

Project:	Woodburn to Ballina Pacific Highway Upgrade	Reference:	00561193
Meeting	COMMUNITY LIAISON GROUP – Meeting No.8	Date:	19 July 2005

Present:	Apology:	Name:	Group/ Organisation:
✓		David Judge	Wardell
✓		Kerry Kelly	Bagotville
✓		Bill Walker	Broadwater
		Ron Rosolen	Wardell
✓		Natasha Heath	Wardell
✓		Mike Rushby	Wardell
		Julieanne Coyle	Wardell
		Roger Stanley	Coolgardie
✓		Trevor Monti	Bagotville
✓		Emma Walke	Bagotville
	✓	John Degotardi	Broadwater
✓		Jack Matthes	Broadwater
✓		Jeffrey Phillips	Woodburn
		Rodney Ison	Ballina
✓		Darren Woolage	Broadwater
✓		Murray Shergold	Woodburn
✓		Steve Flatley	Wardell
✓		Bert Plenkovich	Alstonville
		Tony Carusi	Woodburn
✓		Ray Collyer	Wardell
✓		David McDonald	Woodburn
✓		Stephanie Lymburner	Coolgardie
✓		Mark Graham	Meerschaum Vale
✓		Rik Nutt	Woodburn
		Bill Salapic	Woodburn
✓		Colin Duncan	Wardell
✓		Francine Hitchens	Riley's Hill
✓		Richard Paton	Whytes Lane West
✓		Michael Archer	Whytes Lane West
✓		Lois Cook	Observer
	✓	Paddy Wilde	Rileys Hill
✓		Artie Ferguson	Wardell
✓		Peter Moore	Meerschaum Vale
✓		Michael Meszaros	Meerschaum Vale
✓		Barry Jameson	Lismore
✓		Shane Higgins	RTA
✓		Toby Heys	RTA
✓		Andrew Nathan	Hyder Consulting
✓		Graham Richardson	Hyder Consulting
✓		Carolyn Stone	PPM Consultants
✓		Annette Ross	Hyder Consulting
✓		Daniela Payne	GeoLINK
Recorded By:	Daniela Payne, GeoLINK		Total Pages: 6

WOODBURN TO BALLINA – COMMUNITY LIAISON GROUP
NOTES of Meeting No.8 – Tuesday 19 JULY 2005

Item 1: New CLG Members

- New CLG members were introduced: Michael Archer; Richard Paton; Mike Meszaros and Peter Moore.
- The new members were asked to briefly introduce themselves, the area they represent and outline their main issues of concern at this stage.
- Lois Cook a representative of traditional owners, who will be attending the VMW, attended this meeting to be able to get a brief introduction to the project and the current issues.

Item 2: Comments on CLG 7 Notes

- Emma submitted some changes to be made on her comments at CLG 7. These will be incorporated.
- Rik Nutt submitted some changes to his comments at CLG 7.
- Kerry Kelly – a statement and question to Bob Higgins regarding windows and air conditioning; in the city they often do buffer fences and in the country. Asked Bob Higgins whether the noise mitigation considered for residents would include air conditioning, and he said yes.

Carolyn Stone thanked the attendees for otherwise confirming the notes and then indicated that the main purpose of the evening's meeting is to hear from each person on their views which they would like expressed by their representatives at the VMW meeting on 21 and 22 July 2005. Prior to that Andrew Nathan would give an update on the CLG route (Flood Free route)

Item 3: Short Presentation of "Flood Free" Route (Andrew Nathan, Hyder)

Andrew gave a short presentation on the flood free route submitted by some members of the CLG. The route is being investigated by the Hyder team and was presented on the screen. The route was superimposed over the proposed CLG alignment and this showed that some location modifications had been made to allow the alignment to reduce impacts and improve engineering aspects.

After and during the presentation a number of points and issues were raised:

- Mark asked whether a map showing National Park boundaries would be shown: Andrew confirmed they would be.
- When Andrew showed the map of the National Parks boundaries, Mark disagreed with the accuracy of the mapping saying that certain areas of Broadwater National Park had not been correctly mapped and that the boundary extended to the Evans River. Mark said he would check with DEC on those details with regard to what is gazetted and what is not. (Post meeting note – Mark's comment is correct, the published LEP map does not show the full boundary extent, however the title information does show the extension to the Evans River and this is represented correctly in the RODR)
- Andrew discussed the various levels of constraints and the relationship of the proposed route to the constraints mapped for that area. The ecological data so far received had indicated areas of high ecological value within both the Bundjalung and Broadwater National Parks. The preliminary status of the heritage constraints were introduced. Mark asked what ecological data had been placed before the project team, to which it was answered that DEC and Fisheries had provided this information, the detail of which was contained in a draft report submitted to the RTA earlier today.
- A question was asked, on behalf of community members, as to when sand mining ceased within the National Park and how long Broadwater National Park had been established. The answers were not known exactly, however the project team would get back to her on these. She states that parts of the National Park are of very bad quality.
- An RTA route had been suggested 40 years ago. Is the current proposed flood free route similar to this one? Shane answered that he often hears rumours that are not founded on concrete information. Nevertheless, before commencement of this project, the RTA established what information was already available on the study area. At this stage there was no record of a route ever before being proposed before.

- It was asked what the next stage in the process was with regard to the flood free route proposal. Shane advised that it is now up to the RTA to decide if it should be taken further. The RTA will assess the information that will be submitted in Hyder's report on the flood free route option. The VMW will consider the routes that were on public display, which does not include the "flood free" route at present. It was stated that many CLG members want this route placed on public display, and that they have wanted this route to be considered for a long time already. It was asked whether members were required to be quiet at the VMW over this issue. The RTA indicated that they expected this to be raised at the VMW. A CLG representative attending the VMW said that he would certainly be mentioning the "flood free" route proposal at the VMW.
- It was suggested that if the flood free route could not be presented at the VMW, all it does is fortify a perception that this whole process of community consultation is a hoax.
- Shane said that it should not be overlooked that the flood free route does not impact upon Section 3. In fact, it would be possible to consider the portion in Section 1 as a separate issue to the section in Section 2 that runs from the Richmond River through to Wardell.
- A member of the CLG did not agree. He felt it was important to consider the flood free route in its entirety from south of Woodburn through to Wardell.
- Another community member felt it is valid to be discussing the flood free route at the VMW because many community members believe that 1A, B, C are not good flood-related options. Shane replied that the VMW is a forum for only those options that went on public display to be discussed and considered. He said that the "flood free" route has come up as one of the responses to the public display of options and is being given consideration in the context of the public submissions. It was stated that it has been pointed out to Hyder and RTA over the past few months that there is broad support for the idea of investigating the "flood free" route further. The CLG member felt that it had not been considered prior to this. It was added that this option also provides an option of protecting otherwise very vulnerable National Park vegetation in terms of bushfires. It was added that the community knows there is an Act of Parliament that needs to be addressed as well as Council LEP amendment that would need to be undertaken.
- A community member feels that the current highway kills more animals than the "flood free" proposal would, as it would be correctly fenced, unlike the current highway.
- A point was made for the information of new CLG members – that part of the existing highway between Woodburn and Iluka is cut off over an 8km length during a major flood event.
- It was stated on behalf of the majority of Woodburn residents, that 1C is a better option than 1B and 1A but is still not an ideal option. The CLG member does not agree with options 1B and 1A as they do not avoid flooding.

Item 4: Individual CLG issues to be raised by the CLG members attending the VMW.

The issues raised by individuals are listed below, although they are not verbatim:

- Fully supports the flood free route and recommends picking up 2D and 3B to the north.
- Supports the flood free route. Why has an invitation not been taken up with regard to the offer to take the project team on a tour of the area? He has been waiting for a response and is quite hurt that there has not been any forthcoming. HB responded that both he and Andrew Nathan had taken up offers from other community and CLG members and had in fact both driven and walked much of the "flood free" route on separate occasions. On other occasions, several members of the project team and CLG members had driven, walked and boated key parts of the route.
- Pine Street people oppose Option 2D as it comes to within 200 metres of the properties and up to 75 m at some points. The member asked why the original buffer distance had come down from the original 200 metre buffer of a residential area. It was answered that with a balance between different constraints – it may have been adjusted according to other constraints. They are not opposed to route going ahead behind Wardell on West – but they feel that it should be further away from the residences. Flooding and prime cane lands are also important.
- Mark: stated his immense concerns over the environmental assessment within the study area. He has raised issues and expressed his views on "massive flaws" in assessment and mapping of ecological areas to start with that has "huge ramifications".
- There were insufficient ecological studies in Section 3- anything north of Coolgardie Rd has not been studied and presented in the same way as the rest of the study area from an environmental point of view. The corridor 2F has least environmental impact on whole area, and so she prefers this option in

Section 2. There have been insufficient studies on noise and impact on communities undertaken. Property values cannot be replaced in this area.

- Local people do not want a fast highway – they want one which they can get on and off easily. Travel time savings along this section of the Highway would be negligible. Suggests 90km/h speed zone over the 32 km length. Also it was suggested using the existing highway and bypassing towns only. Curves could be tighter if 90km/h is the maximum speed attainable.
- Lois Cook: indicated to the CLG that she is present to mainly observe and listen. She will put points forward at the VMW meeting.
- The CLG member would like to see a route nearer to the sea, not past where people live.
- 2F is a better route in Section 2 – but there should be changes to it, so as not to impact on the Caravan Park and Cooks Hill. 2A, B,C,D receive a “no vote” due to huge ecological and social reasons.
- 2C, 2D and 2E– may pass through Jali land and will severely disrupt the quality of lifestyle they hold dear. Aboriginal heritage items are strewn across the route options. Issues of access need to be considered through the Aboriginal heritage areas too.
- The implications of Section 42 of the Aboriginal Land Rights Act were raised in relation to Options 2C and 2D. The provisions of this Section indicate that it would be difficult to proceed with Options 2C and 2D without the agreement of the relevant Land Council.
- There are 40 residential sites and 60 further tourist sites at the Sandalwood caravan park and this number may increase to 100 residential sites in the next 5 years. The CLG member is interested in access points. Route 2F has a huge impact on the 40 sites and would result in a need for large compensation claims. Noise levels would severely impact upon Wardell and 2F would cross prime agricultural land, as well as resulting in the loss of generations of small scale farmers in the area. Flood free route is supported – least direct impact on people and 2D and 3A onwards of that proposal.
- The growth area for Wardell is to the east, 2F would impact on the growth of the town. Maybe everything should be taken off display until the flood free route can be displayed..
- Supports flood free route as it saves agricultural land - our small communities survive on the cane industry. Disagree with 2A and 2B – disregards communities of Meerschaum Vale and Rileys Hill. He disagrees with the 2F option as it limits growth potential of the town.
- Supports other remarks. Disappointed that the VM is going ahead without a full study of the flood free route. The VM should be pushed back. We are effectively not giving the flood free route an opportunity of being considered.
- There is nothing good at all over all route options on display. 2D and 2C are not in flood but have other constraints. 2F nothing good to be said, prime agricultural land and bridging necessary. 2A and 2B crossing 2 rivers.
- Hopes that between the “four of us” (CLG members representing the group at the VMW) we would have covered the range of concerns that exist within the CLG. The impact of flooding on this whole flood plain region is huge and in the recent floods 3500 people were inundated and cut off by waters – valuable information was gained by Lismore and Richmond Valley Councils. Having been involved with the SES for many years. Building a levee across the flood plain would affect the whole region irreparably.
- Would the four people attending the VMW represent the majority of the CLG voice, and not their own concerns? The flooding impact should be completely avoided on Woodburn, as a proposal. The flood free route has greatest benefit to the environment, least agricultural land impacts, least social impacts, least impact upon communities during construction process, and so he fully supports it.
- Supports the flood free route as the best possible route. 2F is wicked in many ways and has the largest impact upon flooding out of all of the Section 2 options. The preference is 1C out of the 3 options in Section 1. In Section 2 - 2D, 2E and in Section 3 - 3A is crazy, visual scar on side of the hill, affecting too many people. 3B is recommended in section 3.
- Supports the flood free route with less damage to agricultural land. None of 1A, B and C options are acceptable to the people of Woodburn. The route seems to have been pushed aside by people who are making the decision. Minimal impact upon communities is required; therefore, flood free route is supported.
- Brought a list of issues to give to one of the CLG members that are representing the group at the VMW. Route 2A and 2B - strongly object to. Do not want Rileys Hill Rd as access road. Rileys Hill has formed a committee which supports the flood free route. Are not happy with 2F where there are a lot of cane farmers within the community as that industry supports the community. She supports the flood free route.

- RODR has “major flaws”. Flood free route looks good. 1C looks fine, but the flood free route is preferred. In terms of ease of construction with regard to fill – the only way is Option 2D, as there is good fill available there. Prefers a route a little further west (away from Pine Street residents) however. We don’t need to cut into 3A, so 3B is very much preferred. If areas are cut from the heath land or scrub, it would be disastrous. High ground good to construct on but still has the water table and will carry noise.
- Cannot comment on flood free route, as this is the first time it has been seen. The community prefers a further east route than 2A and 2B. 2D is the obviously better option and then straight through 3B.
- Cannot support 2F. 2A & 2B have bad river crossings Supports the flood free route 110%.
- There is a need to consider the provision of access of cane trucks.
- Access of cane trucks without having to pass through town of Wardell is very important.
- 3A is ludicrous. There have been no studies done on the area and no consultation with the community and he therefore cannot see how it can be considered as a feasible option.
- Information supplied thus far is very inaccurate and does not represent the community or other impacts in section 3. No one has been out to visit the area Supports option 3B.

Item 5: Feedback on Issues Raised in Submissions

- Annette gave a brief presentation on the issues raised during the public display period. She said that a Submissions Report will be released as soon as it is complete.
- Preferences for different options will not be treated as a vote. It is the issues raised in submissions which will assist in the decision process.
- For information purposes at the CLG meeting, the issues were ranked in terms of the number of issues raised by submissions.
- Mark asked when the submissions report will be available. Annette confirmed that it will be some weeks before it is finalised.
- It was raised that the main aim throughout whole process should be limiting the impact upon people. It was confirmed that people have been a core concern throughout in terms of their properties and lifestyles.
- Annette went on to discuss a summary of various issues raised within various submissions.
- Mark asked if the alternate routes proposed would be considered. Annette said that they are considering all alternate routes that have been proposed, and added that although the flood free route is getting a lot of coverage, all other route options proposed will be considered as well.
- A CLG member said he thought the western side of the river options were dismissed as a result of their flood impacts. Annette said that someone had sent in a proposal which is being considered for that side of the river.
- It was asked whether issues raised in Feedback Forms had been included as a submission. It was stated that these were being treated separately to the written submissions but that additional information concerning preferences for Options were gained from the forms.
- It was raised that we need to include a representative from Evans Head, as they will be impacted upon. There had been some talking to people at Evans Head at a councillor level – but none of them have been interested in joining as yet. The CLG member has undertaken to talk to a few other people shortly.
- Mark asked whether in Section 2, there was a percentage breakdown of who preferred which routes in Section 2. Annette said that just the relative number of total submissions is available at the moment. Mark stated that in his view there was no preferred option in Section 2, although Option 2F was less undesirable than the rest. He considered that the existing highway should be upgraded.
- The community liaison group was not able to tell everyone information throughout the process, which was totally disagreed with.
- Regarding the CLG charter, the original charter was agreed upon by all CLG members (regarding confidentiality) and that decision is still supported. The members agreed to the charter and that the issue was worked over a number of times already.
- It was asked whether there a brick works or not (at Meerschaum Vale)?
- Quantative data coming out of reports. Wants to access raw data. Hyder will get back with the appendices to RODR reports.
- Surprise was expressed that no one had followed up a visit to the Byrnes family in Broadwater to talk to them about the heritage of their property. Carolyn and Jack would consult Tanya about this.

Item 6: Closure of Meeting (Carolyn Stone, PPM Consultants)

Carolyn thanked everyone for attending tonight's meeting, and for their input.

No date has been set for the next meeting yet, but as soon as one is decided upon, it will be communicated to the CLG members.

It was asked whether it was possible to get a copy of the minutes from the VMW. It would be good to see other people's viewpoints. Shane suggested that it was probably best to discuss the VMW at next CLG meeting as the notes are a very long process of filtering through information. There was a request that the next meeting is sooner rather than later.

The meeting was closed at 9:20pm

No.	Action	Who
1.	Check DEC records on gazetted boundaries of National Parks	Mark Graham and Hyder
2.	How long has the Broadwater National Park been established? When did the sand mining cease within the Broadwater National Park?	Hyder to investigate and get back to Francine at the next CLG meeting.
3	Respond to John concerning his offer to take the project team on a tour of the area.	Hyder to respond to John (Refer Post meeting Note)
4	Appendices to reports accompanying RODR.	Hyder to get back to Mike Meszaros
5	Identify heritage aspects of the Byrnes family property in the Woodburn area.	Hyder to check with heritage consultant and respond to Jack Mathes.