

Project:	Woodburn to Ballina Pacific Highway Upgrade	Reference:	000561486
Meeting	COMMUNITY LIAISON GROUP – Meeting No.3b	Date:	9 February 2005

Present: Apology: Name: Group/ Organisation:

✓		David Judge	Wardell Progress Association
✓		Kerry Kelly	Bagotville
✓		Bill Walker	NSW Sugar Milling Co-Operative, Broadwater Mill
✓		Ron Rosolen	Wardell
✓		Natasha Heath	Wardell Progress Association
	✓	Mike Rushby	Wardell
		Julie Coyle	Wardell
✓		Roger Stanley	Coolgardie
✓		Trevor Monti	Bagotville
✓		Emma Walke	Bagotville
		John Degotardi	Broadwater
✓		Jack Matthes	Broadwater
✓		Jeffrey Phillips	Woodburn
✓		Rod Ison	Public Transport Operator
✓		Darren Woolage	Broadwater
✓		Murray Shergold	Woodburn
✓		Steve Flatley	Richmond River Cane Growers Association
✓		Bert Plenkovich	Richmond River Cane Growers Association
✓		Tony Carusi	Richmond River Cane Growers Association
✓		Ray Collier	Wardell
✓		David McDonald	Rural area between Woodburn and Broadwater
✓		Stephanie Lymburner	Coolgardie and Coolgardie Scrub Conservation Group
✓		Mark Graham	North Coast Conservation Council, Big Scrub Environment Centre and Nature Conservation Council
✓		Rik Nutt	Woodburn
✓		Bill Salapic	Woodburn
✓		Colin Duncan	Wardell
✓		Francine Hitchens	Riley's Hill
✓		Paddy Wilde	Riley's Hill
✓		Allen Macourt	Hyder Consulting
✓		Harry Batt	Hyder Consulting
✓		Andrew Nathan	Hyder Consulting
✓		Carolyn Stone	PPM Consultants
✓		Tim Rodham	Hyder Consulting
✓		Astrid Jordan	Hyder Consulting
✓		Brendon Johnson	Hyder Consulting

✓		Tanya Coates	Hyder Consulting
✓		Shane Higgins	Roads and Traffic Authority
✓		Toby Heys	Roads and Traffic Authority
✓		Daniela Payne	GeoLINK
✓		Brett Campbell	Geolyse
Recorded By:	Daniela Payne, GeoLINK		Total Pages: 13

**WOODBURN TO BALLINA – COMMUNITY LIAISON GROUP
MINUTES OF MEETING NO.3B – WEDNESDAY 9 FEBRUARY 2005**

Carolyn Stone opened the meeting at 6.30 pm, and welcomed members. Apologies from Mike Rushby.

Allen recapped on yesterday's meeting and clarified a few issues, as well as making some apologies:

- Issues raised the evening before went on longer than was necessary or desirable
- Apologies to all those people about whom personal remarks were made
- Reference was made to the rules of the CLG– to have mutual respect for each member and all project team members, to talk in a civil manner to all present at the meeting.
- Every person has a right to express their personal opinion as long as the way it is presented is consistent with the above points
- The use of offensive words in the future will not be acceptable.
- Apologies to the project team who bore the brunt of an accusation that they were unprofessional, whereas their work over the past few months has been nothing short of exemplary.
- The project team and RTA have no hidden agenda with regard to staging community consultation. The project team are working hard to find out from the CLG members and the broader community what is important to them.
- The study area was identified by the RTA before the project team was appointed.
- The Community Liaison meetings were information sharing sessions and not decision making sessions

The updated project objectives were presented as below:

- Improve efficiency of state, regional and local travel, safety, and accessibility.
- Provide a flowing road alignment responsive to and integrated with the landscape; optimising views, elegant design and planting opportunities.
- Engage with the community and be informed by their views and experience.
- Identify and enhance potential beneficial environmental effects, and mitigate potential adverse environmental effects.
- Minimise adverse socio-economic effects on the local community and maximise socio-economic benefits arising from the project
- Achieve high quality design and constructability.
- Value for money.
- Apply a sustainability framework to all stages of the project.

The plan for meetings to be held this year was presented, as on the following page. It was recognized that there would need to be a degree of flexibility in the detailed programming.

Milestone	Milestone Dates	CLG Meetings	Focus Group Meetings	Planning Focus Meetings	Council Presentation (2 to 3 wks after PFM)
CIS/PFM	Nov 04	CLG 1 – Charter/Objectives	FG 1 – Charter/Objectives	PFM 1	CP 1
	Dec 05	CLG 2 – Constraints/Process	FG 2 Constraints	PFM 2 – Constraints	CP 2 – Constraints
Corridor Workshop	Feb 05	CLG 3 – Corridor Development	FG 3 – Corridors Development		
		CLG 4 – Pre Corridor Workshop		PFM 3 – Corridor Workshop	CP 3 – Corridor Workshop
	Mar 05	CLG 5 – Post Corridor Workshop	FG 4 – Post Corridor Workshop		
Options Display	April 05	CLG 6 – Pre Options Display	FG 5 – Pre Options Display	PFM 4 – Pre VMS and Options	CP 4 – Pre VMS and Options
		CLG 7 – Pre VMS			
VMS	May 05	CLG 8 – Post VMS	FG 6 – Post VMS and Comments on Options	PFM 5 – VMS	CP 5 – VMS
		CLG 9 – Assessment of comments from display			
		CLG 10 – Pre Preferred Route Display	FG 7 – Pre Preferred Route Display	PFM 6 – Pre Preferred Route Display	CP 6 – Pre Preferred Route Display
Preferred Route Display	July 05	CLG 11 – Post Preferred Route Display & comments assessment	FG 8 – Post Preferred Route Display & comments assessment		
VE/Risk WS	Sept 05	CLG 12 – Draft Concept Design	FG 9 – Draft Concept Design	PFM 7 – Draft Concept Design	CP 7 – Draft Concept Design
Final Concept Design	Oct 05	CLG 13 – Pre Final Concept Design	FG 10 – Pre Final Concept Design	PFM 8 – Final Concept Design	CP 8 – Final Concept Design

ITEM 1 Introduction to the participatory process (CAROLYN STONE)

The process of presenting the various corridor options produced by the three methods the day before was of the basis of the corridor assessment by the CLG members. The CLG members were asked to pick a piece of paper from the box which had a Hyder team representative's name on it. This would determine their group.

ITEM 2 Presentation of route corridor options to date (BRENDON JOHNSON)

Brendon presented the framework for strengths and weaknesses, and explained each of the corridor "titles".

Q: With regard to the traditional mapping process presented last night, how did that come about – by best practice with a team of engineers using pen and paper?

A: It was workshopped in a room of professionals – including urban designers, ecologists, engineers, community consultants etc.

Q: Can more options still be presented?

A: Yes, this is part of the interactive process we are involved in throughout the year with the CLG.

ITEM 3 Presentation of strengths and weaknesses of route corridor options by team representative

ROUTE CORRIDOR OPTIONS: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Table 1 (A Nathan)	
Strengths	Weaknesses
West Richmond River	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access to better (narrower) bridge sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Too close to river ▪ Impact on houses ▪ Agricultural lands impact
Far West	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High impact on agricultural lands ▪ 3 bridge crossings ▪ Soft ground ▪ Flood affected ▪ Extra small bridges for drainage
West Kilgin	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good bridge crossings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact on agricultural lands

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Further from Rileys Hill ▪ Less impact on National Park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High flood impact ▪ Soft ground
West Rileys Hill	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fire control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Too close to Rileys Hill ▪ Affects National Park ▪ 2 bridges ▪ Wetlands impact ▪ Impact on koala corridor
Western	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Generally flood free at north end 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2 bridges – large bridges ▪ High impact on agricultural lands ▪ Too close to towns – Coolgardie and Woodburn ▪ Too close to river ▪ Impact on heathland
East Evans River	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improve fire control ▪ Better ground/high ground ▪ Less agricultural land affected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact on the oxyalin pygmy perch
East Richmond River	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High impact on agricultural land <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - loss of land - operational impacts ▪ Flood affected ▪ Big bridge crossing
Table 1 (A Nathan)	
Strengths	Weaknesses
East Blackwall Range	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Higher ground ▪ Avoids agricultural 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Longer
Eastern	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good river crossing ▪ Good from East Evans River ▪ Good from river crossing to north end of project ▪ Little impact on national park ▪ Good fire control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ South end too close to river ▪ Too close to town (Broadwater and Woodburn) ▪ South end affects prime agricultural land ▪ Swamp/bad ground at south end ▪ No improvement to fire protection ▪ South end is too close to existing houses
Suggested Improvements	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From intersection of East Evans River and Eastern Route use the East Evans River corridor ▪ Go further east at Broadwater ▪ Refer to B on map – further away from Broadwater, other side of Cooks Hill, avoids “Ponderosa” mostly 	

Table 2 (T Rodham)

Strengths	Weaknesses
Eastern	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Re-use of existing Highway through National Park and north of Wardell (what side is duplication?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Divides wildlife corridor edges in vicinity of Wardell
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Following edge of ecological and cane between Broadwater and Wardell 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact to sugar cane at southern end
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ground conditions north of Wardell
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noise impacts close to Broadwater and Wardell
East Quarries	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Material supply 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bisecting healthland and severing wildlife corridor
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact on flora
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional length / less direct
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noise related issues close to Wardell
East Richmond River	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Less environmental impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact to cane land
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Divides Pimlico Road urban investigation area from Wardell. Note: direction of development - difficult to west
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noise impact of being close to Wardell
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Flooding
East & West Blackwall Range	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental impact. Nb:SV 4-5 highly sensitive area, road kill, fauna fences / crossings
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visual amenity / view
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noise stress to koalas and humans (in Range)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coolgardie Road and Whytes Lane intersections are dangerous
East National Park	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not on floodplain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental impacts of cutting through National Park
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Away from villages for noise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact to indigenous heritage sites
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fire break 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Close to Cabbage Tree Island
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Geotech good 	
East Coastal	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Behind the hill at Broadwater 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effects on cane - major
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Avoids all sensitive areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access to minor lanes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Can be constructed with no disruption to existing Highway 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access to coast
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Flood
East Evans River	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Geotech good. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minimal impact to National Park

Table 2 (T Rodham)	
Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can be built with no impact to National Park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect Evans River high quality
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> View of Evans River 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant impact to Woodburn re economic
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce noise to Woodburn 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better feeder alignment to many other corridors 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better to connect with existing Highway at Taylors Lane 	
Western	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good for economy of Woodburn 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two bridges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses large portion of existing Highway at south 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flooding west of Broadwater (localised floodplain)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct / straight 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cuts environmental sensitive area northwest of Wardell
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good geotech 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts to National Park and koalas at southern end
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct off-line in central section 	
West Wardell Road	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Nb: Similar issues to western corridor</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On west of hill and better for noise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less direct
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good geotech 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less environmental impact than western 	
West Richmond River	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Along edge of sensitive wetland area
West Rileys Hill	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two bridges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Views at bridges 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Koalas
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Park
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close to rural residential area - impact to development
Far West	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic value to Woodburn. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise impact to Woodburn
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact to cane
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two bridges
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact to environment and Bagotville Road
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close to Barrage
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise impact to Blackwall Range
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flooding
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor geotech
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distance from Broadwater (economic)
West Kilgin Road	

Table 2 (T Rodham)	
Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No environmental impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Flooding
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two bridges
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Geotechnical

Table 3 (A Jordan)	
Strengths	Weaknesses
Eastern (from Woodburn to southern National Park boundary)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No ecological impacts ▪ Close to Neranleigh-Fernvale material for fill ▪ Reduces noise impact to Woodburn ▪ Proximity to Woodburn to encourage stop-off traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Flooding/low land ▪ Impact on agricultural land and small individual properties ▪ Close to river ▪ Would cut access from properties to existing Highway if new highway built in between ▪ Potential for larger road footprint ▪ Noise impact on new residents
Eastern (from southern National Park boundary to Broadwater)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minimal disruption to National Park (uses existing route) ▪ Good construction material/base (Woodburn Sand) ▪ Less sensitive ecological area affected ▪ Fire break advantages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Loss of existing Highway as local access ▪ Noise impacts are moved to east Broadwater ▪ Impact on cane land
Eastern (Broadwater to north of river)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability of hard rock 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Would be better to go east of Cooks Hill</i>
Eastern (north of river to north of Wardell)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compromise on impacts on agricultural land and ecology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Too close to Wardell ▪ Splits Lumleys Lane area from town ▪ To west of Wardell corridor goes into extremely sensitive ecology ▪ Indigenous heritage issues west of Wardell
Eastern/Western – north of Wardell	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eastern has no impacts on ecology ▪ Use of existing asset ▪ <i>No major objections to either Eastern/Western in this area</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lose possibility of using existing Highway as local road
East Blackwall Range	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minimises impacts on agricultural land ▪ Good fill material along base of range ▪ Can use existing Highway as local road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ecological impacts (known endangered species)
East National Park	

Table 3 (A Jordan)	
Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good soils in some areas ▪ Less flood impact ▪ Fire break ▪ Less impact on agricultural land ▪ Away from the town ▪ Views to Ocean west of Broadwater 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential to impact highly sensitive wetlands ▪ Peat material in some areas forms poor road base ▪ Affects new area of National Park
East Coastal	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Few ecological impacts ▪ Away from Wardell 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Huge economic/cane land impact ▪ High flood impact on crop land ▪ Length of bridge required
East Richmond River	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Narrow river crossing ▪ No ecological impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact on caravan park and residents along Pimlico Road ▪ Too close to Wardell ▪ Agricultural impacts ▪ Long bridge structure required because of roads to be crossed adjacent to river
East Quarries	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Limited impacts on agricultural land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fragments ecological communities in southern and northern sections ▪ Comes in too close to Wardell ▪ Heritage sections here ▪ Acoustic impacts on west Wardell
Western (near Woodburn)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Too close to Woodburn ▪ Flooding
West Rileys Hill	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Affects cane land near river ▪ Goes through new area of National Park ▪ Massive ecological impacts ▪ Flooding ▪ Noise effects on Rileys Hill ▪ Koala habitat ▪ Wetlands ▪ Heritage areas ▪ 2 river crossings
West Kilgin Road	

Table 3 (A Jordan)	
Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some ecological impacts along southern precinct ▪ Largely avoids National Park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Flooding! ▪ High agricultural impact ▪ Noise impacts to new residents ▪ Wide river crossing ▪ Roads prohibited/SEPP 14 area
Far Western (near Woodburn)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opportunity to work with existing cane farm configuration/layout as there are a lot of north-south aligned properties near Woodburn ▪ Short route 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Flooding ▪ High impacts on cane land
Far Western (north of Dungarubba Ck to X-junction)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wet ▪ Acid sulphate soils ▪ Wetland ecological impacts ▪ Many endangered ecological communities
Far Western (north of X-junction)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lower ecological sensitivity if using existing road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How will local residents get across this area if Old Bagotville Rd is used?
East Quarries/West Wardell Road	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Should not even be considered</i>

Table 4 (H Batt)	
Strengths	Weaknesses
Far West	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Skirts bushland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Floods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Flatness compared to quarry – flatter than East Quarries corridor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has two crossings of river (restricts the river)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Forms a fire break (aids fire control) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A lot of mitigation drains cut across
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Restricts flood waters
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Acid sulphate soils
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prime agricultural land – crossing river at narrowest point
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has potential to restrict flood waters
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ People who have chosen to live in peaceful area (away from existing road noise etc.) would be impacted greatly. Their loss would be great and there are a lot of such people).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All above applies to southern 2/3 of corridor at the crossing node with west
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High ecological value

Table 4 (H Batt)	
Strengths	Weaknesses
	<i>Note: Don't want to see Pimlico Road upgraded as a service road</i>
Western	
▪ Section skims Rileys Hill	▪ Unstable ground close to river
▪ Second bridge crossing has good foundation	▪ Opposed to two river crossings
▪ Higher land	▪ Koalas and other extreme environmental constraints
	▪ People of Rileys Hill lose quiet enjoyment. A "real strong cohesive community".
	▪ Conflict with National Parks
	▪ Second bridge crossing is at bad point (narrow and bend in river) as far as flooding is concerned
Wardell Road	
▪ Avoids Jali territory.	▪ Not as direct – is a longer route
	▪ Cutting straight across is smarter and better
	▪ <i>No benefits</i>
West Kilgin	
▪ Skirts bushland	▪ Flooding
	▪ Has 2 crossings
	▪ Cuts through a low of cane
	▪ Huge barricade for flooding
	▪ <i>Group wishes to reject this.</i>
East Richmond	
▪ Least ecological impact	▪ Almost all cane land
	▪ Valuable land (cane land is generally flood liable so should be avoided where possible)
East Costal	
	▪ <i>Red herring. Not worth considering further</i>
Eastern	
▪ Need to ensure existing Highway is kept as local	▪ Flood liable
▪ No strengths	
▪ Converse view – if follow existing road, lesser disturbance because is already disturbed	
East Quarries	
▪ Skims between bush and property	▪ Route is longer (not as direct)
▪ Quarries – can get some good fill material	▪ Intercepts existing drainage systems from Blackwall Range
	▪ Imposes on local community "Bagotville"
	▪ Weaknesses exceed strengths

Table 4 (H Batt)	
Strengths	Weaknesses
East Evans River	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Could win a lot of fill material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not worth considering. Involves massive cutting to the south of current study area through 180m high mountain range – impact is too great.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Crosses long way east of man made canal – much better for flooding. 	
East National Park	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fine line to go in gap between cane farms. At eastern end of man made canal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National Park
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good for flooding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Near river crossing. Weakness is need to address Aboriginal sites. "Improvement" suggested is to ensure corridor does not impact Aboriginal zones.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good for noise 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As far to east as possible is best 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sand base is good foundation 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good fire break for National Park (this is low grade) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No need for underpasses for cane harvesters 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Well away from most of community 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Skirts fringe of heath country by going to west side of "Back Channel". <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - good from flooding point of view - can put road up out of flooding and not take any cane land. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Shale quarries – construction (dust) a long way from this area. 	

ITEM 4 Nominations for Corridor Mapping workshop (CAROLYN STONE AND ALLEN MACCOURT)

Each CLG member was given three voting papers, on which they would write the name of the individual they would like to see represent the group - whether they voted for the same person; themselves; three different people; or any combination of the above.

The CLG was reminded that it would be two whole days of time commitment (16th and 17th February 2005), as well as a dinner commitment on one of the nights. Following this, nominations were called for people to represent the CLG in the workshop. The members were nominated:

Jack Matthes

Mark Graham

Bert Plankovitch

Stephanie Lymburner

Rodney Ison

Murray Shergold

David Judge

The CLG group voted for the following members:

Jack Matthes

Mark Graham

Bert Plankovitch

No.	ACTION	WHO
1.	Jack, Mark and Bert to attend the Corridor Mapping Workshop in Ballina on February 16 and 17 2005.	Jack, Mark and Bert

ITEM 5 Closure and final comments

Allen outlined updates on issues that were still to be finalised – team would seek to finalise the date of opening of the shopfront by the following week, possibly to be opened in early March. If the builders were not finished renovating the building by this date, we would use the CWA hall for the interim period.

The date for the next CLG meeting was set and agreed on by all CLG members, for Monday 14th March at 6:30 for 7pm at the Broadwater Community Hall. The next CLG meeting would cover the performance criteria and performance measures reviewed at the Corridor Mapping Workshop.

Q: A general question, could there be a book available for CLG members to see what submissions have been received from the community, at our CLG meetings?

A: Agreed to provide a record of community issues raised at CLG meetings for the CLG to view. Also, Mr Owers' comments, when they have been received, will be taken into consideration.

Shane reminded all CLG members that all constraint maps were draft and confidential and stated that all maps issued to date, would be re-issued, so as to remove the level of confusion that had been created by distributing some maps that were for public consumption and some that were of a confidential nature (and therefore purely for the information of the CLG members). Draft documents can be shown to people outside the CLG, but the onus is on the CLG members to explain that it is a draft and could change. Draft documents should not be published in any form. Confidential documents are only for discussion within the CLG.

It was commented that project updates are not reaching the broader community. Project team to investigate where delivery is failing.

Q: Will there be an environmental focus group set up?

A: In principle yes, however the details would still need to be finalised. A final answer would be given as early as possible.

Kerry apologised to all CLG members for taking up so much time during CLG 3a meeting and said she was pleased the "draft – confidential" issue had been clarified as a result.

The group members were thanked for their attendance and input, as it was extraordinarily valuable and the meeting was closed at approximately 9:30pm.

The CLG agreed with the arrangements for the next meeting.

No.	ACTION	WHO
2.	Community comments book available at CLG meetings for CLG members to put down issues arising from their community.	RTA/Hyder