

## Meeting Record

Project:	Sapphire to Woolgoolga Upgrade Project	Reference:	<b>1093.40.GE</b>
Location:	Cinema Room, Woolgoolga Bowling Club, Boundary Street, Woolgoolga	Date:	6 July 2004

Present: Apology: Copy: Name: Interest/Groups represented:

<b>NORTHERN CFG (Woolgoolga Area)</b>			
✓			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 Langhorn
	✓		Pam Stone
	✓		Coffs Harbour & District Local Aboriginal Land Council (Mark Flanders)
	✓		Yarrawarra Aboriginal Corporation – Dee Murphy
	✓		Jas Benning
<b>NORTHERN CFG (Sapphire/Moonee Area)</b>			
	✓		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	
	✓	Gary Davey	
<b>PROJECT TEAM</b>			
✓		Chris Clark	RTA
	✓	Bob Higgins	RTA
✓		Adam Cameron	RTA
✓		Tim Paterson	Connell Wagner
✓		Rosemary Russell	Connell Wagner
	✓	Andrew Smith	Pramax Communications
	✓	Janice Smith	Pramax Communications
	✓	Steve Murray	DIPNR
✓		John Finlay	DIPNR
	✓	Barry Hancock	Connell Wagner
	✓	Jo North	Connell Wagner
Recorded By: Pramax Communications			Total Pages: 13
Subject: Community Focus Group Meeting No 14 (combined meeting of Woolgoolga & Sapphire/Moonee areas)			

Details:

Action By/Date:

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Tim Paterson (TP) of Connell Wagner (CW) opened the meeting at 5.55pm.
- 1.2 A summary of submissions and Comment Forms received from the exhibition of Coffs Harbour City Council's preferred corridor would be presented by Rosemary Russell (CW).
- 1.3 Arrangements for the upcoming Value Management Study would be presented by Chris Clark (RTA).

## 2. NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

- 2.1 A CFG member said he noticed identification of members had started to be included in the minutes.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.2 Rosemary Russell (RR) - This was requested by the Coffs Harbour CFG but not the Sapphire to Woolgoolga CFGs.
- 2.3 A CFG member - Item 3.132 of the Notes had the word 'single' omitted and that changed the meaning of what I said. Item 3.132 of last Notes should read: The CFG member said he knew of stakeholders who had purchased property for growing avocados on Option E and had been told by Council that they could not cut down one single tree because of the environmental significance of the land. Yet Option C went through the middle of it.
- 2.4 CFG member - Any chance of having minutes out earlier? Also there was an agreement I would be given verbatim minutes within 3 days of the meeting. This was not done.
- 2.5 TP - We will check that.
- 2.6 The CFG member - Also the minutes are condensed more than they used to be. A lot of the detail has been left out and I have a problem with that. They are not proper minutes.
- 2.7 RR - There was discussion at some of the earlier meetings of this CFG about whether they should be verbatim minutes and it was agreed that Meeting Notes were appropriate.
- 2.8 The CFG member - I still think they are briefer than they used to be.
- 2.9 A CFG member - I hope they don't get much bigger than that. Is anything being missed?
- 2.10 TP - The Notes are put on the website in a simple form for people to get an idea of what is going on.
- 2.11 A CFG member - The statements that came out after the previous release about Option A were slightly different. This needed to be clarified. Is Option A on or off?
- 2.12 TP - We had endeavoured to get a media release from the last CFG meeting but this is not always possible. In this case the only media release we could get out was advising that the closing date for submissions was 25<sup>th</sup> June.
- 2.13 A CFG member - Item 3.67/3.68 in relation to the highway and proposed routes being flooded. This is incorrect. One of the proposed roads would create a flood-free route whereas the project team's would still mean the highway would be flooded.
- 2.14 Chris Clark (CC) - Any redevelopment of the highway would be flood-free. That is a requirement of the Pacific Highway Upgrading Program.
- 2.15 The CFG member - It depends where the highway is.
- 2.16 CC - No, it doesn't matter.
- 2.17 The CFG member - One option has talked about Corindi River. If built, that would be flood-free but with the other proposal, Black Adder Creek would still flood the highway.
- 2.18 CC - No, that is not correct.
- 2.19 The CFG member - Most options don't figure in Corindi River to Black Adder Creek.
- 2.20 A CFG member - Because the creek is north of where they finish.
- 2.21 CC - All options were taken through to Halfway Creek and the assessments were prepared on the basis of upgrading the existing highway north of Arrawarra. There

Details:

Action By/Date:

is a table in Community Update No 5 showing all options up to Halfway Creek and incorporated in the costings is that the highway be flood-free.

- 2.22 CFG member - This is not indicated on the map – Bob's comment that any re-development of the highway will be flood-free is ambiguous.
- 2.23 CC - If you are going to fix it up, why would it not be flood-free?
- 2.24 CFG member - Will the highway be upgraded north of where some routes join the present highway - OK
- 2.25 CFG member – I've got a query about Item 3.95 "Way Forward"?
- 2.26 CC - There was no discussion with regard to this question.
- 2.27 CFG member - Should that not be required? Why is he (Bob Higgins) not in a position to provide feedback?
- 2.28 CFG member - Some things need to have clearance of the Minister.
- 2.29 CC - Any organisation looks at a range of options as to how it goes about its business and what is open to discussion and until such time as a decision is made it is purely speculation.
- 2.30 CFG member - There seems to be a lack of feedback from RTA as to how information put forward by community is being received.
- 2.31 CC - What information?
- 2.32 CFG member - There's little feedback of things we put forward or items appearing in the media as to how they are received by the RTA.
- 2.33 CC - There's no way we can respond to every matter raised by the media.
- 2.34 CFG member - Answers have not been given. I don't recall a definition of the word feasible. I am sure the RTA has ideas but I don't.
- 2.35 CC - We will come back to this in Matters Arising.
- 2.36 CFG member – Item 4.28, the Value Management Workshop was not a balanced mix of community and technical stakeholders. It was loaded towards the project management team.
- 2.37 CFG member - The RTA wants to limit the numbers but when you look at the make-up of the government department representatives, a number of them were very similar. Forests and National Parks don't want a highway going through them. The community representation is relatively smaller in relation to Government representation.
- 2.38 CFG member - Community are the ones that are going to have to deal with the highway forever.
- 2.39 CFG member - People from the community were also screened considering the area they were from.
- 2.40 John Finlay (JF) – My understanding from a Value Management Workshop is that the group reaches consensus and there is a ranking of priorities, but a vote is never taken on any issue.
- 2.41 CFG member - There was never a vote taken but a consensus made about the

Details:

Action By/Date:

assessment criteria.

- 2.42 CFG member - There are Value Management principles that the workshop has to follow.
- 2.43 TP - There is never any voting on the options.
- 2.44 CFG member - What about the paired comparisons used to determine the selection criteria - don't you twist this.
- 2.45 CC - There was never any voting about options. This is a Value Management issue which is already listed for later on the agenda. We can deal with it then.
- 2.46 CFG member - An article in the newspaper stated that Option A was no longer viable? It was said by a Councillor. How can what is in the newspaper be different from minutes of the meeting.
- 2.47 CC - A councillor is entitled to put in the paper whatever they want.
- 2.48 CFG member - How can someone think a report on what a councillor said is true? The newspapers are not gospel, in a court of law this would mean nothing.
- 2.49 TP - The question is should the RTA be correcting incorrect statements? I don't know when that happened.
- 2.50 CFG member - If the statement is not correct, I think it should be corrected.
- 2.51 CC - That has been done in a previous meeting. It is not practical or feasible for the RTA to respond to every article that is not correct.
- 2.52 CFG member - We were told the project management team works closely with the council. I am surprised this has not been corrected.
- 2.53 CFG member – Item 5.39, he is just confirming what a councillor said – it is provided previously. I think this should be qualified.

### 3. SUBMISSIONS REPORT

- 3.1 RR advised that handouts of the PowerPoint presentation on the Submissions Report would not be provided to members at the meeting as the report is still being finalised
- 3.2 CFG member – When will it be finalised?
- 3.3 RR - Maybe towards the end of this week or early next week.
- 3.4 RR gave her presentation on the Submissions Report.
- 3.5 CC - This report was purely and simply options within Council's preferred corridor. One thing that came out was that a lot of people expressed support for an upgrade of the existing highway from Coffs Harbour to Woolgoolga for local traffic only. Quite a number see it as important to upgrade that section of highway anyway.
- 3.6 CFG member - Is that more or less the same as saying the existing highway will be upgraded anyway? If there is a bypass, there will still be local traffic and it will need upgrading.
- 3.7 CC - It is hard to know what people were thinking. While some people support a far west bypass option, they also believe there is a need to upgrade the existing highway.

Copies of presentation slides attached.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.8 CFG member - I think some people would be concerned about speed. A lot of people are concerned about driving from Coffs Harbour to Woolgoolga and back again, which is what most local people do.
- 3.9 CFG member - Does it not really reinforce the argument about the fact that the locals will not use it, I will use this road but I want everyone else to go out there.
- 3.10 CC – It's very hard to tell.
- 3.11 CFG member - I would have thought that there would be a lot more responses than that – it was a very poor response.
- 3.12 CFG member - For the last 3 or 4 Community Updates were the responses getting less and less?
- 3.13 CC - Hard to say, different reports for different areas. Hard to say if responses are decreasing or not.
- 3.14 CFG member –It's curious. The northern section upgrade option in the original schedule was supposed to start construction this year and Coffs Harbour 20 years down the track. Why was Coastal Ridge Way tied in with option A? If you're looking at Option A in isolation, it's cheaper than the whole length. Together, the cost is quite different. This is a recent combination.
- 3.15 CFG member - There has been a push to make it one project.
- 3.16 CC - Yes.
- 3.17 CFG member - A lot of people are saying don't wait 20 years for the southern section, you should do all in one go. There was a feeling it should be all one project – CRW and option A together for that purpose.
- 3.18 CC - In December 2002, Option A was assessed in isolation. Then this year CRW was assessed as its own special entity – the report that we recently put out was in response to identifying options in the CHCC corridor. Because of the constraints we had to look at a bypass option which included both so they had no joins across the northern boundary. While we have addressed the overall picture, we have never said the indication would be to build them in one go and always said we would need to look at staging them – we looked at the costing implications and timing implications etc.

#### **4. VALUE MANAGEMENT STUDY**

##### **Value Management Agenda**

- 4.1 CC – It is expected that the Value Management Study will be held in the week beginning 2<sup>nd</sup> August but a final date is still to be confirmed.
- 4.2 CFG member - How will individual community representatives be selected?
- 4.3 CC - Same process as with the last Value Management Study. Regarding the comment earlier in the meeting, it is our experience that no particular group thinks they have appropriate presentation. We have also received strong feedback from the government agencies that they are not well represented as well.
- 4.4 CFG member - It is thought that out of the thousands of people that will be affected, the community are major stakeholders and are not adequately represented.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 4.5 CC - I do believe a good and fair representation is there. It is essential that we bring to the table all the key stakeholders. We are going to have to agree to disagree.
- 4.6 CFG member - If the majority has consensus and one particular group is in a minority, it is difficult to believe it's consensus.
- 4.7 TP - I don't know that holds.
- 4.8 CFG member - I have been there. That is why I am disturbed.
- 4.9 JF - It is never a vote about options. It is about dissecting options/information according to agreed selection criteria. Even people who come to present similar community views build different judgments.
- 4.10 CFG member - I never said about voting on options, I said voting on consensus – before CFG agree on one point you have got 4 out of 29, this is not balanced.
- 4.11 CC – The CFG is only part of the community representation.
- 4.12 TP - At a VM, you have 15-20 parties. It is about getting representation. It is never about trying to play numbers.
- 4.13 CC - When we went through this whole process the first time, there were many views expressed and the facilitator took a long time to get a consensus of opinion. I don't consider that unfair.
- 4.14 CFG member - You mentioned that this process of Value Management is now Codified. Could you please make available a copy of the code at least a week before the VM meeting so they have a chance to look through and make a decision.
- 4.15 TP - There will be details of the VM process made available. This was done last time and will be done again.
- 4.16 JF – It is important to note that the facilitator is accredited. He is the person that leads you through the process and the facilitator was at great pains to point out the way it was to go and made sure everyone was happy with the way it was going. I am glad to say it is Ross Prestipino again. He is a very good facilitator.
- 4.17 CC - Yes, I agree.
- 4.18 CFG member – Is this paper straightforward?
- 4.19 CC - Yes, it meets Australian Standards.
- 4.20 CFG member - I am talking about the actual code. I think when you get down to reading it, it is far different to what is put forward at many of the meetings.
- 4.21 CC - If any attendees want a copy of it, it is readily available.
- 4.22 CFG member- What is your definition of consensus?
- 4.23 CC - Where we have got an agreement, a balance after weighing up the facts.
- 4.24 CFG member - Is it 51%?
- 4.25 CC – No, an agreement, an appropriate balance.
- 4.26 CFG member- The definition is different in Macquarie and Oxford dictionaries.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 4.27 CFG member - On balance, it comes up to a consensus. Certain people can sit on their bums and not express an opinion.
- 4.28 CFG member - With all the discussions on consensus, we are presuming that there will be a consensus.
- 4.29 CFG member - I might suggest when you're talking about consensus, the word majority comes into play, it is a majority view.
- 4.30 CFG member - No it is not.
- 4.31 CC - With respect, what you are saying the intent is to get everybody together and to get them to focus on what is essentially important and if you are going to take a vote on that you will never reach a consensus. I think you have got to go into these things thinking you are never ever going to get what you would like to have but rather the view that it is the best outcome for everybody.
- 4.32 CFG member - You have 33 people there, you are not going to get 33 people to agree, where is the cut-off point?
- 4.33 CC - It has never been the way.
- 4.34 CFG member - You are going to get the views of the facilitator.
- 4.35 CC – No, he is only facilitating.
- 4.36 TP - The code demands that this does not happen.
- 4.37 CFG member - Who forms the consensus?
- 4.38 TP - There are many instances where there is no consensus but the whole point is you are examining 10-20 criteria. You then rely on other issues.
- 4.39 CFG member - What does consensus mean? What is majority?
- 4.40 CFG member - I have always been told that you have to vote one way or the other. I refuse to vote. I think we need to work through an issue rather than vote on it. You work on it until you reach consensus.
- 4.41 CFG member - That is not fair. There is a pair and you make a selection out of those – it is all about comparisons.
- 4.42 CFG member - You break issues down and compare one against the other but you have to make a selection.
- 4.43 RR - OK but tell me how it is possible to know where that choice is leading?
- 4.44 CC – At the end of the day, attendees have to make a choice. It is not a vote, it is making a decision on the balance of the information available.
- 4.45 CFG member - If you have 33 people making a choice between 2, how do you know where that is going to lead to?
- 4.46 CC - You don't vote.
- 4.47 CFG member - I didn't mention voting on options.
- 4.48 CFG member - Four out of 33 - this does not seem fair.
- 4.49 CC - I think it is reasonable to say stakeholders are Council, business, community, environment, etc. At the end of the day, it is important that they have

Details:

Action By/Date:

representatives that actively represent the community and put their views forward.

- 4.50 Adam Cameron (AC) - That also applies to the government agencies. They don't only come from one particular area of the Government.
- 4.51 CC - You are right. There are going to be times when the Department of Agriculture will think differently to State Forests.
- 4.52 CFG member - Please qualify why you would not vote.
- 4.53 CFG member – If I was told A or B, I would not vote on it.
- 4.54 CFG member - How would people know?
- 4.55 CFG member -You have a position to look at all of the issues and make some decisions along the way that will get you to a position you want to be. (More discussions took place with regard to voting or having an opinion on certain aspects etc.)
- 4.56 CC - The VM is an assessment of all the information covered on the project. This is the one particular forum where you get everyone to attend and get their viewpoints etc. While you may not have a positive outcome, there is usually a particular way to go. If you go in with a reasonable open mind, you may well see at the end of the day, I think that is an appropriate way to go.
- 4.57 CFG member - If you go to this with an open mind, who is to say that none of these views will be taken up. You need to look at all the issues and make a decision.
- 4.58 TP - We need to move on.

### **Selection of CFG representatives to participate in VM study**

- 4.59 CC - We require four representatives (from the CFG) to go to the workshop. We are looking for nominations of who would be available to attend.
- 4.60 CFG member - One of my worries is that we don't have many people here tonight representing the groups. Out of 31, we only have 10 here tonight.
- 4.61 CFG member - How could certain members go to the meeting with such strong views?
- 4.62 CFG member - I agree I do have particular ideas. I attended the last VM workshop and in that time found myself changing those ideas because of some of the information given to me.
- 4.63 CFG member - I'm saying the workshop's not balanced because I didn't agree but as a statistical balance. At the beginning of the first day they said it was not a matter of reaching conclusion on any particular option. It was a matter of listening and making a decision on what was presented – like being on a jury.
- 4.64 CC - There are going to be views from someone who doesn't have a preference for anything and from someone determined a particular option is going to get up. This can be accommodated as long as people are prepared to get in and work with the information put forward.
- 4.65 CFG member - If you exclude anyone you are going to exclude everyone – Government wanting jobs, truck drivers wanting East option, National Parks saying not going through National Parks – you are going to have to get them together and come up with consensus.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 4.66 CC - VMW is considering the options identified in the Supplementary Options Report (i.e. Options C1 and E)
- 4.67 CFG member – Can we nominate ourselves?
- 4.68 TP - There are only 9 representatives here tonight – we would like to know by tonight but let's stop for a break and discuss nominations afterwards.
- 4.69 CFG member – Will there be any meeting prior to the VM?
- 4.70 TP – No.

## Break

- 4.71 TP - Does anyone know anyone who is not here that wants to be part of the VMS?
- 4.72 RR – No one has expressed interest via the project team.
- 4.73 CFG member - As far as I am concerned, if they are not here then we can't say they go as we don't know their availability.
- 4.74 CFG member - Several Ulitarra representatives – this leaves 8.
- 4.75 CC - Of this 8 are there any who desire to participate (show of hands)? - 5.
- 4.76 CFG member - Can I go as an observer?
- 4.77 CC - I cannot give an answer on this. We would have to put it to the facilitator. If an observer gives his word not to participate it may be alright, but if he does participate he would have to leave. At the end of the day it is up to the facilitator.
- 4.78 CFG member - How many do you think we can say can be observers – are we setting a precedent?
- 4.79 CC - We will have to check with Ross Prestipino.
- 4.80 CFG member - I don't think it would worry anyone if I was up there. I would think it very strange if I would not be allowed.
- 4.81 CFG member - I think there is a lot to be said about letting people in to observe. It gives a lot of advantages to being an open forum.
- 4.82 TP - It is not open forum.
- 4.83 CFG member - I don't see any objection. I would not be aware of another situation you could not put your hand up and if the facilitator said no observers then that would be the case.
- 4.84 CFG member - How many people would be prepared to go along? I don't know many and can see there being a problem with this.
- 4.85 CC - Ross is the facilitator. We have to make sure he is comfortable and that is fair and reasonable.
- 4.86 CFG member - I'd be worried that at times the observer would go and discuss things instead of them discussing with people in the team therefore things might be slightly changed to what they might be thinking.
- 4.87 CFG member - Would the observer be able to know everything that is being discussed.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 4.88 CFG member - There is nothing to stop anyone attending a meeting and ringing up someone else in the break.
- 4.89 CC - I can't see if he has an opinion to the discussions in the break that there'd be a problem with that. There are quite a number of situations where we break into groups – you would not be part of these so you may need to take some reading material.
- 4.90 TP – Announced the names of the four CFG members (who expressed interest at the CFG) who would be attending the VM as well as a reserve if one of them was unable to attend.
- 4.91 CC – Thanked the members. Choosing representatives was not easy but the result was very much fair participation. Did anyone require a copy of the Australian Standard?
- 4.92 The five representatives indicated they did.
- Steve Moody  
Bruce Scanlon  
Col South  
John Langhorn  
Graham Ashton (reserve)
- Send copy of AS for Value Management to four VM representatives plus reserve

## 5. OTHER MATTERS

### Issues Arising and Media Release

- 5.1 Members suggested media release be issued that a Value Management Workshop will be held giving the names of the representatives going to be attending.
- 5.2 CFG member - Option A still on table – can some qualification be made?
- 5.3 TP - All attempts will be made to get this done. Perhaps what could happen for this is a release to the effect of the value management study and what it is studying and therefore qualifies this situation.
- 5.4 CFG member - C, C1 and E and nothing else will be looked at.
- 5.5 TP – Yes
- 5.6 CFG member – It's clearly not worth further consideration Option A – not worthy of consideration – it should be qualified as a lot of people are confused.
- 5.7 CFG member - If you are going to qualify one part, you are going to qualify all parts.
- 5.8 CFG member - RTA said option D is not worth any further consideration and I think the same should be done about option A if that is the case.
- 5.9 CFG member - C, C1 and E are the only options left.
- 5.10 CFG member - The public should know that as well
- 5.11 TP - Are there any other issues regarding media release?
- 5.12 CFG member - A decision on Option A would have to be put out with remarks about value management workshop?
- 5.13 TP - This would be put forward but can't say if it will turn into a media release.
- 5.14 CFG member - If there is an agreement from other CFG members, there would be some link with the media release. Given the response of 128 preferring- Option A and 76 preferring CRW – given that slant is the obvious question going to come up

Details:

Action By/Date:

“why is Option A not going to be featured in the VMW?”

- 5.15 CFG member - It is sending a message to the community that the project team is not taking on board community preferences. You have taken it on board and recorded but you are now doing VM on what is the RTA preference.
- 5.16 TP - The RTA listened and the response has been a whole lot more investigation work etc. I think there has been a big response to community issues.
- 5.17 CC - A lot of time, money and effort considering the viewpoints and desires set by the community. We have done the analysis and put the reports on the table and told the community what the outcome of the assessments is.
- 5.18 CFG member - Until the Minister actually puts pen to paper they are still on the table technically. The whole process is still on the table. He could say “Stop this, I am going for this option”.
- 5.19 CFG member - But this is not likely to happen.
- 5.20 CC – The Minister will make the decision.
- 5.21 CFG member - What Councillors are going?
- 5.22 CC - We have told them 4 positions are available but a decision has not been made whether it's Councillors or Council officers.
- 5.23 CFG member - Where to from here?
- 5.24 CFG member - When will a decision be made with the date of the VMW?
- 5.25 CC - You will be advised when this is set. The Minister has said that there will be a decision made by the end of the year, a decision on the VM date needs to be made ASAP so that can be done by the end of the year. We do intend to push forward as fast as we can but we have to be true to the process.
- 5.26 CFG member - Is construction starting 18 months after that?
- 5.27 TP - It's impossible to have a construction start under 2½ to 3 years.
- 5.28 CFG member - Out of \$765 million the Federal Government has put up, \$200 million was already committed, so there is only \$565 million being put into Pacific Highway – is that right?
- 5.29 CC - The \$765 million includes the funds to complete the 10 year program, and \$160 million each year for 3 years subsequent to that.
- 5.30 CFG member - Not true then is it?
- 5.31 CFG member - State Government has to match that dollar for dollar?
- 5.32 CC - Yes, the Federal Government is seeking a matching contribution from the State Government. An increase from \$60 million to \$160 million after the end of the 10 year program is a significant increase to the Pacific Highway program.
- 5.33 CFG member - Can you advise the VMW date ASAP?
- 5.34 CC – Yes.
- 5.35 CFG member – Thanked RR, who is retiring, for her contribution to the project and her pleasant disposition.

Details:

Action By/Date:

5.36 Both TP and CC acknowledged RR's valuable input.

**6. CLOSE OF MEETING**

Meeting closed at 8.30pm.

**Next Meeting:** To be advised – after the VMW, sometime in August 2004.