



22 May 2006

Project	Woolgoolga to Wells Crossing Pacific Highway upgrade	From	Nicole Martyres
Subject	CLG meeting 5	Tel	02 9239 7251
Venue/Date/Time	Yarrawarra Large Conference Centre, 11 May 2006, 7pm – 9pm	Job No	21/13306
Copies to	All attendees		
Attendees	Sloane Scott John Imrie Tony Wade Rick Mockridge Richard Casey Mark Sinclair Patrick Benefield Milton Duroux (Yarrawarra Aboriginal Corporation) Scott Lenton (Clarence Valley Council) Stephen Williamson (RTA) Christophe Steinbach (RTA) Eugene Golshtein (GHD) Mirella Di Genua (GHD) Nicole Martyres (GHD)	Apologies	

Item No.	Minutes	Action By	When
1.	Welcome and introductions		
1.1	Mirella welcomed everyone and introduced Eugene Golshtein, the new Project Manager who has replaced Andrew Geddes.		
2.	Update of activities from Route Options Display to today		
2.1	In the last 5 months, the following activities have taken place: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Value Management Workshop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The group recommended a route for further investigation – A number of 'subject to' items were identified ▶ The project team has gone away and carried out further investigations/technical studies and made refinements ▶ Preparation of the submissions report 		
2.2	The project team have taken into account outcomes of VMW, submissions and technical studies.		
2.3	The project team are in the process of finalising the preferred route.		



Item No.	Minutes	Action By	When
2.4	<p>Q. Following the VMW, there has been no community input at all. The Department of Environment and Conservation and Council have had input. We are now in May. By the time the announcement is made, 6 months would have passed with no community input. The process is wrong. Would have liked an opportunity to read other people's submissions and comment on them.</p> <p>A. The opportunity to speak to the project team did not close when the route options display closed. The submission process is one element of the consultation process. There needed to be a deadline so that the project could keep going and the team could go ahead with the route selection workshop. The 1800 number, email and freepost address is open, so CLG members and other community members are free to contact the team at any time to raise questions and provide feedback. Following the public display we received community submissions. Everyone had the opportunity to comment.</p>		
2.5	<p>Q. There has been no feedback since the VMW on issues that were raised for further investigation.</p> <p>A. There were a number of 'subject to' items raised during the workshop. These were documented in the VMW report. The project team went away and carried out further technical studies in order to address these issues. The outcomes will be in the Preferred Route report.</p>		
2.6	<p>Q. The VMW procedure was a good procedure, there is no dispute with that, but what was needed was a follow on workshop.</p> <p>A. The team addressed the 'subject to' items arising from the VMW. It is in a road designer's interest to address as many critical issues/constraints in road design. They need to understand what they can and can't do, so we have taken into account public submissions and all the concerns raised.</p>		
2.7	<p>Q. There has been no feedback since on the concerns raised.</p> <p>A. You recently received a copy of the draft submissions report and will get a preferred route report and a copy of the specialist reports once the preferred route has been announced. There has been lots of opportunity for people to voice their concerns. Unfortunately due process takes time to approve reports and GHD cannot issue documents before they have been approved.</p>		



Item No.	Minutes	Action By	When
3.	Value Management Workshop Update		
3.1	<i>All CLG members were sent copies of the draft Value Management Workshop report prior to the meeting. Stephen gave a presentation of the key findings of the VMW.</i>		
4.	Route options submissions report update		
4.1	<i>Mirella gave a presentation of the key findings of the submissions report.</i>		
4.2	All CLG members were provided with a draft route options submissions report prior to this meeting. The final route options submissions report will be distributed shortly.		
4.3	<p>Q. It is hard to get a feel for the significance of comments such as 'strong support' and 'some support' – what numbers are we talking about?</p> <p>A. The graphs in the submissions report show the numbers. You should not really focus on the numbers, as some people may like one option for one reason and another for another reason. The main thing is that you get a feel for the issues.</p>		
5.	Selection of a preferred route		
5.1	The same company who facilitated the VMW facilitated the route selection workshop. They followed a similar process as that followed at the VMW, i.e. development of assessment criteria and assessment of the route options in terms of environment, community, function and economics. The group took into account outcomes of VMW, submissions and technical studies.		
5.2	A preferred route report will be prepared. There are 13 specialist reports, which support the preferred route report.		
5.3	<p>Q. Who was at the workshop?</p> <p>A. Senior management from the RTA and project team members.</p>		



Item No.	Minutes	Action By	When
6.	Preferred route display		
6.1	<p>The Minister for Roads will announce the preferred route display. The information provided during the display would be similar to that used for the route options display. There will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Advertisements ▶ Calls to CLG and EFG members and landowners who are potentially affected by the preferred route ▶ Static displays ▶ Staffed displays ▶ Community updates 		
6.2	<p>The potential site for the interchange will be indicated on the display posters.</p>		
6.3	<p>The preferred route report will be available at the display locations.</p>		
6.4	<p>Letters, with copies of the community update, will be sent to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Property owners who are potentially directly affected ▶ Property owners adjacent to the preferred route ▶ Property owners who are no longer affected <p>Potentially directly affected property owners will receive a plan, which shows their property in relation to the preferred route. The letter will advise how they can arrange a meeting with the project team.</p>		
6.5	<p>Although there will not be a feedback form this time round, comments are welcomed on the preferred route. They should however relate to issues to do with the preferred route, e.g. access etc, as opposed to previous options.</p>		
6.6	<p>The Minister is looking to announce all Pacific Highway upgrade projects by the end of June 2006.</p>		
6.7	<p>Q. Could people get more than one letter?</p> <p>A. Yes, people could get two letters if they own more than one property, as one could be potentially affected by the preferred route and another could be no longer impacted. We will cross check the mailing lists to ensure that people do not receive more than one type of letter by mistake.</p>	NM	Prior to mailout



Item No.	Minutes	Action By	When
6.8	<p>Q. How wide will the preferred route be?</p> <p>A. The final width will be approximately 150m, however in some areas it may be wider, for example, up Dirty Creek Range it may be up to 300m.</p>		
6.9	<p>Q. Will the display show the width of the interchange?</p> <p>A. Yes, a nominal width, but no detailed drawings.</p>		
6.10	<p>Q. Will access arrangements be shown?</p> <p>A. No. This will be developed at the concept design stage.</p>		
6.11	<p>Q. You mentioned that additional work had been completed. Will that be made public?</p> <p>A. Yes. There are supplementary sections to some of the specialist reports.</p>		
6.12	<p>Q. Is it possible that someone could receive a letter saying ' you are not affected', but then be affected by an access road?</p> <p>A. Yes, the extent of service and access roads is a function of the concept design process.</p>		
6.13	We would like CLG members to encourage people who receive a letter saying they are potentially affected to ring the 1800 number to contact the project team to arrange a meeting.	All	During preferred route display
7.	CLG update and Q&A		
7.1	<p>The following feedback has been received by CLG members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ People want to know what the business impacts will be and the location and format of interchanges. ▶ There are concerns over access for emergency services, access to properties, the location of the interchange and property issues. Although property issues have been to a lesser extent as people have come to terms with the fact that they won't have direct access to the highway. ▶ There are concerns about how to get onto the highway and how people will get to Grafton and Coffs Harbour. 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	



Item No.	Minutes	Action By	When
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Access and safety seem to be key issues. Also, people want the RTA to stop getting opinions on where the highway should go and should just tell them where it is going. They feel that there should be a cut off. People are not saying 'not in my backyard', but 'get on with it'. If you are going to take people's houses, they just want the RTA to let them know and for them to take it. People are concerned about the unknown and uncertainty. ▶ People would like an end to the uncertainty. There is not a lot of hype up at Halfway Creek, but there are rumours flying around which aren't true, e.g. people saying that the RTA are going to take their house when the RTA have not been in contact with them. There needs to be some finality and to get the upgrade done. ▶ Some people feel that they are getting over-consulted. There should be a single meeting to tackle a few issues, as people have limited time. 	Noted	
7.2	<p>Q. Once the preferred route is signed off, what is the timeframe for acquisition? Could it be years?</p> <p>A. Yes. The RTA only buys property when they need it, however there are grounds to request the RTA to purchase property once the preferred route is announced. If people demonstrate their case on grounds of hardship, the RTA will enter into negotiations to purchase at market value</p> <p>The RTA can also prioritise looking at an area to see if they can shift the alignment to avoid impact.</p> <p>The RTA encourages people to maintain their house/property as they would normally until such time that the RTA acquires the land.</p>		
7.3	<p>Q. People see a line on a map and think it will happen overnight.</p> <p>A. It may be years away. One of the main objectives of these planning projects is to get the corridor on council's local environmental plan so it is protected and there is an element of certainty for people.</p>		
7.4	<p>Q. Why did the RTA not do that 30 years ago?</p> <p>A. The RTA did in sections.</p>		
7.5	<p>Once the RTA has a preferred route and concept design, local Aboriginal groups can check the cultural impacts.</p>		
7.6	<p>People say 'get on with it', however when they get more information and see where the highway is going, they will kick up a fuss. People want the road to be made safe and for it to be able to deal with traffic.</p>	Noted	



Item No.	Minutes	Action By	When
7.7	One of the CLG members sent a letter to the RTA on 31 January 2006, but has not received a reply. It does not encourage people to have input. The RTA has discussed this matter with the CLG member.	SW	
7.8	<p>One of the CLG members gave the group an update on cycleway developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A cycleway at Darkum Creek, Mullaway has been opened. It runs for 150m each way. It will probably be 50 years until we get a coastline cycleway from the Queensland border to the Victorian border. ▶ Petrol prices are on the increase as is childhood obesity, and there has been more interest in cycling. ▶ It is mystifying that the government has decided to build a tunnel on the Eastern Freeway extension and are putting a 2.5 asphalt bike path through Mullum Mullum. ▶ A mountain bike event was held in Coffs Harbour in July and the cycle group are organising a breakfast meeting for businesses. 	Noted	
7.9	<p>Q. Will there be bus stops in a Class A scenario?</p> <p>A. Buses will be encouraged to pull over into accesses clear of the shoulders.</p>		
7.10	<p>Q. Will that lengthen the distance parents have to drive to drop their children at bus stops?</p> <p>a. Yes. People going north may have to travel south for 2-3 km.</p>		
7.11	<p>There was discussion on potential loss of building entitlement if the RTA acquires part of a lot. This would be considered at the time of the acquisition. The owner should not be disadvantaged by the acquisition.</p>		
7.12	<p>Q. Is there provision for underpasses on divided land?</p> <p>A. Yes, in certain circumstances.</p>		
7.13	<p>Q. Has the RTA got a book which outlines their approach to various scenarios?</p> <p>A. There is a property acquisition book, but the RTA has property specialists, who deal with acquisition issues, who can be contacted that.</p>		
7.14	<p>Q. Will the preferred route display start on the day of the announcement?</p> <p>A. Yes.</p>		



Item No.	Minutes	Action By	When
8.	Future CLGs		
8.1	<p>The RTA is considering holding focus groups during the next stages of the project (after the preferred route display). The reason for reviewing the approach is that some people in the community perceive that they've been excluded by not being involved in the CLG and as the team moves onto concept design, it will be necessary to obtain input on more specific issues. The formation of focus groups would allow people to become involved in project, by looking at specific areas that they are interested in. Focus groups would give people the opportunity to look at specific design issues and provide a forum where people can share their ideas. The focus groups would not have a decision-making role or be there to review the project teams work.</p> <p>These focus groups could be based on key areas within the study area or specific issues, for example access. There could be two or three focus groups to look at different aspects. During the focus groups, there could be small discussion groups. The CLG would continue, but the shape it takes would change. The RTA would like to see the continued involvement of CLG members through these focus groups, but obviously if some members felt that they did not want to continue that would be fine.</p> <p>Registrations for the focus groups would be advertised through local newspapers. The project team would manage attendance, with the view to keeping numbers to 30-40 people. They would try to make sure that there is a cross section of interests represented.</p> <p>The project team would like your views on whether focus groups would be a good idea.</p>		
8.2	<p>Please could everyone have a think about possible topics for the focus groups and send their ideas to Nicole.</p> <p>Access was suggested as a topic of discussion.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>Noted</p>	
8.3	<p>Q. It is agreed that people should understand that they do not have a decision-making role, but it is a concern that the EFG has been disbanded.</p> <p>A. The EFG has not been disbanded. They will meet again when the preferred route goes on display. From the outset it was agree that the EFG would have a limited lifetime, with agreement for members to meet three times during the project. The meeting during the preferred route display will be meeting three.</p>		



Item No.	Minutes	Action By	When
9.	Summary and close of meeting		
9.1	The next meeting will be towards the end of the second week of the display. The agenda will be the preferred route. Specialist reports will be available, but they won't be placed on the internet as they are too big.		
9.2	CLG members will get a phone call from the project team when the preferred route is announced.	NM	Day of announcement
9.3	Mirella thanked everyone for their contribution.		

Nicole Martyres

Community Liaison Representative, Woolgoolga to Wells Crossing