

| | | | |
|----------|---|------------|-----------------|
| Project: | Woodburn to Ballina Pacific Highway Upgrade | Reference: | 000561486 |
| Meeting | COMMUNITY LIAISON GROUP – Meeting No.3a | Date: | 8 February 2005 |

Present: Apology: Name: Group/ Organisation:

| | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|
| ✓ | | David Judge | Wardell Progress Association |
| ✓ | | Kerry Kelly | Bagotville |
| ✓ | | Bill Walker | NSW Sugar Milling Co-Operative, Broadwater Mill |
| ✓ | | Ron Rosolen | Wardell |
| ✓ | | Natasha Heath | Wardell Progress Association |
| | ✓ | Mike Rushby | Wardell |
| | | Julie Coyle | Wardell |
| ✓ | | Roger Stanley | Coolgardie |
| ✓ | | Trevor Monti | Bagotville |
| ✓ | | Emma Walke | Bagotville |
| | | John Degotardi | Broadwater |
| ✓ | | Jack Matthes | Broadwater |
| | | Jeffrey Phillips | Woodburn |
| ✓ | | Rod Ison | Public Transport Operator |
| ✓ | | Darren Woolage | Broadwater |
| ✓ | | Murray Shergold | Woodburn |
| ✓ | | Steve Flatley | Richmond River Cane Growers Association |
| ✓ | | Bert Plankovitch | Richmond River Cane Growers Association |
| ✓ | | Tony Carusi | Richmond River Cane Growers Association |
| | ✓ | Ray Collier | Wardell |
| ✓ | | David McDonald | Rural area between Woodburn and Broadwater |
| ✓ | | Stephanie Lymburner | Coolgardie and Coolgardie Scrub Conservation Group |
| ✓ | | Mark Graham | North Coast Conservation Council, Big Scrub Environment Centre and Nature Conservation Council |
| ✓ | | Rik Nutt | Woodburn |
| ✓ | | Bill Salapic | Woodburn |
| ✓ | | Colin Duncan | Wardell |
| ✓ | | Francine Hitchens | Riley's Hill |
| | ✓ | Paddy Wilde | Riley's Hill |
| ✓ | | Allen Macourt | Hyder Consulting |
| ✓ | | Harry Batt | Hyder Consulting |
| ✓ | | Andrew Nathan | Hyder Consulting |
| ✓ | | Carolyn Stone | PPM Consultants |
| ✓ | | Tim Rodham | Hyder Consulting |
| ✓ | | Astrid Jordan | Hyder Consulting |
| ✓ | | Brendon Johnson | Hyder Consulting |

| | | | |
|---------------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| ✓ | | Tanya Coates | Hyder Consulting |
| ✓ | | Shane Higgins | Roads and Traffic Authority |
| ✓ | | Toby Heys | Roads and Traffic Authority |
| ✓ | | Daniela Payne | GeoLINK |
| ✓ | | Brett Campbell | Geolyse |
| Recorded By: | Daniela Payne, GeoLINK | | Total Pages: 8 |

**WOODBURN TO BALLINA – COMMUNITY LIAISON GROUP
MINUTES OF MEETING NO.3A – TUESDAY 8 FEBRUARY 2005**

Carolyn Stone opened the meeting at 6.30 pm, and welcomed members. Apologies from Ray Collier, Mike Rushby and Paddy Wilde were received.

Carolyn introduced a few project team members that had not previously been present at the CLG meetings – Harry Batt (Project manager); Tanya Coates (Environmental consultant) , Brendon Johnson (Engineering consultant), and Brett Campbell (Ecology consultant, Geolise).

ITEM 1 Acceptance of CLG 2a and b notes (CAROLYN STONE)

Carolyn asked for comment on the notes of the last two CLG meetings prior to the minutes being accepted by all. There were no comments on the notes.

ITEM 2 Workshop objectives (ALLEN MACOURT)

- To advise the CLG on the corridor identification process to date;
- To present the identified corridors options;
- To enable the CLG to comment on the identified corridor options;
- To advise the CLG of the future programme and opportunities for further consultation.

Q: Kerry asked whether the project team realised that the community had had a meeting over the past weekend, from which further proposals on corridor options were produced.

A: Yes, we were aware of the meeting being held, but as it was not a meeting held under the aegis of the project team, we were unaware of the contents of and output of the meeting as yet. The work produced by the meeting held over the weekend was welcomed as input into the corridor identification process, and as such, it was asked whether a submission on this could be made soon. The team is happy to receive any submission from the community.

| No. | ACTION | WHO |
|-----|---|-------------|
| 1. | Saturday Community meeting notes and corridor mapping exercise material to be submitted to the project team as input into the corridor mapping process. | Kerry Kelly |

ITEM 3 Project objectives (ALLEN MACOURT)

The revised project objectives were presented (and will be contained in CLG meeting 3b notes), and further suggestions were made on the revised set of objectives. The following further suggestions were made and would be considered and re presented at the CLG 3b meeting.

Suggestions received on the revised set of project objectives were:

Objective 2: To mention Fauna within two of the project objectives, as it was special enough to be included on both points.

Objective 4: A few words were changed, and will be reflected in the objectives in the notes for CLG 3b meeting.

Objective 5: Suggested that the words “maximise benefits” arising from the project be added to the objective.

Objective 8: The word “study” was suggested to be changed to “project”.

Q: Is there an objective which addresses staging construction so as to minimise the time and adverse effect on the community?

A: Yes, that area of concern falls within the objective which aims to minimise adverse socio-economic effects on the local community.

Q: If a quarry had to be built in order to provide material to build the road, would this be included in the project costs?

A: All aspects and costs involved in the project are measured and the effects assessed against the whole suite of objectives.

ITEM 4 General Discussion on CLG members and problems they are experiencing

Issues raised and responses given were as follows:

1. Kerry Kelly did not believe there should be the required level of secrecy regarding the meetings and the information heard by the CLG or given to the CLG. She disagreed with the ban on consulting with the media. She was aware that it was discussed at the first meeting, but still believed it was wrong and should be re-addressed. She also said that members of the Harwood/Wells Crossing CLG had a public meeting with the media present and mapped information on display similar to the information that they received earlier and were told was confidential. She said that the community they represented at these meetings had a right to know the process and to be able to look at something tangible.

The project team confirmed that this issue was covered in the charter that each member had signed, and that maps in the future would be released clearly marked as Draft and/ or Confidential. The CLG was addressed over the fact that material that was currently confidential would be released as and when it was finalised. All information, after finalisation, would eventually become public information.

2. Through a few of the members of the CLG it was communicated that community members were upset not to have been a member of the CLG group, and that many people in the community were, and still are, unaware of the whole project going ahead.

Other members of the CLG group responded by saying that they could have been a part of it, but chose not to be. All the members did not agree with the proposition that community members were not aware of the initial meetings. They believed that most members of the public would have been aware of the project as there was sufficient publicity surrounding it.

3. There was an issue surrounding the release of information pertaining to the project to the media. Kerry from the CLG wanted to be able to talk to the media freely.

Members of the CLG voted on not being able to talk to the media as a representative of the CLG. It was agreed that members of the CLG were able, as general members of the public, and not representing the CLG, to speak to the media in their personal capacity. In talking to the media in a personal capacity, individuals would not be able to release any of the information received at a CLG meeting session. Members of the CLG were cognisant of the fact that the media often misquoted information given to them, and that misinformation was potentially damaging, especially at this early stage of the project. The group then agreed that it was not desirable, to be giving the media information at this stage (the information collection stage) of the project.

4. An issue was raised as to why there was no focus group on the environment, since there was a focus group on Cane farming and Flooding.

This issue would be on the agenda for the next night's meeting.

ITEM 5 Updated constraints and opportunities (ASTRID JORDAN AND TIM RODHAM)

Allen described that after updating the constraints and opportunities it would be possible to develop performance criteria and then performance measures which would help measure the various corridor options in terms of their ability to address project objectives.

Astrid and Tim presented the updates on constraints and opportunities to the CLG. (The updated constraints and opportunity maps will be sent out in due course, along with the re-issue of all other maps). The additions were as follows:

- New sites were identified as non - indigenous heritage sites, which were added to the constraints mapping of heritage areas.
- Voluntary Conservation Agreement (VCA) areas mapped
- Topography analysis provided for Indigenous Heritage areas
- LEP roads prohibited areas mapped
- Services identified
- Cane haulage routes identified

Q: Have the registered property agreements with DIPNR also been mapped, as these have the same legal standing as VCA's, under the Native Vegetation Conservation Act of 1998?

A: The DIPNR registered properties have not yet been included; that database will however be sought after.

Q: How easy is it for property owners to get their property registered as a Voluntary Conservation Area with the Department of Environment and Conservation?

A: Stephanie answered, as her property has achieved this listing, that the DEC has a huge backlog of people wanting to get their properties listed, and that the waiting list may take a few years to get through.

Q: What is an LEP?

A: A Local Environmental Plan

| No. | ACTION | WHO |
|-----|---|-----------|
| 2. | Specific property listing of those properties, within the study area, that are either Voluntary Conservation Agreement areas, or are registered properties with DIPNR under the Native Vegetation Conservation Act of 1998. | Hyder/RTA |
| 3 | Send Constraints and Opportunity Maps to CLG Members | Hyder |

ITEM 6 Corridor identification process (TIM RODHAM)

The three-pronged process of corridor identification – using Quantm; Traditional and Consultation ('Community') methods, was explained and then each method was described. The multiple sets of routes mapped as a result of using each of the three methods were rationalised and then overlaid, and further rationalised to produce the various corridor options. The strengths and weaknesses of these were to be assessed by the community the following evening.

Corridor options generated by each of the above processes will be sent with the whole pack of maps being reissued to all CLG members.

The corridor identification process was presented by Tim as follows:

Quantm method: This is a powerful corridor and route optimisation computer software tool, which generates multiple routes based on cost. The constraints and opportunities are mapped as linear features or special zones which are attributed specific criteria, costs or identified as avoid zones. The programme considers geometric road design requirements and construction costs. The Quantm data centre is in Melbourne. Once all the data has been entered into the programme, it runs thousands of iterations and reports the 50 most cost efficient options. Hyder/RTA has then selected the 30 top most cost effective options. An attractive benefit of using this system is that once the base work of inputting all the data is done, it doesn't take long re-run the analysis after changes are made to the base information – without consuming huge amounts of time and labour (which the traditional method does consume).

The data input required for the Quantm system includes items such as geological type and zones (e.g. cut and fill requirements, and the hauling and borrowing costs of material); linear features such as utility lines, networks (road design inputs), costs and any other lines on a map; special zones that are not represented as polygons, but rather have an enclosed shape like flood zones and other socio economic, ecological and heritage zones. Aerial photographs/ images were also used as input.

The Quantm system has been used in producing corridor scenarios based on taking a particular approach (as described below) for any one run:

- 'free to roam' programme run based on minimal constraints (but which included such data as watercourses, Q100 levels and digital terrain models).
- **engineering** (using data such as cost of land, cost of construction and the presence of major utilities such as sewerage works and telecommunications towers)
- **environment** (areas of ecological significance of 4 or 5 (as stipulated in previous hand out maps), heritage areas, SEPP 14 and 26 areas, noise pollution and other issue.
- **social, community and economic** aspects (such as open space and recreational amenities), as well as a
- **Significance level 5 only**

- Significance level 4 and 5
- Significance level 3,4, and 5

The top 30 routes were chosen for each scenario. Consolidated corridors were identified from route clusters for each individual scenario. The consolidated corridors for each individual scenario were then combined and the clusters once again rationalised to produce the combined corridors output.

Q: When do you start using Quantm?

A: Have been using Quantm for a bit over a month. We have been entering in all of the constraints data, which is in detail and takes time – generating routes using Quantm doesn't take long once the data is entered.

Q: So you didn't get the study area from Quantm?

A: No.

Q: When you mention the system criteria as being based on 'cost', do you mean cost in terms of dollars or social impact costs too?

A: The costs include engineering construction costs plus some other cost that are quantifiable at this stage such as property acquisition.

Q: Have you ruled out the East of Wardell route that was identified in the original mapping process from Quantm?

A: We did not rule out any route, we just rationalised the route selection. It does not mean that certain routes are no longer an option, just that where there is a clustering of routes, a representative route is identified.

Q: Why was there no route chosen for the area to the East of the study area?

A: Quantm has to work within fixed boundaries in order to produce results. At this time the project team were focused primarily within the study area.

Q: All the maps presented this evening started around 15 kilometres south of the Bruxner Highway intersection with the Pacific Highway, why is this?

A: The Quantm method did not see the cost benefit of moving the highway away from its current axis; it was the most economic solution in identifying a corridor. At this time the project team were focused primarily within the study area.

Q: Why are all the roads not shown on the maps, so that it would be easier to orientate ourselves?

A: If all the roads were mapped over and above all the information being presented in each map, we would not be able to see the information being presented.

A comment from the project team was that the corridor options that were presented represented a 250m corridor, and that they were not "set in stone", but rather were to be used as a base to work around.

Q: Will Quantm be given a chance to look at corridors outside of the study area.

A: Once the corridors produced now have been rationalised, other corridors outside of the study area may be included, which would require the study area to be modified.

Traditional method:

This method was guided by the Pacific Highway Upgrade Goals and project objectives. Constraints and opportunities were identified after analysing the study area and these were spatially mapped and assigned significance.

Key members of the project team attended the mapping workshop, which resulted in corridors being mapped that avoided highly significant constraint areas and acknowledged lesser constraint areas. Also the corridors captured opportunities identified.

Q: Was noise pollution part of the data used in the selection of routes in this process?

A: Yes, this was part of the socio economic study data.

Q: Where does the flooding data come into this method?

A: Flooding maps were referred to in the workshop. Flood levels were used to set minimum road levels.

Community consultation method:

The constraints and opportunities were presented at CLG 2a, and at CLG 2b. The CLG split into five groups to generate corridors according to the constraints and opportunities presented and their local knowledge. Each of the groups then summarised the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed corridors. The corridors for all the CLG groups were combined. The same rationalisation process from the corridor clusters was undertaken to consolidate the options.

A set of corridors (based on outputs from Quantm, the traditional method and the 'community' approach) was consolidated. For ease of understanding the consolidated corridor options were described on the relevant map as Eastern and Western corridor options:

These corridors were to be the subject of the next night's CLG meeting, where the CLG was to split into groups and discuss in detail each of the identified corridors, and report back on their strengths and weaknesses.

ITEM 7 General (CAROLYN STONE)

Carolyn took general comments and queries from the CLG members, after stipulating that time on Wednesday night was allocated to discussing corridor options – both their strengths and weaknesses; advantages and disadvantages.

General questions ensued:

Q: Kerry asked whether the community meeting notes from the past weekend's community meeting could be included in the corridor mapping process?

A: Yes, we are happy to put your options generated through the same process as all the other options were put.

Q: Could the lists of strengths and weaknesses of the corridors mapped by community members in the CLG 2 meetings be supplied?

A: Yes, these will be provided.

Q: Will the RTA include the Woodburn to Ballina (and other relevant) Pacific Highway Upgrade Projects into the Integrated Regional Transport Strategy being prepared as part of the Northern Rivers Regional Strategy. It was suggested that to prepare such a major planning initiative without the inclusion of relevant PHUP's would limit the effectiveness and overall outcomes of the Strategy. DIPNR staff have advised Mark Graham that the RTA had suggested that the PHUP would be considered outside of the programme. Could the issue be clarified by the RTA?

A: This item will be reported back to the CLG at their next meeting.

Q: Kerry requested that Gary Owers be invited to share his local knowledge with respect to the local environment within the study area. He belongs to an association called Wetland Care Australia, has a Bachelor of Applied Sciences and is working upon his Doctorate.

A: After consultation with all the CLG members on the request, it was agreed that Gary be invited to give a presentation of half an hour at the next CLG meeting in March.

| No. | ACTION | WHO |
|-----|---|--------------|
| 4. | The project team will investigate what relationship the Pacific Highway Upgrade Projects have with the Northern Rivers Regional transport strategy. | Hyder / RTA |
| 5. | Gary Owers to be invited to present information pertaining to the study area for half and hour at the March CLG meeting. | Kerry/ Hyder |

Carolyn finalised the meeting by thanking everyone for their contribution and noting the enormity of the task ahead of us all. The issue of the shop front was raised, and there was a suggestion from various community members that the shop front needed to be opened for a few hours over a weekend to allow for those members of the public that worked to be able to access the information without having to take time off work.

It was agreed that at the beginning of the next meeting, the CLG would take names out of a hat to arrange all the community members into groups that would then sit down and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the Eastern and Western corridors identified.

The group members were thanked for their attendance and input, and the meeting was closed at approximately 9:30pm, and the CLG agreed with the arrangements for the next meeting.