

Record of Meeting



Purpose of Meeting Combined Community Liaison Group Meeting No. 1

Project Wells Crossing To Iluka Road -
Upgrading the Pacific Highway

Prepared By Jenny Bailey **Phone No** 1800 557 673

Place of Meeting Grafton Community Centre **Date** 23 June 2005
59 Duke St, Grafton 6:30 – 8:30pm

Present**Grafton CLG**

Helen Busby (HB)

Scott Flynn (SF)

David Foster (DF)

James Lloyd (JL)

Col Milne (CM)

Bill Noonan (BN)

Tony Wade (TW)

Tucabia CLG

Heidi Beynon (HB)

Bruce Bird (BB)

Roy Bowling (RB)

Sarah Dunlop (SD)

Robert Jefferies (RJ)

Kerry Lloyd (KL)

Iven McLennan (IM)

David Pinnells (DP)

Mark Purcell (MP)

Ian Rees (IR)

Dorothy Scutt (DS)

Brad Sharp (BS)

Maclean CLG

Pat Battersby (PB)

Lisa Brudenell (LB)

Peter Dibella (PD)

Don Day (DD)

Brian Holland (BH)

Mark Kingsley (MK)

Harry Lang (HL)

Alex McCartney (AM)

Tony McGrath (TM)

Austin Sheehan (AS)

Chris Sparks (CS)

Project Team

Mark Eastwood (RTA) (ME)

Peter Black (RTA) (PB)

Scott Smith (RTA) (SDS)

Susan Scott (RTA) (SS)

Jo Moss (SKM) (JM)

Paul Robilliard (SKM) (PR)

Richard Davies (SKM) (RD)

Jenny Bailey (SKM) (JB)

Ross Prestipino (ACYM) (RP)



Apologies	Grafton CLG Des Harvey (DH) Henk van der Merwe (HM) Peter Morgan (PM) Dave Morrison (DM) Tucabia CLG Roslyn Harradine (RH) Megan McCullough (MM) Sharron Todd (ST)	Maclean CLG Rob Donges (RB) Bruce Walsh (BW)
Not Present	Tucabia CLG Victor Pashkevich (VP) Russell Widin (RW)	Maclean CLG Ivars Katuzans (IK) Robert Thompson (RT)
Distribution	All of the above	

The meeting commenced at 6:35 pm.

Welcome and Purpose of Meeting

JM welcomed everyone and noted the apologies (see above). JM also indicated that BW and ST had indicated they would like to be nominated as community participants for the Value Management Workshop (VMW).

JM explained that the purpose of the meeting was to provide CLG members with an understanding of the value management process and to select community participants for the VMW.

As a matter of "housekeeping" JM said it had come to her attention that a rumour has been circulating in the community that one of the CLG members is an ex-RTA engineer, and that person had been very concerned especially from a professional point of view. JM said that the rumour is not true. She said that it was important to remember that all CLG members volunteer and to treat each other with respect.

Introductions

JM introduced ME and invited him to address the group.

ME confirmed that PB is leaving the RTA and consequently ME will be assuming the Project Manager role. ME is a Senior Project Development Manager at the Pacific Highway Office and as such, he has been involved in all of the Pacific Highway projects, including the Wells Crossing to Iluka Road project. ME has lived in Grafton for over 20 years and has knowledge of many of the local issues. ME worked with JM on the Yelgun to Chinderah project and believes the good working relationship they developed will carry through into this project. ME acknowledged there is a lot of fear in the community, which can place pressure on CLG members, however, ME emphasised that the responsibility for identifying route options lies solely with the project team and the RTA. ME commented that this project has generated



some media interest but cautioned CLG members that the media may report things out of context. ME also emphasised that the VMW is not a decision making workshop but it is an avenue through which the options can be discussed and recommendations made.

JM introduced SDS (Project Development Officer from the Pacific Highway Office), RD (Design Team Leader from SKM) and RP (from ACVM).

JM asked the CLG members to introduce themselves (name, where they are from and which CLG they are part of). All members present (see above) then introduced themselves.

Value Management Process

RP explained that he is an independent consultant who has been engaged to facilitate the VMW. He emphasised that he has no personal involvement in the project and no preference for a particular outcome and therefore, he can objectively facilitate the workshop.

RP then provided an overview of the value management process and explained the objective of the VMW is to reach an agreement as to which option is the best "on balance". Stakeholders from all different backgrounds will be invited to the VMW. Initially participants will be asked to individually document the issues which are important to them. They will then be asked to share these views with a small group and then with the larger group. RP emphasised that everyone will have different ideas and values and it is important that all participants listen and try to appreciate the views of other people. RP used an overhead to illustrate that people may initially only see one view of a situation but when the different possibilities are explained they may see a number of perspectives.

RP outlined the expectations of the VMW participants. They must be:

- Able to express their opinion and prepared to listen to the opinions of other participants;
- Open minded and objective;
- Able to represent the views of a group or organisation and not just their own personal views;
- Able to commit the time to prepare for the workshop and to participate for the full duration (2-3 days);
- Able to work with others to achieve the best outcome "on balance".

RP then presented a typical agenda of a VMW (refer to Attachment A). VMWs are usually held over two days but sometimes may require a third day. There are usually between 25 and 30 participants from different stakeholder groups at the workshop. RP used a case study to illustrate the various stages of the workshop and the scoring of criteria and options (refer to Attachment A).

Question

Are the different groups of criteria (functional, environmental and socio-economic) compared/weighted against each other?

Answer

RP – Criteria within the one "silo" eg. "functional" are weighted against each other but the different "silos" ("functional", "environmental" and "socio-economic"¹) are not weighted against each other.

¹ The term "socio-economic" criteria encompasses "social" criteria and "economic" criteria.



Selection of Community Representatives

JM explained the VMW will be held after the route options display and it will probably be held in Grafton. Participants will include members of the project team, local and state government agencies, key stakeholders and community members. Ideally there will be no more than 30 participants to enable meaningful discussion in which all participants can have an input and to minimise the duration of the workshop (ie. two days).

JM explained the reason this combined CLG meeting has been held prior to the route options display is to remove the emotion from the nomination and selection of community representatives. The CLG members will be asked to select up to six representatives. They will also be asked to select up to six "back-ups" in the event that a selected community representative is not available at the time of the workshop or for some other reason, considers they are not able to participate.

JM explained there is no perfect process for selecting community representatives. Having a broad range of localities represented is preferable, as is having them selected through a fair and transparent process. In this regard, she explained that she would hand over to RP to work with the CLG members to select the community participants for the VMW.

As a starting point, JM suggested the CLG members could consider choosing their representatives based on geographical distribution eg.

- Maclean and surrounds;
- James Creek / Gulmarrad / Townsend;
- On or close proximity to existing highway;
- Grafton and surrounds;
- Tucabia / Pillar Valley;
- Rural / coastal location.

Question

Will there be six representatives from each CLG or six representatives altogether?

Answer

JM – There would normally be 3-4 community representatives at a VMW but due to the size of the study area, the RTA has agreed to including up to a total of 6 community representatives.

RP – The VMW is not a voting game.

Question

Will the VMW be held during the week?

Answer

JM - Yes.

RP – Typically workshops are held on Tuesday/Wednesday or Wednesday/Thursday to accommodate a possible third day and to avoid potential conflicts with the weekend.

Question

Will the Chamber of Commerce be invited to nominate a representative in addition to the six CLG members?



Answer

ME – It depends on the outcome of tonight's meeting. For example, if a community representative was able to represent the Chamber of Commerce as well, there may be an opportunity for dual representation, to minimise the number of participants at the VMW.

Comment

It would be difficult for any one person to represent the views of the entire CLG. It might be more appropriate to have two representatives from each CLG.

Response

RP – It is up to the CLG members how the community representatives are selected. RP then asked the group if they would prefer to select participants on that basis and there was a general consensus that two representatives from each CLG would be appropriate (rather than selecting the participants on the basis of the geographical spread suggested by JM).

Comment

The earlier suggestion (presented on slide 12) is essentially the same ie. it would also provide two people from each CLG.

Comment

Maclean won't really be affected by the project and therefore, a representative from Maclean and surrounds may not be required.

Comment

Maclean will be affected from a hydrological perspective.

Comment

It seems inappropriate to pick representatives prior to route options display as the people chosen tonight may not be affected by the route options.

Response

ME – Participants need to be open minded and objective. Even though the participants may not be directly affected, they will have plenty of time to discuss the route options with other affected community members prior to the VMW.

Comment

If the community representatives are chosen on the basis of two per CLG, it would not be fair to choose two people from the same location eg. two people from the Gulmarrad / James Creek / Townsend area.

RP then called for nominations from the 3 CLGs, with the outcome as follows:

- Maclean CLG - BW, BH, HL, TM, AM and AS;
- Tucabia CLG – DP, ST, SD, MM, IR and KL;
- Grafton CLG – JL, BN and TW.

The combined CLG group members (not including RTA or SKM) then broke up into the individual CLGs to select the two representatives and the two "back-ups". Following their discussions, the group re-formed to share the outcome of their discussions. The selected representatives and "back-ups" are presented in the table below.



CLG	Representatives	“Back-ups”
Macleam	Bruce Walsh and Brian Holland	Austin Sheehan and Tony McGrath
Tucabia	Ian Rees and Kerry Lloyd	Sharron Todd and Sarah Dunlop
Grafton	Bill Noonan and Tony Wade	James Lloyd and Col Milne

RP asked each of the selected representatives and “back-ups” if they were willing to be involved in the VMW on the basis that had been outlined earlier. All members who were present indicated they were prepared to do so.

JM thanked everyone for their co-operation and involvement in the value management selection process and for attending the meeting.

Announcements

- JM congratulated HL on his Queen’s Birthday honour;
- JM stated she is looking forward to working with ME on this project;
- JM thanked PB and wished him well for the future;
- ME indicated a combined CLG meeting, rather than individual CLG meetings, may be held during the route options display period.

Questions

Question

How much notice will participants receive about the VMW?

Answer

JM – A few weeks.

Question

What is the timeframe for submissions on the route options?

Answer

ME – At least a month.

Meeting closed at 8:30pm

Attachments

- Attachment A – Overheads
- Attachment B – Powerpoint presentation delivered at the combined CLG meeting