

Meeting Minutes

Project:	Sapphire to Woolgoolga Upgrade Project	Reference:	1093.40.GE
Location:	Woolgoolga Bowling Club, Board Room	Date:	16 August 2006

Present: Apology: Copy: Name:

SAPPHIRE TO WOOLGOOLGA NORTHERN CFG (Woolgoolga Bypass)			
	▼		Graham Ashton
▼			Rebecca Pickering (proxy)
		▼	Parvinder Lalli
▼			Kashmir Singh Gill (proxy)
▼			Bhupinder Singh Lalli (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
▼			Lucia Coletta Connell Wagner

	▼		Andrew Smith	JMS Consulting
▼			Denise Wilson	Id Planning
Recorded By:			Adam Cameron and Lucia Coletta	Total Pages: 22
Subject: Sapphire to Woolgoolga Northern Community Focus Group Meeting No 19				

Details:

Action By/Date:

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Denise Wilson (DW) opened the meeting at 5.50 pm.
- 1.2 DW explained the outline of the Agenda, and indicated that although discussion of the Minutes of the last CFG was not on the Agenda, it would be addressed at the end of the meeting. DW then invited any other agenda items from the members
- 1.3 Richard Casey (RC) indicated that he wished to discuss the consultation process

2. ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS CFG (13 June 2006)

- 2.1 DW invited Chris Clark (CC) to talk through the Actions list (a copy had been provided to each community member as they had entered the meeting)
- 2.2 CC began discussing the item list
- 2.3 Item 2- Percentage of dual carriageway that was Class M/A.
- 2.4 Margaret Murphy (MM) wanted the figures clarified
- 2.5 Robert Forrest (RF) wished for an explanation of Class M/A.
- 2.6 CC: Class A consists of at grade intersections and direct highway access onto side roads and properties. Class M highway has no direct access from private roads and access onto the highway is via grade-separated interchanges. Explained that 40% of the dual carriageway sections of the Pacific Highway is Class M.
- 2.7 MM: Class M is a 6 lane road with a service road?
- 2.8 CC: Class M projects (on the Pacific Highway) have 4 lanes for highway traffic. There is no service road on the majority of the Class M Pacific Highway Projects to date as the old highway provides the local access / service road function, an example being the Yelgun to Chinderah project. Class A projects can be set-up for conversion to class M if required in the future. Projects are generally set-up so that if additional lanes are required in the future, they can be added without the need for additional land acquisition (reason for a wide median).
- 2.9 MM: Definition of Class M from the Parliamentary Inquiry is that Class A has no provision for 6 lanes. It is exactly as worded in the Inquiry
- 2.10 CC: Couldn't recall the terminology used in the Parliamentary Inquiry
- 2.11 MM: What would the speed limit on a Class M highway be?
- 2.12 CC: Generally 110km/h for long stretches of road, but can also be 100km/h for shorter sections.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.13 RF: What about from Englands Road to Arrawarra?
- 2.14 CC: Coffs Harbour Bypass is a Class M- with access from grade-separated interchanges with the existing highway serving as a service road. Woolgoolga Bypass is a Class M- with the existing highway serving as the service road. The RTA is preparing a concept for a Class M type highway between Sapphire and Woolgoolga but at this stage, no decision has been made on what will be constructed.
- 2.15 RC: No maps or data has been provided that indicate that it is a Class M/A or what is the speed limit.
- 2.16 MM: Council said that they had been informed by the RTA that it would be a 4 lane duplication at 100km/h
- 2.17 RC: Chris can take actions for the next meeting
- 2.18 BS: The last few minutes of the CFG's have been reduced minutes
- 2.19 DW: She can only respond for the last minutes taken- they had been provided by the Minute takers.
- 2.20 BS: What about any changes to be made to the Minutes? He remembered the question from the last meeting to be the percentage of highway that is Class M or Class A
- 2.21 DW clarified the action from the draft minutes of the last CFG meeting.
- 2.22 CC continues on the Item List. Item 3- Council to consider display at Moonee Shopping Centre. CC indicated that Council had advised that a notice was placed at Moonee Beach Shopping Centre in July this year
- 2.23 RC: This year? That's a bit late. Clyde Treadwell (CT) attending the last CFG however, he left during the meeting and did not respond to a question asked of him. He did not advise the RTA as to what was happening.
- 2.24 CC: Which question?
- 2.25 RC: How far back had you had the answer?
- 2.26 CC: The question was asked at the last meeting. The answer is provided in the information supplied to the CFG tonight
- 2.27 DW understood that the point being made was that Council was accountable and it was her role to ensure that responses to actions had been received. The issue had come up at the June 2006 CFG meeting and was being addressed now as it was the next meeting.
- 2.28 CC continued with the item list. Items 5 and 6 were information to be released to the CFG at the following meeting. This would be the meeting after the Part 3A Application for the project had been submitted to the Department of Planning.
- 2.29 MM: When? After the EIS is completed
- 2.30 CC: There are two phases of the planning process. The first is the submission of a Project Application to the Department of Planning (DoP). After this, the CFG meeting will be held. The second phase is the release of the Environmental Assessment (EA). At this point, the RTA receives community comment on the EA, which is then collated and provided to DoP.

CC to provide percentage of highway that is Class M/A

CC to provide information on what is going to happen- What input (into the EA) from the CFG? Who takes account of the comments? When will DoP get the PA report?

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.31 Des Saunders (DS) : No community input in the Part 3A Application Report?
Concerned that the community had no input into the Part 3A application prior to its submission to DoP.
- 2.32 CC: Explained the Part 3A application was a RTA document, and that information from the community consultation (including the CFGs) has been included within the Part 3A Application Report
- 2.33 RC: When will the report be received? At the next CFG or earlier?
- 2.34 CC: the Project Application Report would be made available to the CFG after it is lodged with DoP.
- 2.35 CC: DoP gives advice as to what the RTA is to address in the EA. When the EA is placed on exhibition- community - including the CFGs - can provide input and the RTA has to respond and address the issues raised- that may include additional studies.
- 2.36 MM: But the Minister doesn't have to take into account community concerns.
- 2.37 DW: explained that a detailed presentation on the Part 3A process was given at the previous CFG meeting, and that a fact sheet was also distributed to the CFG members
- 2.38 BS: The special meeting only came about because he made representations to the Minister's office- it is the only reason why it is being held. It is an indication of the community consultation on the project. The last meeting was 16 months ago.
- 2.39 DW noted the point to come back to later to address
- 2.40 CC continued on item list. Item 7- noise level changes in recent years
- 2.41 RC: it doesn't take into account because of greater road capacity, there would be more trucks
- 2.42 MM: People who currently have no traffic noise will have traffic noise.
- 2.43 CC: Noise consultants provided the answer to the question.
- 2.44 RC: Stop-Start lessening of noise is a concern.
- 2.45 CC: Based on the same volume and the mix of traffic, predictions indicate that there would be less noise from a dual carriageway.
- 2.46 RC: Less congestion equals less noise. The flow of traffic is better. However, there is an increase in noise from the additional traffic. What is the situation in relation to increase in traffic?
- 2.47 CC: the noise assessment looks at the traffic volumes and assesses any noise impacts.
- 2.48 MM: What about noise levels in areas which are not currently near the highway
- 2.49 CC: the noise level requirements in the Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) Guidelines for areas away from current highways are more stringent than for areas adjacent to current highways.
- 2.50 MM: JMS told the tenant on MM's property that the noise levels cannot get any greater than the existing noise levels.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.51 CC continued in item 8 concerning MM's conditions of entry not being complied with
- 2.52 MM: There were quite a few other people as well, not just her, whose conditions of entry were not complied with. Her conditions were complied with because she stood her ground.
- 2.53 CC: Can you provide the details of the people who didn't have their conditions complied with, and I will follow up.
- 2.54 MM: The RTA already knows who they are.
- 2.55 CC: Item 9 Fauna impacts from highway.
- 2.56 BS: The fauna will come back assuming that the noise levels will drop?
- 2.57 CC: Not assuming that- research and monitoring undertaken at new highway projects indicate that the fauna does return. The operational traffic noise on the highway does not seem to annoy them
- 2.58 BS: What annoys them?
- 2.59 CC: Research demonstrates that the traffic noise does not seem to affect them
- 2.60 BS: It doesn't say that
- 2.61 DS: Yes, it does say it in the writing
- 2.62 BS: No but the traffic noise would impact on them
- 2.63 RC: There would be different studies which would show a different result
- 2.64 CC continued on item list. Item 12- Wind Vector Studies
- 2.65 BS: were Wind Vector Studies taken into account during the route selection phase?
- 2.66 CC: We have a preferred route and we are now in the process of addressing issues that may affect the preferred route
- 2.67 BS: Should have been used to take into account in the preferred route
- 2.68 DW: Clarified that the question was asking whether micro-climate effects were taken into account for the preferred route?
- 2.69 CC: It has not been assessed in detail to date
- 2.70 MM/BS: Why not?
- 2.71 CC: The assessment of all route options was not at that level of detail. It addressed the key issues for the route
- 2.72 DS: If you do the investigation and find that there are major impacts, would the RTA consider moving the proposal? If not? Why not?
- 2.73 CC: We first have to do the investigation to see what the outcome is
- 2.74 Bhupinder Singh Lalli (BL): RTA is confusing the community- first they say that it is the preferred route, and then they undertake the community consultation.
- 2.75 DW: clarified what CC was saying- microclimate / wind effects investigations were

Details:

Action By/Date:

- not done on the route options as it was not a key issue
- 2.76 BL: Is this the preferred route?
- 2.77 CC: Yes
- 2.78 BS: Wind Vector study was not in the route selection stage?
- 2.79 CC: Not in detail
- 2.80 MM: requested that CC clarify his answer
- 2.81 CC: Part of the overall assessment of the impacts on agricultural land with the various route options was consideration of wind vector impacts. This issue had come up as part of the consideration of impacts on agricultural land and was one of the reasons why the B options were removed.
- 2.82 KG: Option E has no wind vector issues?
- 2.83 CC: It is a concern to the community and an issue for the agricultural assessment
- 2.84 KG: What will happen now?
- 2.85 CC: The investigations will be undertaken and we will examine the results
- 2.86 BS: There are no Wind Vector studies in previous reports by the RTA- Steve Moody had raised this previously
- 2.87 CC: I said that there were no wind vector reports prepared for the route options. However, in assessing the route options, wind vector impacts were discussed.
- 2.88 BS: SM had been told that it had not been done, but you say that it has been discussed. By who?
- 2.89 CC: RTA internally. It was also raised at the Value Management Workshops
- 2.90 BS: He had no recollection of the issue being addressed
- 2.91 MM: How much banana land was affected by the B options?
- 2.92 CC: part of the reason the B options were rejected was due to impact on agricultural land. Some discussion of wind vector issues took place in the Value Management Workshop.
- 2.93 BS: Option B - one reason it was rejected was due to wind vector issues?
- 2.94 CC: The main reason was the impact on agricultural land- particularly banana properties. Other associated issues- B routes: cut through the east/west ridge- opened up Woolgoolga to the southerly wind more than the C and E options.
- 2.95 BL: Options B and E are not different in the agricultural land impacts. Option E is totally wrong.
- 2.96 BS: In the next few days, send the Wind Vector studies to the CFG members
- 2.97 CC: There aren't any studies.
- 2.98 CC continued on item list. Item 13-Brief of Sikh Assessment
- 2.99 RC: It is a waste of time- RTA ought to give the CFG the results of meetings with the Sikhs

CC to provide summary of Sikh meetings

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.100 CC: could provide a brief summary of the meetings held with the Sikhs. The Assessment will be released as part of the EA.
- 2.101 KG: meeting with the Sikh community (property owners?)- Who was called and how?
- 2.102 MM: response before next CFG
- 2.103 DS: Wind Vector studies haven't been done, Sikh assessment in the EA, no conclusive answer to the removal of Option E as the preferred route. CC and Bob Higgins (BH) are saying this is it. RTA need to look at something else.
- 2.104 RF: Large impact on the Sikh community and agricultural land has got to be a good reason to remove the preferred option
- 2.105 BS: The consultations with the Sikh community began with how can you mitigate the impacts?
- 2.106 DW: Clarified the action from the last CFG meeting.
- 2.107 CC: Ongoing consultation with Sikh community has been documented. Option E and other options assessed and took into account the impact on agricultural properties. Option B has a worse impact on agricultural properties- it has been referenced in reports- and documents how Option E was selected as the preferred route.
- 2.108 BS: Consultation with the Sikh community from the beginning- it is incorrect. It only started after May last year. Virtually no consultation beforehand.
- 2.109 BL: Meeting with Bob Benning- CC said that he would address issues, but never did.
- 2.110 CC: 2 meetings were held. Can I arrange a time to talk to you about this concern, It was my understanding that the issues were addressed.
- 2.111 BL: Bob Benning and Kashmir Gill at Unwins Road- no contact after the meeting, no confirmation of access arrangements
- 2.112 Adam Cameron (AC): In relation to the statement made by BS- I totally disagree- the Sikh community has always been consulted by the project team.
- 2.113 BS- document the consultation undertaken with the Sikh community before March 2005
- 2.114 CC continued item list. Item 14- RTA funding for community to engage specialists to review EA working papers. Not RTA policy
- 2.115 BS: Standard practice- we knew that. Would the RTA consider it?
- 2.116 CC: No
- 2.117 BS: There has been criticism of transparency- not RTA practice. Wouldn't it go towards improving transparency with the CFG? Documents are not given to CFG members. Information not provided before this CFG. At what level was this decision made? Can approaches be made to the RTA?
- 2.118 CC: will not divulge which level of the RTA made that decision
- 2.119 DW: Can the decision be altered?

CC to provide information on which property owners in the Sikh community were called for meetings and how - required before next CFG

Action from 2.99 repeated by BS

CC to contact Bob Benning in regard to access issues

CC to provide details of Sikh Consultation prior to Mar 05

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.120 CC: the community can make representations to the RTA
- 2.121 RC: Other organisations provide community consultation and help lay people understand reports.
- 2.122 CC continued Item List. Item 15- bus stops and safety.
- 2.123 BS: Tollway/Motorway will open before the service road?
- 2.124 CC: No decisions have been made whether the new highway will be a tolled, or if the service roads would be built before the highway.
- 2.125 BS: Is there a possibility?
- 2.126 CC: No decision has been made
- 2.127 Question was repeated another two times, the same answer being given both times.
- 2.128 RF: You can put the resources into sending out a Community newsletter, but won't assist the community in reviewing the EA documents.
- 2.129 CC continued item list. Item 16 WAR meeting with RTA. Safety concerns raised were referred to Regional Office Grafton
- 2.130 BS: Why hasn't there been a response/ invitation to a meeting at this stage?
- 2.131 CC: It will be put into place. There has been discussions on possible locations and times but it has not yet been finalised.
- 2.132 MM: How many more people must die? On Saturday, there was an accident- not fatal, but it could have been so much worse
- 2.133 WAR proposal was for the safety upgrade of the highway. The RTA has an attitude with- it's not our problem it is a different section of the RTA. Safety was the main issue for the upgrade and the submission that was made.
- 2.134 DW: Will the RTA Office get in contact with WAR?
- 2.135 CC: They will get in contact with either SM or BS to arrange a meeting. It will happen. WAR will be invited to a meeting at a mutually acceptable time.
- 2.136 BS: I haven't been contacted
- 2.137 CC: That is because the meeting arrangements have not yet been finalised
- 2.138 RF: read the community newsletter released and read that safety issues had been discussed at the WAR meeting. If he didn't know more, he would read it and think that everything was ok
- 2.139 MM: RTA should tell the community that they are not concerned about safety
- 2.140 RC: By saying that, RTA is being loose with the truth
- 2.141 CC: Don't agree. RTA has been truthful. Safety concerns had been discussed at the WAR meeting- the newsletter didn't imply anything more. RTA will arrange the meeting to discuss safety issues, it just hasn't been done yet.
- 2.142 DW asked that SM and BS be contacted about the meeting by the end of the week.

CC to arrange meeting between WAR group and Regional Office Grafton

Details:

Action By/Date:

2.143 MM: RTA don't give a damn

2.144 BS: WAR group meeting, BH let slip that there would be a service road from Sapphire to Woolgoolga not circulated to any community group. RTA are showing that once again they are not being transparent.

CC to contact BS and SM to arrange meeting by 18 Aug

2.145 CC: In the Joint ministerial announcement released on the 22 June 2006, the service road scheme was included.

2.146 DS: In the first CFG meeting there was concern about bypassing Coffs Harbour and Woolgoolga. Now there is to be a motorway with a service road, and although most traffic volume consists of local traffic, the local traffic will have to fit on 2 one way lanes.

2.147 MM: further evidence of the RTA being loose with the truth includes the update in April 2005 and the minutes on previous meetings- things that had not been undertaken.

2.148 CC continued item list. Item 18- 20 responses from WAR

2.149 DS: indicated that he received the responses last week

2.150 BS: He received his email 24 hours before the meeting- he had no hard copy of the response. Why did the RTA send out 24 hours prior when they had 16 months?

2.151 PN: his email was dated the 2nd of August- and it was addressed to everyone in the CFG.

2.152 MM: She has 11 August

2.153 PN: Information on his email was the 2nd of August

2.154 BS: Documents received on the CFG meetings- no opportunity to discuss and review them. Said the same thing at previous meetings, but nothing had been done.

2.155 DS: discussion with PN over date of the email

2.156 DW: today is the 16 August 2006- many people got this today.

2.157 BS: It seems to be RTA strategy to send out document at the last minute. IF circulated previously then can make meetings more productive. Previously- RTA will not carry out procedures to give documents.

DW to send out Draft CFG Agenda 2 weeks before CFG meeting

2.158 CC: Documents are provided to the CFG members as soon as they have been completed and are available.

2.159 MM: Wont give us the resources and yet make it hard as possible to respond

2.160 RC: Draft Agenda- why hasn't that been sent at the time of the invite? Members can make up their minds better if they see the draft agenda first.

2.161 DW: Agenda- can provide to CFG members and get responses back.

2.162 CC continued Item list. Item 20 Traffic Volume data to be provided

2.163 MM: The Council letter attached to the Actions- whose comments are they?

2.164 CC: Council

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.165 MM: Shouldn't the RTA provide a response?
- 2.166 CC: RTA will respond. RTA is still in discussions with Council regarding the issues raised in the December 2004 ordinary meeting.
- 2.167 DW: invited MM to talk about the Emerald Beach Interchange
- 2.168 MM: It is a safety issue- how long does it have to be before RTA do something to improve the situation
- 2.169 RF: The intersection is awful- the NRMA is always in there. Can't see south or north and need to get to 100km/h in a few seconds. It is not the only intersection.
- 2.170 MM: CC confirmed at WAR meeting- the dangerous intersection is not part of this Project Teams brief. Not about safety issues, but to get a motorway in.
- 2.171 CC: Safety is the prime driver of the upgrade. The RTA is a large organisation, and needs to work in sections – the Brief for the Project Team is to progress the Preferred route. There is a section at the regional office whose role is to look after safety improvements on the existing highway. What we said at the WAR meeting was that this was the more appropriate section of the RTA to deal with the issue. The Project Team has referred the issue to them.
- 2.172 MM: There is a push to get in a motorway- not part of a safety issue. If a service road is going in, why not put the motorway out further to the west for freight
- 2.173 PP: You mentioned previously that the reason for not putting the highway further west was due to a benefit-cost ratio. How much local traffic would use the service road instead of the highway?
- 2.174 CC: Currently looking at the predicted traffic volumes under the motorway proposal.
- 2.175 DW: pointed out that it would be covered later in the agenda
- 2.176 BS: Lack of consultation- no meeting since May 05 previously. Only reason for special meeting is because he made representations to the Roads Minister.
- 2.177 DW noted that a meeting had been held in June 06.
- 2.178 CC: Community consultation is ongoing. This was a "Special Meeting" as it was not a meeting that was previously included in the program. It is to specifically address issues from the community in the Northern section of the project..
- 2.179 BS: Reply to the 20 points for WAR. The May 2005 CFG meeting was not a full meeting on everything. CC shut the meeting down earlier and took control of the meeting cause he didn't like what was being said in the meeting
- 2.180 BS: he emailed JMS items on the minutes- 1st email didn't get to Andrew Smith (AS). He re-sent it and hadn't heard back from AS- so he assumed that that he got it.
- 2.181 DW: Appropriate for this matter to be referred to the discussion of the Minutes of previous meetings
- 2.182 BS: Discussion of the Minutes (of previous meetings)on the Agenda
- 2.183 DW: Noted

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.184 CC: Neither AS or himself had received the e-mail from BS
- 2.185 BS: AS isn't here- is there a reason?
- 2.186 CC: AS had family commitments
- 2.187 MM: Community consultation- organising meeting with the Sikhs
- 2.188 DW: We have dealt with the Sikh issue. Your question was on other properties in the area.
- 2.189 MM: Other property owners on JMS and CW lists had given Conditions of Entry to the Project Team and did not receive a response. The conditions were ignored. RTA are well aware of who they were – one was very public and went to the newspaper – the other one took a noise monitor and handed it into the police
- 2.190 DW: requested that MM provide more information in order for the RTA to follow up her concern
- 2.191 MM: Didn't want to provide the information. The RTA always had excuses. Yes she received an email agreeing to her conditions but only because she stood up and refused access onto her property if they weren't met.
- 2.192 RC: RTA well aware of number of properties that will be impacted. How many properties contacted? Wanted a copy of the letter that had been received.
- 2.193 CC: Which letter? In relation to? There are numerous pieces of correspondence- some is advice indicating that they are affected, others seeking approval for access
- 2.194 RC: Advising property owner, that they are being impacted.
- 2.195 BS: CC is a project manager he should know the number of properties impacted
- 2.196 DS: Was the letter a standard letter or an individual letter?
- 2.197 CC Standard letter. I will provide a copy. He couldn't give exact numbers on property impacted and he wasn't going to guess.
- 2.198 MM: Stated that someone did not know they were effected until the preferred route was announced
- 2.199 CC: RTA cannot advise landowners that they are directly affected until the preferred route is announced.
- 2.200 RC: How many didn't you contact because you didn't have a phone number?
- 2.201 CC: All property owners received a letter, however, if there wasn't a phone number, then it could not be followed up with a phone call. Instead, the letter had contact details where the owner could contact the RTA
- 2.202 MM: All directly affected properties- notified only after the preferred route was announced. Property owners tried phoning into the RTA and it took forever for them to get a response.
- 2.203 CC: Letters and follow-up phone call was undertaken after the announcement- it would not have been proper to release that information prior to the announcement.
- 2.204 MM: Allegations have been made of RTA not getting back to property owners until February 2005.

CC to advise How many properties directly affected by Option E? Has RTA contacted all of them? How many property owners not contacted due to lack of phone number? Copy of letter to all property owners

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.205 CC: The Preferred route announcement was for the upgrade from Englands Road to Arrawarra. There were a lot of people being contacted and trying to get into contact with the RTA.
- 2.206 RF: Safety Issues- Community newsletter is misleading in that it says that safety concerns were addressed at the WAR meeting.
- 2.207 MM: Information is misleading. Information in the paper is wrong- because the information was misleading
- 2.208 DW: requested that the information be restated for the record
- 2.209 RF: Safety concerns had been addressed at the WAR meeting (in the Community Newsletter)
- 2.210 Rebecca Pickering (RP): Community Consultation- 16 months is a huge length of time
- 2.211 CC: Although the project team undertook a number of activities in the period between the May 2005 and the June 2006 meeting, there was no specific information to present to the CFG. However, a number of individuals were consulted regarding the investigations. Community consultation with individuals also continued in that period. Council has also been consulted continuously in that period.
- 2.212 PP: Talking to individual people is not community consultation
- 2.213 RC: Council has no role in speaking for the community.
- 2.214 CC: He wouldn't discuss Council's role
- 2.215 RF: Doesn't have money to help the community, but can put out the newsletter
- 2.216 DS: Item 20- traffic levels. Surprised that in the paper he read that there were further studies being undertaken. At the beginning of the CFG process- there was a lot of traffic data. Service road to cater for local traffic. But the CFG are not being provided with 2005 traffic volumes.
- 2.217 CC: traffic data to be given at next CFG - after the Part 3A application is lodged.
- 2.218 BS: too late. Footprint may be incorrect in the newspaper- the media used drawings from the RTA.
- 2.219 CC: What we know is that there are two elements to what was published in the newspaper- the aerial photography not supplied by the RTA, it is the same as the aerial photograph available from Google Earth.
- 2.220 MM: It was obtained from Google Earth
- 2.221 CC: 2- A plan of the Gaudrons Road / Split Solitary Road interchange appeared to be overlaid on the aerial photo at a different scale. The engineering plan was previously only supplied to CFG members. . The scale of the engineering plan in relation to the aerial photo grossly exaggerated the road footprint.
- 2.222 MM: Newspaper went to the RTA- with no response- had to use the information that they had
- 2.223 CC: What request was made?

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.224 MM: Don't know- but a request was made to the RTA
- 2.225 CC: He was not aware of any request coming from the newspaper
- 2.226 PP: Footprint from the paper was incorrect. But the information provided earlier from the RTA was also incorrect.
- 2.227 CC: CC clarified that the layout and size of the interchange differed slightly from that shown in December 2002. This was due to the continual refinement of the concept design. The RTA has always stated that concept designs are subject to refinement.
- 2.228 PP: Sadly the RTA responded to it very quickly
- 2.229 RC: There was an email from a councillor saying that it was a complete fabrication, however the newspaper had no other complaints from anyone else
- 2.230 CC: I cannot comment about other people
- 2.231 RC: You would think the RTA would have complained
- 2.232 CC: People in the surrounding area were very concerned and called the RTA regarding the plan shown in the paper.
- 2.233 RC: Yes, because they were concerned about their properties- not that there a problem with the information
- 2.234 MM: I want it minuted that the RTA should announce that the brochure released recently is incorrect.
- 2.235 BS: Is the plan of the upgrade available and does it show the land take of properties?
- 2.236 CC: that information and a full plan will be part of the Part 3A Application
- 2.237 BS: When will it be released?
- 2.238 CC: the Gaudrons / Split Solitary Road intersection plan has been released already
- 2.239 BS: Is this the first time the community has seen it?
- 2.240 CC: Yes- in that format
- 2.241 BS: Advocate can't be blamed for the incorrect information when no information has been released
- 2.242 CC: The RTA is not laying blame on anyone.
- 2.243 BS: This meeting would not have been held unless the representations had been made to the Ministers Office.
- 2.244 Meeting adjourned 8.45
- 2.245 Meeting re-adjourned 8.55pm

3. Community Agenda Items

- 3.1 DW invited RC to go through the Community Agenda Items he had requested be discussed
- 3.2 RC: Item 4.33 southern CFG meeting 11 May 2005: JB (Jim Browne) requested to

Details:

Action By/Date:

- give a presentation next meeting of why an ultimate upgrade was preferred and needed. Has it occurred? And could it be presented to the northern CFG?
- 3.3 CC: it had not occurred as there has not been another meeting of the southern CFG since that meeting.
- 3.4 RC: Rests his case
- 3.5 DW: The micro-climate issue- did we cover it earlier?
- 3.6 RC: Yes, covered earlier.
- 3.7 DW: Item 3- Coffs Council/ Option E/Viability of Agricultural Land
- 3.8 RC: In their submission for Woolgoolga to Wells Crossing, the Coffs Council said that they would not support any proposal that had significant impact on Agricultural land. How does that equate with the Council supporting Option E? Council isn't here to answer that question. How do I proceed with this?
- 3.9 DW: We could refer it to the Council
- 3.10 RC: The submission for Woolgoolga to Wells Crossing should be consistent with the submission for Sapphire to Woolgoolga. He has been trying to get a copy of the Council submission. There was an email this afternoon from CC that he hadn't gotten a chance to take a look at it.
- 3.11 CC: The email this afternoon from Andrew was for other information that you had requested copies of.
- 3.12 RC: Looking for Council's response/submission to the RTA for S2W. He assumed that it would be in the documentation on the website. He is also looking for the DEC submission
- 3.13 DS: What does the Coffs Council have to do with Woolgoolga to Wells Crossing ?
- 3.14 RC: Well it was off the top of my head
- 3.15 DW: next item- the Parliamentary Inquiry
- 3.16 RC: Its been raised
- 3.17 DW: Supplementary Options Report referral to agricultural land
- 3.18 RC: Referring to the Agricultural report in the Supplementary Report dated 2004. There is a statement about 3rd class banana lands. Where has the classification come from?
- 3.19 CC: It has come from mapping undertaken by the Department of Agriculture
- 3.20 MM: Noise report was an appendix in the Supplementary Options Report, however she couldn't find it.
- 3.21 RC: No mention of Blueberry farms in the Supplementary Options Report. One of the prime crops which Sikhs are now moving into
- 3.22 CC: At the time of the preparation of the report, bananas were the most dominate crop. More are now moving into blueberries. The current Agricultural report will look at blueberries as well as the bananas.
- 3.23 RC: So we won't see it until the EA?

LC to provide MM with Noise Report from Supplementary Options Report

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.24 CC: That is correct
- 3.25 RC: The RTA have the information- there is no reason why they can't release it, so that the community is in a position to respond
- 3.26 CC: It is an iterative process. Baseline studies and the design are developed concurrently. The design is then adjusted to mitigate the potential impacts where possible. Assessment of issues progress when the design is progressed. Although there may be draft reports, the information changes. The RTA want to make sure that the information that is released is current- on all issues of the proposal. It is why the information comes out towards the end of the process.
- 3.27 RC: Other areas release the information. No reason why you shouldn't release the information. Write the draft reports- ask for feedback. You are scared that we would take it out of context.
- 3.28 CC: There are concerns that draft reports could be taken out of context as they may be incomplete. At the EA stage- the total assessment is released, and the RTA can look at responses at that stage after seeking input from the community. There is no decision made on the proposal throughout the exhibition stage.
- 3.29 MM: Blueberries are an important crop- with the recent cyclones in N. Queensland, there has been a turn back to bananas. Has this been taken into account in the Agricultural Assessment?
- 3.30 CC: Agricultural impacts are further addressed in the EA
- 3.31 RC: We have saved Johnny's bacon by the planting of bananas- if not inflation would have been 5% instead of 4%
- 3.32 DW proceeds with MM Agenda Items
- 3.33 MM: How many organic Farms are impacted by the proposal? Sent an email to Andrew about the inclusion of this item on the agenda
- 3.34 CC: Have not obtained that information at this stage
- 3.35 MM: Why not?
- 3.36 CC: We are at the EA stage and a lot of information and reports have not been completed. Agricultural report is not only looking at bananas and blueberries
- 3.37 MM: You are only looking at the Certified properties? What about people for who organic farming is a way of life? Or people who have spent a lot of money to try and get certification?
- 3.38 CC: the data will only show the certified properties.
- 3.39 MM: If you asked the community you could get the additional information
- 3.40 DW requested that the statement be clarified
- 3.41 BS: There are properties trying to become organic farms
- 3.42 CC: we can only assess the information that is available
- 3.43 DW: Which information? What mechanism is used to get information?
- 3.44 BS: The data is available- through community consultation. A couple of years back the noise data was incorrect. The housing on the aerial photography was out of

Details:

Action By/Date:

- date- you can't just rely on the data- it isn't the only form.
- 3.45 DW: Clarified the point. Can the people be identified?
- 3.46 MM: People with Organic Farms have made themselves known to the RTA/CW and they have not had a response.
- 3.47 DW: This meeting is flagging the concerns of the community and providing them with the opportunity for discussion
- 3.48 RC: There are many search processes that the RTA can utilise to get the information
- 3.49 CC: Agree and if the CFG are aware of any people that are in the process of certifying the farms it would be appreciated if the members could make the project team aware of this.
- 3.50 RC: You can go through the submissions received
- 3.51 CC: We will look through them
- 3.52 BS: There is a company called Croppo or something which is the region's Organic Farming body.
- 3.53 CC: Thanks for the information
- 3.54 RF: Who is undertaking the Agricultural Assessment?
- 3.55 CC: Alan Hartley
- 3.56 RF: What is his scope of work- is it a justification of the route? Or is it an independent assessment of the impacts?
- 3.57 CC: AH is undertaking an assessment of the potential agricultural impacts on the preferred route and will provide advice on possible mitigation measures. He is a professional and his assessment will show the potential agricultural impacts from the proposal
- 3.58 MM: What compensation will be paid to Organic Farmers?
- 3.59 CC: First we would have to undertake the assessment to see what risks there are, then the mitigation measures would be looked at. Any potential for compensation will be considered after the potential risks are identified.
- 3.60 MM: Wayne Evans at a WAR meeting said that he was told by his certifier that as soon as the road goes in, he will lose his certification. Will the organic farms lose their certifications?
- 3.61 CC: We don't know that at this stage
- 3.62 BS: There should be more frequent meetings for the CFG
- 3.63 MM: What compensation would be paid to the owners?
- 3.64 CC: It would be inappropriate of me to guess what, if any compensation there would be at this stage
- 3.65 MM: Wayne Evans- what process is there for people like him to get recognised?
- 3.66 CC: We will identify the certified properties through the agricultural assessment. We will look at the requirements for certification and see about mitigation measures.

LC to check the submissions for owners who have identified themselves as organic farmers

Details:

Action By/Date:

- Until we go through this process, we will not know
- 3.67 BS: They will lose their certification
- 3.68 DW: If people can prove that they will lose their certification- would there be compensation?
- 3.69 CC: No, this has not been an issue on any other highway project that he is aware of.
- 3.70 MM: Where are natural springs along the route and how are they impacted?
- 3.71 CC: our geotechnical assessment has picked up the information on ground table levels and aquifers or springs. A significant spring has been identified near Greys Road. If intersecting a spring or aquifer, measures will be put in place to mitigate the effects..
- 3.72 BS: It may be okay to build over the spring, but what about the person who relies on the spring- they won't have water due to the interruption of the spring
- 3.73 CC: Wherever possible, the design will still enable the water flow
- 3.74 BS: But you are interrupting the flow- it won't be the same
- 3.75 CC: Wherever possible, the design will still enable the water flow
- 3.76 BS: What about compensation to the owner?
- 3.77 CC: We will look at that at the time
- 3.78 BS: Are they available to compensation? The answer is a simple yes or no
- 3.79 CC: I don't know
- 3.80 MM: Will Ullage pits be put into place to catch the contaminants from the road to preserve water quality?
- 3.81 CC: The design must meet DEC requirements
- 3.82 RC: the difficulties in that is that the requirements are within the Contractor's Environmental Management Plan (EMP). Is this available for the community?
- 3.83 CC: At this stage of the project, no it is not available because it hasn't been prepared. But the requirements are available from DEC
- 3.84 RC: But the measures to meet those requirements are not from the DEC
- 3.85 CC: In the specification for contractors, they must meet performance requirements. The contractor will work out the measures to meet the requirements. This will enable the contractor to be as innovative as possible.
- 3.86 RC: So the contractor is responsible?
- 3.87 CC: They will prepare an EMP which will be vetted by agencies and then made a public document.
- 3.88 MM: What was the rationale for having the highway here and not further west? Why couldn't it be further west?
- 3.89 CC: The strategic access points at Split Solitary/ Gaudrons Road, Moonee Beach Road, Bucca Road- Emerald Heights area, south Woolgoolga and Arrawarra will allow local traffic to travel along the highway to Grafton or Coffs Harbour. But the service road will enable local traffic to cross the highway without having to travel

Details:

Action By/Date:

- along it for any length. An example is to get from Emerald Beach to the Sandy Beach School - you can travel along the service road and not have to travel along the highway.
- 3.90 RF: In the newsletter, there is no mention of a future upgrade for a grade-separated interchange between Bucca Road and Sandy Beach- it should be noted there. There is no service road there and there is high speed traffic through there
- 3.91 CC: They are currently looking at opportunities for Interchanges- there would only be one in that area. In the joint ministerial announcement- it mentioned that there would be service road to link the interchanges.
- 3.92 BS: Until the media release, for 4 years the community was told by the RTA that the highway would incorporate both through and local traffic. But now there is a service road for local traffic. Why is the highway still through here?
- 3.93 RF: Why does the freight have to go through our towns?
- 3.94 CC: CC not saying that all the local traffic will use the service road. They can also use the highway- it is highly likely that they will use the highway to travel to the nodes (strategic access points), as it is faster and more efficient
- 3.95 BS: Is that your opinion or what the studies say?
- 3.96 CC: It is what the preliminary studies say
- 3.97 BS: Knows lots of people who would use the service road and not a 110km/h highway. The design guidelines and criteria being used for the project are incorrect- the project should go back to the drawing board.
- 3.98 CC: Disagreed with the statement.
- 3.99 DS: What was the preferred distance for a speed of 110km/h?
- 3.100 CC: Between the interchanges? the preferred minimum distance is 5km, however due to the constraints on the area, some are closer. Split Solitary Road / Gaudrons Road interchange to Moonee Beach interchange is about 3km, Moonee Beach to south Woolgoolga interchange is about 5km, south Woolgoolga to Arrawarra is approximately 12-13km.
- 3.101 DS: I live in Mullaway and to get into Coffs Harbour, I would have to travel through Woolgoolga. There now seems to be an increase in merging points with the highway that would be less safe.
- 3.102 CC: Access from Mullaway would be through Woolgoolga. The number of merging points along the highway is unchanged from that indicated in December 2002- 5 between Sapphire and Woolgoolga
- 3.103 DS: it's a large number
- 3.104 BS: For 4 years we have been told that the highway would incorporate through and local traffic
- 3.105 CC indicated that he had already answered the question
- 3.106 BS: No, you refuse to respond to the question.
- 3.107 MM: In a letter from the Federal Minister dated 31 July 06, it says that western options would attract less traffic. If most of the traffic is freight traffic, how can they say that western options would attract less traffic?

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.108 CC (attempts to respond)
- 3.109 MM: It's a motorway
- 3.110 CC: Even with the service roads in place, it is anticipated that most of the traffic on the new highway will be local traffic.
- 3.111 DW indicated that the meeting should move forward as there were a couple of issues still to discuss
- 3.112 BS: if this issue is left unresolved it will create a level of distrust between the community and the RTA. In Coffs Harbour most of the traffic would be freight traffic, but he disputes that most of the traffic on the northern end is freight and local traffic
- 3.113 MM: Is the highway being considered for a tollway?
- 3.114 CC: The government is looking at options to progress the upgrade of the Pacific Highway.
- 3.115 MM: Is it being considered?
- 3.116 CC: The government is looking at options to progress the upgrade of the Pacific Highway.
- 3.117 MM: What was the width of the land take for the interchanges?
- 3.118 CC: I cannot recall the exact footprint size of each interchange.
- 3.119 BS/MM: You should know
- 3.120 MM: 250m
- 3.121 CC: I cannot recall the exact footprint size of each interchange
- 3.122 MM: Up to 250m?
- 3.123 CC: I will get back to you
- 3.124 DW: We have 20 minutes to discuss previous Minutes or we could do it in-between CFG with members writing in with comments
- 3.125 BS: Should provide another CFG meeting in the next 3-4 weeks to discuss the Minutes
- 3.126 CC: It is not cost effective to hold a CFG meeting to go over the minutes of previous meetings.
- 3.127 BS: Minutes were not on the agenda. Requested that Minutes be placed on the agenda
- 3.128 DW: Request did not come through
- 3.129 BS: It is a normal meeting issue. It was usually the first thing
- 3.130 DW: All the information is important. It was her job to move the meeting forward and cover all the issues
- 3.131 BS: The Minutes should not be published on the web before being adopted
- 3.132 DW: Perhaps you can provide a consolidated copy of changes to the Minutes
- 3.133 RC: When will the next CFG meeting be?

CC to advise before next CFG (in the next 2 weeks): what is the width of land take for the interchanges

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 3.134 CC: after the lodgement of the Part 3A Application
- 3.135 BS: There is only one more- no negotiations?
- 3.136 DS: When will the meeting be held?
- 3.137 CC: possibly in the next month or two. I cannot guarantee an exact time as it depends on the lodging of the part 3A application.
- 3.138 DW: written submissions to be received from the CFG members on amendments of the Minutes to be sent out with the Agenda for the next meeting
- 3.139 RC: Legitimising the decision
- 3.140 BS: clarified that there would be another meeting of the CFG with no additional meeting considered
- 3.141 MM: Not draft Minutes
- 3.142 DW: We will look at amendments to the Minutes out of session and discuss next CFG. Draft CFG minutes will be issued to CFG members for comment. A consolidated copy will then be reissued to the CFG.
- 3.143 RC: Don't think there will be another meeting
- 3.144 BS: The only straight answer that the CFG had received in the past 5 years is the seating arrangements for the meeting. Reflection of the consultation by the RTA
- 3.145 DW: reiterated what CC had said earlier that there would be another CFG when the Part 3A Application was sent.
- 3.146 MM: Why waste our time when they are not given the opportunity to comment. No consultation
- 3.147 BS:DW, as a facilitator, you must see that there has been no consultation by the RTA
- 3.148 DW: She understood his frustration. But her job is to get through the agenda items
- 3.149 MM: A letter sent to her on 30 July 06 by CC in relation to a letter tabled by some CFG members in response to a letter by Bob Higgins. Why was she the only person who received it?
- 3.150 CC: It had been distributed to everyone
- 3.151 MM: Why hadn't they been received?
- 3.152 CC: He understood that the letter had been distributed to all signatories of the letter. But he will get a copy
- 3.153 DS: I received a copy.
- 3.154 BS: The Minutes, if being placed on the website should bear the notation that there were strong objections
- 3.155 CC: Minutes posted on the website have a notation of "draft" or "not adopted"
- 3.156 BS/MM indicated that they did not want the Minutes of the meeting published on the website until they had been adopted
- 3.157 MM: In the letter (from CC- mentioned above) it mentions that new Aerial

CC to forward copy of letter to CFG members to ensure letter sent to all signatories

LC Minutes of meeting not to be posted on the website until

Details:

Photography had been flown and that it would be provided to the CFG. It is too late now. How many properties are being impacted by the proposal? Could the aerial photography be provided to the CFG? They need it now not later

Action By/Date:

after they have been adopted.

3.158 RC: What is your definition of Consultation? Does the RTA have a set of guidelines?

3.159 CC: Consultation- a two-way flow of information between the RTA and other stakeholders. Providing information and getting feedback

3.160 RC: If you provide the information we could give you feedback. Is there a set of guidelines? Could we have a copy?

3.161 CC wasn't sure if it was a public document. If it is, then he will provide a copy

3.162 BS read out a definition of consultation

3.163 CC: Yes I would agree with that definition

3.164 RC: Minutes- all community consultation groups have some problems

3.165 BS: Previously they had spent 3hours in meetings discussing Minutes because they were incorrect.

3.166 Meeting closed at 9pm

CC to provide RC with a copy of the RTA's Consultation Guidelines (if a public document)

4. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 9.00 pm.

Next Meeting: To be held after lodgement of Part 3A Application. Exact Date to be advised

Summary of Meeting's Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC to provide percentage of highway that is Class M/A <i>(Item Number 2. 20)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC to provide information on what is going to happen. What input (into the EA) from the CFG? Who takes account of the comments? When will DoP get the PA report? LC to reissue to MM copies of overheads from June 06 CFG <i>(Item Number 2. 30)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC to provide summary of Sikh meetings <i>(Item Number 2.99)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC to provide information on which property owners from the Sikh community were called for meetings and how - required before next CFG <i>(Item Number 2.101)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC to contact Bob Benning in regard to access issues <i>(Item Number 2.110)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC to provide details of Sikh Consultation prior to Mar 05 <i>(Item Number 2.113)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC to arrange meeting between WAR Group and Regional Office Grafton by 18 August 2006 <i>(Item Number 2.131)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC to contact BS and SM to arrange meeting by 18 Aug <i>(Item Number 2.144)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DW to send out Draft CFG Agenda 2 weeks before CFG meeting <i>(Item Number 2.158)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC to advise how many properties directly affected by Option E? Has RTA contacted all of them? How many property owners not contacted due to lack of phone number? Copy of letter to all property owners <i>(Item Number 2.193)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LC to provide MM with Noise Report from Supplementary Options Report <i>(Item Number 3.20)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LC to check the submissions for owners who have identified themselves as organic farmers <i>(Item Number 3.51)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC to advise within 2 weeks: what is the width of land take for the interchanges <i>(Item Number 3.124)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC to forward copy of letter to CFG members to ensure letter sent to all signatories <i>(Item Number 3.154)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LC Minutes of meeting not to be posted on the website until after they have been adopted <i>(Item Number 3.157)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC to provide RC with a copy of the RTA's Consultation Guidelines (if a public document) <i>(Item Number 3.161)</i>