

# Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting

## Rutledge Street to Cardwell Range Highway Planning Study

Hinchinbrook Community Support Centre Ingham

<b>Date:</b>	29/01/09	<b>Time:</b>	Start: 10.00am Finish: 12.35pm	<b>Meeting no.:</b>	2
--------------	----------	--------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------	---

Attendees	Bill Morganson	Warragamay Traditional Owner
	Carlo Cervellin	Landholder
	Caroline Savage	Department of Main Roads (DMR) Project Manager
	Ceara Hart	EBC
	Doug Ladner	S.E.S
	Erin Finn	DMR Communications Officer
	Heather O'Neill	Herbert River Express
	Howard Goodes	Maunsell AECOM
	Isabel Scarpa	Hinchinbrook Community Support
	Jocelyn Dyer	EBC
	Keith Phillips	Self employed
	Linda McClelland	Hinchinbrook Community Support
	Marc Tack	Hinchinbrook Employment
	Maria Bosworth Cr	Hinchinbrook Shire Council
	Mark Fenton (Chair)	EBC
	Peter Gofton	Landholder
	Peter Mondora	CSR Ltd
	Phil Rist	Nywaigi Traditional Owner
	Piera Delroy	Hinchinbrook Chamber of Commerce
	Pino Giandomenico Mayor	Hinchinbrook Shire Council
	Rene Edhardt	Business owner
	Ricky Quabba	Cane Harvesters Association
	Rodger Bow	Hinchinbrook Road Safety
	Sam Girgenti	Landholder
	Shirley Luxford	Gallery Hinchinbrook
	Terri Buono	EBC
	Vince Vitale	Landholder, Herbert River Catchment Group
Apologies	Bill Pickering	Herbert River Improvement Trust
	Craig Caton	DMR
	Ian Rose	DMR
	Kara Miller	Youth Development Officer
	Maria Battoraro	Lower Herbert Water Management Authority, Canegrowers, Landcare Secretary
	Shaun	Youth Council member
	Steven	Youth Council member
	Rick Butler	Stone River Bus Service
	Sherry Kaurila Cr	Hinchinbrook Shire Council

Item No.	Description	Actions
1.0	<b>WELCOME AND APOLOGIES</b>	
	Mark F welcomed attendees who introduced themselves to the group. Apologies were given.	

**Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting**  
**Rutledge Street to Cardwell Range Highway Planning Study**  
Hinchinbrook Community Support Centre Ingham

Item No.	Description	Actions
<b>2.0</b>	<b>CONFIRM PREVIOUS MINUTES</b>	
	<p>Mark F went through actions from the previous meeting held on November 13 2008.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pino G was concerned about the time that may lapse between the planning study and actual construction. Suggested that MRD make it clear that this is only a planning study.</li> <li>The PAC confirmed the minutes from PAC meeting no. 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Ongoing actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EBC to enquire with Dan Hoban from the Council about creating a link between the Hinchinbrook Council's website and EBC's webpage on the highway study.</li> <li>Future community updates on the study are to be produced as posters and distributed around the area. For example at Woolworths, Coles, Victoria Mill and Forest Beach shops.</li> <li>DMR to promote the use of photos of the PAC or the study team engaging with community in media releases.</li> </ol> <p>New actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EBC to place minutes on the highway study's webpage.</li> <li>MRD need to communicate that this is only a planning study; no construction date has been set.</li> </ol>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>PROGRESS REPORT</b>	
	<p>Caroline S introduced herself as the highway study's project manager. She explained that study was in the process of identifying 'corridors of interest' having begun initial project assessments and consultation last year. Howard G would explain the progress that had been made in more detail in agenda item 4 (outcomes of constraint mapping).</p> <p>Ceara H provided an update on consultation activities since the PAC last met on November 13 2008:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Having initially met with the members of the PAC, consultation focussed on meeting with representatives of</li> </ul>	

# Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting

## Rutledge Street to Cardwell Range Highway Planning Study

Hinchinbrook Community Support Centre Ingham

Item No.	Description	Actions
	<p>as many local organisations/key stakeholders as possible before Christmas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Met with over 25 organisations to (1) explain objectives of study (2) gather information about any initial constraints within the study area, to help the study team narrow down corridors of interest.</li> <li>First met with the Chamber of Commerce in December 2008. The next meeting is scheduled for 17 February 09 to discuss Economic Impact Assessment (EIA) proposal and business consultations. The economic consultants will also be present as Mark F will discuss later.</li> <li>EBC webpage was updated. New features include: extended map draw feature with a flooding, roads &amp; rivers overlay; flood hazard map produced by WBM; advertorial/ community update links; and a "last updated" feature to keep people informed of new information. There have been over 10 map submissions on the map draw feature.</li> <li>Communication materials include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advertorial in Herbert River Express, Townsville Bulletin, Tully Times.</li> <li>Community updates delivered in the mail to Ingham and outlying areas. These updates were translated into Italian, and both versions were left at community places and service stations. Ethnic Community Care Links offered to provide the translated updates to their Italian clients.</li> <li>A ministerial release was also drafted in preparation for this PAC meeting.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Ceara H explained that there had been few website comments or 1300 number callers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PAC members explained that the majority of community members are waiting for DMR to come out with a refined area or alignment options before they make comment.</li> <li>EBC responded that a number of community members had said the same thing. DMR and their consultants are trying to narrow down the area as soon as possible, but it is</li> </ul>	

# Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting

## Rutledge Street to Cardwell Range Highway Planning Study

Hinchinbrook Community Support Centre Ingham

Item No.	Description	Actions
	<p>important to ensure the community is consulted with at every step so local knowledge and opinion can feed the development of options.</p> <p>PAC members asked if anybody from the team had been out in the last week to check the rain water around town. With heavy rain forecasted it would be a good time to get out and take photos!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mark F/Howard G said no-one had been to Ingham to specifically check the floodwaters as yet.</li> <li>• Vince V said how important he thought it was to look at recent flooding as it has been some years since Ingham has had a decent flood event and the landscape has changed so no-one really knows what to expect.</li> <li>• PAC members agreed that it would be good to arrange a helicopter flight after heavy rainfall to take photos of the floodwaters.</li> <li>• Howard G said he would look into this and asked for PAC members to inform us of the best time to go out.</li> <li>• PAC members explained that floodwaters generally take 2-3 days to dissipate. High tides often maintain water levels.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Howard G/DMR to enquire about hiring a helicopter to take photos/video footage if the area experiences a flood.</li> <li>2. DMR to inform flooding expert Mark Jempson (WBM) of recent/upcoming flood events.</li> <li>3. EBC to ask landowners about the impact of high tides on floodwaters when interviewing landholders.</li> </ol>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>OUTCOMES OF CONSTRAINT MAPPING</b>	
	<p>Mark F explained that the original intention was for Maunsell to present three clear corridors of interest or swathes of land, within which alignments could later be identified. Unfortunately, it has not been as simple as first thought.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial feedback from consultation as well as flooding, cultural, and environmental assessments, were used to identify a number of constraints within the area between Rutledge Street and the Range.</li> <li>• It was hoped that by looking at these constraints, more suitable areas for a potential highway would become apparent. These suitable areas were then to be refined into 3 'corridors of interest' to present at this meeting. As Howard G will present the suitable areas are not as clear cut as that!</li> </ul>	

# Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting

## Rutledge Street to Cardwell Range Highway Planning Study

Hinchinbrook Community Support Centre Ingham

Item No.	Description	Actions
	<p>A number of PAC members mentioned that certain constraints should be seen as more of an issue than others (i.e. like resuming people's land).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PAC explained that it would be a matter of how much DMR could spend in the end.</li> <li>EBC explained that consulting with the community helped to identify the criteria the community most wanted to see in the upgrade/new highway. This would help the study team identify and compare the alignment options.</li> </ul> <p>Howard G presented the outcomes of the constraint mapping exercise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projected a 'constraint map' that showed the flooding, environmental and cultural constraints within the study area as well as the cane rail network (see attachment).</li> <li>Explained that the Herbert Resource Information Centre (HRIC) had been an important source of information for the study.</li> <li>Described how different shades on the map corresponded to different levels of potential environmental, cultural and flooding impact.</li> <li>Pino G asked what level of flooding immunity DMR was basing the study on?</li> </ul> <p>Howard G explained that the aim of the study was to achieve 10/48 flood immunity. This is what Main Roads and the federal government were trying to achieve across the Bruce Highway from Townsville to Cairns. 10 = 10 hours Average Annual Time of Closure and 48 = 48 hours total time closed in a 50 year flood event.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keith P asked why the areas of cultural heritage significance were so large. Was the whole area significant?</li> </ul> <p>Howard G explained that something of cultural significance had been identified in that approximate area and further research was needed to quantify what and where. Phil R agreed with Howard G explaining that the shaded area could refer to a specific object/meeting place. It might indicate that archaeological material is buried underground.</p>	<p>1. Howard G to further to quantify shaded areas of cultural significance</p>

**Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting**  
**Rutledge Street to Cardwell Range Highway Planning Study**  
Hinchinbrook Community Support Centre Ingham

Item No.	Description	Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keith P asked why DMR was not considering following the railway line east around the bottom of the Cardwell Range?</li> <p>Mark F explained that this option had been investigated as part of the current Cardwell Range project but found to be unsuitable due to environmental impacts. The Rutledge Street to Range study must therefore connect to the southern base of the Range.</p> <li>Pino G asked whether Main Roads was considering building another bridge across the John Row Bridge?</li> <p>Howard G said yes a new bridge was a possibility. With no preferred option in mind, DMR would consider all options which may or may not mean a new John Row Bridge.</p> <li>Howard G projected another map which showed the accessible areas for a highway and the constrained areas, which were least suitable (see attachment).</li> <li>Howard G explained that narrowing down accessible areas had not been as easy as first thought. There are obviously a number of constraints within the area which made the identification of three distinct swathes difficult.</li> <li>Howard G explained that the next task was to identify three swathes or corridors of interest within the accessible area, as originally planned. He explained that in addition to the existing highway there already appears to be corridors to the east and west, although they need to be refined.</li> <li>Howard G advised that the project team will be using a software package called Quantm to help better define the three swathes, using the information already gathered.</li> <li>Howard G explained that the process of identifying options may become more difficult too when you consider combining elements from one corridor with the other. I.e. bypassing the town to west before joining the existing highway at Gairloch.</li> <li>Roger B said Main Roads needs to keep the highway through the township and upgrade another section through town for use as an alternative route during floods. He suggested using the higher ground down Mcilwraith</li> </ul>	<p>2. Maunsell to identify three swathes and report back to the PAC. The next step being to identify options</p>

# Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting

## Rutledge Street to Cardwell Range Highway Planning Study

Hinchinbrook Community Support Centre Ingham

Item No.	Description	Actions
	<p>Street, with a bridge across Menzies Street to connect Cartwright Street to Herbert Street. Roger B explained that the town is cut in half by Palm Creek when it floods with the SES and Ambulance on one side of the town and the Police and Fire Station on the other.</p> <p>Pino G advised that you couldn't have highway traffic passing by the school due to noise and safety concerns.</p> <p>Roger B explained that the kids would not be at school during a flood.</p> <p>Ceara H said the alternative route through town had been discussed with the study team and a number of community members had also mentioned it. One issue that was raised with this option was that it did not get the heavy vehicles out of town.</p> <p>Howard G said the study was investigating if upgrading Herbert Street was still an option given the flood immunity target of the study. The study was not looking at alternative routes through town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pino G had the impression, from previous discussions with Main Roads, that they were not looking at 2 highways (i.e. main alignment plus heavy vehicle bypass) they were only looking at one alignment?</li> </ul> <p>Caroline S responded that the Department of Main Roads was keen to find a solution that suited the community and would not rule that out at this stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marc T explained that it was important to explain to the community that DMR were obliged to follow the highway one planning policy. This means investigating projected traffic volumes and acquiring a four lane corridor.</li> </ul> <p>Howard G explained that the options being investigated as part of the study were based on the acquisition of a four lane corridor. Marc T was correct it is not just an issue of today's requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pino G advised that the community needs to be aware of such requirements for a new/upgraded highway.</li> </ul>	<p>within these swathes.</p> <p>3. Clearly communicate DMR's planning responsibilities.</p>

**Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting**  
**Rutledge Street to Cardwell Range Highway Planning Study**  
Hinchinbrook Community Support Centre Ingham

Item No.	Description	Actions
5.0	<b>BREAK FOR MORNING TEA</b>	
4.0 cont.	<b>OUTCOMES OF CONSTRAINT MAPPING</b>	
	<p>Mark F asked for the PAC's advice on how to communicate the constraint mapping to the community and get feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heather O said she would like to publish the corridor and constraint maps Howard G presented in the paper to help spark further discussion. She asked if the maps could be made easier to read by taking out the hashed area of the corridor map.</li> <li>The next steps EBC had in mind were to arrange interviews with landholders who lived or owned property off the existing highway. EBC would undertake the cognitive mapping exercise using an aerial map of their property/s to gain local knowledge and get their thoughts on where the highway should go.</li> <li>Whilst this is occurring, the study team will continue to refine the study area, identifying another two swathes, in addition to the existing highway. Once this is completed, EBC will arrange meetings with those landholders who own property within the other swathes.</li> <li>Once, EBC and the economic consultants had meet with the Chamber of Commerce, business interviews would also commence to gain data for the economic and social impact assessment.</li> <li>PAC agreed with the next steps.</li> <li>Maria B explained that it was important to communicate the study's methodology to the general public whilst meeting with landholders on the existing highway. Landholders within the study area are therefore given the chance to talk to EBC before the other 2 corridors/swathes are identified, if they desire.</li> <li>A community update on the study's progress and next steps will also be delivered in the mail and produced as posters and flyers to be left at public places. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PAC explained that the update needs to clarify the objectives of the study and its standards. I.e.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Howard G to amend maps and send to DMR. Erin F to provide maps to Heather to go in Herbert River Express.</li> <li>EBC to meet with landholders off the existing highway.</li> <li>EBC to conduct interviews with businesses after the Chamber of Commerce meeting.</li> <li>EBC to communicate the constraints and next steps to the community via Herbert River Express, flyers and mailbox/PO box drop, and website. Include clarification of the study's objectives.</li> </ol>

**Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting**  
**Rutledge Street to Cardwell Range Highway Planning Study**  
Hinchinbrook Community Support Centre Ingham

Item No.	Description	Actions
	<p>its primary objective is to reduce flooding closures but must also address future traffic needs (resumptions of 4 lanes although they will not be built immediately), safety etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ceara H explained that EBC had intended to hold public displays as well as community displays (stands outside Woolies and Coles etc.) when the 3 swathes/corridors had been identified. Did the PAC agree with this or should there be displays to show the constraints first?</li> <li>PAC agreed to hold the displays after the 3 swathes had been identified as the study area would be more refined and therefore of greater interest to the community.</li> <li>EBC asked Howard G if we could give the PAC a rough timeframe on how long it would take to identify the 3 swathes including the existing highway?</li> </ul> <p>Howard G was not in a position to say at this time but would get back to the PAC with a timeframe.</p>	<p>8. EBC to hold public displays after the 3 swathes have been identified.</p> <p>9. Howard G to report on the possible timeframe for identifying the 3 swathes/corridors of interest.</p>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	
	<p>Mark F explained that 3 consultants were considered to undertake the assessment and Marsden Jacobs Associates were awarded the contract.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marsden Jacobs took account of the participatory approach of the Economic Impact Assessment (EIA) brief.</li> <li>Whereas some EIA's are done from a desk, this study would use the information provided by the community as its primary data.</li> <li>The economic consultants from Marsden Jacobs will present their proposal to the Chamber of Commerce on Feb 17<sup>th</sup> to receive feedback. In addition they are devising a set of structured questions for EBC to ask local business people to inform the assessment.</li> <li>Mark F described the EIA brief to the PAC. Highlighted that it would look at construction impacts as well as the impacts of a bypass of the town.</li> <li>Jocelyn D outlined the integration of a very large</li> </ul>	<p>1. EBC/Marsden Jacobs to seek feedback from the Chamber of Commerce on the proposed economic impact assessment proposal and business consultations. Report back to PAC at next meeting.</p>

**Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting**  
**Rutledge Street to Cardwell Range Highway Planning Study**  
Hinchinbrook Community Support Centre Ingham

Item No.	Description	Actions
	<p>construction team can have both positive and negative impacts to the community. Negative impacts being increase in need for resources, housing etc and the carryon affects this has for increase in costs of rentals and services for the rest of the community. Also impacts on employment in the local industry with main employers noticing a loss of workforce who take up the opportunity to work for the project. Positive impacts are obviously the increase to business across all business sectors, employment and training for locals and businesses, as well as sponsorship and community involvement from the construction team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mark F explained that it was hoped the Chamber of Commerce would take this opportunity to get involved with the EIA. The EIA's primary objective is to help in the development/comparison of highway options, but could also be valuable resource for the Ingham community.</li> </ul>	
<b>7.0</b>	<b>OTHER ITEMS AND GENERAL BUSINESS</b>	
	<p>Mark F said EBC would advise of the next meeting time, depending on progress with identifying the three swathes/corridors of interest. As much prior notice will be given as possible and the meeting would be held on a Thursday morning as usual, as the RSL.</p> <p>The PAC attendees did not raise any other items or business.</p> <p>Mark F closed the meeting.</p>	<p>1. EBC to advise PAC attendees of the next meeting date and time.</p>

<b>Finish Time:</b>	12:35pm	<b>Next Meeting Date:</b>	To be advised
<b>Attachments:</b>			