

Meeting Notes

Project:	Sapphire to Woolgoolga Upgrade Project	Reference:	1093.40.GE
Location:	Cinema Room, Woolgoolga Bowling Club, Boundary Street, Woolgoolga	Date:	2 March 2005

Present: Apology: Copy: Name:

SAPPHIRE TO WOOLGOOLGA NORTHERN CFG (Woolgoolga Bypass)

	✓		Graham Ashton
✓			Rebecca Pickering (proxy)
✓			PS Lalli
		✓	Tony Johnson
			J Shipway (proxy)
	✓		Paul Norton
✓			Ron Gray
✓			Margaret Murphy
✓			Robert Forrest
✓			Steven Moody
✓			Phillip Pearce
		✓	Des Saunders
✓			Bruce Scanlon
✓			Satpal Singh Bhatti
✓			Paramjeet Singh Bhatti
		✓	Jas Benning
✓			Rashmere Bhatti

PROJECT TEAM

✓			Chris Clark	RTA
	✓		Bob Higgins	RTA
	✓		Adam Cameron	RTA
✓			Tim Paterson	Connell Wagner
✓			Barry Hancock	Connell Wagner

✓			Nick Hearfield	Connell Wagner
✓			Andrew Smith	Pramax Communications
✓			Janice Smith	Pramax Communications
Recorded By: Pramax Communications				Total Pages: 13
Subject: Community Focus Group Meeting No 16 (Woolgoolga Bypass)				

Details:

Action By/Date:

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Andrew Smith (AS) opened the meeting at 6.00pm.
- 1.2 Apologies were received from Bob Higgins, Adam Cameron, Paul Norton and Graham Ashton.
- 1.3 AS outlined meeting courtesy procedures for the benefit of new members and then asked all seated around the table to briefly introduce themselves and their representation. He also asked members to fill in and circulate a contact sheet.

2. NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

- 2.1 A CFG member asked whether the charter of the CFG was being adhered to. In the charter it stated that meeting notes would be circulated to members within two weeks of a meeting. The CFG had been adhering to the charter but the RTA, Connell Wagner and Pramax hadn't. Circulating the meeting Notes so long after a meeting made it hard to remember what had been said. He had raised this before and it was reflected in Item 2.2 of the Notes of the previous meeting. Item 2.3 of the previous Notes had not been answered. He had asked for a definition of the word 'feasible', which should be able to be defined, and had still not received one.
- 2.2 Chris Clark (CC) (RTA): Undertook to come back with a definition of the word feasible.
- 2.3 The CFG member: In item 3.4, reference to 'Option E had been preferred by the August 2004 VMW participants because it was likely to have higher community acceptance' ... he had attended both value management workshops (VMW) and the comment was wrong, it was not how the community felt.
- 2.4 Tim Paterson (TP) (Connell Wagner): It was seen to have higher community acceptance in comparison to the other options considered by the participants at the workshop ie Options C and C1. It needed to be read in context. The matter of the accuracy of the Notes had been raised before. It was a matter of Notes versus minutes. The Notes were not a verbatim record, they were a transactional record.
- 2.5 AS: The member was talking about what type of documentation was coming out of the meetings. Previously stenographers had taken the Notes and that had been a labour in itself with all the time taken to transcribe the shorthand. The stenographers also had difficulties grappling with the technical information.
- 2.6 TP: Perhaps there should be a qualifier to the effect of that was what was discussed at the VMW.
- 2.7 The CFG member: Took issue that a comment made by TP at the combined meeting of the Coffs (southern), Sapphire-Moonee and Woolgoolga Area CFGs, held on June 15, 2004, that there was an 11km run of 6% on the CRW, had not been

Note: CC to provide definitions of "feasible" and "viable"

Note: JS to clarify format of meeting notes

Details:

Action By/Date:

corrected in the Notes of the following meeting. There was only a 1.1km run at 6% on the CRW. This was a crucial point and it had not been corrected.

2.8 TP: He would have to check on that. Perhaps it had been corrected in the Notes of the following meeting of the Coffs CFG and not the Notes of the following Woolgoolga Area CFG.

2.9 The CFG member: The error from the June 15 meeting had not been corrected.

2.10 Another CFG member: At a presentation at Coffs Harbour, TP provided a slide that had the incorrect information on it and agreed at the meeting that it was incorrect. This was reflected in the Notes of the meeting.

2.11 TP: I would have to check the meeting Notes.

Note: Check notes of combined meeting of June 15, 2004.

2.12 The CFG member: The minutes also were going to be circulated to the members and any changes made to them before being approved and placed on the website.

2.13 CC: We have had this discussion before. What was agreed was that the Notes would be placed on the website and any changes to them would be corrected in the Notes of the following meeting.

Note: Clarify procedure for placing notes of CFG meetings on website

2.14 A CFG member asked whether it was possible to tape the meeting?

2.15 CC: Obviously there was an issue with the Notes. He also had issues with the style of Notes that were produced from the meeting. They were not user-friendly to people who did not attend the meetings and looked at them on the project website. He wanted to get away from the formal 'he said, she said' style. The role of the CFG would be different for this phase. The CFG would be providing input into the refined concept design and environmental impact assessment and the format of the meetings also would change. It was an opportunity to change the way the Notes were produced.

2.16 A CFG member: He read Item 3.26 (of the notes from the previous CFG meeting). It was incorrect. Arup's brief had not been to review the technical findings, it was only to look at the process and he had made that comment and it was not recorded.

2.17 TP: That was incorrect. Arup's brief was to review the technical findings. They had gone through the technical process, the studies that had been carried out

2.18 A CFG member: For future meetings, if there was something incorrect, the group needed to get onto it straight away.

2.19 CFG member: Maybe those minutes should be amended.

2.20 A CFG member: This was not a fresh start. How could they move into the process of the next stage when things such as this were not addressed?

2.21 A CFG member: Were they talking about some of the stuff not being recorded correctly?

2.22 AS: It sounded like the CFG member was saying the Notes were totally wrong and that was not the case. There were some problems with the Notes not coming out quick enough.

2.23 A CFG member: It was a fundamental problem. Could they close off on the minutes?

2.24 A CFG member: As far as the rest of the minutes went, he hadn't been able to read through them because he had work commitments and he had only recently received

Details:

Action By/Date:

them, yet the meeting had been held four months ago.

2.25 AS asked if it could be taken that the Notes were accepted?

2.26 The CFG member: He did not accept them as a true and correct record. He was not happy with the Notes regarding the Arup peer review.

2.27 CC: What was his concern?

2.28 The CFG member: His reply in Item 3.27. The purpose of the Arup review had been to report on the process and not the technical findings. He did not believe his reply had been accurately recorded.

2.29 TP: There were two issues – what Arup's brief was and whether Item 3.27 accurately reflected what the CFG member had said. Perhaps he could resolve the first by getting a copy of the Arup report for the CFG member. He believed Item 3.27 reflected what the CFG member said he had said.

Note: Clarify purpose of Arup report.

2.30 The CFG member: Still did not agree with the record.

2.31 TP: What was in error with 3.27?

2.32 The CFG member: Said the purpose of Arup was to report on the process, not the technical findings.

2.33 TP: What was it that 3.27 didn't do? He had said Arup's brief was to investigate the technical findings. That was recorded in Item 3.26 and why it preceded 3.27.

2.34 CC: His recollection of the discussion was how it was recorded.

2.35 The CFG member: This was the problem they got into when not complying with the charter (regarding distribution of Notes). The issue had been raised before. The Notes went to various departments for approval before they were provided to the CFG members. How could people not even at the meeting approve the Notes? The RTA cleansed the Notes.

2.36 AS: Referred to CC's earlier comments that he had some ideas on the format of the Notes that could achieve earlier distribution of the Notes. The primary focus of the group was to provide input on design issues at the meeting, not pour over the Notes of the previous meeting.

2.37 Further discussion was held on the merits of taping the meetings.

2.38 CC: Wanted to clarify what had been said regarding people not even at the meeting approving the Notes. This was not correct. The Notes were placed on the RTA's website. This meant they had to go through a process for placing on the website. Forwarding the Notes on did not mean the reason was for other people to go through the Notes and agree or not agree with them. The approvals process (for placing the notes on the website) simply had to happen.

2.39 A CFG member: This was causing a problem. It needed to be addressed before the CFG moved on to the next phase.

2.40 TP: What now had not been addressed?

2.41 CC: It was not the intent to 'sanitize' the Notes, it was a matter of the protocols needed to get them on to the website.

2.42 A CFG member: Regarding the issue raised about the gradient (on the CRW), had it ever been corrected or was it still on the website?

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.43 TP: It may have been corrected. He would need to check. The error was acknowledged in the forum. Let's check.
- 2.44 A CFG member: If the minutes had been distributed four months after the last meeting ...
- 2.45 CC: It had not been four months after. It had been two and a half months.
- 2.46 A CFG member: At one stage, we had a stenographer taking the Notes. (The Note taker at this meeting) has said she does not take shorthand.
- 2.47 AS: When the meeting is not mechanically recorded, the practicalities are that the Notes are taken as accurately as possible. The stenographers who previously took the Notes had as much criticisms as anyone.
- 2.48 The CFG member: There were not issues with the Notes when they were taken by a stenographer.
- 2.49 AS: Urged the group to move on to look at solutions to how it could bring out a better transactional record. The Arup and incline issues would be checked.
- 2.50 A CFG member: Wanted the statement in the previous Notes in Item 3.4 explained regarding Option E having better socio-economic outcomes.
- 2.51 AS asked if that could be 'parked' for the moment and called on CC to discuss how the Notes could be made more user-friendly.
- 2.52 CC: The Notes needed to provide a better service. At present they were virtually a pseudo-verbatim record of what was said. Feedback he had received from people reading the Notes on the website was that they were not user-friendly. He preferred to see Notes that recorded the key issues, the information presented by the project team and the feedback by the members. The Notes then became a reference for the project team members and others and a document that could be placed on the website and more readily understood by others who were not part of the CFG. He was putting that up for discussion.
- 2.53 A CFG member: Had an issue with that. He understood why that might be preferable from a project management perspective. But the community was dealing with a position taken by the Government and the Notes provided evidence of issues raised by the community on various issues. Over the last four years, members had raised various issues and they had been Noted. The community would want to see evidence of what the CFG had been doing. The Notes were of value. If they became just bullet points, they would lose evidence of the community consultation and what came out of it.
- 2.54 CC: If there was an issue or concern raised and the CFG member wanted to make sure it was recorded, it was only a matter of asking for it to be Noted. At the moment the format didn't add value to the process. If issues were raised, it was right and appropriate to record them and the CFG members could indicate what they wanted Noted to the person taking the Notes.
- 2.55 The CFG member: The problem he had was that if it was not written down, it never happened. He had had experience of minutes that were just bullet points and he did not want that for the meeting Notes. He said it was important for as much information to be recorded if they had to go to court.

Note: Clarify accuracy of previous meeting notes

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.56 A CFG member said the minutes were not verbatim. The group had in the past expressed concerns about the briefings given to Council.
- 2.57 A CFG member: Which was exactly why he had asked for copies of verbatim minutes and it was agreed that he would be given them within three days of the meetings.
- 2.58 AS: Advised the member he had received verbatim records.
- 2.59 The CFG member: Disagreed.
- 2.60 AS: Agreed to check.
- 2.61 TP: Pointed out that the current Notes were not a stenographic record.
- 2.62 A CFG member: So they were suggesting a summarised version of Notes?
- 2.63 CC: Yes, not a word for word record of he said, she said. At the moment, the Notes were a chronological record. A number of people had said it was hard to get a great deal of benefit from them. It would lessen the burden on the record keeper. It was not meant at reducing the accuracy of what was recorded. The Notes needed to be in a better format which could reduce the time to get them out to members and on the website, possibly within two or three weeks of the meeting.
- 2.64 A CFG member: Sounded like some people needed just bulleted points while others needed more detail. Perhaps taping them could provide that detail although they would have sit and listen to a few hours of tape.
- 2.65 CC: The RTA did tape some meetings eg contractual meetings. The tapes were not transcribed. Attendees had an opportunity to listen to the tape if they had issues.
- 2.66 A CFG member: Sounded like there were two types of people whose needs would have to be satisfied. Was there a simpler solution?
- 2.67 CC: That was exactly what he was looking for.
- 2.68 AS: Did the group concur with the suggestion that they wanted the detail left in so that all issues from the community were aired?
- 2.69 A CFG member: He understood from what had been said that was the case. The issue was the accuracy of the Notes, having trust in them.
- 2.70 TP: There was this presumption going on that the Notes were so inaccurate. The reality was that there were two or three items worthy of debate.
- 2.71 A CFG member: He usually had 10 or 12.
- 2.72 TP: Out of 200 items, that was a small number.
- 2.73 The CFG member: A lot of people were wanting to know the detail. The detail should be there.
- 2.74 A CFG member: If there was only an overview, it could be the subject of subjectivism.
- 2.75 A CFG member: Could see the value in both ideas.
- 2.76 A CFG member: He had suggested a media release following CFG meetings but that had fallen by the wayside because the approvals in the RTA meant it took six months to get one out and by then it wasn't relevant. That was why he had suggested dot points being put forward by members at the end of meetings for incorporation into a

Note: Clarify request for and provision of verbatim records

Details:

Action By/Date:

media release. The meetings were not RTA meetings. The meetings were for the CFG. What was wrong with the CFG deciding to put out a media release following meetings?

- 2.77 CC: While the charter did not impinge on the ability of individual members to make statements to the media, they could not do so on behalf of the CFG.
- 2.78 The CFG member: The charter had not been complied with in relation to the issuing of minutes so why should it be referred to?
- 2.79 CC: He was searching for ways to streamline the process and enable the process to comply with what was in the charter. Individual members of the CFG could make statements to the media but not speak on behalf of the CFG.
- 2.80 The CFG member: Could the CFG members all get together after the meeting? He didn't see why they couldn't continue what they had been doing with the Notes as long as what was in the charter was implemented. Was there any reason why some people ie project team members were named in Notes but CFG members weren't.
- 2.81 A CFG member: Why wasn't there an action column? Meetings she had attended usually actioned items and if items weren't actioned, they were carried over.
- 2.82 Another CFG member: Pointed out that there was an action column.
- 2.83 The CFG member: Shouldn't we be looking at the actions and addressing them?
- 2.84 AS: Agreed that perhaps more use could be made of the action column.
- 2.85 The CFG member: When she had lodged her letter regarding increased representation from the Sikh community on the CFG, she had been told that the CFG would be providing input into the design phase of the project but how could the CFG do that when it seemed there were a lot of issues. She was not there to meet the RTA's rollercoaster agenda.
- 2.86 AS: Was she saying that the group shouldn't be looking at design issues as was on the meeting's agenda?
- 2.87 The CFG member: Maybe they needed to look at the agenda and ask if anyone wanted to add anything to it.
- 2.88 AS: Was the member saying the group was not ready to provide input into the design?
- 2.89 A CFG member: We are saying that.
- 2.90 CC: Acknowledged that perhaps more use could be made of the action column, even if it meant that the response at the next meeting was that the matter was still being investigated.
- 2.91 A CFG member: How far apart were meetings held? If an issue needed to be actioned, a meeting could be called for the group if it was an important issue for the community.
- 2.92 CC: Said he had acknowledged the point being made about the action column.
- 2.93 A CFG member: How do we know mistakes won't happen in the future if they happened in the past?
- 2.94 CC: There was a difference between providing a response and getting that response accepted.

Note: Clarify identification of CFG members in meeting notes.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.95 A CFG member: Referred to the item she had raised earlier about an explanation on the statement about the socio-economic outcomes of Option E.
- 2.96 CC: It was a summary of the outcomes of the VM study.
- 2.97 The CFG member: Didn't agree with that Option E had higher community acceptance and most of the community didn't either. It was in the papers.
- 2.98 CC: There were two issues – whether the Notes had accurately recorded what he had said and whether the CFG member agreed with the statement about the VMW. In both cases, the Notes had recorded what he had said and what he had said was correct. It had been one of the conclusions of the VM workshop that Option E had higher community acceptance.
- 2.99 A CFG member: Didn't recall that being said – not that he didn't say it.
- 2.100 CC: Was trying to get a shorter version of the Notes but it had not been accepted (by the CFG).
- 2.101 A CFG member: So he was trying to save the Note taker's work?
- 2.102 CC: If someone wanted something they had said recorded, they could ask to have it Noted and avoid the current he said, she said approach, get the Notes out quicker and onto the website quicker. The meeting would be fresh in members' minds.
- 2.103 AS: An example would be, regarding the comment about the socio-economic impacts of Option E, that a CFG member wanted it Noted that several CFG members disagreed with the statement. The Notes would record that without it trying to be a verbatim record. Having people say 'I don't remember saying that' was difficult to validate. Surely the important information was what were the key issues, how they were discussed, how they were resolved, were they resolved, if not – why not. The minutes would be shorter.
- 2.104 A CFG member: Who would pick up what should be recorded – that was the issue.
- 2.105 A CFG member: It came down to one person.
- 2.106 CC: In response to that, if a member was making a point they could ask for it to be recorded.
- 2.107 A CFG member: Didn't want to be a signatory to having Notes reduced to bullet points. This was a public consultation process. Presentations were given and questions asked and answers given. He didn't see how that could be recorded by having a bullet point summary.
- 2.108 AS: There would be detail on the bullet points.
- 2.109 A CFG member: They had just spent an hour and a half discussing these minutes.
- 2.110 A CFG member: The issue of the minutes had never really been resolved and this was a healthy debate. He described an event where he had been responsible for taking the minutes. He didn't have shorthand skills yet he had recorded the Notes, typed them up and passed them on to the chairman within five days. He did not see why they could not have a stenographer recording the meeting.
- 2.111 AS: Reminded the member that there had been amendments to the Notes taken by stenographers.
- 2.112 CC: Stenographers did not have an understanding of the technical information

Details:

Action By/Date:

discussed at meetings.

- 2.113 A CFG member: The benefit of having a person just focussed on taking the Notes could be a contributing factor. The current Note taker had other obligations. If the prime responsibility for someone was taking the minutes, perhaps it would be quicker getting them out for review.
- 2.114 AS: Pointed out that the Notes were actually turned around quicker by the current Note taker than when the Notes were being taken by stenographers.
- 2.115 The CFG member: Then why did it take so long to get the minutes out?
- 2.116 A CFG member: The minutes should be adopted by the members before they were seen by anyone else. Why did they have to go to people outside of the group? It made the members think they were sanitising them.
- 2.117 AS: This had been answered off already by CC.
- 2.118 A CFG member: Then why so long?
- 2.119 A CFG member: The Notes were a low priority – that was the answer.
- 2.120 CC: Acknowledged there was a need to put more effort into getting the Notes back to members and he would endeavour to do that. Sometimes there were other things that needed to be attended to but he would address that.
- 2.121 A CFG member: So should they be looking at the action column before moving onto the design phase?
- 2.122 CC: There seemed to be a perception that some things might not have been addressed and that was not the case.
- 2.123 A CFG member: It was a procedural thing. The Minister had endorsed the preferred option and what they were discussing didn't change that. The issue of the Notes could be resolved separately.
- 2.124 CC: In some opinions it might be thought that the consultation process was flawed and he accepted that people were entitled to their view. At the last meeting, the CFG had talked about having plans at this meeting to work on and he was looking for comments and suggestions from the CFG about those plans.
- 2.125 A CFG member: At a previous meeting, they had all agreed to the revised charter. Regarding the supply of minutes, did that mean they would now be supplied within two weeks or that the charter would not be complied with?
- 2.126 CC: Undertook to try to get the Notes out within two weeks but he could not give a gilt-edged guarantee.
- 2.127 A CFG member: Then why was the timeframe in the charter?
- 2.128 CC: If the consensus of the meeting was that there were difficulties in getting the Notes out within that timeframe, maybe the group needed to revisit the timeframe in the charter.
- 2.129 A CFG member: Could not see why they could not get out a couple of pages of minutes within two weeks.
- 2.130 A CFG member: Because it was a bureaucratic process and it was a low priority. They should insist the minutes should be raised in their level of importance or priority to the consultation process. The project team had to walk the talk and CC had to

Details:

Action By/Date:

take the issue back to (the Pacific Highway general manager) Bob Higgins (RGH) and if necessary the CEO of the RTA. Could he take this request to the RTA to elevate the importance of processing the records of the CFG meetings because the CFG was not happy with it?

Note: CC to raise the issue with RGH

- 2.131 CC: He had said before that he would try to get the Notes out quicker.
- 2.132 A CFG member: Could they raise the resolution of the issues raised at the meeting by a CFG member and increased use of the action column before they moved on to look at design issues.
- 2.133 A CFG member: Why the play on words of Notes, minutes or a transactional record?
- 2.134 AS: Previously the CFG had talked about having a transactional record of what took place at meetings instead of having a verbatim record.
- 2.135 A CFG member: Didn't recall that. He didn't recall the discussion at an earlier meeting. AS might have decided that in conjunction with the RTA and Connell Wagner.
- 2.136 A CFG member: But the charter referred to the minutes being out within two weeks. If it hadn't happened, should the charter have been revised?
- 2.137 TP: Possibly.
- 2.138 AS: The Notes went from being about five or six pages to about 15 or 16. CC was trying to find a way to make them meet the needs of more people. The comments about the action column and the timing of issuing the Notes had been taken on board.
- 2.139 A CFG member: Were they talking about the Notes getting out to CFG members or the members agreeing to what the Minister was saying?
- 2.140 AS: Thought that all issues regarding the Notes were on the table. No one was saying the situation was perfect.

Break from 7.50pm-8.20pm.

- 2.141 AS: Asked if he could go around the table and see if there were any other issues regarding the Notes.
- 2.142 CFG member: Was happy.
- 2.143 CFG member: As long as the project team came back with responses to what had been raised.
- 2.144 CFG member: No issues.
- 2.145 CFG member: Couldn't see advantages in them being more condensed. Could see disadvantages. If someone wanted a summary, they could read the Notes in their entirety and get out what they needed.
- 2.146 CFG member: No issues.
- 2.147 CFG member: Agreed with what had been said.
- 2.148 CFG member: Didn't want to see the Notes condensed. Dot points would be a waste of time.
- 2.149 CFG member: No issues.

Details:

Action By/Date:

- 2.150 CFG member: The detail was important but needed to be presented in a clearer format ie by more use of the action column and resolution of the issues raised before they moved on. The issue shouldn't be left to fester.
- 2.151 CFG member: Agreed.
- 2.152 CFG member: Agreed with what had been said by other members.
- 2.153 CFG member: How many other members of the CFG were not at the meeting?
- 2.154 AS: Three.
- 2.155 A CFG member: Asked if she could raise the representation of the Sikh community on the CFG. Previous representatives had poor attendance records – why wasn't it addressed.
- 2.156 AS: It had been addressed. The members were contacted to see if they wanted to continue as part of the group on a number of occasions. The group had to remember the CFG was one aspect of the community consultation. There were other avenues for feedback from the community.
- 2.157 The CFG member: Asked how one representative with a poor attendance record had been selected.
- 2.158 JS: He had been nominated by a CFG member and endorsed by the CFG.
- 2.159 CC: Membership of the CFG had been reviewed on the basis of the attendance records and those with poor attendance had been contacted by phone to see if they wanted to continue.
- 2.160 AS: It had to be recognised that some people had work commitments that sometimes prevented them from attending meetings.
- 2.161 The CFG member: Thought it was important to raise that it hadn't been addressed.
- 2.162 Another CFG member: They were contacted the same as everyone else.
- 2.163 A CFG member: Asked if when referring to the preferred option, could they say it was the RTA's preferred option?
- 2.164 CC: It was the RTA's preferred option which had been endorsed by the Minister.
- 2.165 A CFG member: Shouldn't they say past Minister?
- 2.166 CC: The office of the Minister didn't change even if the Minister did.
- 2.167 AS: Could they clarify whether the previous minutes had been adopted?
- 2.168 A CFG member: Were they not adopted?
- 2.169 A CFG member: Comments were made about Option E being preferred – it was discussed and the comments were recorded.
- 2.170 CC: They needed to get the Notes adopted and on to the website. If there were members with issues, the best way of progressing was to let Pramax know. His recollection was that changes to Notes were recorded in the notes for the following meeting. Members with any issues or concerns were to let Pramax know before the end of the following week (by 5pm on March 11). Amendments would be made and the Notes redistributed to the members. If no further changes came back, it would be agreed the Notes had been adopted.

Note: Current format of CFG notes to be retained.

Note: Members with any issues or concerns to let Pramax know before the end of the following week (by 5pm on March 11). Amendments would be made and the Notes redistributed to the members. If no further

Details:

- 2.171 A CFG member: The CFG had recorded comments in meetings and recorded others in subsequent meetings and action items and they had not always been resolved. Any unresolved issues needed to be carried forward.
- 2.172 AS: So the onus was on the CFG members to produce a written statement that such and such an item had not been resolved. Members might find the situation was not as alarming as some had made out.
- 2.173 The CFG agreed to CC's suggestion.
- 2.174 CC: Queried whether CFG members were happy to have their names recorded in the Notes and on the website instead of 'a CFG member said'.
- 2.175 TP: Pointed out that every member had to agree to this because of privacy issues.
- 2.176 CC: Asked Pramax to contact the CFG members who were not present.

Action By/Date:

changes came back, it would be agreed the Notes had been adopted.

Note: Pramax to contact members not present at meeting regarding names being included in Notes.

3. WORKSHOP ON DESIGN ISSUES

- 3.1 CC: He invited the CFG to identify what they saw as the three or four main issues or concerns that they had with the design of Option E and then break into groups to examine those in more detail before coming back to report back to the whole group.
- 3.2 Steve Moody (SM): Objected to that. While he might be able to quickly understand what the drawings in front of them meant, it would not be the same for everyone. Some would have difficulty interpreting them. He asked for the information to be presented and then the members given time to absorb it and provide meaningful input.
- 3.3 Bruce Scanlon (BS): The members needed to have the data for some time. Some might even take it out on location.
- 3.4 Robert Forrest (RF): Would agree with that.
- 3.5 CC: He was trying to get genuine feedback from the group. Barry Hancock (BH) would run through the preliminary design. The project team then would run off copies of the plans, have them stamped as 'subject to change' because the members needed to recognise that they were work in progress. They could then come back to the next meeting to provide their input.
- 3.6 BS: Suggested members would need copies the same size as those at the meeting.
- 3.7 CC: Agreed.
- 3.8 BS: Could that practice be adopted for all technical information in future?
- 3.9 CC: It depended on the information. These plans were not a major issue because a lot of the information was already in the public domain although the lines could vary. Other information made available to the CFG would be of a confidential nature which they could not take away. It would be presented at meetings.
- 3.10 TP: Said CC was alluding to some of the technical investigations, information from which would have to be held within the group eg threatened species.
- 3.11 BH then presented information to the group about the preliminary design, pointing out various features.
- 3.12 BS: Asked for a list of all members and contact details to be provided to the CFG. He asked when the plans would be provided to members.

Note: list attached.

Details:

Action By/Date:

3.13 BH: Indicated they could be provided in the following week.

4. CLOSE OF MEETING

Meeting closed at 9.30 pm.