

* Amendments made to the meeting record by the Northern CFG (Woolgoolga Area) are shown in italics

Meeting Notes * (*Minutes*)

Project:	Sapphire to Woolgoolga Upgrade Project	Reference:	1093.40.GE
Location:	Cinema Room, Woolgoolga Bowling Club, Boundary Street, Woolgoolga	Date:	15 December 2004

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 Langhorn
		✓	Pam Stone
		✓	Jas Benning
		✓	Coffs Harbour & District Local Aboriginal Land Council (Mark Flanders)
		✓	Yarrawarra Aboriginal Corporation
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
	✓		Gary Davey
PROJECT TEAM			
✓			Chris Clark RTA
	✓		Bob Higgins RTA
✓			Adam Cameron RTA
✓			Tim Paterson Connell Wagner
	✓		Barry Hancock Connell Wagner
	✓		Jo North Connell Wagner
✓			Andrew Smith Pramax Communications
✓			Janice Smith Pramax Communications
	✓		Steve Murray DIPNR
	✓		John Finlay DIPNR
Recorded By: Pramax Communications			Total Pages: 14
Subject: Community Focus Group Meeting No 15 (combined meeting of Woolgoolga & Sapphire/Moonnee areas)			

Details:

Action By/Date:

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Andrew Smith (AS) opened the meeting at 5.55pm.
- 1.2 Apologies were received from Bob Higgins, Steve Murray, John Finlay, Greg Benson, John Langhorn, Vincent Brooker, Gary Davey, Barry Hancock and Jo North.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

- 2.1 A CFG member: It seemed that if some members didn't turn up, they were automatically listed as an apology. He suggested that for those who did not tender an apology, they should be listed as not attending.

Members who did not tender an apology listed as receiving a copy of the meeting Notes
*(Minutes)

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.2 CFG member commented that there were a lot of questions that did not seem to have answers in the Notes **(Minutes)* of the previous meeting but the meeting was some time ago which made it difficult to remember.
- 2.3 Another CFG member: He had asked a question in relation to what was 'feasible' but it didn't seem to be answered in the Notes **(Minutes)*. However he would go through them and look for the item in question. He queried when corrections were made to the Notes **(Minutes)*.
- 2.4 AS indicated corrections were made in the subsequent Notes **(Minutes)*.
- 2.5 Notes **(Minutes)* of the meeting were accepted.

3. PREFERRED OPTION

- 3.1 Tim Paterson (TP) (Connell Wagner) gave an overview of the Coastal Route which had been announced as the Minister's preferred option. Copies of presentation slides attached
- 3.2 Two CFG members queried whether the option had been accepted by the Minister. They said they were under the impression the announcement was of the RTA's preferred option.
- 3.3 TP: The Coastal Route was the RTA's recommendation to the Minister and it had been accepted by the Minister. It was also the outcome recommended by the majority of attendees at the Value Management Workshop (VMW) held in August 2004. There were large-scale display maps available for CFG members to examine. Many of the questions asked at the last CFG meeting were questions relating to the value management process and representatives who attended included CFG members attending that night. The Preferred Option report focussed on the short-listed options and the process used at the VMW repeated the process followed at the previous VMW held the year before. The Preferred Route was the general recommendation made by the August VMW although not all participants favoured Option E.
- 3.4 Chris Clark (CC) (RTA): After the VMW, all information available including the technical reports, community submissions and the VMW report were examined at a series of workshops held by the RTA and Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources (DIPNR). All the corridors and options raised during the Strategy's development were revisited and the outcome was that the Coastal Route Options were the best. The workshops then looked at the options within the coastal corridor, bearing in mind that the southern (Sapphire to Moonee) section was constrained by its topography, and reviewed the report of the VMW held in April 2003. The outcome was that Option E was the preferred option over Option C1 even though it was \$15m more expensive than C1. Option D had been discarded earlier because of its socio-economic impacts on Woolgoolga. Option E had been preferred by the August 2004 VMW participants because it was likely to have higher community acceptance, it had better socio-economic outcomes, better provided for the future growth of Woolgoolga taking into account Council's development plans (it was west of Country Club Estate and didn't sever the estate from the township of Woolgoolga), and, because it rejoined the existing highway at Ararawarra Creek, it provided noise and safety benefits for Safety Beach. The outcome of all of that – the technical investigations, the community submissions and the VMWs – was that Option E was recommended as the preferred option for a bypass of Woolgoolga and Option E was the option endorsed by the Minister's office. Were there any questions?

Details:	Action By/Date:
3.5 CFG member: The VMW for the Sapphire to Woolgoolga section was the subject of a letter of complaint to the Minister from three of the participants and the subject of correspondence going back and forward and he wanted that	Noted
3.6 Another CFG member: Council also had been making representations.	
3.7 CC: A report was going to Council's meeting tomorrow night.	
3.8 A CFG member read an extract from P3 of the Executive Summary of the Preferred Option report. He said the community had been told from the start that the RTA had no preferred option but the extract indicated that in December 2002 the RTA already preferred the existing highway between Korora and south Woolgoolga as a section to be upgraded. Therefore, any variations around Coffs Harbour and Woolgoolga became irrelevant because there was nowhere else to go. It had made the community consultation a farce because it had excluded other considerations. Every time the community has suggested other routes, the RTA had only looked at them from the point of view as to how it could knock them out. He said he also did not read into the media release regarding the preferred option that the Minister's concurrence was part of the announcement. Why had the strategy been split up into three areas? If it hadn't been split up, the option to upgrade the existing highway between Korora and south Woolgoolga wouldn't have been relevant.	
3.9 CC referred to the history of the development of the strategy. Three broad corridors were originally examined. They were the far western or Orara Valley corridor, the central and outer corridors, which sat generally in Council's preferred corridor, and the inner corridor. The assessment was made that the inner corridor was the most feasible option for further investigation.	
3.10 The CFG member: Was that before community consultation?	
3.11 CC: If you brought all the work together, you would see that there were western, central and eastern corridors investigated.	
3.12 The CFG member suggested that the RTA knew where the preferred option was going before the investigations started. He said the RTA was splitting communities rather than looking at the whole picture. It looked only at how it could knock other options out.	
3.13 CC: No. All of the corridors and options were assessed on the basis of information gathered. The history of the project was that it started only as a Sapphire to Woolgoolga project. Then, because of responses from Council and the then Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, investigations were undertaken into whether a bypass of Coffs Harbour was feasible and, if so, where it could go. Three broad corridors had been developed. Some of them came in around Bucca and those corridors were examined early on. Early on, the topographical constraints at the southern end of the Sapphire to Woolgoolga project meant it was appropriate to have two separate CFGs – one for the southern end and one for the northern end. The Coffs CFG was formed later.	
3.14 A CFG member said he did not agree with the other CFG member's interpretation of the extract from the Executive Summary of the Preferred Option Report. The section has to be read in its entirety. The decision that an upgrade of the existing highway from Korora to south of Woolgoolga was the only feasible option was well past the date that community consultation started.	
3.15 The CFG member: What other options were looked at for that section?	

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.16 TP: The Sapphire-Moonee CFG looked at a number of options from Sapphire up to Woolgoolga and beyond. There was a 'spaghetti' of options all over the map. Members of the Sapphire-Moonee CFG would remember that.
- 3.17 Members of the Sapphire-Moonee CFG present at the meeting supported this, saying there were a great number of options examined in that area.
- 3.18 CFG member: There was a corridor that came in around Skennars Creek and came up around the back of Sealy Lookout and they were ruled out for good reasons such as National Parks. Several routes came up from the south to the Gun Club and others went from the Gun Club north.
- 3.19 Another CFG member: A large group of us looked over a wide area.
- 3.20 Another CFG member: What was the collective view of the CFG?
- 3.21 TP: The view of the members was that an upgrade of the existing highway was the only feasible option.
- 3.22 CFG member: The CFG was asked what its views were and it decided that there was no other option.
- 3.23 CFG member: Any opportunity to have a proper bypass further west through the Orara Valley had been precluded because of the decision made regarding the Sapphire section.
- 3.24 TP: Community forums were held at the start in the Orara Valley and Bucca areas. When the community asked about a far western bypass, the corridor was investigated and the findings were that the only corridor worthy of further consideration was the inner corridor. This was accepted by the Steering Committee.
- 3.25 A CFG member: When you say the Steering Committee, the public didn't give much credibility to the Steering Committee. The RTA didn't follow the recommendations of the peer review by Arup and went behind closed doors.
- 3.26 TP: Arup fully endorsed the technical findings that the inner corridor was the only corridor that was feasible.
- 3.27 The CFG member: Arup had a lot of criticisms about the process but the recommendations weren't adopted by the RTA.
- 3.28 CC: The RTA looked at the Orara Valley area, the Bucca Valley area with the central and outer corridors, and the coastal corridor. It had a genuine look at all of them and found the coastal corridor was the best option. Once back on the coastal plain, the CFG went through all the 'spaghetti' options and found that an upgrade of the existing highway was the only option through that corridor.
- 3.29 CFG member: The preferred corridor was not preferred by Council or the community. The media release should have said it was the RTA's preferred corridor. He said people he had talked to were not aware this had been approved by the Minister.
- 3.30 CFG member: The Minister had been disgraceful in this matter. The Minister was hiding behind the RTA. He didn't know what the community was feeling about the media release but he knew what the greater community thought and he knew what Council thought. He said he would question the validity of the decisions made by the Steering Committee, particularly when the chairman hadn't supported a western option. There were good reasons for not doing community consultation but once you had it, the community should be listened to. He wasn't criticising the engineers

Details:

Action By/Date:

because he thought they did a great job but he wanted to be treated like a citizen and that hadn't happened.

- 3.31 CC: The CFG member had said they hadn't listened to the community but they had. They had investigated the community's and Council's proposals and put them out to the community for comment. But at the end of the day, the technical assessment had to be taken into account, not just what was the popular view.
- 3.32 A CFG member suggested it be done the other way around – take into account the community view and then work out how the technical assessment could be done.
- 3.33 CC reminded the CFG that the strategy also had implications for the wider community outside of the immediate area.
- 3.34 A CFG member: There also was more to the community than what was this side of the mountain.
- 3.35 Another CFG member: In Australia, it was a democracy.
- 3.36 CFG member: It wasn't a vote.
- 3.37 CFG member: The decision however was based on budgetary constraints. You have to say that any option selected was constrained by budgetary estimates. The media release referred to cost. It got back to budgetary estimates even from the outset. From an RTA management perspective, they were driven by budgetary constraint views. That was why the Coastal Ridge Way (CRW) had been discarded basically because it was outrageously more expensive than other options. So wasn't it true that they did have preferred options because of budgetary constraints. For example, Option C worked perfectly but Option E got close to Option C.
- 3.38 CC: When planning for Pacific Highway projects, they had to prepare cost estimates for budgetary purposes. It was not a constraint they had to work with. They didn't have a preferred option before the announcement last Tuesday.
- 3.39 The CFG member: Remembered Bob Higgins (Pacific Highway Manager, Pacific Highway Office) saying if the CRW went ahead, it would be one of the costliest projects the RTA would build.
- 3.40 CC: Cost did have to be considered, but it was not the only factor. There were a great range of other issues. For example, with Option A, there were major environmental and indigenous heritage issues and that was clear at the VMW held in April 2003. While cost was an issue, it was by far not the only issue. Even Option E was not the cheapest option and therefore an indication that cost was not the only consideration.
- 3.41 TP: The final recommendation was based on value for that option, rather than cost. Option E had a \$15m higher cost than C1 but the value bought was seen to be justified and substantial. In the southern section, IN2 had a greater cost than IN1 but its value over it was seen to be justified. Conversely, IS2 was found not to be justified because the value it provided was just not there.
- 3.42 A CFG member: They had talked about value to the community but what about the cost of lost opportunity for the land affected by Option E?
- 3.43 A CFG member said the group might like to think that Coffs Harbour and Woolgoolga were the centre of the universe but, on the South Coast, the topic of conversation was how much money was spent on the Pacific Highway as opposed to the Princess Highway. It had been getting a great deal of press from the MPs and radio wanting

Details:

Action By/Date:

money diverted. The reality was the Minister had to make decisions based on the whole State and that was the Minister's job. The RTA didn't announce the preferred option without the Minister making the decision. There was no doubt that the Minister made the decision.

- 3.44 A CFG member: You mentioned the extra cost of \$15m of Option E over Option C which was the construction cost. But there were other costs. Option C showed cost to the Government of lost revenue by interfering with the West Woolgoolga DCP which would be a loss of \$20-\$26m. So it was misleading to say that Option E would cost \$15m more because it was actually \$5-\$11m cheaper.
- 3.45 TP: He could not comment on Council's costs.
- 3.46 The CFG member: But it should have been taken into account.
- 3.47 TP: The assessment hadn't tried to put a dollar value on all impacts and benefits and they had said that from the start. That was why Option E had been basically generally accepted.
- 3.48 CC: If they were comparing construction costs with construction costs, Option C1 was cheaper. But they also made other comparisons in qualitative terms. At this point in time, there was no universally accepted method of applying costs to those other issues.
- 3.49 The CFG member: No, these were about dollar figures – the cost of the overall route benefit to the Government.
- 3.50 TP: They were urban development figures.
- 3.51 A CFG member asked could they get to what they came here for?
- 3.52 A CFG member: Wasn't that what they were here for?
- 3.53 A CFG member: If people weren't prepared to listen to that, they shouldn't be there.
- 3.54 A CFG member: Would there be a separate VM report?
- 3.55 CC: It was part of the Preferred Option Report – Appendix C.
- 3.56 The CFG member: The previous VM report didn't have as wide a coverage as this one.
- 3.57 CC: The Preferred Option Report also included the previous VM report.
- 3.58 A CFG member: Would they get a timeframe tonight?
- 3.59 A CFG member: Further to the discussion on figures, he didn't agree that Option E was \$15m more expensive than C1. It was misleading and he wanted it Noted.

**The comment has been Noted as requested.*

4. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

- 4.1 CC: Early next year the geotechnical investigations would start which would lead into the concept design. The concept design stage would be followed by an environmental impact assessment which would involve a number of specialist studies. The list shown on the slide was not exhaustive. Interviews with property owners directly affected by the preferred option were being carried out. The EIA would be placed on exhibition for public comment and responses would be provided to the comments received. Approval of the EIS would then be sought. The anticipated program shown was based on earlier similar projects. Approval of the project represented a key milestone. Once approval was given, the RTA could then

Copies of presentation slides attached

Details:

Action By/Date:

initiate property acquisitions. In the meantime, the RTA could respond to property owner initiated acquisitions but could not initiate them itself. Construction was dependent on a range of factors including funding. The timeframe provided was a best estimate but a guarantee could not be given on it.

- 4.2 CFG member: This was on the whole Sapphire to Woolgoolga section?
- 4.3 CC: Yes. The concept design and an EIA would be carried out on the whole length. There was a need to maintain flexibility to enable the proposal to be constructed in stages.
- 4.4 A CFG member: Acquisition would not take place until late 2006 so property owners having interviews were saying what if they found a rare orchid smack in the alignment. This would mean deviation and could mean some property owners might not be in the firing line after the EIA.
- 4.5 CC: The RTA could not initiate the acquisition process at this time. Under the Just Terms Compensation Act, there was a distinct difference between what the RTA could do and what property owners could do. Now that they had a preferred route, if a property owner wanted to sell their property and could not, the owner could approach the RTA to acquire it. As of the announcement last Tuesday, property owners could initiate the process.
- 4.6 The CFG member: But it was an important point.
- 4.7 CC: Some property owners felt as if their lives were frozen at the moment but that was not the case. They can approach the RTA so if the members knew any of these people, they could tell them to either ring him or the RTA's property division people.
- 4.8 The CFG member: So if a rare orchid was found, they would already have sold to the RTA and the RTA could then sell the property if it was no longer affected.
- 4.9 CC: Yes, the RTA could still sell it.
- 4.10 TP: There were risks. The preferred option had been based on all the investigations that had been done. Inevitably, there would be some changes but it was rare that there were major alignment shifts. But they needed to look at it in finer detail. Constraints might come up.
- 4.11 A CFG member: How often did the RTA purchase prior to an EIA coming out?
- 4.12 CC: A number of times. The number depended on how many approaches it received. It had occurred on a reasonable number of occasions.
- 4.13 A CFG member: Did the RTA have a preference for the construction of the stages?
- 4.14 CC: What would be constructed depended on the availability of funding.
- 4.15 The CFG member: If it was constructed all in one go, would it change the completion date?
- 4.16 CC: He could not make commitments on behalf of a Government of the future.
- 4.17 A CFG member: Whether you wanted to construct it in one piece or split up, the reality was it would have to be split up – it was an engineering decision.
- 4.18 TP: There were areas that would be critical for delivery – for example, you might carry out the earthworks but they could sit for months and then you might address the pavements etc. Maintaining funding of the Pacific Highway would be a key

Details:

Action By/Date:

consideration.

- 4.19 A CFG member: If you constructed it in stages, the Government might lower the money allocated for construction. Wasn't it all supposed to be started by 2004?
- 4.20 TP: That prediction was always qualified by saying it could be 'an early start'.
- 4.21 CC: And that's exactly why he was hesitant about stating timeframes and always made qualifying statements because people tended to remember the timeframe but not the qualifier. The next stage was the concept design. There were two intersections that were to have interchanges – the intersection of the existing highway with Moonee Beach Road and the existing highway with Headlands Road. These were based on the traffic volumes expected. The other intersections would be seagull intersections.
- 4.22 CFG member: Seagull turns under heavy traffic conditions were dangerous now. Under future traffic conditions, they were not on.
- 4.23 CC: They had had discussions about these before. Grade separated intersections were safer but at the end of the day they had to use the money available and get the best results in terms of adequate service. But they were also looking at future design needs and the process was now entering the concept design phase where they would be looking at that.
- 4.24 A CFG member: Would property acquisitions take account of future interchange needs?
- 4.25 CC: Yes, they had been particularly looking at interchange locations and setting boundaries based on that.
- 4.26 TP: It was important not to forget that the southern end of Woolgoolga and at Arrawarra Creek would be interchanges in the future and that the strategy would need to look at other locations.
- 4.27 A CFG member: Noted they said possible interchange locations – so at this stage there was no absolute certainty?
- 4.28 TP: The time issue was why uncertainty sat on those.
- 4.29 A CFG member: Would they consider putting an interchange in the middle rather than two later?
- 4.30 CC: They would put the concept design out to the community and that sort of suggestion might be made. They would have to look at what the feedback was and they had done that all the way through the project.
- 4.31 TP: Part of the process was assessing if those things might come in earlier rather than later.
- 4.32 CC then outlined the process in the southern (Coffs) section. The RTA had made an offer to Council to assist with the replanning of North Boambee Valley.
- 4.33 A CFG member: Did that include the completion of Hogbin Drive?
- 4.34 CC: The RTA was looking at a broad package of works not necessarily restricted to the existing highway.
- 4.35 The CFG member: The assessment of the southern section was based on Hogbin Drive being completed.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 4.36 CC: Yes, it was based on Hogbin Drive being completed and the other ring roads that Council had planned being completed.
- 4.37 The CFG member: Would the Government do the work or would it give it to Council?
- 4.38 CC: Didn't know what shape the package would be – they would have to identify the works first.
- 4.39 A CFG member: The media release said the RTA would now work closely with Council – was that saying that it didn't before?
- 4.40 Another CFG member: Coffs had always been the bottleneck. In five years, it would be intolerable. Given travel times and the number of accidents, he was perplexed why the RTA was of the view that Coffs Harbour was a longer-term project. Coffs Harbour was the greatest problem, more so than Woolgoolga.
- 4.41 A CFG member: Disagreed. If Hogbin Drive was completed it would take southern traffic off the existing highway. There was nothing to take the pressure off once you were north of Coffs Harbour. With local traffic, the increase in traffic would be from Moonee and the Northern Beaches. The northern section was the most pressing.
- 4.42 CFG member: So he was saying from Bucca north?
- 4.43 CFG member: No, from Sapphire.
- 4.44 Another CFG member agreed.
- 4.45 CFG member: Traffic was getting heavier, the accident rate was increasing and now they were adding the Moonee Beach development and other development on both sides of the highway.
- 4.46 CC: The average travel speed through Coffs Harbour was slower but road safety also was important. The accidents in Coffs Harbour were mostly fender benders whereas there had been a number of fatalities on the highway north which was an important consideration in providing dual carriageway.
- 4.47 CFG member: Could not see Coffs Harbour waiting 20 years. Building Option E would not save any lives at the moment.
- 4.48 CC: The other aspect of the answer was value for money. There was a lot of scope to get value through a package of works for Coffs Harbour which was far better spending than building the preferred route in the short-term.
- 4.49 A CFG member: Agreed that waiting 20 years was not on.
- 4.50 CC: There could be increasing pressure on the Government to bring that timeframe forward.
- 4.51 A CFG member: It was a pity politicians reacted rather than stepping forward. They reacted to people jumping up and down and that was a pity.

Break from 7.35pm to 8pm.

5. FUTURE CFG ROLE AND MEMBERSHIP

- 5.1 CC: There was a need to progress the refined concept design and the environmental impact assessment. This would mean a significant change in the role of the current CFGs and they were looking for people who could help in that process, bring their views and understandings of how it could be improved or modified and also

Details:

Action By/Date:

contribute to the EIA process. It would mean providing input into issues such as noise, air quality etc. It would not mean going back and revisiting what had been done in the development of the strategy. The refined concept design was expected to be developed by mid-2005. It was a short timeframe and would be an intensive process. He asked for any suggestions or observations.

- 5.2 CFG member: His suggestion was that, with Option E and an upgrade of the existing highway, surely the CFGs should have people from the areas affected. If they had one group dealing with the whole section, the group would be covering too large an area. It would be more beneficial to split the groups as they did now.
- 5.3 A CFG member: Suggested staying with two groups and on the third or fourth meeting, have the two groups come together.
- 5.4 TP: There might be some need to tweak the design from Sapphire to Moonee but, at the Woolgoolga end, they were traversing a new area.
- 5.5 A CFG member: From south of Woolgoolga to Sapphire there were some sorts of changes but Option E was a different set of circumstances.
- 5.6 CFG member: Thought if there were two groups, they should meet together sometimes.
- 5.7 CC: The combined meetings they had held previously had been when there were key announcements thus enabling them to hear the same information at the same time.
- 5.8 AS: Asked what about the size of the groups? Would they be more of a working group?
- 5.9 TP: There would be a lot of scope for working 'hands on'.
- 5.10 A CFG member: Primarily the size of the group should be dictated by the size of the area to be covered.
- 5.11 CFG member: But they needed sufficient representation from the areas affected.
- 5.12 AS: How many members – 12-15? .
- 5.13 CC: They needed a practical working size.
- 5.14 CFG member: Two groups of between 12-15 members.
- 5.15 CC: Was there a feeling that they needed to extend the area covered by the Sapphire-Moonee group to Sandy Beach?
- 5.16 A CFG member: Did they need a fresh set of faces?
- 5.17 CC: We could contact the members of the two CFGs and see who wanted to stay on, consider if there were areas not currently represented that needed to be or perhaps the group here could suggest where there were major holes and they could advertise for representation if needed be. But he suggested there was not a need to make a commitment to something there but rather leave it flexible.
- 5.18 A CFG member: Well the exciting part was now over.
- 5.19 Another CFG member: Didn't agree. The design concepts would have significant impacts on the community eg through noise and environmental issues.
- 5.20 A CFG member: There was value in retaining some of the members because of their prior knowledge of the project.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 5.21 A CFG member: Now they had a plan, he could see the group would break up into sectional interests – so what was CC looking for in terms of help?
- 5.22 CC: He needed a review of the thoughts and ideas they were putting together for the design, a sounding board. It would be hands-on stuff. They didn't have blank paper – they had designs they had prepared to date and were working through more. Some of the more detailed information would contribute to the functionality of the road.
- 5.23 TP: They wanted to be challenged. That was why they had had 15 forums. They wanted to be challenged in the next stage whether it was 'what about my access?' or finding an endangered orchid.
- 5.24 A CFG member: Therefore they needed local representation from each area. If it was not already represented, then they had to find it either by invitation or advertising.
- 5.25 TP: Thought they had representation from all the areas affected.
- 5.26 The CFG member: Unless there were some who won't want to be involved.
- 5.27 CC: It was important to have certain community interest groups represented, for example, there was a member who represented environmental interests on the Sapphire-Moonee CFG. Those sorts of groups had to be represented.
- 5.28 A CFG member: Suggested they would get better output from the CFGs if they presented the questions they needed input to before a meeting and the members could go back to their groups and get feedback. This would give them forewarning of what sort of input would be required.
- 5.29 Another CFG member: They needed committed members and not casual observers.
- 5.30 Another CFG member: Thought some of the suggestions had been good. They could tell us the stage they were up to and say here were the options and they could meet with their communities and get feedback and then hold the CFG meeting.
- 5.31 Another CFG member: If interests were sectional, was it easier to have say small groups rather than one big one?
- 5.32 CC: Larger numbers of groups were more resource hungry. Two separate groups was probably a good way to go. They could have working groups within one meeting and deal with the separate sections.
- 5.33 A CFG member: Some members had more than one interest – he had environmental interests, social interests and was also a representative of the Chamber of Commerce.
- 5.34 CC: But when the working groups got back together, there would be a lot of information crossing all those areas.
- 5.35 A CFG member: It depended whether some members obtained input from the community or whether they were just going through the motions. Could they have any presentation for the meetings sent out beforehand so they could analyse and research and then have the meeting?
- 5.36 CC: Noted the suggestion. They had been sensitive to criticisms of presentations not being sent out beforehand and it had been talked about so they would look at how the process could be improved. They didn't want to spend time just going through

Details:

Action By/Date:

the motions.

- 5.37 A CFG member: Did not necessarily agree with a split. There was commonality between the areas.
- 5.38 A CFG member: Said he looked around and saw the usual suspects. They could bring in 12 or 15 more – fresh people.
- 5.39 CC: In defence of those that were not there, they needed to give them the option of whether they wanted to continue.
- 5.40 The CFG member: Some he hadn't seen in years.
- 5.41 A CFG member: Didn't agree with the suggestion to not have two groups. They could select those who had attended meetings but there were areas on Option E and at Mullaway that needed to be brought on board.
- 5.42 CC: Yes, they hadn't brought anyone new into the group since Option E was investigated.
- 5.43 Further discussion followed.
- 5.44 A CFG member: What about agricultural representation? They had had some members representing that area but they had to make sure they did turn up.
- 5.45 A CFG member: They were looking at issues from an industry perspective. Did they need the guy who would lose his land?
- 5.46 AS: Perhaps they could generate a list of areas that needed to be represented as well as ask the current members who wanted to stay.
- 5.47 A CFG member: What about Aboriginal community representation?
- 5.48 AS: They had discussed previously that there were other avenues for receiving their input.
- 5.49 A CFG member: Suggested they look at the attendance list for the last two years and those not attending at least half the meetings be sent a "show cause" letter asking them what they could contribute.
- 5.50 CC suggested a softer approach – a phone call.
- 5.51 The CFG member: Said it had been just a figure of speech but they should be approached to see what they could contribute.
- 5.52 Another CFG member: There was a significant difference between what they were looking at now and what was previous. There were certain people who came in on a more political basis before rather than a hands-on basis – they needed a commitment to some serious work.
- 5.53 A CFG member suggested the Heritage Park and Bucca areas be included in the southern group because they would share issues about a link road.
- 5.54 CC: Believed they had a fair feeling for what the groups wanted.
- 5.55 A CFG member: An overlap might occur – how would they deal with that?
- 5.56 AS: That could be solved. They would get together a list, make calls to the existing members and come back to the members.
- 5.57 A CFG member: Asked about the frequency of meetings? The last meeting was five

Pramax to contact existing members of the Woolgoolga Area and Sapphire-Moonee CFGs about their continuing involvement. Pramax to contact members advising of the community sections that have been identified as needing representation on the CFG and that approaches will be made to

Details:

Action By/Date:

- and a half months ago which was too long.
- 5.58 CC: About every two months was a target.
- 5.59 A CFG member asked when would Council be informed of the preferred option decision?
- 5.60 CC: A formal letter had been sent to Council.
- 5.61 A CFG member: Would there be a media release from this meeting?
- 5.62 CC: Was there anything to make a media release out of?
- 5.63 The CFG member: Thought there was community misunderstanding that this was the Minister's decision and it needed to be clarified.
- 5.64 CC: There could be issues in getting a media release out.
- 5.65 **AS: There possibly were some misunderstandings in the community but they had had this discussion before regarding difficulties in getting a media release out. There were only a few weeks until Christmas.*
- 5.66 *A CFG member: It did seem that there were some people who were not certain.*
- 5.67 *A CFG member: But it was an issue that should be addressed.*
- 5.68 *CC: I'll take it up.*
- 5.69 *A CFG member: Who's Karen Smith?*
- 5.70 *CC: She's part of the RTA's communications section.*
- 5.71 *A CFG member: But there was not one mention of the Minister in the media release...*
- 5.72 CC agreed to take the matter up.
- 5.73 A CFG member: Were they expecting responses from the community?
- 5.74 CC: They would accept responses at any time but the document (Community Update No.6) was more advice. They would consider any responses received.

community groups to fill any 'gaps'

6. CLOSE OF MEETING

Meeting closed at 8.50 pm.