



MINUTES

Coffs Harbour bypass project Community Consultative Committee

Date	09/02/2022	
Time	5:30 pm	
Venue	Zoom online and Coffs Harbour City Council Chambers Meeting Room	
Chairperson	Dr Col Gellatly	
Attendees	Anna Zycki (TfNSW) Greg Nash (TfNSW) Rochelle Hicks (TfNSW) Scott Lawrence (TfNSW) Gary Orange Helen Davies Alan Clayton (Coffs Chamber) Chris Spencer (Coffs Harbour Land Council)	Marina Rockett (CBAG) Tammy Hosking (TfNSW) John Hutchinson (AA) Mick Raby (CHCC) Tom Handle (CHCC) Crystal Donovan (TfNSW)
Apologies	Paul Shoker Shelly McPhee (DPIE) Lee McCourt (DPIE) Barbara Davies Belinda Ryan-Novicky (TfNSW)	

Agenda Items	Responsibility
1. Welcome to Country	Chris Spencer
2. Apologies and housekeeping	Col Gellatly
Col Gellatly introduced Chris Spencer, the new CEO from the Coffs Harbour Land Council and Tammy Hosking, from TfNSW, who works in Community Engagement and is filling in for Belinda tonight as she is unwell.	Col Gellatly
3. Minutes and previous meeting and review of actions arising	Col Gellatly
Col Gellatly noted that the draft minutes had been sent to attendees after the last meeting for comment. No comments were received, and minutes were accepted. It was later noted that a discussion regarding an anticipated housing shortage was omitted from the November Meeting minutes. It was asked that this be added retrospectively.	Col Gellatly Belinda Ryan-Novicky



Action items from the last meeting – there were no action items from the previous meeting.	
4. Update from Department of Planning, Industry and Environment	Shelley McPhee
Shelley McPhee (DPIE) was not in attendance.	
5. Update from Transport for NSW	Greg Nash
<p>Greg Nash (TfNSW) provided a project progress report.</p> <p>The presentation key points were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tender process update • Early work update • Noise management • Environment update • Aboriginal stakeholders <p>Tom Handle - In relation to design and construct, how much change will we see to the original concepts due to the Design element of the contract?</p> <p>Greg Nash - Transport have set mandatory functional requirements in our request for tenders. This locks in all things that are mandated, for example, tunnels, interchanges and pavements. There are still opportunities for tenders to innovate and influence design; however, this might be on things like designing a circular interchange instead of a dumbbell interchange. The same functional outcomes are mandated, but this allows the tenderer to develop a design that can give them the best constructability. It will enable them to develop a design that can be built more efficiently and more cost-effective. Service outcomes will remain mandatory.</p> <p>Tom Handle - Will the design of the tunnels still include the ability to meet the changes to the proposed dangerous goods laws?</p> <p>Greg Nash - At the moment, Transport’s policy is for Dangerous Goods to stay on the old highway. We are working with tenderers to allow them to develop the tunnels so that if Transport’s policy changes, they could accommodate Dangerous Goods through the tunnel because they have the safety systems in the tunnel to accommodate it, but at the moment, that’s Transport’s policy. That hasn’t changed at this point.</p> <p>Tom Handle - It was indicated that the tunnels would be built in such a manner that if the rules changed, it would potentially allow these vehicles to travel through the tunnels.</p> <p>Greg Nash – Absolutely, that is why we are working with the tenders to ensure that those safety systems are in place so that if the rules change, the tunnels will be designed for that opportunity.</p> <p>Helen Davies – How far away in the national policy review on Dangerous Goods?</p>	



Greg Nash – Could not answer this question. At this point, nothing has changed to provide the group with an update, but Greg will come back to the group with an answer.

ACTION: Greg to provide an update on the timeline of the national policy review of Dangerous Goods

Helen Davies – You mentioned that you had been doing the tendering process on contaminated land. Have you had to report anything under the contaminated land management act, and if so, has this changed your timelines?

Greg Nash – There hasn't been any change to the timeline, and all the contamination has been what we expected. Our strategy has been to encapsulate any contamination into the project rather than send it off-site.

Marina Rockett– The St Helena Tunnel is a similar length to what we are getting here, and the only Dangerous Goods not allowed through there is Class 1 and Class 2.1. This classification enables fuel tankers to go through as they are Class 3. CBAG members were hoping that tunnels here would operate on similar lines. Is there anything to say that they can't?

Greg Nash – They will be operating on similar lines as our policy stands, but we are trying to see if that can be stretched further.

Marina Rockett – What percentage of properties have been acquired?

Greg Nash – 92% of the total properties have been acquired.

Tom Handle – What is the delay on the remaining 8%?

Greg Nash – Some of the remaining properties have now gone compulsory, so once we go compulsory, they get gazetted. There are a couple that are yet to be gazetted as there has been a delay getting registered boundaries locked in before they can go to the gazettal. Following gazettal, typically the Valuers office provides valuation; however, there have been some delays statewide with the valuer generals due to the number of valuer generals authorised to provide valuations.

We do have an early access agreement for some of those properties with the property owners.

Tom Handle –Has work commenced by the independent contractor tasked with reviewing the modelling of the sound impacts? How does that place the western side of Coffs Harbour to potentially have more houses requiring AHNT than expected?

John Hutchinson - There has been an independent study recently completed regarding baseline monitoring during shoulder periods; nothing formal has come out of this yet. Nothing further will occur because the EPA and Transport have said they are not treating the shoulder periods.

The other thing you might be referring to is modelling, Tenderer modelling now on their tender design.)
(Note successfully contractors will be required to prepare Operational Noise Report on final 100% detailed design)e



Tom Handle - Previously supplied modelling shows that the noise impact finishes on the boundary of the western residential area on Shepherds Lane. So whether houses would or would not be eligible for AHTN treatment comes down to the difference of meters.

John Hutchinson – That 600m buffer not an arbitrary decision. It is where the alignment is assessed to; this is not a decision made by Transport. We will be moving the monitors right out to the boundary to ensure the entire area is covered regarding baseline monitoring. Watch this space for the updated report.

Scott Lawrence discussed the Flora and Fauna slides. Translocation of the threatened flora species is on track for Autumn.

Chris Spencer – Will Dr Ogbourne, from the University of Sunshine Coast, conduct any further scientific analysis outside of the propagation of the species?

Scott Lawrence - There is a lot more research work that we are doing both locally and with the University, particularly to identify where perhaps these species might occur in the wild, to target more populations. We have undertaken extensive surveys outside the alignment, and we are progressing with other areas within the LGA to target. Additional genetic analysis will be undertaken, looking at the propagated seeds and cuttings to determine gene flow and identify the ultimate mix when planting out the species at the translocation sites. We are also looking at analysing the plant as we think it produces male and female flowers. It is about to bud now, so in the next few weeks, we will be looking into the sex of the flowers. We are looking to identify how we can protect these species in the future and create a viable population. While this is a big challenge for the project, we hope to bring this species back from brink of extinction.

Chris Spencer – We would also be interested in finding out if this has specific properties for medicinal use, food source or whether we used it for our resources, particularly equipment and things that helped sustain the livelihood of the Aboriginal people back in the day. Given it is such a rare find, the Aboriginal community would be very interested in the scientific analysis.

Scott Lawrence – We would absolutely want to share those findings, and research we do will become publically available.

Also, we are about to engage with the North Coast Botanical Gardens to work with them on local propagation trials.

Crystal Donovan – discussed the Aboriginal cultural heritage salvaging slide.

Chris Spencer – As the CEO of the Land Council, I have had a role linking Transport with Community and making sure the original landowners and trusted custodians are involved and have the ability to have their say in how Aboriginal culture is portrayed to the local community. There have been learnings and improvements, but the most important thing is that the traditional custodians have the ability to have their say about what can and can not be said. We have a lot of special stories and songlines but not all of those can be spoken about. It is exciting that we have made it to this part of the project. For the most part, my interaction with the project team has been positive.

6. General Business including updates from Community members

Col Gellatly



Mick Raby – Rochelle has agreed to meet with the new councillors on the 18th February to provide them with an overview of the project.

Alan Clayton – From a Chamber perspective, it is good to see that the Dangerous Goods issue is still front of face and we are also pleased to see that local contractors are being considered to work on the project. With regards to issues around the housing and accommodation shortage, do we know how many people will be coming into the area to work on the project? And what plans are their regarding temporarility housing them?

Greg Nash – At the project’s peak we would expect the workforce to be around 600 people on the ground. A lot of the workforce will come from Coffs Harbour. There is an issue with accommodation and that is a challenge that we have put to the contrators, Council is also looking to put a working group together to address this issue. Transport are working with closely with all parties to identify opportunities for example, is there temporary accommodation that can be bought in to the project? Each contractor will need to assess that for themselves and we have highlighted this issue with the contractors so they can start planning how they are going to manage this issue.

Mick Raby – This issue is on the top of the Council’s strategic impact list and there has been a working group established who are working closely with Rochelle. While there is no firm direction yet, as it is really in the hands of the contractors to figure it out, we have certinaly flagged our availability to be proactively involved to make sure that this issue doesn’t cause disruption to the local community. Vacancy rates are down under 1% but we are fully aware of the issues arising.

There are some small scale subdivisions in the wings and we could potentially actively support the early activation of those to provide a site that we can connect the sewer and the site could be occupied by dongas and occupied for the period of project, then cleaned out and houses built later.

Another options are that the council and potentially the commercial sector, together with the contractor fund a high denticity, low cost housing facility which would be utilised by workers for the duration of the contract then reverted to public ownership potentially and is available for low cost housing.

Gary Orange – Identified that this issue was discussed in quite a lot of detail at the last meeting and this discussion has been omitted from the minutes.

ACTION: This discussion is to be added in the previous meetings minutes and recirculated.

Tom Handle – When would you expect the peak period to be? When do you predict there be to be 600 staff on the construction site?

Greg Nash – I think it would be around 2024 – 2025.

Rochelle Hicks – It is important to note that there is talk, and this just speculation, that there is around 60% of local people available waiting to work on the construction of this project.



Helen Davies – Thanked the team for the update on the progress on the flora and fauna, and she would love to see an exhibition centre at the North Coast Botanical Gardens showcasing what has been found. While the Dangerous Goods National Policy is not in sync with this policy, it would be good to get an update as a matter of priority and that Transport could provide the group with an update at the next meeting.

Anna Zycki Is happy to talk to the heavy vehicle and freight team and find out timeframes. So even if we can't provide an update on the policy, we can at least give an update on the timeframes.

Gary Orange - Due to the delay in the tender process from the COVID impacts, has the project timeline been changed? Also, when do you expect the first vehicles to be travelling on the bypass?

Greg Nash – No, we are still on track to award the tender in the middle of this year, and we are still on track to having vehicles on the road by the end of 2026.

Marina Rockett discussed correspondence received from Brian Pollock regarding the road noise policy and how it impacts sleep in certain circumstances.

John Hutchinson – advised that he has been speaking with Brian Pollock and Brian Clarke regarding this issue. John advised that noise is categorised as LEQ and LMAX. LEQ is a constant stream of noise, and LMAX is a noise that “sticks up” about the LEQ. This noise is what can cause sleep disturbance.

We are bound by specific frameworks and guidelines regarding the physical mitigation of noise, particularly the road noise policy. These policies consider a series of gates that will decide whether or not you have to apply quiet pavements or how tall the noise barriers will be, who gets what acoustic treatments at their houses and what treatment that might be. These decisions are all based on the LEQ.

The LEQ is not perfect in all situations; it is suitable for continuous noise; however, when there are intersections, bends and tight corners, we use the LMAX to help choose between route options on the bigger picture level. The LMAX is used to feed into those design options.

When it comes to the mitigation stage, we don't use LMAX; it's all determined through LEQ and the series of gates as is required by the NSW Road Noise Mitigation Guideline. Brian is asking for an assessment of the LMAX in the subsequent documents to the EIS. The EIS did look at it, , they did measurements of the existing LMAX on the existing road, and projected likely Lmax events for the new section of the highway (greenfield areas).

So that's what Brian is looking at, what is the LMAX situation going to be on the highway. It's an academic question, but it won't change who gets what treatments.

Brian is requesting that John and Scott formally require the contractor to address LMAX. John does not believe that this will make anyone's life any different, but he and Scott can discuss this further. Generally, the LMAX assessment is included in the requirements for writing a noise and vibration report. I will review whatever comes to me from the contractor, and I will question them if there is no LMAX assessment however, if they say it is not needed, my position does not allow me to tell someone to spend money on something that is not needed.



<p>Marina Rockett – Is 600 metres as far as the machine goes?</p> <p>John Hutchinson - The 600m is as far as noise model bears any semblance of reality.</p> <p>Marina Rockett – What happens if you are 620m or 700m or 800m?</p> <p>John Hutchinson – Then the results modelled are going to be very dubious. The contractors will remodel the contours in the upcoming tender design, and we will see again that the predicted noise levels will not make it to your house.</p> <p>Gary Orange – Would it be fair to say that the contractor is going to pick an elevated part of the mountain to tunnel through to create a shorter tunnel that will result in gradient rises and falls throughout different parts of the alignment, and this will increase the LMAX if trucks put on their brakes or put their foot down.</p> <p>Rochelle Hicks added that there are Mandatory Functional Requirements that the contractor must meet, and one of those is vertical alignment, and we have requested that the grade remain as it is.</p> <p>Gary Orange – Does the gradient remain consistent along the alignment?</p> <p>Rochelle Hicks - There are gradient changes throughout the design in the amendment report, in the reference design, but they won't be increasing the gradient and shorting the tunnels.</p> <p>Gary Orange – Expressed concerns regarding the ground height in the Boambee Valley and the western side of Coffs Harbour is very low.</p> <p>Rochelle Hicks invited Gary to talk through the vertical alignment, which has been on display during the amendment report. It is complicated to explain verbally, and it is something worthwhile doing with a visual.</p> <p>Gary Orange - requested that this be discussed at the next meeting so everyone could visualise it.</p> <p>Rochelle Hicks - agreed that she could talk through the vertical alignment on the screen at the next meeting and that it is available at the display office. (Open Wednesdays)</p> <p>Marina Rockett – Requested a copy of the slides today to provide use when reporting on the outcomes of this meeting.</p>	
<p>7. Next meeting</p>	<p>Col Gellatly</p>
<p>Next meeting Thursday 19th May– 5.30pm. ACTION: Belinda Ryan-Novicky to confirm date.</p>	



Australian Government

BUILDING OUR FUTURE

