarding feedback. Regarding the bus trip, the group had also felt there needed to be more stops made in the northern section and that it would have been better to have shared information between the buses. The group had spent some time on the

Details:

Action By/Date:

Notes of the previous meeting. The group had also asked similar questions regarding traffic movements and B-doubles.

6. VALUE MANAGEMENT STUDY

- 6.1 Tim Paterson said the aim of this agenda item was to provide a view of where the Value Management and Value Engineering studies fitted into the overall assessment process and to look at Multi Criteria Analysis and 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. In the Moonee to Woolgoolga end, there were the 4 route options: A, B, C and D; and in the southern end, a number of design options and alternatives including the interchange locations in the Sapphire area. The Value Management workshop would be held on 31 March/1 April and then the Value Engineering workshop on 7 April. Both would involve a diverse range of stakeholders sharing their views and contributing to a range of issues. Both workshops would contribute to the development of a preferred project.

Overhead: Day One – Monday 31 March

- 6.2 Tim Paterson ran through the various points on the overheads. 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.

Overhead: Typical assessment factors or criteria used for a highway route selection project

Attach overheads to Notes

- 6.3 Tim Paterson: Typical 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 use 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.

Overhead: Value Management Workshop Agenda

- 6.4 Tim Paterson indicated the workshop first needed to test that we have got all the Options that we need to look at and ways to improve them. There was a deal of ideas building. Then, through different group methods, the workshop moved into more convergent thinking. Using a suite of criteria it proceeded on to an evaluation of the Options against each of the criteria.

Overhead: MCA – Multi Criteria Analysis

- 6.5 Tim Paterson indicated Multi Criteria Analysis involved drawing on the technical data and the knowledge and opinions of the many people attending. It was not about getting absolute measures. The primary concern was about establishing the advantages and disadvantages of the alternatives. The workshop would then involve the evaluation of ideas, development of potential value improvements, consideration and assessment of Options and then recommendations. The Action Plan developed would then set the basis for any additional thinking which needed to be done. A representative from the CFG

Details:

Action By/Date:

group would be invited to take part.

Overhead: Value Engineering Workshop

- 6.6 Tim Paterson said the Value Engineering workshop would also explore Options and issues such as access and connections to the local road network, but also many of the criteria that were on the list for the VM workshop. The VE workshop involved an introduction, background, presentation, a review of the concept and alternative improvements, issues and concerns, ideas and options, an assessment of the ideas and options, and a review of the wide issues. It ended up with a similar sort of process – an evaluation, documentation of it, and an Action Plan for taking the project forward.
- 6.7 **Selection of CFG representatives to participate in VM study**
- 6.8 Chris Clark indicated he wanted to emphasise that while the VM and VE workshops were an important part of the input into a decision on a preferred option, there were other inputs that also would be taken into consideration. He indicated one representative of the CFG was needed for the two-day VM workshop and three were needed for the one-day VE workshop.
- 6.9 Discussion followed on why only one representative from the Sapphire-Moonee CFG could take part in the VM workshop. It was suggested that the three representatives already chosen from the Woolgoolga CFG did not represent some of the areas affected by the Options.
- 6.10 Chris Clark indicated the Steering Committee had decided the representation on the VM would be 3 from the Woolgoolga CFG and one from the Sapphire-Moonee CFG while the VE would have 3 representatives from the Sapphire-Moonee CFG. It had been left up to the Woolgoolga CFG members to determine who would represent them. The same process would be used tonight.
- 6.11 One CFG member suggested the word “objective” was important. The people who attended needed to be objective and not subjective. They needed to think outside the area they represented.
- 6.12 Chris Clark said it was important to remember with both the VM and the VE studies that they worked on consensus

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

- 6.13 Chris Clark said the VM workshop attendees would be comprised of:
- Steering Committee 3
 - Local Government 4
 - State Government Agencies 4 (Representatives would have to bring issues from other government agencies as well, to keep numbers down. A planning focus meeting of all the government agencies would be held next week to nominate the four representatives.)
 - Emergency Services 1
 - 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).

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 6.14 CFG member: *I notice you said Gumbala Elders. There will be contention there. There is another group. The Julipi group from Coffs Harbour.*
- 6.15 Chris Clark indicated that because the VM concerned the area from Moonee to Woolgoolga, at one of the meetings held with the Yarrawarra community, they had a letter from the other indigenous community saying they were quite happy for the Gumbala Elders to represent them. He continued:
- Business community 2
 - General community:
 - CFG 4
 - Environmental interests 1
 - Road users 2
 - RTA Project Team 4
 - Connell Wagner Project Team 4
 - Facilitator 2
 - Total Attendees: 33
- 6.16 Chris Clark: *Effectively, there are 31 participants including the Facilitator and his assistant.*

6.17 Break-up of the Value Engineering Workshop

- 6.18 Chris Clark indicated the Steering Committee also had decided that the representatives from the general community of both the VM and VE workshops needed to be people who had an in-depth knowledge of the project. It was clear that the CFG members were the community members who knew most about these workshops.

Overhead: Attendees at Value Engineering Workshop

- Steering Committee 3
 - Local Government 3
 - General community 3
 - RTA Project Team 7 (includes Project Manager, Road Development Planner, Construction, Geotechnical)
 - Connell Wagner Project Team 6
 - State Government Agencies 1
 - Facilitator 1
 - Total: 24
- 6.19 Chris Clark indicated the technical representation included traffic issues, particularly intersections which were very complicated, noise and urban design issues. Urban design was very much about integrating the facility into the environment in which it was located to make it less intrusive, easier on the eye. It meant noise attenuation measures could be provided without them being "in your face".
- #### 6.20 Selection of Representatives
- 6.21 One CFG member indicated interest in taking part in the Value Management workshop and was accepted
- 6.22 Three CFG members indicated interest in taking part in the Value Engineering

Details:

Action By/Date:

workshop and were accepted.

- 6.23 Chris Clark indicated a formal invitation would be sent out to the members and asked if they had copies of the Route Options Development Report (The members indicated 'yes').
- 6.24 Andrew Smith told the group that five members of the Woolgoolga CFG had indicated interest in the 3 positions available to them on the VM Workshop. One had withdrawn and then the group decided to vote on the remaining four members to resolve it.
- 6.25 Discussion followed on the ability of members to liaise with the workshop representatives from both CFGs to ensure they were briefed on all issues.

7. OTHER ISSUES

7.1 Meeting Notes on the Website

7.2 This matter had already been dealt with.

7.3 Media Release from this Meeting

- 7.4 Andrew Smith indicated the government was in "caretaker mode" at the moment because of the State Election and a media release from the meeting was unlikely.
- 7.5 Chris Clark told the group that, for three weeks prior to the election, the government was in "caretaker mode". The upshot of that was that the public service stepped out of the limelight as much as it could and the only press releases were ones that basically had to go out. The Woolgoolga CFG had felt there was merit in getting information out about the Value Management and Value Engineering studies but it was extremely unlikely that that would occur.
- 7.6 Andrew Smith suggested that the members could filter out that information through their networks.
- 7.7 One CFG member said he had been asked by the Crystal Waters Residents Association to ask the CFG if it could have a representative on the CFG. He said the association didn't feel they were being properly represented by him and others in that area.
- 7.8 Andrew Smith indicated he believed the next CFG meeting would be held after the workshops. The next major information release mid-year would be regarding the preferred Option.
- 7.9 CFG member: *How many meetings will we have? If it is only one or two, it's pointless.*
- 7.10 Chris Clark indicated that, at this point in time, no consideration had been given to what the process would be for community consultation after the announcement of the preferred route. It would be appropriate for the Steering Committee to consider that issue and what the future role of the CFG might be.
- 7.11 A CFG member suggested it might be more appropriate, if the CFG was to continue, for the representative to come on board for the phase following the announcement of the preferred option – if specific input was required from the Crystal Waters area.
- 7.12 Andrew Smith indicated two members of the CFG had previously liaised with residents of that area.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 7.13 CFG member: *I am happy to continue what I am doing, but I raised it because they raised the issue.*
- 7.14 Another CFG member said her concern was with the Gaudrons/Sugarmill area not being represented.
- 7.15 Andrew Smith suggested it was important to keep in mind that the CFG could not be comprised of representatives from every small pocket of interest or the group would not be manageable. There were other means of providing feedback that would input to the process. He suggested there was a need to make a formal response to the Crystal Waters group.
- 7.16 CFG member: *I think it is appropriate that some structured answer go back. The consensus seems to be that it is probably not appropriate seeing we are close to that milestone. We can go back and say we think that it is inappropriate for someone to come in at this late stage without all the information.*
- 7.17 Chris Clark suggested that a response be deferred until after the Steering Committee considered what the future of the CFG might be.
- 7.18 Tim Paterson indicated it was still important for them to be aware they could still have access to the CFG team.
- 7.19 Chris Clark told the group that, for their information, about a dozen submissions had raised concerns about the documentation on the route options. These concerns were examined and addressed and then, if possible, project team representatives met the respondents face-to-face to discuss them.
- 7.20 Another CFG member said she had an issue regarding a display at the Park Beach Plaza during the route options exhibition period. She said the display implied it was official by having maps up and handing out comment forms to the community. Was it possible for official staffed displays to be held when other groups were also holding displays?
- 7.21 Chris Clark: *We did hold two staffed displays – including one at the Woolgoolga Library for two days prior to the closing of the submissions.*
- 7.22 The CFG member suggested there was a need to be at the same place at the same time.
- 7.23 Another CFG member said the problem was that, being a government entity, the RTA could not respond to any public comment made in the newspapers.
- 7.24 Chris Clark: *We do need to be careful about how we respond and in most cases we tend not to respond directly but what we tend to do is get factual information out to the community for them to make their own assessment. Again, the phase we are at in the political cycle has made that difficult for us to do at this point in time.*
- 7.25 A CFG member suggested it was not just that. Some of the things that were being said were almost personal.
- 7.26 Andrew Smith indicated the group concerned had asked for a large number of Comment Forms to hand out at their display but only a relatively small proportion had been filled in and returned for processing.
- 7.27 One CFG member said he had visited the display and had been told what was affected and what was not. He said when he told them that was not his understanding, the debate become heated.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 7.28 Another CFG member said she also had found that those at the display had *"no idea what they were talking about"*.
- 7.29 One CFG member said he often had people asking him about the options and he had taken a carload of them to inspect some of the routes.
- 7.30 Chris Clark indicated there were many diverse opinions. The aim of the workshops was to bring those views into a forum, put the views on the table, work through them and, at the end of the day, end up with a consensus as to the best way forward.
- 7.31 CFG member: *I think people think if they get enough votes they can change the course of things. The reality is that it is a National highway. The bottom line is, it still is a National highway and it has got to go through. It provides transport for two state governments and it is a major state issue. It can't be voted on by 300-400 people in one community. You can change governments but the Minister for Transport is still going to make the decision.*
- 7.32 Andrew Smith indicated a date had not been set for the next meeting but it would be following the Value Management and Value Engineering workshops.

8. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 8.25 pm.

Next Meeting: To be advised