



**Pacific Highway Upgrade
Brunswick Heads to Yelgun
Community Liaison Group Meeting No. 2
11th May 2005**

Attendees:

Robert Kooyman
Brett Lee (BSC)
Pauline Millington
Frank Mills
Malcolm Murray
Kathy Norley-Farmer
Barry Hutton
Robert Rosen
Gillian Secombe
Sue Stirton
Tony Stupka
Jack Taylor
Patricia Warren

Will MacDonald (Abi)
Mark Sabolch (Abi)
Terry Paxton (Abi)
Wendy Dooley (Abi)

Peter Borrelli (RTA)
David Purdy (RTA)

Bill Gardyne (EMR)

Apologies: K Morrison, P Wallbridge, S Scott, R Holmes, G Millham, C Tarbox

1.0	<p>Previous Meeting Notes</p> <p>The team apologized that a rough draft of Meeting 1 notes had been distributed and was then re-issued as the intended meeting notes.</p> <p>Several members of the group indicated they would rather see a verbatim account of the meeting. The project team noted that the format that was being followed was the same as that adopted for the planning stages of the project, and would remain so during the construction phase of the project. It was further noted that the intention was not to get 'bogged down' in detailed recorded minutes, but rather to focus on the key issues, outcomes and actions arising from the meetings.</p> <p>Several points were raised for inclusion in Meeting 1 notes.</p>
------------	---

	<p>Landscaping plan comments: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscaping adjacent to the floodplains should match the existing vegetation of the nearby endangered ecological vegetation communities (as per the project Environmental Documents eg., EIS, SIS); • The landscape architect suggested broad themes, e.g. structure and colour but at no times mentioned individual species. The project team noted that once more detailed landscaping plans including species types were known, these would be discussed with the CLG. <p>Schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In relation to any impacts on traffic and consideration of / notification to schools, the Higher School Certificate exam period needs special consideration and specific forward notification. <p>Species and Hydrology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to ensure that both items are linked in regard to the rest area, flood plain areas and throughout the project generally. <p>Rest Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Felt the discussion was somewhat truncated in the meeting notes. <p>Noise Monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification was sought regarding post construction noise assessment. The project team advised that as per the approval conditions for the project, and previous RTA commitments, post construction noise monitoring would be done six months after construction completion, the collected data would be entered into the noise model for the project and the noise model would be re-run to then forecast noise levels 10 years after the project was opened to traffic. If the forecast noise levels for ten years after opening to traffic exceeded the approved noise goals for the project then the project team would reassess noise mitigation options in accordance with the project approval conditions.
1.1	<p>Agenda outline</p> <p>The agenda was outlined as: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on current Project Works; • Feedback on the Urban Design and Landscape Plan presentation at the last CLG meeting; • Presentation on the scope of the Brunswick Heads to Yelgun DCM contract so people could put the draft charter (tabled at the last CLG Meeting) into context; • Comments on the draft charter for the CLG;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of Abigroup company experience and track record; • Overview of project Construction Environmental Management Plans; and • General business- including the Yelgun Rest Area.
<p>2.0</p>	<p>Update on current works</p> <p>Abigroup indicated the following activities were currently being undertaken: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various Environmental Management & Project plans are being prepared, submitted and reviewed for approval prior to commencement of substantial construction. • Property boundary fencing (between the Upgrade and adjoining property) is underway. • Redundant buildings in the line of the Upgrade are being demolished and removed from site. • A drilling rig has been undertaking further geotechnical testing. • Three crews of surveyors, have been establishing survey control for the project and pegging out buffer zones to protect sensitive environmental areas. • Preparing for pre-construction condition surveys of adjacent properties in close proximity to work areas. • Preparation of Traffic Control Plans and subsequent submission to RTA / Council for worksite area entry and exit points to and from the existing Pacific Highway. • Non substantial clearing along the northbound carriageway alignment of the Brunswick Heads Bypass. • The erection of an Osprey nesting pole prior to breeding season at a location remote from the worksite. • Application to Byron Shire Council and RTA for the temporary closure of Tunnel Rd at its eastern Pacific Highway intersection end). • Removal of redundant power poles utility services and relocation of services underground. <p>Discussion regarding the process and works around the Osprey and its nest followed. The following points were discussed: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a 100m buffer zone around the nest? • Does this contravene the Threatened Species Act? • Who is doing the monitoring? <p>RTA indicated that the process had been undertaken in close consultation with Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) – the National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) side of the organization and the Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources (DIPNR). NPWS supplied the project team with the nesting platform. The objective of undertaking the work now was to ensure the impact on the bird was minimised,</p>

	<p>less than that which might have otherwise occurred during the breeding season.</p> <p>A request was made that the the activity be explained in further detail at the next Meeting.</p> <p>Action: Project Team to provide further details of the clearing activity.</p> <p>The CLG also discussed the areas to be covered by the pre-construction building condition surveys. Abigroup indicated that the areas to be offered a survey were defined within the contract for the Project, and related to their proximity to works and potential for construction impacts. Any requests for surveys outside the potentially impacted area would be assessed on a case by case basis and can be discussed with Abigroup at the Community Display Centre during normal business hours.</p>
<p>2.1</p>	<p>Feedback on Urban Design and Landscape Plan</p> <p>It was noted that the feedback to date related largely to the interest in the: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southern foreshore planning process; • Treatments around certain Service Road intersections, such as Rajah Road, Shara Boulevard and Balemo Drive and the major interchanges; and • Landscaping of the Billinudgel industrial area. <p>The CLG raised that the Project Team need to ensure the plan was cognizant of existing adjacent endangered ecological communities.</p>
<p>3.0</p>	<p>Presentation on Scope of Contract by RTA</p> <p>Peter Borrelli of the RTA provided an overview of the scope of the Design Construct and Maintain contract that had been awarded to Abigroup which was for the detailed design, construction and ten year maintenance of the Project. The Contract was based on the approved project and concept design details.</p> <p>General Comments following the presentation were as follows: -</p> <p>Q If the CLG is not the forum to deal with planning issues and decisions regarding the route etc because the project is approved and is in the construction phase, then what recourse do we have?</p> <p>A Such matters can either be referred to / discussed with the RTA, or given that it is an approved project, the Minister for Planning.</p> <p>Q Will fishing be allowed from the local traffic service road bridge over the Brunswick River?</p> <p>Action: RTA to provide advice in relation to fishing</p>

	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>from the bridge.</i></p> <p>BSC Council does not want its services suspended from the bridge. What is the timeline for negotiations?</p> <p>RTA Those negotiations need to be resolved now.</p>
<p>4.0</p>	<p>Draft Charter</p> <p>Comment was called for on the draft charter. Discussion largely focused on the issues of CLG members commenting in the media. The following questions and answers ensued: -</p> <p>Q How are members to know what they can comment on in the media?</p> <p>A Members of the CLG may be party to discussions about items that are just under consideration or that have not been made publicly available yet. For example, the CLG was given a preliminary viewing of the project scale model before any official announcements were made as a courtesy to the group. It was noted that individual CLG members were not representatives of the collective CLG or the Project Team and hence media contact on that basis or quoting another member was not permitted. If others in the community had specific concerns or issues then the CLG members should feel free to direct them to visit the Community Display Centre to speak to the Project Team directly. If items are expected to be kept in confidence then the group would be so advised. If any one is in doubt they should contact the Project Team.</p> <p>Any member has the right to speak to the media as an individual (or of the group they represent), but not as a representative of the group or quoting another member of the group. The Project Team and CLG would expect that any such comments would be true and accurate.</p> <p>Q Someone in my group that I report back to may go to the media - not me, someone else.</p> <p>A Should any person in your group feel that they need to make comment it would be preferable to directed to the Community Display Centre where they could discuss any issues or concerns with a member of the Project Team. CLG members should not feel as though they have to shoulder the responsibility of informing or managing the entire community.</p> <p>Q As a group representative we often have to take instructions from our organisations and they may want us to take a very strong stance on an issue and to report back regarding the success or failure of our delivery.</p> <p>A Acknowledged and there is plenty of room in this forum for passion, but not at the expense of courtesy to other</p>

	<p>members or presenters or understanding and respect that others equally have the right to share share with the CLG a different perspective on a particular issue. That is essentially why the Project Team has proposed the guidelines.</p> <p>Comment: It was noted that one of the roles of the CLG Chair was to ensure that meetings were not dominated by individuals, but rather that all members have a chance to speak and that the meeting runs in an efficient and courteous manner.</p> <p>Q If we cannot get an item onto the agenda a week before, can we still bring it up on the evening of the meeting?</p> <p>A The Project Team will try to be as flexible as possible, but if you bring an item up on the evening it may be that the Project Team will need to investigate the issue and may not be able to respond until the next meeting, particularly if the agenda for the night is already very full. It may also be that an urgent matter arises and we need to devote an entire meeting to a single issue.</p>
<p>5.0</p>	<p>Abigroup Company Experience and Track Record Presentation</p> <p>Construction Manager Will MacDonald provided the group with an overview of Abigroup Contractors Pty Ltd (Abi), explaining that the organisation was a major civil engineering, construction and asset services group in Australia. Abi is 100% owned by Bilfinger Berger Australia Pty Ltd, a wholly owned subsidiary of Bilfinger Berger AG.</p> <p>Structurally, Abi has three main divisions, Abi Civil, Abi Asset Services and Abi Asset Developments Pty Ltd and had a combined 2004 turnover in excess of \$1.3 billion.</p> <p>The Civil division, who are building this road, had a 2004 turnover of approximately \$1b last financial year and were involved in such major projects as the Westlink M7 road project, Warragamba Dam upgrade and the Bauhinia Rail Link, to name a few.</p> <p>Will went on to provide some details about these major projects and the importance that Abi placed on community liaison in such projects.</p> <p>General comments and questions following the presentation were as follows: -</p> <p>Q Where will the concrete batching plant for the project be located?</p> <p>A Most likely on the western side of the highway south of</p>

	<p>the Billinudgel Industrial Estate.</p> <p>Q If there is to be a concrete batching plant near the Billinudgel Industrial Area, won't it be dusty?</p> <p>A No. The project planning approvals, and the Construction Environmental Management Plans require a number of mitigation measures to control dust. In addition, the DEC / EPA enforces quite strict guidelines in relation to dust emissions from concrete batching plants.</p> <p>Q Will the Brunswick River bridge be prefabricated?</p> <p>A No, it will be a balanced cantilevered bridge that is poured and constructed in-situ. Perhaps we will do a presentation on this component of the project at a future meeting as this style of bridge construction is unusual and there are only a handful of them that have been built in Australia.</p> <p>Q Where is the gravel coming from?</p> <p>A Most likely south of the project.</p> <p>A: By the time it's finished we won't have any cheap gravel for our own roads.</p> <p>BSC Council has its own secure gravel resources.</p> <p>Q Will there be a good view available from the Brunswick River bridge or is there going to be a screen?</p> <p>A Yes, it has been designed to be very open, we made extra efforts to ensure the structure is elegant and achieves good views both to and from it.</p> <p>Comment: I had the misfortune to have to do a live-to-air TV broadcast with koalas in the background trees, (at Yelgun to Chinderah) on World Environment Day. I had to inform the audience that Abi were at that moment clearing endangered species. I don't want to have to do the same type of interview next World Environment Day.</p> <p>RTA When is World Environment Day?</p> <p>A June 5.</p> <p>RTA Please come and see the Project Team if you would like some assistance with information for the next World Environment Day in identifying some of the many very positive environmental outcomes the project will achieve available.</p>
<p>6.0</p>	<p>Overview of the Project Construction Environmental Management Plans</p> <p>Mark Sabolch, the Abi Environmental Manager for the project then provided an overview of both Abi's internal project management systems, environmental policy and the</p>

	<p>Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMP's) that will provide the construction management framework for this project.</p> <p>Mark indicated that it was a significant component of the early work for this project to review all the input and conditions included in the Environmental Documents and the various Approvals for the project by the various Authorities and to produce management plans that effectively address all the issues and conditions previously raised. The various management plans would then have to satisfy the respective regulatory Authorities prior to commencement of work. Mark listed some of these agencies including: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Land and Water (now Department of Infrastructure Planning and Natural Resources (DIPNR)); • Environmental Protection Agency (now part of Department of Environment and Conservation -DEC) • National Parks and Wildlife Services (also now part of DEC); • NSW Fisheries (now known as Department of Primary Industries - Fisheries); • NSW Agriculture (now known as Department of Primary Industries - Agriculture); • Byron Shire Council. <p>Mark indicated there was an overarching Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) made up of numerous specific sub-plans including: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air Quality; • Flora and Fauna; • Indigenous Heritage; • Non Indigenous Heritage; • Waste Management Plan; • Soil and Water; • Noise (Construction and Operational) and Vibration; • Flooding and Drainage; • Urban Design and Landscaping; • Community Involvement; and • Spoil, Fill and Contamination Plan. <p>Mark also noted that as an organisation Abi had won several environmental awards for projects including the Warragamba Dam Upgrade Project and the Yelgun to Chinderah component of the Pacific Highway Upgrade.</p> <p>Comments and questions following the presentation were as follows: -</p> <p><i>Awards:</i></p> <p>Q Who judged the awards?</p> <p>A The awards were provided by the Earthmovers Federation and CASE but not sure who actually did the judging.</p>
--	---

	<p><i>Water:</i></p> <p>Q Will you be tapping into our water supply like you did last time?</p> <p>A As far as water spraying for dust management, we intend to use non potable water and have a hierarchy of where we would get water from. The first point of call will be run off collected from on site.</p> <p>Q And if we have dust problems around Billinudgel for instance, we just ring and you'll get a water tanker out?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p><i>ISO 14001:</i></p> <p>Q The ISO 14001 makes the environment plan more than a greenwash. If RTA and State and regulatory requirements don't meet the highest standards are you prepared to go beyond that because that's what your environment policy requires?</p> <p>A ISO 14001 is an international standard for a management system, it doesn't give actual environmental targets, e.g. doesn't give requirements for decibels of noise. It provides a process with a built-in review mechanism. The Abigroup Senior Management Executives meet on an annual basis to review the system at a corporate level, and this is the time when they review what's working and what's not, and where can we deliver better outcomes. Their review is for the integrated Quality/OH&S and Environmental system and Abigroup Senior Management Executives also consider the financial and social outcomes too.</p> <p>RTA One of the reasons the RTA accepted the Abi tender, is that Abi offered more than what other tenderers offered environmentally, and in some cases better than the specified requirements for the project.</p> <p><i>Risk Management:</i></p> <p>Q Is there a separate Risk Management Plan?</p> <p>A Yes.</p> <p><i>Contaminated Sites:</i></p> <p>Q How are the contaminated sites - the old cattle tick dip and former Ocean Shores Service Station sites- to be dealt with?</p> <p>A We can provide a presentation on that at a future meeting if you like. We have consultants working on the Contaminated Sites Management Plan at the moment. We do have preliminary advice on the extent of contamination at the sites but require further testing advice. In relation to the Ocean Shores Service Station, the issue is hydrocarbon leakage.</p> <p>Q Is it entering the water table?</p> <p>A Our advice is that it has reached the water table but has</p>
--	---

	<p>not traveled far from the project site.</p> <p>RTA The reality is the service station has been there for a fairly long time with ongoing leakage occurring over this time. The good news is that we have detected it will be cleaning it up as part of this Project.</p> <p>In relation to contaminated soils, there are accepted management practices for dealing with such materials.</p> <p><i>Waste Management:</i></p> <p>Q On the softer side of waste management, have Abi's got any percentage targets?</p> <p>A Not actual percentages but we do have a management plan and will be tracking the waste generated from the project. We can also look at the Waste Management Plan at a future meeting.</p> <p>BSC In terms of recycling, Abi are providing mulch to Landcare as one recycling initiative.</p> <p><i>Vibration:</i></p> <p>PB Usually services and utilities run alongside or within the road corridor and these often are the primary constraints in terms of vibration limits as they are closest to the works and tend to be very sensitive.</p> <p>Q In December which Government Agency said in their letter to RTA that consideration should be given to residents outside the 500m buffer for the proposed facility for noise and vibration? So can that be looked into?</p> <p>A The letter referred to is for the Yelgun Rest Area and this will be considered.</p> <p><i>Noise:</i></p> <p>Q Is the noise monitoring which was undertaken in 2005 comparable to the previous noise monitoring done for the project in 2001 or 1997?</p> <p>RTA Yes from what I've seen, it is done in a similar way.</p> <p>Following the discussion the group was asked to prioritise which plans they would like a presentation on. It was agreed that air quality, noise and vibration management plans would be a logical choice, with flooding and hydrology to be dealt with in the future.</p>
<p>7.0</p>	<p>General Business:</p> <p><i>Rest Area</i></p> <p>In response to a request to have the Rest Area on the agenda Peter Borrelli of the RTA provided an overview of this component of the project.</p> <p>The basis for the decision included various factors. The Pacific Highway Safety Review stressed the need to provide rest areas in addressing the issue of driver fatigue and identified Yelgun as a potential site. The new project would also result in the loss of</p>

the current Brunswick Heads Driver Reviver station at the old Fins Restaurant site. The RTA had reviewed possible areas but potential impacts on immediately adjoining properties and sensitive land uses limited opportunities.

The Yelgun site had several advantages over others considered: -

- Topography which isolates it visually and acoustically – no residents within 500m;
- Good access to both the existing highway and upgrade;
- Is isolated from ecologically sensitive land;
- Is on RTA owned land.

Rest Area Features:

- Separate entry and exit points to reduce traffic conflict;
- Dedicated RH turning bay for southbound traffic to enter and leave;
- Speed limit of 60 km/h on the Service Road adjacent to the facility;
- Picnic shelters, barbeque facilities, emergency telephone, information boards, toilet facility, landscaped mounds, rubbish bins, play area, low level security illumination.

Peter indicated the RTA had produced a Review of Environmental Factors (REF) that addressed:

- Noise and vibration;
- Flora and fauna;
- Urban design and landscaping;
- Social and community interaction;
- Traffic and transport;
- Water quality and hydrology;
- Soils and geology; and
- Air quality;

amongst other criteria.

Key findings of the REF were:

- Maximum noise levels would typically be lower than the Upgrade;
- At residence treatment (for operation and noise) would be provided to one RTA owned property deemed potentially impacted;
- RTA to prepare an operation noise management plan and monitor noise once the facility is opened;
- While largely grazing country there were two stands of Davidson Plums that would potentially need to be translocated;
- The RTA would provide an Urban Design and Landscape Plan that integrated into the surrounding landform and also provided mounding and vegetation screening as soon as possible;
- There would only be slightly increased traffic volumes on the Yelgun interchange ramps and the section of Service

	<p>Road directly accessing the facility;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific water quality drainage structures would be used to collect and treat run-off from the site; and • RTA to produce a Construction Environmental Management Plan. <p>As part of the process there had been a call for submissions with 34 being lodged, including those from other Government Agencies. As a result of the review of submissions another report was prepared, and a decision was made to proceed with the Rest Area, subject to various conditions, including implementation of all environmental safeguard measures and commitments made in assessment of the community submissions received.</p> <p>REF key issues and responses:</p> <p><i>Issue</i> Mixing of heavy and light vehicle two way traffic at the Yelgun interchange.</p> <p><i>Response</i> Review alternative access arrangements and subject to feasibility, RTA will modify access to the Rest Area.</p> <p><i>Issue</i> Potential pollution of Billinudgel Nature Reserve</p> <p><i>Response</i> Inclusion of spill containment devices including a downstream storage basin.</p> <p><i>Issue</i> Potential light pollution</p> <p><i>Response</i> Only the required areas will be lit. Lights will be shielded, and landscape screening will be provided. Other than an RTA owned residence, there are no other residences in direct line of sight.</p> <p><i>Issue</i> Community Consultation (process)</p> <p><i>Response</i> The REF was publicly exhibited from 23/11/04 to 22/12/04 at six locations within the Shire and on the RTA website. It was also advertised in local papers and there was a staffed display at Ocean Shores on 25/11/04.</p> <p><i>Issue</i> Alternative locations</p> <p><i>Response</i> A number of alternate locations were considered based on a number of criteria including: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity to sensitive noise receptors; • Available space; • Access limitations; • Environmental constraints; • Property ownership; and • Visual impact. <p>Sites such as Tyagarah and Sleepy Hollow</p>
--	---

	<p>were considered as well, but Yelgun was considered the best site.</p>
<p><i>Issue</i></p>	<p>Responsibility for maintenance</p>
<p><i>Response</i></p>	<p>The RTA contractor will be responsible for maintenance for 10 years from opening. Any assets that RTA does not propose to maintain would depend on an arrangement being negotiated with Byron Shire Council.</p>
	<p>General Discussion, Comment and Questions</p>
	<p>There was discussion in relation to the statement that there were no residents within 500m of the rest area with some confusion relating to whether this was an established buffer. The RTA indicated this was not a guideline for the location of rest areas but simply a statement of fact at this particular location.</p>
	<p>Some members of the group also reported that there was community concern the rest area would include commercial enterprises, but RTA and Council both agreed that it was not the intent and Council zoning doesn't permit a service station or restaurant with a drive way facility. The RTA noted that this was clearly stated in the REF for the Rest Area.</p>
	<p>Other issues raised included:</p>
	<p>Nature Reserve</p>
<p><i>Comment</i></p>	<p>The area is adjacent to the Billinudgel Nature Reserve.</p>
<p><i>Response</i></p>	<p>The area in question is actually 100m from the Billinudgel Nature Reserve and on the opposite side of the existing highway. The existing highway provides a buffer between the Billinudgel Nature Reserve and the rest area.</p>
<p><i>Comment</i></p>	<p>There are a high number (27) of threatened flora and fauna species in the area and the rest area should be rejected on environmental grounds alone.</p>
<p><i>Response</i></p>	<p>There are a range of competing considerations, including social, environmental and travel safety considerations which all have to be considered, and considered in the context of the environmental protection measures which can be implemented.</p>
	<p>Ownership Status</p>
<p>Q</p>	<p>Isn't the land for the rest area a part of the compensatory habitat package for the project?</p>
<p>RTA</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>Q</p>	<p>RTA owns it?</p>

RTA	Yes – we own all of what’s known as the former Jagwen property, a small piece of which (identified by RTA on the plan) is part of the compensatory habitat package and has already been transferred to DEC - NPWS.
Q	Any ideas on how you would use the adjoining hectares?
RTA	Because there is a house on it, I would expect it would go back on the market for sale at the end of the project.
<i>Locations/Separation Distances between Rest Areas</i>	
Q	Where is the next rest area? Is there is one at Ballina?
RTA	Picnic area north of Ballina.
Q	On completion of the new highway, won’t it be less than two hours between Ballina and Tweed Heads? Why therefore is a rest area required in this vicinity?
RTA	That’s assuming truck drivers want to stop at Ballina, and the RTA needs to plan the highway network for the future, when the Ballina Bypass will be in existence – and hence that option for highway use will no longer be easily available.
Comment	Usually they want to eat and there’s nothing between Ballina and Tweed.
RTA	There is a range of options available to road users along the highway. Some road users including truck drivers say they want to bring their own eskies and use the facilities provided.
Q	It was stated the RTA reviewed the area between Ballina & Tweed. When did they do this? Was this after the B-doubles started using the highway?
RTA	Yes, but it was more in response to general traffic and road user safety along the full length of the highway.
Comment:	It’s not just for truck drivers, but also families and the general traveling public.
<i>Planning Status</i>	
Q	This is only a concept plan?
RTA	Yes, the concept plan has been approved but detailed design in accordance with the concept is now required.
<i>Process</i>	
Q	Has there been an REF on the truck stop?
A	Yes, it’s on display here at the Community

		Information Centre and available on the RTA's website.
Q		One issue of concern is about the process. What was the level of submissions?
RTA		35 submissions.
Q		Which government departments responded?
RTA		Responses came from all of them – and are included in report prepared on the submissions received.
Q		RTA say this is a different project but you appear to draw on the EIS for the highway upgrade.
RTA		Yes they are separate projects. All the assessment has done has made use of the available published information.
Comment:		Response from DEC - NPWS to the REF was that the two are not only independent but are mutually exclusive.
		<i>Traffic Movements</i>
Q		Where do we get onto the road north?
RTA		By following the existing road.
Comment:		We asked for consideration of an alternative for local traffic to avoid the roundabout and it appears you (RTA) are listening.
RTA		That is the process. We want to canvas the thoughts and views from the CLG to try and deliver the best outcome in balancing the various competing needs.
Comment:		The people of the Pocket and Billinudgel use Stock Route Road as an alternate access in flood times or as a shortcut to the north, even though it is not a good road.
RTA		Noted.
Q		Concerned that the rest area will increase the number of vehicles using the interchange. This is not an issue at Sleepy Hollow.
RTA		Yes there is a slight increase in traffic and in response to those concerns we are considering the option of providing a local road link that bypasses the interchange for local traffic movements.
		<i>Spill/Rubbish Management</i>
Q		How would spills be managed should

RTA	<p>something like this occur in the rest area? A key part of the design is a gross pollutant trap and basin to collect road runoff or a spill. The basin will hold a significant volume of captured material and in addition we would also build a basin with a lockable valve. Any spills could be manually locked off. Maintenance is included as part of Abi contract. They have a maintenance standard for how often they have to pick up litter. RTA even provided information on how many cups there may be from the Driver Reviver operations! It is also a low speed environment so from a risk management point of view it is considered a very low risk when compared to the existing highway with a lot of traffic currently using it and a bad curve, but with no current environmental protection.</p>
Comment:	<p>The Driver Reviver people said it is just the same to go to Tyagarah. They are concerned about pollution etc.</p>
RTA	<p>That is different to the official Driver Reviver submission received on the Rest Area.</p>
<i>Rest Area Timing</i>	
Q	<p>When will the Rest Area be built?</p>
RTA	<p>It will start at a similar time to the rest of the Project but will be operational some time before the Upgrade is actually complete and opened to traffic.</p>
<i>Sleepy Hollow Alternative</i>	
Comment:	<p>The main worry is that the RTA is taking B-doubles out of Sleepy Hollow and putting them into this Rest Area.</p>
Q	<p>How many residents at Sleepy Hollow are effected by noise – 1 or 2?</p>
RTA	<p>No, it is more like 6 or 7.</p>
Q	<p>If it comes to pass that there are noise issues with Yelgun, can people come to RTA and talk about double glazing etc ?</p>
RTA	<p>As previously discussed the RTA has committed to post construction noise monitoring, and if predicted noise levels exceed the goals for the Rest Area ten years after opening, then the RTA would need to consider additional noise mitigation measures. Current assessment indicates that residences won't be affected.</p>
Comment:	<p>To put Sleepy Hollow in perspective with</p>

	<p>Yelgun, there are currently spaces for four trucks in each direction.</p> <p>Q RTA Was an REF was done for Sleepy Hollow? Yes</p> <p>Q RTA Couldn't you just put high sound walls around Sleepy Hollow to shield the residents there? Wouldn't it be cheaper than a new Rest Area at Yelgun? The height of noise walls would be astronomical and they would have to surround the entire area including the road to pull in. We also do not own adequate land at Sleepy Hollow to accommodate sufficient space for the demand. RTA has provided offers to residences at Yelgun to provide sound mitigation to residences already affected by the Upgrade.</p> <p>Q RTA And how do environmental comparisons between Sleepy Hollow & Yelgun stack up? For example in terms of proximity to sensitive lands. The issue we had was to weigh up competing interests. While there are no ecological issues at Sleepy Hollow, the RTA had to weigh up a range of evaluation criteria including social, economic and environmental interests – it's a difficult balancing act.</p>
8.0	Next meeting: Wednesday 8 June, 2005