

Record of Meeting



Purpose of Meeting	Maclean 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	Maclean Civic Hall	Date	7 December 2004
	River Street, Maclean		7-9pm
Present	Pat Battersby (PB)	Peter Black (RTA) (PB)	
	Brian Holland (BH)	Jo Moss (SKM) (JM)	
	Austin Sheehan (AS)	Tanyia Tuckey (SKM) (TT)	
	Donald Day (DD)	Jenny Bailey (SKM) (JB)	
	Mark Kingsley (MK)		
	Chris Sparks (CS)		
	Ivars Katuzans (IK)		
	Tony McGrath (TM)		
	Victor Pashkevich (VP) – visiting from Tucabia CLG		
	Apologies	Bruce Walsh (BW)	
Sue Schmolke (SS)			
Distribution	All of the above		

General

The meeting commenced at 7.10 pm. TT 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
- Brainstorming and ranking activity
- Close

SINCLAIR KNIGHT MERZ



Introductions

- TT welcomed CLG members and introduced herself as being from SKM and the Community Liaison Manager for the Wells Crossing to Iluka Road Upgrade Project. TT will facilitate the CLG meetings.
- 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.

TT 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.

- Victor Pashkevich
 - lives in Tucabia (visiting member of Tucabia CLG)
 - is concerned about possible impacts on the community
 - representing Tucabia residents
- Mark Kingsley
 - lives in Gulmarrad
 - is a teacher at Maclean High School
 - interested in impacts on youth
- Tony McGrath
 - lives in Tyndale
 - is concerned about property impacts
 - representing his neighbours
- Pat Battersby
 - lives in Maclean
 - is concerned about safety of existing Highway, particularly with respect to semi-trailers and the potential impacts on agricultural land
 - would like the Highway to be located away from the floodplain and away from Harwood Bridge
 - representing Clarence Cane Growers Association
 - has been involved in other community groups
- Chris Sparks
 - lives on the existing Highway near Tyndale
 - he believes the worst stretch of Highway is located between his boundary and Shark Creek
 - concerned about safety of existing Pacific Highway

SINCLAIR KNIGHT MERZ



- works for Dept of Lands as a Lands Officer
 - representing Grafton Sporting Car Club and Grafton Vintage Motor Vehicle Club
- Austin Sheehan
 - lives on Broomshead Rd in Gulmarrad area
 - is concerned about impacts on lifestyle and property prices
- Ivars Katuzans
 - lives in the James Creek Road area
 - concerned about impacts on properties
 - representing neighbours
- Don Day
 - lives on existing Highway
 - concerned about impact on his house
 - concerned about the safety of the existing Highway, particularly at night when trucks use the Highway
 - believes an eastern route would be appropriate as it would minimise impacts on settlements

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 and commitment to the consultation process
- emphasised the need and importance for two-way communication between project team, CLG members and the communities they represent
- work on the Wells Crossing to Iluka Road Pacific Highway Upgrade project commenced approximately 6 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) 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

– Question

Will government agencies be consulted and involved in the project?

Response

PB: Consultation with government agencies has already commenced and it will continue for the duration of the project. A meeting was held last week in Grafton with

SINCLAIR KNIGHT MERZ



representatives from state and local government, emergency and fire services, utility and services organisations.

— *Question*

What is the political situation relating to this project?

Response

PB: Ian Causley released a media statement several months ago, which displayed a suggested Highway alignment. That alignment was based on previous Government strategies from the early '90's and is not related to this project. The upgrade for the Pacific Highway, between Wells Crossing to Iluka, is part of the current strategy by the NSW Government to identify the remaining corridors by July 2006. This study will be undertaken to determine route options in accordance with this current strategy.

CLG Process

TT 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
- need commitment from both parties (project team and CLG members) to make this an effective process
- 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
- apologised for late notice for this CLG meeting and explained the need to hold a meeting prior to the Christmas break and to avoid the Christmas period to minimise inconvenience for CLG members.
- as a general rule CLG members will be given a minimum of one week's notice but preferably 2-3 weeks notice about upcoming meetings. CLG members will be contacted in writing and by phone
- Minutes from CLG meetings will be distributed within two weeks
- all CLG members except DD indicated they have access to email and are happy to receive electronic correspondence
- MK volunteered to check the Minutes on behalf of CLG members prior to distribution

— *Question*

How should community concerns be conveyed to SKM outside of the meetings?

Response

TT: While CLG members can relay concerns to the project team themselves, we also encourage community members to contact the project team directly. This is particularly important for more significant issues. Members of the project team are also available to meet concerned community members face-to-face.

— *Question*

What reporting procedures will be followed for this project?

SINCLAIR KNIGHT MERZ



Response

TT: The project team will summarise the top 10 issues raised by the community via the 1800 number, email and other correspondence at each CLG meeting. A summary of the consultation activities will also be provided at each CLG meeting

— *Question*

Will CLG members be reimbursed for photocopying expenses?

Response

PB: CLG members should advise the project team of these types of needs and they will make copies for CLG members

- the CLG charter was accepted by the CLG

Pacific Highway Upgrade Strategy

PB presented on the planning and development for this project. Key points were:

- summarised the “gaps” in the planning and development of the Pacific Highway Upgrade between Coffs Harbour and Tweed Heads
- the RTA is aiming to fill in the “gaps” such that planning (preferred route and concept design) is complete for the whole Highway by July 2006
- the 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 (Attachment B, C and D)

— *Question*

What will happen to the existing Highway if a new route is selected?

Response

PB: This would be reliant on agreement between RTA and Clarence Valley Council but the existing Highway would convert to a local or regional road.

Program and Project Objectives

PB handed out the Pacific Highway Upgrade Program and 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.

- target of minimum 15 crashes per 100 MVK (million vehicle kilometres). PB gave this example:
 - say there are 10,000 vehicles/day (vpd) travel between Wells Crossing and Iluka Road

SINCLAIR KNIGHT MERZ



- 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 kms (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).
- by comparison, the current accident rate on the existing equivalent stretch of the Pacific Highway is well above this.
- 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 will be minimal access points from properties to the proposed upgrade to improve safety (underpasses and overpasses would be considered for local traffic movements around the local area)
- between Wells Crossing and Harwood Bridge the Highway would be of Type A standard, ie. No direct access from properties and interchanges for access to regional areas would only be considered at this stage at Wells Crossing and in the vicinity of Harwood Bridge. (An interchange provides ramps on and off the highway, including overbridges, to provide a safe access to major destinations)
- between Harwood Bridge and Iluka Road the Highway would be of Type B standard, ie, intersections would be considered at existing major intersections. These intersections would be designed to be upgraded, in the future, to Type A standard to include interchanges and local access by service roads.
- the Highway would be designed to have a desirable flood immunity of 1 in 20 year event and an optimum flood level of 1 in 100 year event
- the selection of route options will be based on project criteria as described earlier. A two-day workshop will be held to determine the weightings that will be assigned to each of the project criteria. The workshop will be attended by SKM, the RTA, environmental groups, business groups and CLG members and the weightings will be determined by that group.

Deleted: the

— *Question*

What compensation will be provided for affected properties?

Response

PB: The RTA would consider purchasing the property earlier if the owner requested based on the hardship encountered. Purchase of affected property would be by negotiation at market value for their property, that value determined as if the property was unaffected by any RTA proposals, plus compensation is available depending on the specific issues of purchasing that property. The market value would be determined by an RTA valuer as well as an independent valuer selected by the property owner (paid for by the RTA). Negotiations would then commence for the sale of the property.



— *Question*

How will the Ulmarra Bypass be affected by this process?

Response

PB: An EIS has been completed for the Ulmarra Bypass, however, it has been put on hold. One of the options that would be considered for this project is an upgrade of the existing Pacific Highway and the Ulmarra Bypass would be included in that option. Copies of the EIS can be provided on request

— *Question*

Can statistics on the number of reported crashes along the existing Highway be provided to CLG members?

Response

PB: Yes. PB will provide the available statistics

— *Question*

Why will the speed limit be restricted to 110 km/hr?

Response

PB: Road safety is a priority and it will be safest to maintain a constant, safe speed limit along the whole Highway

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 transportation, economics, environmental, land use, planning and zoning, social and design
- 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 the nature of the information which will be developed during the route option assessment phase for this project

SINCLAIR KNIGHT MERZ



Community Information Sessions Feedback

TT presented the most common concerns that came out of the workshops held at the community information sessions at Grafton and Maclean. These are listed in Attachment G.

CLG members were asked to choose (with a coloured dot) the three issues they considered the most important. For the Maclean CLG, the most important issues were identified as:

- Study area extended east
- Noise pollution
- Adequate and timely compensation to property owners

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

Meeting closed 9.05pm

Please note: As evaluation forms were not handed out at this meeting they were mailed out the following week.

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