

Meeting Minutes

Project:	Sapphire to Woolgoolga Upgrade Project	Reference:	1093.40.GE
Location:	Woolgoolga Bowling Club, Board Room	Date:	13 June 2006

Present: Apology: Copy: Name:

SAPPHIRE TO WOOLGOOLGA SOUTHERN CFG (Sapphire/Moonee Area)			
▼			Vincent Brooker
▼			Jim Browne
▼			Steve Clemesha
▼			Ray Faggotter
▼			Jill Heris
	▼		Tammy Mills-Thom
	▼		Shinichi Otani
▼			Phil Price
▼			Col South
▼			Gary Davey
▼			Greg Benson
	▼		Kevin Knott
	▼		John Langhorn
▼			Peter Lubans
	▼		Jeff Burrows (proxy)
	▼		Sue Neil
	▼		Leslie Meredith (proxy)
	▼		Sandy Van Veluwen
	▼		Paul Norton
SAPPHIRE TO WOOLGOOLGA NORTHERN CFG (Woolgoolga Bypass)			
	▼		Graham Ashton
▼			Rebecca Pickering (proxy)
	▼		Parvinder Lalli

▼			Kashmir Singh Gill (proxy)
	▼		Tony Johnson
	▼		John Shipway (proxy)
	▼		Paul Norton
	▼		Ron Gray
	▼		Margaret Murphy
▼			Richard Casey (Proxy)
▼			Steven Moody
▼			Phillip Pearce
▼			Des Saunders
▼			Bruce Scanlon
	▼		Satpal Singh Gill
▼			Paramjeet Singh Bhatti
▼			Rashmere Bhatti
▼			Robert Forrest
PROJECT TEAM			
✓			Chris Clark RTA
✓			Adam Cameron RTA
✓			Tim Paterson Connell Wagner
✓			Lucia Coletta Connell Wagner
✓			Andrew Smith JMS Consulting
✓			Denise Wilson ID Planning
Recorded By: Andrew Smith and Lucia Coletta			Total Pages:
Subject: Combined Sapphire to Woolgoolga Community Focus Group Meeting No 18			

Details:

Action By/Date:

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Denise Wilson (DW) opened the meeting at 5.45 pm.
- 1.2 DW introduced herself and her background. Invited Chris Clark (CC) to talk to the CFG in regards to why there was a change in facilitator. CC welcomed DW

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.1 DW stated that the minutes be discussed at the next separate CFG meetings, rather than be discussed at this meeting.
- 2.2 Bruce Scanlon (BS) indicated that it had been more than 12 months since the last CFG meeting- when would the next meeting be held
- 2.3 DW indicated a date had not been established for the next meeting but that the minutes would be out 2 weeks from the CFG meeting
- 2.4 Richard Casey (RC) indicated that if the minutes would not be discussed until the next meeting, then the agenda (which had been placed on the chairs) was incorrect.
- 2.5 DW indicated the agenda had recently been altered and apologised for it and noted that Item 2 "Matters from Previous Meeting" would be covered under Item 5 "Issues arising from last meeting".
- 2.6 BS mentioned that the CFG had previously requested that information and the Project Team agreed that it would be provided prior to the meeting. Why wasn't this the case this time?
- 2.7 Tim Paterson (TP) noted that the presentation material was updated in the last week. The information presented was the most recent information.
- 2.8 BS: Could have and should have been sent to the CFG members that week
- 2.9 DW invited CC to begin presentation (slides of presentation provided at CFG meeting)

Copy of PowerPoint Presentation to be provided to CFG members

3. Presentation

- 3.1 Pacific Highway Upgrade Program
- 3.2 CC updated the CFG on the Pacific Highway Upgrade Program including upgrade work completed to date and funding arrangements.
- 3.3 BS wanted to know out of the 233km of highway that had been turned into 4 lane carriageway, what percentage was Class A and what percentage was Class M.
- 3.4 CC did not know off the top of his head and he wouldn't guess off hand. Some notable examples of Class M projects include the Yelgun to Chinderah and Bulahdelah projects.
- 3.5 BS could you provide the figures next CFG meeting?
- 3.6 CC indicated he would and continued the presentation
- 3.7 Gary Davey (GD): in the 3 year financial agreement between the NSW and federal government or in the MOU, was there any mention of the Coffs Harbour CBD Bypass?
- 3.8 CC responded that he was not aware of any specific mention in the MOU
- 3.9 GD: No funding until 2009?
- 3.10 CC: No, not for that project
- 3.11 JB: the construction for S2W is to start in 3 years time?
- 3.12 CC: hopefully construction would start in 2008/2009

ACTION: CC to provide figures on the percentage of dual carriageway that is Class M/A

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.13 DW thanked CC for his presentation and invited Clyde Treadwell (CT) to present an update on Coffs Harbour City Council (CHCC)'s strategic planning strategies
- 3.14 CHCC Strategic Planning
- 3.15 CT gave an overview of planning issues of the past couple of years. Council had prepared a Settlement Strategy which provides direction for the Coffs Harbour City until 2030 when there is estimated to be a population of 100 000 people. The proposed Pacific Highway Upgrade of Sapphire to Woolgoolga has been incorporated into this strategy. This Strategy replaces the 1996 Urban Development Strategy. The Strategy is planned to go before Council on Wednesday night (15th of June) with the recommendation that it be put on public exhibition from July to September.
- 3.16 RC wanted to know where he could get a copy
- 3.17 CT: copies could be found on the website and there will only be limited hardcopies produced upon request. They had printed out a 1000 copies of a previous document where only 700 were picked up.
- 3.18 RC indicated that the reason that the hardcopies were not picked up was because Council did not chase the community for feedback/comments
- 3.19 CT indicated that there would be community forums held in relation to the Settlement Strategy.
- 3.20 RB: Would they be held just in Woolgoolga?
- 3.21 CT: Yes, there would be a forum held in Woolgoolga
- 3.22 Col South (CS): Would there be a display at Moonee Shopping Centre?
- 3.23 CT indicated that some form of display could be considered
- 3.24 CT: DCP's that have come into force- Moonee DCP (providing for 5000 people), Sandy Beach/Hearns Lake DCP (Independent Town from Woolgoolga), West Woolgoolga Release Area DCP (released in October 2004). 30/40 large Development Applications had either been approved or were in the approval process. An example is a DA for 380 lots at Moonee Beach which is with the Department of Planning for approval. Other DA's include development at Emerald Beach, Hearns Lake and Woolgoolga. CT indicated that he would provide a listing of DA's to DW to provide to the CFG members.
- 3.25 BS: the Council states that it is heading in the direction that the community wants it to. However, Option E is not in the community interest and Council endorses it.
- 3.26 CT: Council considered a report in December 2004, and did not specifically endorse the option.
- 3.27 BS: Council adopted Option E in a Council meeting. He knew because he was at meeting
- 3.28 CT: report was considered by Council in 2004
- 3.29 RC: suggested that Council not support anything that affects agriculture
- 3.30 CT: Council did not necessarily support the Upgrade Option
- 3.31 BS: If Council supported the community, how was this possible if it is in support of

ACTION for CT to consider possibility of community display at Moonee Shopping Centre

CT to provide response to question on the 15

Details:

- Option E? What about the other 15 recommendations in the report considered by Council?
- 3.32 CT: Feedback had been received from the community and had been taken into account, however there were other considerations that had to be taken into account. The upgrade option was the position that the Government had taken, so Council had to adopt the Option as a basis for their Settlement Strategy.
- 3.33 RC: then Council must spell out why Council isn't doing what the community wants
- 3.34 DW advised that the meeting needed to move forward. She would ask CT one more time to answer the question as best as he could
- 3.35 CT: would take the comments on board
- 3.36 DW thanked CT and invited TP to give a presentation on an update of the field investigations
- 3.37 Field Investigations
- 3.38 BS: 15 months ago aerial photography was out of date, has new photography been done?
- 3.39 TP: New flying was undertaken in about May 2005
- 3.40 BS: Some properties weren't shown on the old aerials
- 3.41 TP: Correct, new flying done to update and correct inaccuracies.
- 3.42 RC: Why haven't the reports been released to the public?
- 3.43 TP: The reports aren't finished yet
- 3.44 RC: That is not right- they have been completed and forwarded to you (TP)
- 3.45 TP: some reports were in draft form since before December 2005 but due to the delays in gaining access to properties for the geotechnical investigations and survey, design was not completed and hence impact assessments could not be completed
- 3.46 RC: But the impact assessment has been done
- 3.47 TP: No, the field investigations have been done and the impact assessments are in progress
- 3.48 GD: How can you say that there are "no absolute constraints" if the reports are not completed?
- 3.49 TP: A Project Team meeting had been convened on the Friday before (9 June 2006), where specialist ecological consultants had provided their professional judgement on the potential ecological impacts of the proposal
- 3.50 RC: Why hasn't the community been given the opportunity to provide input?
- 3.51 TP: There is a formal process for community input. The technical reports are compiled and summarised as part of the EA. The EA and the reports are released for community review. Prior to that, the RTA as proponent will review the draft reports, and there will be an editorial process.
- 3.52 RC: Then the community can provide input. No opportunity given for input in the field investigations. Why are the reports secret?

Action By/Date:

recommendations in the report considered by Council and an update on Council's position on the announced option

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.53 TP: They are not secret. All the assessments and reports are still being drafted.
- 3.54 Des Saunders (DS): Field Investigations completed- Geotech Mar 06, Flora and Fauna Feb 06. Why is the Project Team waiting to release all the information? Why not provide the field investigation information?
- 3.55 RC: Other projects release this information
- 3.56 DS: How can you say that there are no "absolute constraints"
- 3.57 TP: Consultants had provided their professional judgement on the potential impacts of the proposal on Friday
- 3.58 DW: (to TP) What information is available for the CFG?
- 3.59 TP: Most draft reports will be done by the next CFG and key findings can be presented
- 3.60 DS: Wants field investigations information released. Community consultation is a joke- being done in name only
- 3.61 TP: summary information can be provided at the next CFG
- 3.62 DW: There seems to be a feeling in the CFG that they would like the information released. Can information be presented at the next CFG meeting?
- 3.63 RC: preferably before the meeting
- 3.64 Greg Benson (GB): What was the detail of the study area?
- 3.65 TP: It depends on the individual study as to the different layers of information required, which would affect the study area analysed, but in general, it looked at a 200-250m wide corridor.
- 3.66 BS: the presentation information had not been provided to the CFG prior to the meeting, this was not the first time that the CFG had requested it and the Project Team agreed to supply the information prior to the meeting. Also, why are the reports not completed when the field investigations were completed in February-March 2006 and some in mid 2005?
- 3.67 TP: Well for example with the heritage report we had to get additional information from Jacqui Collins, the consultant archaeologist on an aboriginal heritage site, which resulted in altering the design.
- 3.68 RB: Going back to DS's comments- how can the field investigations be completed if the route isn't yet known
- 3.69 TP: the Study Area analysed is sufficiently wide to accommodate any changes in the route option and the investigations have occurred in this area.
- 3.70 RB: you mentioned earlier that the RTA would "edit" the reports
- 3.71 TP: No, I didn't say that
- 3.72 Short discussion with various CFG members expressing opinions about whether TP said the word "edit" or not.
- 3.73 DW: TP could you please provide an explanation on the process
- 3.74 TP: the reports are provided to the RTA as part of a review and editorial process that

CC and TP to determine available information package to be distributed to CFG members prior the next meeting

Details:

Action By/Date:

is usual for all such projects. Most of the reports are technical - this process ensures that the document content is accurate and can be easily read by non-technical people.

3.75 RB: So the community receives filtered information?

3.76 TP: Not the word I would use

3.77 BS: Previously, there has been the release of confidential information to the CFG. Why isn't this being done now?

3.78 TP: That is what is being done

3.79 BS: Noise assessment- there is no draft report?

3.80 TP: No

3.81 TP continues presentation (Agricultural Assessment)

3.82 Kashmir Gill (KG): What did the Noise assessment show?

3.83 TP: the noise monitoring shows the ambient or background noise both before and after the upgrade. No modelling completed yet but it will address both before and after the upgrade. It will also split the noise into heavy/light vehicles and day/night figures

3.84 GD: Have noise mitigation measures already been designed

3.85 TP: We have a pretty good idea of the areas that would require noise mitigation, but not detailed individual site details.

3.86 GD: If only fine-tuning, why not release the data?

Noise data to be released next CFG

3.87 TP: we can release the key findings at the next CFG

3.88 BS Will it be released?

3.89 TP: yes

3.90 JB: indicated that he had detected a change in the level of noise from the highway. He had also been receiving subjective reports that the traffic had become louder. In the past year there had been an increase in noise level, and was unsure whether it was due to things like the design of vehicles

TP to ask Wilkinson Murray about changes in level of noise in recent years

3.91 TP: I can't comment on that, but I will ask Wilkinson Murray (noise consultants)

3.92 JB: Level of noise has changed in the past couple of years

CW to check if and when a response was made to Margaret Murphy letter re access to her property

3.93 RC: RTA and CW installing monitors on private property without the permission of owners. Margaret Murphy sent a letter to CW outlining conditions to access her property. She never got a response.

3.94 TP: There will be no more field investigations on private property

3.95 RC: Was there any noise assessment done for flora/fauna?

TP to ask Wilkinson Murray about noise assessment for flora/fauna

3.96 TP: Unsure if there was, but will ask

3.97 Peter Lubans (PL): noise levels during drought are a lot louder than a non-drought period.

3.98 TP: Will take the comments on board

Details:

Action By/Date:

3.99 KG: The agricultural assessment shows the properties which would be severely impacted on by the proposal. But there are other properties which would be affected to a lesser degree.

**TP to refer this to Wilkinson
Murray**

3.100 TP: Yes, the assessment will assess all the properties impacted

3.101 KG: Had the report been recently undertaken?

3.102 TP: Yes, Hartley International has undertaken the assessment and draft report

3.103 KG: Why Hartley?

3.104 TP: They are specialists and had been involved in the route option stage

3.105 KG: Why was Option B dismissed?

3.106 TP: There had been a large piece of work undertaken in assessing Option B with many factors considered

3.107 KG: Why was Option B dismissed on agricultural grounds, but Option E is still being assessed?

3.108 TP: the process looked at all the issues and the decision process chose Option E as the preferred route

3.109 KG: The agricultural properties were not assessed for Option E previously

3.110 TP: It was considered previously and is being undertaken in more detail at this stage for the preferred route

3.111 BS: (to CT) Is Council going to be happy with the removal of Class A agriculture land?

3.112 CT: South Woolgoolga has a Special Investigation Area, where Council is looking to rezone the land to urban land use. The land will not be rural/agricultural forever.

3.113 RB: What about the rest of the agricultural land?

3.114 CT: Council cannot rezone all agricultural land as being urban land use as only some areas are suitable, and the Settlement Strategy shows that the Council would only have to accommodate a further 35 000 people in the Local Government Area.

3.115 GB: A detailed analysis was included in the Route Options Report for the first 5 route options developed. Nothing was done for Option E

3.116 CC: Option E was developed after the report came out

3.117 RB: Wanted to clarify KG question earlier- how come agriculture affects on B were assessed but not for Option E? Why wasn't it done? Sikh community has 19 properties severely affected. Why was agriculture an important impact on Option B, but not on Option E?

3.118 TP: There has been no change in process, agriculture is an important issue, which is why it is being currently assessed.

3.119 RB: This meeting is about the RTA/CW agenda- what about the community agenda?

3.120 TP: The reason that Option E was chosen as the preferred route is documented in the Preferred Option Report released in late 2004. It has been 18 months in the public domain. The CFG's role is now to focus on Option E. The Project Team/ RTA

Details:

- are duty bound to assess all the issues properly on Option E.
- 3.121 RB: Option B was rejected due to agricultural reasons?
- 3.122 TP: Partly, yes, but many other factors considered
- 3.123 RC: The CW report said that it was 2nd class banana and vegetable land which was why it was rejected
- 3.124 TP: It is not that simple
- 3.125 RB: What about a response to my earlier question?
- 3.126 DW asked RB to clarify the question RB stated that 18 Sikh properties were affected by option E and there appears to be a difference in the criteria used to address the different options
- 3.127 TP: The earlier agricultural report was used in the Route Option Report. The purpose of this CFG phase is to examine the design parameters for the current preferred route, not debate its selection
- 3.128 BS: commented that there were far too many items on the agenda- and there had not been proper consultation
- 3.129 GD: commented that while Tim was duty bound to consider all the design issues for Option E, the CFG is duty bound to question and raise concerns about the selection of Option E on behalf of the community
- 3.130 DW asked that the discussion move on
- 3.131 TP continued with the presentation (Sikh Community Impact Assessment)
- 3.132 SM: Had a few issues: Why wasn't the Sikh Community Impact Assessment within the Heritage Report? He had accompanied the agricultural specialist but had not seen any wind sector study taking place. SM expected to see Wind Vector study to be included in the agricultural assessment. The agricultural report had a lot of assumptions.
- 3.133 TP: The Sikh assessment was a component of the Social/Heritage assessments.
- 3.134 RB: wanted to know why the Sikh Community Assessment was being undertaken, she commented that while it looked good the process showed the inability of the RTA and CW to consult with the community.
- 3.135 CC: outlined the consultation that had taken place for the Sikh Cultural Assessment. Meetings or presentations were held in both temples, followed by one on one discussions at the First Sikh temple and a workshop at the Guru Nanak temple. There was then a joint meeting with the community to discuss the impact of the proposal. The attendees at the meeting considered that this was not the best manner to get the information and asked that written submissions be accepted. In response, it was decided to allow four weeks for written responses to be received. At the subsequent CRC meeting with the Sikh Community, the timeframe was extended to the 28 July 2006.
- 3.136 RB: the Sikh community was disappointed in the consultation. The consultant only asked a few questions- what the cultural issues were and kept pushing them to find positive impacts of the proposal. The community sees that they were not going to be looked at seriously. The community is mostly non-English speaking and the timeframe wasn't sufficient to respond to the consultation

Action By/Date:

TP to refer to pages in the agricultural reports in response to RB and KB issue of agric. assessment

TP to talk to Hartley International about Wind Vector Study

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.137 BS: Had previously asked why the Sikh Community had only been consulted after the route had been selected. They were only consulted after the CFG meeting last year.
- 3.138 CC: The RTA had always consulted with the Sikh Community. There have always been 2 places on the CFG put aside for the Sikh Community, flyers etc. had been translated in Punjabi
- 3.139 RC: The RTA cannot see that their consultation has failed. They are meant to "engage the community" but they had failed. The consultant, Manidis Roberts was conning the Sikhs. What was the scope of the assessment? It seems all that they were interested in was the positive impacts of the proposal
- 3.140 RB: All consultants have an evaluation of their processes. If the RTA had had an evaluation of the consultation process, they would have picked up sooner that only 1 Sikh member had attended
- 3.141 DW said that it would have to be a point that the RTA and the Sikh Community would have to differ on. DW moved the meeting on. TP continued with the presentation (Traffic Assessment)
- 3.142 BS: General Public and WAR is cynical of the RTA traffic volume studies. They conducted their own study which concluded vastly different numbers of traffic (approximately double). CW took the report on board, and the RTA re-surveyed and found similar numbers.
- 3.143 TP: The WAR survey had been provided at a CFG meeting. However there was no RTA re-survey. The information received from WAR was assessed and the figures correlated quite well with the RTA survey findings.
- 3.144 BS: The RTA figures were half of what was found in the WAR survey
- 3.145 CC: There was a good correlation between the RTA and WAR information. The figure of 7200/7300 in the RTA's report was for vehicles between River and Clarence Street, not at the Woolgoolga roundabout where WAR did its survey.
- 3.146 GD: That's the problem, the RTA surveyed the lowest traffic volume section of the highway
- 3.147 TP: Traffic data from other locations was collected and documented in the reports
- 3.148 TP moved onto the Graphs of historical traffic data
- 3.149 JB: Why was there a kink in the graph (see attached slides)
- 3.150 CC: The red line was a line of best fit to the historically recorded data. The kink was to replicate the opening of the highway to B-doubles, resulting in an increase in traffic volume.
- 3.151 JB: So you have changed the data
- 3.152 CC: No, it was just representing the recorded increase in heavy vehicles when the Yelgun to Chinderah section of highway opened up the Pacific Highway to B-Doubles
- 3.153 JB: Questioned the statistical methodology of the Chart. The Chart shouldn't have a kink in it.
- 3.154 Ray Faggotter (RF): It is not a line of best fit. A line of best fit through those points would be a type of parabolic line. The data set suggests an exponential increase not

**The Brief/Scope of Services
for the Sikh Cultural
Impact Assessment to
be provided to the CFG**

Details:

Action By/Date:

- the linear one shown - RF wanted to know if the line was computer generated or manually drawn in
- 3.155 CC: The line was manually devised, but drawn by the computer
- 3.156 RF: It is rubbish
- 3.157 CC: There has been some discussion between traffic engineers on the appropriate methodology for traffic forecasting
- 3.158 GD: So the traffic surveys are conducted every two years. So there should be another set of traffic data out this year.
- 3.159 CC: Probably next year
- 3.160 CS: There was a request by CFG members to look at the increase in heavy vehicles on the Pacific Highway and the decrease on the New England Highway after the Yelgun to Chinderah project was opened to traffic. The figures received should be re-collated
- 3.161 CC: The graphs look at the historical data and the jump up in figures is due to the B-doubles. Traffic engineers are currently looking at the future traffic flows.
- 3.162 BS: The recorded figures from 1998 show that the rate of increase is much higher than the line of best fit on the graphs.
- 3.163 GB: Yes, but look at the decrease in traffic from 1996 to 1998.
- 3.164 BS: It is a period of 8 years- that is an appropriate period of time to assess traffic
- 3.165 GB: It is not a good period of time to assess traffic
- 3.166 CC: The graph was provided to show the recorded traffic data, with a linear line of best fit.
- 3.167 DS: The traffic engineers at the RTA, see the traffic volume in 2017/ 2018 reaching 12 000 if you utilise the line of best fit. If that isn't what they believe it will be, then why is the line there?
- 3.168 CC: The graph is to provide a historical picture of traffic volume on the Pacific Highway. The Project team will be looking at the future traffic flows.
- 3.169 DS: It is a farce
- 3.170 JB: He can now understand the reasoning for putting a kink in the line of best fit. However he believes the interpretation as shown is not valid. The kink represents a major change in circumstances. A line of best fit is valid up to the point of "kink". The data before and after the kink need to be considered in isolation. If this is done the data after the kink suggests far greater increases in traffic volume than the projected line of best fit shown on the graph.
- 3.171 CC: There is an enormous amount of variability in traffic flow patterns. Other information will show the predicted future traffic flows
- 3.172 KG: Since the highway has been opened to B-doubles, why isn't the upgrade of the highway located away from Coffs Harbour and the Northern Beaches
- 3.173 CC: This is discussed in previous reports which had already been released. Once traffic predictions are finalised they will be represented to the CFG

Details:

Action By/Date:

3.174 BS: The RTA, on other projects has grossly understated their traffic figures. What confidence can we have in the RTA figures?

3.175 Meeting stopped for a 10 minute break at 7.55pm

4. Continued Meeting

4.1 8.00pm DW reconvened the meeting

4.2 As there were many items which had to be addressed, DW proposed that the Project Team presentation of the Parliamentary Inquiries and the CRC meeting not be discussed within the CFG meeting. However handouts had been provided and the CFG members could read through it. This would result in being able to go through other matters

4.3 SM: How does the Parliamentary Inquiry impact on the proposal?

4.4 CC: The Government is yet to provide a response to the Inquiry's findings. He cannot comment on it

4.5 JB: The inquiry criticises the RTA, I would assume it would be the RTA who would respond

4.6 BS: Comments were made during the Inquiry and the RTA had the opportunity to respond to them during the time.

4.7 CS: The Government can choose to ignore the recommendations

4.8 DW invited TP to begin the Part 3A presentation

4.9 Since the 1 August 2005, new approvals process has been developed. However it is not that dissimilar to the old EIS process.

4.10 RC: In the process, the RTA consults with Government Agencies and Councils- what about the Community? *(in reference to the step in the flowchart that reads "DoP consults with agencies and council(s) and issues environmental assessment requirements")*

4.11 TP: It is the Department of Planning (DoP) who consults the agencies and not the RTA. Consultation with the Community will be undertaken while the EA is being prepared and then when it is placed on public exhibition. Submissions can then be made. The RTA then has to consider the submissions. Minor or major tweaking of the proposal and the design can then take place if considered necessary.

4.12 Robert Forrester (RF2): Why doesn't the community consultation come earlier in the process?

4.13 TP: Since 2001, the RTA has chosen to undertake significant consultation. The chart shows the Statutory Process, which identifies where the RTA is legally obliged to undertake consultation.

4.14 RF2: There seems to be a momentum and consultation seems to be a little late if the community have a problem with the preferred route

4.15 TP: There is definitely momentum from the Minister's decision of the preferred route in late 2004

4.16 DS: So it is a fait accompli

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 4.17 TP: No - the DoP could refuse consent of the proposal or the Chief Executive of the RTA could decide not to proceed with the proposal.
- 4.18 BS: Well we don't have one, so no decision can be made.
- 4.19 TP continues with Part 3A slides- timeframe
- 4.20 RB: The lodgement of the Project Application is in July 2006- is this early or late July?
- 4.21 CC: July
- 4.22 RB: The Sikh Community Consultation period ends on 28 of July 2006, how will it be incorporated into the Project Application?
- 4.23 TP: The Sikh Community Assessment will be included in the Environmental Assessment.
- 4.24 GD: How long will the community consultation be?
- 4.25 TP: The statutory period is 30 days or 4 weeks
- 4.26 BS: how can the DoP make a decision on the project in 2 months, when it has taken/ taking longer to produce the reports?
- 4.27 TP: The timeframe given for the determination is based on DoP typical track record for assessing projects
- 4.28 SM: requested that as much information be provided at the next CFG meeting as the community would like to get their own independent environment assessment and there would not appear to be much time during the EA exhibition time
- 4.29 TP: the timeframe of 30 days given was a minimum number of days
- 4.30 SM: there had to be an adequate process of review- so technical information was required.
- 4.31 TP: In advance of the EA?
- 4.32 SM: Yes, otherwise it is asking the community to seek qualified persons in 4 weeks, which would not be enough time
- 4.33 GD: especially going through thousands of technical pages in the 4 weeks running up to Christmas.
- 4.34 Adam Cameron (AC): stated that the RTA and CW have suitably qualified and experienced consultants to undertake the assessment. In response to the comment regarding independence, he pointed out that there is a Code of Ethics which the RTA and its consultants must abide by.
- 4.35 BS: The RTA should provide funds for the community to engage an Independent consultant to assess the EA
- 4.36 CS: Looking at the Statutory requirements, the Pacific Highway may have been built by now. In 2001, 2003 was the date for the commencement of construction. The Inquiry by the Council delayed the process. The process had been delayed in the past, and he would expect it to do the same. The CFG was only meant to be for 3 years.
- 4.37 RC: Perhaps the RTA should consult with VicRoads in regards to their process for

CC to investigate this proposed funding question and to report back at the next meeting whether it could be considered or not.

Details:

Action By/Date:

release of information and funding.

- 4.38 SM: The Council review was not independent. The RTA is a client of Arup who undertook the review
- 4.39 BS: During the review, the RTA stalled the process
- 4.40 CC: The decision to temporarily stop the process was made by the Steering Committee which compromised the Coffs Harbour Council, DoP and the RTA
- 4.41 BS: RTA suspended work on the strategy while it went ahead
- 4.42 CC: No, it was the Steering Committee who decided to halt the Pacific Highway Upgrade while the Peer Review was undertaken.
- 4.43 BS: Well I would debate the semantics, but in the interest of moving along...

5. Other Matters Arising

- 5.1 CS: I would like to talk about a unique situation on the Northern Beaches, one which is close to my heart and does not occur anywhere else. The number of schoolchildren who travel along the highway and parents who have to drop them off/ pick them up. At Heritage Park, there are parents dropping off their children in the left-hand turn bay in peak hour traffic. Something has to be done to improve the safety
- 5.2 CC: thanked CS for his comments and would take them on board
- 5.3 Jill Heris (JH): Bucca Road also does not work
- 5.4 RB: And the roundabout at Woolgoolga
- 5.5 SM: He met with Eric Roozendaal and left with him a CD with pictures of the dangerous road situations. Intersections at Emerald Beach and the north and south exits to Sandy Beach. The community does not have time to wait; they need immediate fixes on current black spots.
- 5.6 CC: We are aware of the intersections from both community and council comments. However, while CC acknowledged that something had to be done, it also had to be done as part of an overall plan.
- 5.7 SM: he has spoken to the Minister and the RTA that they need these changes now. All the time there are lives being lost. He understands that the RTA has a job to do, but the community just cannot wait.
- 5.8 CC: would take the comments on board
- 5.9 SM: would be happy to set up a meeting to discuss these issues
- 5.10 CC: this was the first time that he had heard that SM had wanted to set up a meeting with the RTA.
- 5.11 BS: In previous CFG meetings, the chairs had been arranged so that everyone had a table to place their documents etc. on. The WAR group presented a presentation last CFG meeting outlining 20 points of concern. What had been done about it?
- 5.12 TP: The presentation had been sent to the Project Team to consider in the technical papers

TP to refer issue to designers

Set up meeting between SM and the RTA

Seating arrangements to include tables next CFG

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 5.13 BS: Could they get an update? Provide it prior to the next meeting?
- 5.14 TP: We could provide an update as much as possible next CFG meeting
- 5.15 BS: In regards to the Highway upgrade- why wasn't the CFG consulted when the intersection at Moonee Beach was upgraded (adjacent to the Shopping Centre)
- 5.16 CC: It was part of the Shopping Centre Development Application requirements and was not undertaken by the RTA. It was not within the scope of the CFG.
- 5.17 BS: The intersection took several million dollars, why wasn't the community consulted? There have been accidents there since it has changed
- 5.18 CC: It was undertaken under a different Council process
- 5.19 BS: Why wasn't it discussed?
- 5.20 GB: The proposal for the intersection was put on public display 1 ½ years ago, where you could have made a submission.
- 5.21 JH: Under the upgrade scheme, would the Moonee Beach Intersection change?
- 5.22 CC: Yes, it had always been intended that the intersection would be a grade-separated interchange.
- 5.23 BS: Would there be a change from the 80kmph to 100kmph?
- 5.24 CC: From the submissions received from the Community, the RTA responded by not increasing the speed limit
- 5.25 BS: Nothing came out from the RTA to say that there would not be an increase in speed limit
- 5.26 CC: I am not aware of any proposals to change the speed limit.
- 5.27 RC: He had a series of questions on the agenda- first that the agenda had changed from 2 weeks ago when they had received it, but that there had not been any opportunity for the community to supply any items to be placed on the agenda
- 5.28 DW: From what she understood, an invitation was issued to the CFG members 2 weeks before the meeting. What could be done in future, is that an invitation would be issued to the members 2 weeks before the CFG meeting, and the members of the community, could respond with any items for the agenda. The draft agenda would then be sent out a week prior to the meeting
- 5.29 RC: As long as the RTA don't lump all the community items at the end of the agenda
- 5.30 DW: I have a list of actions which would have to be addressed for the next meeting, and those will start off the meeting
- 5.31 RC: I have an issue with the proxy business. Margaret Murphy couldn't be at the meeting tonight, but wanted me to attend to be here. She got sent a 4 page form for membership of the CFG. After countless emails back and forward we decided to refuse to fill it in and attend regardless.
- 5.32 Andrew Smith (AS): We have utilised the proxy nomination form for the past 5 years with no problems. It just provides simple details about the person to let us know who and what area they are representing. This enables us to provide that information to other CFG members who ask. Given that all other members in the

RTA response to 20 issues raised in previous WAR presentation to be addressed where possible at the next CFG meeting

Invitation to go out to the community 2 weeks prior to the CFG meeting to see if there are any items to be added onto the agenda

Details:

Action By/Date:

CFG had agreed to use this form there does not appear to be any reason why the form should be changed so late in the process. In response to MM's concern over the form he had rung MM to clarify the purpose of it.

- 5.33 DW: You were permitted to attend tonight which is the important issue.
- 5.34 RC: I am on the Woolgoolga to Wells Crossing Project, and there were no forms for that project. There was also nothing in the minutes that required that the proxy nomination form was needed
- 5.35 GD: Are there artist's impressions of what the intersections are going to look like?
- 5.36 TP: Not at this time, a specialist investigation is currently being undertaken by Hassell which will include artist's impressions
- 5.37 GD: Will there not be any other traffic volume update until 2007?
- 5.38 CC: There are standard recording stations along the route and there has been specific additional data collected in 2005.
- 5.39 GD: Could the data be released?
- 5.40 CC: Yes
- 5.41 RF: If you regress the line of best fit back to 1970, then according to the graph, there would be no cars on the Pacific Highway
- 5.42 DW wanted to move on, saying that there had been enough debate on the issue
- 5.43 RB: Wanted to know when Ray's question would be answered
- 5.44 CC: All he could do was to repeat his earlier answer
- 5.45 DS: There has to be an earlier look (than the Pacific Highway Upgrade) at the Sandy Beach and Emerald Beach intersections
- 5.46 CC: The intersection at Moonee Beach was funded by the developer of the Shopping Centre. He was aware of the desire and the need to improve the intersections and he was happy to have a meeting with SM and take his comments on board
- 5.47 DS: it was an important issue and he wanted to reinforce it.
- 5.48 DW ended the meeting at 9.10pm

Recent Traffic Volume data to be provided

8. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 9.10 pm.

Next Meeting: To be advised

Summary of Meeting's Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy of PowerPoint presentation notes to be provided to CFG members
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC to provide figures on the percentage of dual carriageway that is Class M/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACTION for CT- to consider the possibility of a community display at the Moonee Beach Shopping Centre for the Settlement Strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CT to provide response to question on the 15 recommendations in the report considered by Council and an update on Council's position on the announced option
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC and TP to determine available information package to be distributed to CFG members prior the next meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise data to be released next CFG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TP to ask Wilkinson Murray about changes in level of noise in recent years
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CW to check if and when a response was made to Margaret Murphy letter re access to her property
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TP to ask Wilkinson Murray about noise assessment for flora/fauna
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TP to refer drought and non-drought noise levels to Wilkinson Murray
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TP to refer to pages in the agricultural reports in response to RB and KB issue of agric. assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TP to talk to Hartley International about Wind Vector Study
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Brief/Scope of Services for the Sikh Cultural Impact Assessment to be provided to the CFG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC to investigate proposed funding question and to report back at the next meeting whether it could be considered or not
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TP to refer issue of bus stops and safety to designers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set up meeting between SM and the RTA in regards to safety improvements to existing intersections
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seating arrangements to include tables next CFG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTA response to 20 issues raised in previous WAR presentation to be addressed where possible at the next CFG meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invitation to go out to the community 2 weeks prior to the CFG meeting to see if there are any items to be added onto the agenda
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recent Traffic Volume data to be provided

