

# Meeting Notes



Transport  
Roads & Traffic  
Authority

JUNE 2011

## Additional crossing of the Clarence River at Grafton

### COMMUNITY FORUM

30 June 2011

1pm to 3pm

On Thursday 30 June 2011 a community forum was held at the South Grafton Community District Ex Servicemen's Club, with presentations by the Project Manager followed by questions and answers.

More than 35 people attended the forum.

The forums discussed three key areas:

- The results of the three recent community surveys:
  - Postal survey
  - Telephone survey
  - Business survey.
- Project purpose and objectives.
- Outcomes of the feasibility assessment of the 41 route suggestions.

Presentation notes are available on the project website.

Questions, comments and responses made at the forum have been captured broadly below.

With the approval of the attendees, the sessions were videoed. For the full presentation, community discussion and question and answer details please view the recordings available on the project website.

QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
Postal, business and telephone survey	
One member who undertook the telephone survey was not asked the question about which bridge I would most likely use for my day to day	The RTA will contact Jetty Research (who undertook the survey) and investigate this.

<p>travel (if a new bridge was built in my preferred location).</p>	
<p>Who put the telephone survey questions together? Was it by RTA or the survey team?</p>	<p>The questions were initially developed by Jetty Research. They were then reviewed by the RTA project team. The final questions were agreed by both Jetty Research and the RTA</p>
<p>With the telephone survey, which towns were included in the zone 5 area? Was Coutts Crossing and other southern towns included on zone 5, or were they in the South Grafton zone? Were there three zones in Grafton?</p>	<p>Junction Hill was in the outer area (zone 5) and Clarenza in zone 4.</p> <p>The area description included within each zone, are as shown in the Telephone Survey Report available on the project website or from the RTA project team.</p> <p>The three Grafton zones includes CBD and western area (zone 1), eastern Grafton (zone 2) and northern Grafton (zone 3).</p> <p>Zone 5 included: Coutts Crossing, Brushgrove, Ulmarra, Ramornie, Tucabia, Cowper and Coldstream.</p>
<p>Have the zones for the telephone survey changed from the zones for the traffic surveys?</p>	<p>The traffic survey zones are different from the telephone survey zones. There is no direct correlation between the two. They are capturing different information and are not related.</p>
<p>Would be useful to give the length of route from 5 ways. That way when asked about which bridge people would most likely use for their day to day travel (if a new bridge was built in their preferred location), this information would assist the community to identify which bridge they would use.</p>	<p>Noted, thank you for the suggestion.</p>
<p>It appears that the balance is uneven with three zones from Grafton and only one for South Grafton and one for outside. Can South Grafton and downstream residents have more input to future surveys, as they use the bridge more to get into Grafton?</p>	<p>There are two key groups impacted by the existing bridge and an additional crossing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- bridge users; and</li> <li>- local residents.</li> </ul> <p>The quotas used for the telephone survey were based on the populations of the zones.</p> <p>Zone 5 participants had to be bridge users to contribute to the survey. For zones 1 to 4 (Grafton and South Grafton), as these participants were local residents they did not have to meet the criteria of using the bridge.</p>
<p>The recent traffic counts show that about 40% or 50% of people using the bridge are coming from out of town therefore the survey should probably have been split up more to reflect this.</p>	<p>Some of the other corridors do overlap. The main reason for the greater overlap for corridors 4 and 5 is because options for both those corridors connect onto the Pacific Highway north</p>

<p>Why do corridors 4 and 5 overlap so much, whereas the other corridors do not?</p>	<p>of Grafton.</p> <p>Corridor 4 goes from the Pacific Highway to North St, and Corridor 5 goes from the Pacific Highway to the Summerland Way north of North St. These corridors have a similar start point but have a different end point.</p>
<p>Do you agree the results of the surveys show that people want an option out of town?</p>	<p>The RTA is presenting the information and the facts that have been collected. That information will be taken forward for the assessment process moving forward.</p>
<p>Is 514 people a representative sample of the 50,000 people in the Clarence Valley? Does not seem like a lot of people.</p> <p>Also agree more outside people should have been included in the survey.</p>	<p>This sample size was based on advice from Jetty Research. This provides a 95% confidence level, which is suitable for this kind of survey and is higher than some news poll surveys.</p>
<p>From the breakdown of the zones, how many from each zone?</p>	<p>90 from each of the Grafton zones and the remainder from the other two zones (South Grafton 150 and other 80). These details are in the report.</p>
<p>Noted that although there some preferred a location out of town the survey shows they would not use it (if a new bridge was built in their preferred location).</p>	<p>There is a degree of contradiction in the survey results between the route people may prefer and the route they would use.</p>
<p>It seems that people don't know which bridge they would use until the time comes.</p> <p>The community update does not show the percentages for people's preference for the location of a new bridge from the postal and business surveys.</p> <p>Surveys since 2003 show that people want an option out of town.</p> <p>The RTA I hope is not intending on giving something that this town does not want.</p>	<p>The RTA needs to conduct a thorough and robust process that includes studies and investigations so the RTA can understand all the impacts of the options.</p> <p>This information will be made available to the community and will assist people to make up their own views and opinion about the issues and constraints and what is the best option for Grafton.</p> <p>All this will go forward together including the Value Management process to identify the best location for an additional crossing.</p>
<p>The RTA have missed a large number of people by not asking people in Yamba, Iluka, Minnie Water etc.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comments.</p> <p>Part of the next stage of the process is to undertake traffic studies and modelling which will be used to identify who will be attracted to each of the bridge options.</p> <p>This will also be a significant input into the final decision.</p>
<p>Member noted that teachers outside would be a very small drop in the numbers.</p> <p>The community wants consultation but if we</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

<p>keep criticising how long will this go on for.</p> <p>Do we want \$5 billion or \$2.5 billion spent on a bridge and do we want \$2 billion on a bridge and \$2 billion going into hospitals and education systems.</p> <p>If we continue to go round in circles and end up like last time (2003-04) and then there will be no bridge.</p> <p>The RTA needs to get on with the process.</p>	
<p><b>Project purpose and objectives</b></p>	
<p>One of the project objectives is to involve all stakeholders, but you have missed the out of town areas. Who do you consider to be the stakeholders?</p> <p>Not sure the RTA is reaching all stakeholders. The RTA has also removed "be socially acceptable to the community" from the project objectives.</p>	<p>Stakeholders are anyone affected by the bridge. This includes local residents, bridge users, business communities, Clarence Valley Council and other nearby Councils, transport industry, emergencies, the Aboriginal community etc.</p>
<p>What sequence are you undertaking investigations. Suggest starting on corridors 4 and 5, as it seems a waste of time for the RTA to consider corridors 1, 2 and 3.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Can we please hold this discussion until the next section of the presentation where we discuss the feasibility assessment and next steps?</p>
<p>We should be planning for the next 100 years, where will the development be? We don't want a cheap option built in haste that doesn't look to the future?</p>	<p>Again, can we please hold this discussion. I will be discussing future develop shortly.</p>
<p>The biggest problem on the existing bridge is heavy vehicles having to cross the bridge. We need to get heavy vehicles out of town, consider the Summerland Way as a transport route, put a bridge downstream and put a load limit on the existing bridge.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>Feasibility assessment</b></p>	
<p>Regarding bridge construction, why not use a long span bridge with only one column each side of the river?</p> <p>Seen on TV spans on cable supported bridges that are 2km in length.</p> <p>This type of bridge could be used to span (Elizabeth) Island and not impact it.</p>	<p>These types of bridges are very expensive, and would only be considered where necessary. We don't see the need for a bridge of this type for an additional crossing for Grafton.</p> <p>A bridge that spans the island still may have impacts on the area below the bridge and there are other options that can be considered.</p>
<p>Regarding flooding, why would you consider downstream options that cross the entire flood plain?</p>	<p>The options presented here are community suggestions and are deemed feasible at this stage. In the next stage of the process, we will investigate flood impacts and reduce the number</p>

	of options to a short list.
How many options in each corridor will you consider? Will you get down to one in each corridor?	Ideally the RTA would like to get down to one option per corridor, but possibly more if they are considered suitable.
The RTA should plan for a new bridge for the future, not just based on results of surveys taken now. Many of us won't be here. But, more surveys should be conducted once you have a short list. 58% of people want an option in corridor 4 or 5 and you should come back with an option now.	The RTA is working with Clarence Valley Council to understand future planning and development and the future population forecasts in the next 30 years.
Are you speaking with Casino and Richmond areas regarding future growth? Are you looking at Federal funding? Are you dealing with Infrastructure Australia?	Yes, we are talking to Richmond Valley and Kyogle Councils, and we are also getting an understanding of other future developments and the details recent Infrastructure Australia submissions.
If RTA put a bridge near the existing bridge, you will ruin the plans for the transport hubs in Casino and Beaudesert.	(Bob Higgins) At this stage the RTA has not made a call on where the bridge will go. We are putting all the available information on the table and looking at all of it to make the best possible decision.
Is there planning for a corridor from the Summerland Way to the Pacific Highway? If this is north of the Clarence Valley, will it impact on the current project?	(Bob Higgins) The Pacific Highway corridor has been set. The new Pacific Highway will divert from Glenugie to Tyndale.  In 2006, the RTA conducted a study for an inland route up the Summerland Way, connecting with the Pacific Highway. The results showed that an inland corridor for the Pacific Highway was not suitable.  This report is available on the project website.  This project will consider the Summerland Way as part of the State road network. It will also consider the future Pacific Highway upgrade (and bypass of South Grafton).
The Pacific Highway is diverted when it floods, so the new bridge needs to allow for this traffic.	(Bob Higgins) The Pacific Highway will be upgraded to a 1 in 20 year flood standard, a big improvement on the current road, and should mitigate this problem.
Will you be assessing all 25 preliminary options? Or will you just be looking at the five corridors?	The RTA will identify the best option or options in each corridor to take forward for further assessment and then compare the short-list of options against each other to identify a recommended preferred option.
Appendix C of the Feasibility Assessment Report	The next item in the presentation will be about

<p>shows maps and some constraints.</p> <p>We have obtained information through an FOI process which shows what we are not being told about with regard to the huge impacts on the town, such as noise, pollution, vibration, if traffic and heavy vehicles are funnelled into the CBD.</p> <p>(Denise) So the question is about some of the level of detail you are expecting or were expecting to see in the Feasibility Report?</p> <p>Yes.</p>	<p>the next steps for the project. I will be talking about the type of information we will be gathering and making available to the community at that point.</p>
<p>When do we find out about cost?</p>	<p>The comparative strategic cost estimates are included in the Feasibility Assessment Report. These will be refined during the next stages of the process.</p>
<p><b>Traffic and next steps</b></p>	
<p>At what stage are we going to find out what any of these options cost?</p>	<p>High level strategic costs are available in the <i>Feasibility Assessment Report</i>, June 2011. We will refine these as we go through each process.</p>
<p>We are concerned about the absence of other studies, eg heritage, flooding, social issues. When will these be available?</p>	<p>We have recently completed the feasibility assessment on the 41 suggestions. The next stage of the process will be to release the Preliminary Route Options Report which will include reports on all of these issues.</p>
<p>Can you please display information about the cost and impacts (options assessments) in the next community forum/presentations of the short list?</p>	<p>Thank you for your suggestions. In the next stage the RTA will hold discussion and feedback sessions, where the community will have the opportunity to talk to specialists.</p>
<p>Do the costs of a new bridge range from \$130mil to \$500mil, from Corridor 1 to Corridor 5?</p>	<p>Yes, that is correct, as per the figures in the <i>Feasibility Assessment Report</i>, June 2011</p> <p>The cost estimates shown are for comparative purposes only, are strategic and allow for design and construction costs.</p>
<p>Please explain estimates (Bob Higgins).</p>	<p>Estimates considered key components of each option and included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Length of bridge, viaduct and made assumptions on the type of bridge and viaduct.</li> <li>- Length of approach roads and links.</li> <li>- Provision for flood mitigation works.</li> </ul>
<p>Corridors 1 and 2 don't meet Summerland Way.</p>	<p>As part of the strategic estimates the RTA has included provisions for intersection upgrades in town.</p>
<p>The RTA has stated the Community Liaison Plan</p>	<p>An advertisement has not been put in the paper,</p>

<p>is a live document.</p> <p>Has the RTA advertised that feedback on the Community Liaison Plan is requested from the community?</p>	<p>but the RTA has advised people who have made enquiries that it is a live document and the RTA welcomes input.</p> <p>(This is stated on the project website and was advised in the December 2010 community update).</p>
---	--