

Record of Meeting



Purpose of Meeting **Tucabia Community Liaison Group Meeting No. 1**

Project Wells Crossing To Iluka Road -
Upgrading the Pacific Highway

Prepared By Jenny Bailey **Phone No** 9928 2228

Place of Meeting Tucabia Community Hall **Date** 9 December 2004
Clarence St, Tucabia

Present

| | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Bruce Bird (BB) | Peter Black (RTA) (PB) |
| David Pinnells (DP) | Jo Moss (SKM) (JM) |
| Sharron Todd (ST) | Dee Elliott (SKM) (DE) |
| Kerry Lloyd (KL) | Jenny Bailey (SKM) (JB) |
| Sarah Dunlop (SD) | |
| Russell Widin (RW) | |
| Dorothy Scutt (DS) | |
| Mark Purcell (MP) | |
| Roslyn Harradine (RH) | |
| Ian Rees (IR) | |
| Heidi Beynon (HB) | |
| Sam Condoman (SC) – observer | |
| Sandra Grogan (SG) – observer | |
| Marie Kennedy (MK) – observer | |
| Roy Bowling (RB) – arrived late | |

Apologies None

Distribution All of the above

General

The meeting commenced at 7.10 pm. DE welcomed all and outlined the Agenda for the Community Liaison Group (CLG) Meeting No. 1 as follows:

- Introductions
- RTA commitment to consultation
- The CLG process
- Pacific Highway Upgrade Strategy
- Background to the Project
- Project overview
- Community information sessions feedback

SINCLAIR KNIGHT MERZ



- Brainstorming and ranking activity
- Close

Introductions

- DE welcomed CLG members and introduced herself as a member of the SKM communications team for the project and the facilitator for the meeting.
- PB welcomed the CLG members and introduced himself as the Project Development Manager (Pacific Highway Office, RTA).
- JM introduced herself as the SKM Project Manager for this project.
- JB introduced herself as an Environmental Engineer from the SKM team.

DE then invited those in attendance to introduce themselves and to talk to the following points:

- “name and where you live”
- “why you chose to become a member”
- “who you are representing and how you will represent them”
- “any previous CLG experience”

Participants then introduced themselves and responded to the above prompts.

- Sarah Dunlop
 - lives in Pillar Valley just outside the study area
 - she is concerned about impact of a highway on neighbouring areas
- Roslyn Harradine
 - lives in Sandy Crossing and has lived in the area for 25 years
 - served on Local Government as a Councillor
 - interested in community consultation process as parents were involved in the Coffs Harbour Highway Upgrade project
- Sharron Todd
 - lives in Pillar Valley near Sandy Crossing
 - moved to the area in 1992 from Sydney
 - involved in the local business community
 - member of Grafton Chamber of Commerce and Business Enterprise Centre
- Russell Widin
 - lives in Pillar Valley
- David Pinnells
 - lives in Tucabia
 - representing residents from Somervale Rd
 - is a retired surveyor
- Heidi Beynon
 - lives in Tucabia and owns a block of land in Pillar Valley
 - concerned about property impacts



- Mark Purcell
 - representing Clarence Environment Centre
 - lives in Pillar Valley
 - is a member of Rural Fire Service
- Dorothy Scutt
 - lives and owns a business in Ulmarra
 - from Sydney originally – a relative newcomer to the area
 - representing Ulmarra and District Progress Association
 - interested in social issues
- Kerry Lloyd
 - lives on Highway near Ulmarra
 - ex-Councillor and Mayor
 - involved in many flood mitigation projects over the years
 - involved in Ulmarra Progress Association
 - believes information should be disseminated through noticeboards in schools, shops and other local venues
- Ian Rees
 - from the Central Coast originally
 - lived in the area for 18 months
 - owner of the Brushgrove Hotel and the Wooli Hotel Motel
 - would disseminate information through the hotels
- Bruce Bird
 - lives in Wooli
 - President of the Wooli Chamber of Commerce, the Wooli Ratepayers and Residents Association and the Wooli Progress and Dune Care Association
 - runs the Post Office in Wooli
- Marie Kennedy
 - works in a nursery in Minnie Water
 - came as an observer but would like to be involved

RTA Commitment to Consultation

PB outlined the RTA's commitment to community consultation and covered the following points:

- expressed appreciation to CLG members for their attendance
- emphasised the need and importance for two-way communication between the project team, and CLG members and communities they represent
- work on the study for the Wells Crossing to Iluka Road Pacific Highway Upgrade commenced approximately six weeks ago– the team is currently gathering information.
- no route options have been identified yet



- emphasised need for early community involvement from a broad cross section of the community across the whole study area
- every call and email from the community will be entered into a database and they will all be considered
- community concerns will be considered and assessed against project criteria -social, environmental, economic and functional (engineering) - as will all other concerns
- the preferred route will be identified and concept design completed by July 2006 taking into account social, environmental, economic and functional issues

— *Comment*

A comments section should be included on the bottom of newsletters so that people can anonymously respond to the project team.

— *Comment*

All communication needs to be in plain English and “Yes/No” answers given wherever possible.

— *Comment*

The accuracy of the information disseminated is important. Therefore, communication should be written where possible to ensure the key messages/information are preserved.

— *Question*

Should communication be undertaken with SKM or the RTA?

Response

JM: The best way to contact the project team is by using the 1800 number (1800 557 673) and/or the email address (wellscrossingtoiluka@skm.com.au)

— *Comment*

Anonymous means of communication should be provided where possible, ie. comment forms etc.

— *Question*

Has a reply paid address been set up?

Response

JM: A reply paid service is available. Envelopes with pre-paid postage are sent with any correspondence that may require a response.

— *Comment*

There is a Saturday morning junk mail delivery run in Ulmarra. Newsletters and other forms of communication could be delivered as part of that service.



CLG Process

DE distributed and drew members' attention to key points in the CLG Charter (Attachment A) including the Terms of Reference and the roles and responsibilities of the project team and CLG members. In particular the following aspects were discussed:

- emphasised the need for CLG members to represent the broader community rather than individual concerns
- the project team will endeavour to ensure communication is in plain English and free from jargon
- CLG members should let SKM know if they are unavailable to attend CLG meetings so that a briefing can be arranged. This will ensure everyone is up-to-date and CLG meetings are productive
- need CLG members to advise on any community issues which they are aware of
- as a general rule CLG members will be given a minimum of one week's notice but preferably two - three weeks' notice about upcoming meetings
- Record of Meeting notes from CLG meetings will be distributed within two weeks
- SKM will schedule the Maclean, Grafton and Tucabia CLG meetings on consecutive nights
- CLG members who have provided an email address will be contacted via email in the first instance
- SD volunteered to review the Record of Meeting notes on behalf of CLG members prior to distribution
- CLG members accepted the charter

— *Comment*

Concern was expressed that two - three weeks' notice of CLG meetings may be inadequate; longer notice would be preferable.

Pacific Highway Upgrade Strategy

PB gave a presentation on the planning and development for this project. Key points were:

- summarised the "gaps" in the planning and development of the Pacific Highway Upgrading between Coffs Harbour and Tweed Heads
- the RTA's aim is to fill in the "gaps" such that planning (preferred route and concept design) is complete for the whole highway by July 2006
- upgrade is being fast-tracked primarily for safety reasons and to identify corridors in a rapidly developing area
- both the State and Federal Governments have committed to provide funding for the upgrade
- handout of project related maps (Attachments B, C and D)

— *Question*

When was the existing Highway built?

Response

PB: It would have been over 100 years ago.



— *Question*

What is the planning horizon for this project?

Response

PB: The time period for planning, including traffic projections and economic analysis, is generally 30 years.

Program and Project Objectives

PB distributed a copy of the Pacific Highway Upgrading Program objectives and the Project Objectives (Attachment E) and explained the importance and utilisation of the Program and Project objectives. The purpose of the presentation was to convey to the CLG members the process that the RTA takes in selecting a preferred option. The route options are assessed against the project objectives and the preferred option is the one that 'on balance' meets the project objectives. This is a standard process for the RTA for development of route options and, in response to concerns from members of the community within the study area, confirms that the RTA cannot make decisions on route options at this early stage of investigations. The purpose of the presentation was also to convey to the meeting that all community concerns raised are considered, measured against the project objectives, and incorporated into the project if the suggestion contributes towards the objectives.

- the route options will be measured against the Program and Project objectives as these are critical criteria in the evaluation of the options
- target of minimum 15 crashes per 100 MVK (million vehicle kilometres). PB gave this example:
 - say there are 10,000 vehicles/day (vpd) travelling between Wells Crossing and Iluka Road
 - this stretch of highway is 80km long
 - 10,000 vpd x 80km is 800,000 vehicle kilometres per day
 - 365 days per year x 800,000 is approximately 300,000,000 vehicle km per year
 - 300 million vehicle km (MVK)
 - if the target is a minimum 15 crashes per 100 MVK, the target for this stretch of highway would be 45 (i.e. 15 x 3) per year.
 - by comparison, the current accident rate on the existing equivalent stretch of the Pacific Highway is well above this.

— *Question*

What sort of accidents are counted?

Response

PB: Those which are reported to the police.

- vertical and horizontal alignment – the alignment needs to be of a certain design to enable vehicles to travel comfortably at 110 km/hr. Horizontal alignment relates to the radius of curves (there would be a minimum radius of 1,200m). Vertical alignment relates to the



gradient – sufficient sight distance would be provided to enable vehicles to see obstacles and stop in time

- there would be minimal direct access points from properties to the upgraded highway, to minimise conflicts and hence improve safety. Property access can be provided in a number of ways, such as service roads. Access around the local area would be maintained and underpasses and overpasses would be considered for local traffic
- at this stage of the investigations interchanges would be considered in the vicinity of Wells Crossing and Harwood Bridge. Type A roads are freeway standard and have no at grade access. All access to and from the freeway is through interchanges with on and off ramps. Type B standard roads are not freeways, and may include limited access to and from the road at grade in addition to major interchanges.
- the upgraded highway would be designed to have a desirable flood immunity of 1 in 20 years and an optimum flood immunity of 1 in 100 years
- the route selection process for the highway upgrade would seek to minimise impacts on local communities, including community severance (i.e. not cutting communities in half) and access patterns
- the upgrade would be planned and developed in accordance with the principles of ecologically sustainable development (ESD).
- the RTA aims to achieve a benefit cost ratio of greater than 2: this means that over the planning horizon for the project (say 30 years), the saving to the community would be twice the cost of the highway.

– *Question*

Will development be restricted?

Response

PB: Development is a matter for local government planning. Access to the upgrade for future development would be controlled as part of the development approvals.

– *Question*

Why is the design speed only 110 km/hour?

Response

PB: The minimum design speed is 110km/hr however the curves would generally be larger than the minimum and would cater for higher design speeds. Only in the future when the upgrade from Hexham to the Border is complete would there be an opportunity to derestrict travel speeds as they do in Europe.

– *Question*

Is there a maximum distance that the upgraded highway could be located from major towns such as Grafton?

Response

PB: No, however, the impacts of different route alignments away from townships would be considered.

– *Question*

What does LOS stand for? (Refer to project objective)



Response

PB: Level of Service for intersections relates to how efficiently the intersection operates. For example LOS A is where there is freedom of movement and the driver can make decisions to change lanes or make a turning movement easily. LOS F is where the intersections 'locks up' and movement is slow due to the high volumes of traffic. LOS C, which is the objective in 20 years, is between LOS A and LOS F.

— *Question*

Why is "reduced freight transport costs" an RTA objective?

Response

PB: The RTA needs to provide a safe road that considers all road users, including heavy vehicles, which as a result reduces freight transport costs.

— *Question*

Who is the ultimate decision-maker for the project?

Response

PB: The NSW Minister for Roads will make the announcement for any decisions in regards to the upgrade.

— *Question*

How are different options compared? If each criteria can be weighted differently, how are the weightings determined?

Response

PB: A Route Evaluation Workshop will be held in the middle of 2005, which will include Government Agency representatives, CLG representatives and the RTA project team to determine the weighting of each individual criterion within each of the major categories - environmental, social, functional (engineering) and economic.

— *Question*

Will routes through the National Parks and State Forests automatically be excluded?

Response

PB: No, although it is important to recognise that National Parks and State Forests are protected under legislation. It would be very difficult to gain approval from the Minister for the Environment to change the boundaries of a National Park to permit road highway development, if there are other feasible alternatives.

— *Question*

When will the road be built?



Response

PB: The Government will prioritise the different sections of the Pacific Highway Upgrade (from Hexham to the Queensland border) when the concept designs for all sections are completed in mid 2006 and this will determine the future programme for construction of the upgrade.

— Comment

It would be helpful if maps/figures distributed to the community included street names, as it is difficult to clearly identify the study area.

Project Overview

JM described the SKM team, which includes a Project Manager (JM) and Team Leaders for Community Consultation, Environmental and Social, Traffic, Transport and Economics, and Design

JM presented an overview of the project and the process.

- the RTA has commissioned SKM to undertake this project
- the investigations will include, for example: transportation and traffic, economics, environmental, land use and planning, social impacts; and design including engineering, geotechnical, hydrology and hydraulics and urban design and visual assessment
- work on this study commenced in October 2004
- anticipated timing is as follows;
 - route options display - mid 2005
 - a preferred option display - late 2005
 - the concept design of the preferred route - July 2006
- there will be approximately eight CLG meetings over the next 18 months at each of the project milestones and some in between
- as an example of what the community might expect at the route options display stage, JM handed out an extract from the Macksville to Urunga, Upgrading the Pacific Highway Project Route Options Display Community Update (Attachment F). This handout shows nature of the information which will be developed during the route option assessment phase for this project

Community Information Sessions Feedback

DE presented the most common concerns identified by the community at the Community Information Sessions held at Grafton on 30 November 2004 and Maclean on 1 December 2004. These are listed at Attachment G

CLG members were asked to choose (with a coloured dot) the three issues they considered the most important to their area. For the Tucabia CLG, the most highly ranked issues are:

- impact on businesses that currently rely on highway trade
- impacts on flora and fauna



Contact Details

— *Comment*

Some CLG members suggested their contact details be made publicly available

Response

JM: The project team is keen to ensure effective communications but also recognises the privacy of individuals. CLG members were asked to advise the study team using the 1800 number if they did not wish their details to be available.

Evaluation Form

CLG members were invited to complete an evaluation form (Attachment H) in order to assist the project team assess communication activities.

DE thanked everyone for coming and indicated that the next CLG meeting would be held in February.

Meeting closed at 9.30pm

Handouts

Attachment A – Community Liaison Group charter

Attachment B – Route selection study area map

Attachment C – Route selection study area map and National Parks/State Forests

Attachment D – Route selection study area map and SEPP 14 wetlands

Attachment E – Program and Project Objectives

Attachment F – Extract from “Macksville to Urunga Upgrading the Pacific Highway Community Update – Route Options. November 2004”

Attachment G – Key issues from the Community Information Sessions

Attachment H – Evaluation form

Attachment I – PowerPoint presentation delivered at the Community Liaison Group meeting