

**ROUTE SELECTION STAGE - ADDITIONAL  
CROSSING OF THE CLARENCE RIVER AT  
GRAFTON**

**FIRST INTERIM COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION REPORT**

**January 2004**

# Contents

1.	Introduction.....	3
1.1	Purpose .....	3
1.2	Background .....	3
1.3	Community Participation Plan.....	3
2.	Route Selection Process & Community Participation Activities.....	4
	Table 1    Completion of Community Participation Activities .....	4
2.1	Agencies' Workshop.....	5
2.2	Media.....	6
2.3	Letter to Residents in Study Area .....	7
2.4	Community Update Newsletter No 4 .....	7
2.5	Free-call Hotline .....	7
2.6	Community Focus Group (CFG).....	8
2.7	Community Workshops.....	9
2.8	Access .....	9
2.9	Meetings with Stakeholders .....	9
2.10	Consultation with the Aboriginal Community .....	10
2.11	Short Listing of Localities Workshop .....	10
2.12	Written Submissions.....	10
2.13	Evaluation of CFG & Community Workshop Meetings.....	10
	Table 2    Analysis of Evaluation Data – October 2003 CFG & Workshops .....	11
	Table 3    Analysis of Evaluation Data – December 2003 CFG & Workshops.....	13
	Comparison between October and December CFG Meetings:.....	14
	Comparison between October and December Community Workshops.....	15
3.	Social Impact Assessment Interviews .....	15
4.	Community Participation Issues & Next Steps .....	15
	APPENDIX 1 .....	17
	APPENDIX 2 .....	18
	APPENDIX 3 .....	24
	APPENDIX 4 .....	27
	APPENDIX 5 .....	28
	APPENDIX 6 .....	29

## **I. Introduction**

### **I.1 Purpose**

The First Interim Community Participation Report for the route selection stage of the RTA's Additional Crossing of the Clarence River at Grafton project identifies the community participation activities undertaken to date and the participation issues identified.

### **I.2 Background**

In May 2002 a public meeting was convened by a group of business people to campaign for a new bridge at Grafton. Following the meeting the State Government allocated funding to conduct a feasibility study, which was completed in March 2003.

The feasibility study indicated the area between Susan Island and Elizabeth Island be further investigated for a site for the new bridge.

The route selection stage commenced in September 2003 and will conclude mid 2004 with the announcement of the preferred route by the Minister.

The RTA has involved a broad range of stakeholders in its formal participation processes including government agencies; Grafton City, Pristine Waters and Copmanhurst Shire Councils; community organisations, and business, resident and landholder representatives.

Additionally the RTA Project Manager has made himself available to speak with individuals or groups who require additional information or wish to make personal representation.

St Lawrence & Associates Consulting Services was appointed by the RTA to manage the Community Participation component as a member of the RTA project team. The RTA's Grafton Media Liaison Unit has supported the work.

### **I.3 Community Participation Plan**

A Community Participation Plan (CPP) was prepared by St.Lawrence and Associates Consulting Services to guide the process. A copy can be found at **Appendix I**.

The CPP states the:

- RTA's commitment to community participation;
- Objectives of the CPP;
- List of the communities of interest and their requirements to actively participate;
- Participation activities to be conducted at each stage of the route selection process;
- Broad timeframes;
- Community's input to decision making;
- Community Risk Assessment; and
- Monitoring and evaluation processes re effective participation of the community.



Route Selection Process	Community Participation Activities	Completion Indicator
<p><i>Estimated timeframe: End 2003/Early 2004</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community update No 2</li> <li>• Community Workshops No 2</li> <li>• Hold CFG meeting No 2</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> advertisement</li> <li>• Public display of route options – staffed</li> <li>• Community feedback sheets</li> <li>• Public submissions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delayed until Feb 04 for Displays</li> <li>• 3 w/shops held 11 Dec 03</li> <li>• Held 10 Dec 03</li> <li>• Early Dec 03</li> </ul>
<p>4. Route evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop recommended route considering technical, environmental, and community input and Route Evaluation Workshop</li> <li>• Additional investigations arising from the Route Evaluation Workshop</li> <li>• Recommendation made on preferred route</li> </ul> <p><i>Estimated timeframe: Early/Mid 2004</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of submissions</li> <li>• Media release No 3</li> <li>• Route Evaluation Workshop to include community representatives from CFG</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p>5. Display preferred route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preferred route announced</li> <li>• Public display of preferred route</li> </ul> <p><i>Estimated timeframe: Mid 2004</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Media release No 4</li> <li>• Community Update No 3</li> <li>• Community Workshops No 3</li> <li>• CFG No 3</li> <li>• Community submissions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

## 2.1 Agencies' Workshop

The consultation process commenced with an Agencies Workshop on 29 July 2003. The purpose of the meeting was for the RTA to provide details regarding the delivery of the project and for Agencies to highlight major issues relating to the project. The following twenty agencies were represented:

- NSW Department of Agricultural
- NSW Fisheries
- NPWS Conservation Planning Unit
- NSW Dept Infrastructure Planning & Natural Resources
- NSW Environmental Protection Authority

- 
- NSW Waterways Authority
  - NSW Rail Infrastructure Corporation
  - NSW Police Service
  - Bicycle New South Wales Inc.
  - Summerland Way Promotion Committee
  - NSW Fire Brigade
  - NSW Ambulance Service
  - State Emergency Service Clarence/Nambucca Division
  - Grafton Base Hospital
  - NSW Dept of Education & Training
  - Grafton City Council
  - Copmanhurst Shire Council
  - Pristine Waters Council
  - Country Energy
  - Telstra

Apologies were received from:

- NRMA Mobility Infrastructure
- State Forests of NSW

The following agencies were invited with no response:

- Singtel Optus
- NSW Department of Transport

## 2.2 Media

Advertisements and media releases were used at relevant points in the process with reports in the Daily Examiner (Grafton) and Coffs Harbour Advocate Newspapers, and local and regional radio.

The initial release in August 2003 encouraged people and organisations to nominate for the Community Focus Group (CFG) and Community Workshops and promoted the free-call hotline. An advertisement was also placed in the Daily Examiner on 30 August and 3 September 2003.

The RTA's Regional Manager, Northern was interviewed on both the local Grafton commercial radio and regional ABC radio. The interviews explained the site selection process and encouraged people to nominate for the CFG and Workshops.

Subsequent releases in December 2003 promoted the short listed localities, the role of the CFG and encouraged interested people to attend the Community Workshops. The NSW Government Duty MLC for Clarence was interviewed on regional ABC radio and encouraged people to attend the Workshops.

Copies of the media reports & advertisements are contained in **Appendix 2**.

Following the media report about the short-listed localities three critical letters to the editor were printed. None of the authors had attended Community Workshops. The RTA Project Manager contacted one of the authors to discuss the issues and aims to follow up the remaining.

## 2.3 Letter to Residents in Study Area

A letter to residents inviting nomination to the CFG or Community Workshops was posted in late August 2003 to approximately 2,650 households & businesses in the Grafton & South Grafton study area. Nomination forms for the CFG & Workshops were attached to the letter. **Appendix 3 contains a copy of the letter and nomination forms.**

A similar letter was used to forward nomination forms to members of the community who made telephone enquiries and to key community organisations and local government.

A database of landowners in critical localities in the study area was searched for non-residential owners and a letter sent to their residential address or PO Box. This ensured that owners who do not live locally were also made aware of the route selection project.

Anecdotal feedback indicated that some residents did not receive the letter so a random number of key residents were phoned to ensure the letter distribution occurred. A substantial number had received the letter or been contacted by neighbours about it. Additional letters were forwarded to those who indicated they required a copy.

## 2.4 Community Update Newsletter No 4

The Community Update Numbers 1 to 3 were circulated during the Feasibility Study. The Community Update No 4 newsletter was circulated in September 2003 via a letterbox drop to all households in Grafton, South Grafton, Waterview heights & Clarenza. Its aim was to inform the community about the route selection process and the methods by which the community was to be involved. **Appendix 4 contains a copy of the Community Update.**

## 2.5 Free-call Hotline

The free call hotline was established in July 2003. Analysis of the calls indicates:

- Fifteen calls were received between 26 August & 16 September 2003 requesting information or nomination forms to join the CFG & Community Workshops.
- All responded to within 24 hours.
- Ninety-seven calls were received between 25 September & 11 December 2003. These were general enquiries or administrative matters such as RSVP for the CFG & Community Workshop meetings.
- Eighteen calls were received between 16 to 22 December 2003, in response to Daily Examiner article on the short-listed localities. Thirteen were referred to the RTA Project Manager for additional information.
- Seventeen of the 18 calls (94.4%) were against the Villiers St option & the 18<sup>th</sup> call wanted more information about it before deciding.
- Seven calls (38.9%) supported a crossing at the existing site.
- Four (22.2%) preferred a site near Elizabeth Island.
- Two (11.1%) preferred a site across Susan Island & linking into Turf Street.
- Two (11.1%) did not want either Villiers St or existing site but did not have a preference for a site.
- Comments recorded were:
  - Put the bridge on eastern side of the existing one & link it into existing roadwork of Bent St & Craig St. (2 similar comments).
  - Put the bridge next to the existing one on down-river side but turn it up McHugh St & then Dobie St to keep traffic out of CBD.

- Neither site is suitable in long-term due to upgrading of Summerland Way & future of Pacific Highway. Don't want traffic in residential areas, but down-river side of bridge is best of the 2 options. Sure RTA will make best decision.
- Don't put at Villiers St due to conservation area & impact on narrow Victoria St.
- Need more information about the impact of the bridge at Villiers Street.
- Submarine cables run across river near Villiers St.
- Alarmed about Villiers St option. Make a duplication of existing bridge.
- Doesn't want Villiers St. Duplicate existing bridge but join it from the Pacific Highway using Heber St levy. This will avoid the congestion of traffic at the South Grafton crossroads.
- Doesn't want Villiers St, prefers location 3 next to existing bridge. However overall prefer it to be near Elizabeth Island to keep trucks out of town.
- The Villiers St option is an eyesore. Put the bridge near Elizabeth Island & join up to North St & then Prince St to give 2 entrances to the town. Will allow trucks to be diverted.
- It would be an eyesore to place a bridge at Villiers St & it would impact on the Fig tree. Put a bridge down river near Elizabeth Island.
- Both options wrong. Put it near Elizabeth Island to divert trucks. Sure there is more truck traffic than stats show. (2 similar comments).
- Put it across Susan Island & into Turf St to take trucks out of CBD. Congestion on bridge is due to the 2 lanes converging into 1. Take it back to what it was. It's ugly to put another bridge next to the existing one. (3 similar comments).

## 2.6 Community Focus Group (CFG)

The role and establishment of a CFG was widely promoted in the media and via direct mail, which included nomination forms, to 2,650 households in the Grafton and South Grafton study area. Fourteen requests for nomination forms were received via the free call hotline. **See Appendix 3 for a copy of the nomination form.**

The role of CFG members is to convey project information to & from their group of interest and to participate in the process to develop the recommendation of the preferred route to the RTA.

Nominations to the CFG could be made by organisations, an informal group of residents from a particular area or by individuals. Nominations closed on 17 September 2003.

Thirty nominations were received for the CFG by the closing date. A three-person selection committee consisting of the RTA Project Manager, RTA Media Unit representative and the Community Participation Consultant considered the applications to achieve the following aims for the CFG:

- Members to be representative of a broad cross-section of the community;
- Members to have identified links into the community;
- Membership to have a broad range of knowledge and interests relevant to the project; and
- Each member to have commitment to attend CFG meetings and to consult with the sections of the community the person is representing.

Twenty-three people were selected to join the CFG. Interest groups represented include:

- Local government
- Land owners within the study area
- Business representatives



- Environmental groups
- Road transport sector
- River users
- Residents Association
- Aboriginal Land Council

**Appendix 5 contains the list of CFG members and the groups represented.**

To date 2 CFG meetings have been held on 14 October and 10 December 2003. The initial meeting was from 5pm – 7pm to allow for members who worked to attend. The second meeting was extended to 7.30 pm to provided for additional discussion as requested by members.

The purpose of the first CFG was to provide initial information about how the project would be conducted, background information, role of the CFG and an opportunity for CFG members to flag issues.

The purpose of the second CFG was to provide data on the 7 localities between Susan Island and Elizabeth Island, convey the recommendations of the locality short-listing workshop, receive members' feedback and discuss the associated issues.

Minutes of each CFG and Community Workshops have been provided to members of the CFG.

In response to requests for information to be forwarded to members before the meeting a Background Paper was prepared and sent to members prior to the December meeting.

## **2.7 Community Workshops**

Community Workshops have been held the day following the CFG, namely 15 October and 11 December 2003.

The role of the Community Workshops is to provide an opportunity for members of the public to access information about the project and to contribute opinion. There is no membership or expectation that attendees will participate in all workshops.

The nomination form for membership of the CFG was also used to nominate attendance at the first Community Workshop date. Three workshops of 2 hours length were held on each date to ensure a time suitable for most people was available. This provided for approximately 60/70 attendees.

Thirty-four nominations, including twenty-four who also nominated for the CFG, were received. To address the lack of numbers attending the workshops a database of approximately 75 households who had made submissions to the Feasibility Stage of the project, or who had signed letters of support, or made other contact about the project was established.

A letter of invitation to the 15 October Workshops was distributed in early October. A total of 28 people attended the three Community Workshop held on 15 October 2003.

Letters of invitation to attend the December Workshop were distributed to the database that also included those that had previously attended and all who had made contact since. An advertisement and press release was also inserted into the Daily Examiner to promote awareness of the Workshop.

A total of twenty-five people attended including 12 who attended the October Workshops.

**Appendix 3 contains a copy of the nomination form.**

## **2.8 Access**

The meeting venue was fully accessible for people with a disability and near public transport,

## **2.9 Meetings with Stakeholders**

The RTA Project Manager has initiated informal meetings with residents who are located in key positions within the study area and has made himself available to meet with residents who make contact.

Since the media release identifying short-listed localities the following meetings have been held:

- 16 December - meeting with Riverside Drive resident and Villiers Street residents (Sisters of Mercy)
- 17 December - Meeting with CFG member and Greaves Street residents
- 18 December - Meeting with Abbott Street residents
- 18 December - meeting with Fitzroy Street residents on site.

Additional meetings for other key areas are planned for later in January & February 2004.

## **2.10 Consultation with the Aboriginal Community**

The consultant engaged to undertake the Indigenous Heritage Assessment has met with representatives of the Ngerrie Aboriginal Land Council & a letter from the RTA inviting submissions was forwarded. A position is available on the CFG for a Council representative.

## **2.11 Short Listing of Localities Workshop**

A Workshop independently facilitated by the Australian Centre for Value Management was held on 28 November 2003 with the objective to "Review and assess the preliminary localities investigated for the project in order to shortlist those worthy of more detailed investigation."

The attendees were the RTA Project Team and staff representatives from Grafton City, Copmanhurst Shire and Pristine Waters Councils.

The results of the Workshop were presented to the CFG and Community Workshops in December.

Some members of the CFG and attendees at the Workshop expressed concern that they should have received the information beforehand so that they had time to analyse it.

There was also concern expressed by a minority of CFG members in the evaluation sheets that the Short-listing Workshop confirmed their opinion that the community participation commitment of the RTA was tokenistic as no community member was included in the short-listing workshop.

## **2.12 Written Submissions**

Fourteen written submissions from seven people have been received by the RTA Project Team to date. All have been acknowledged and responded to by the RTA.

The submissions covered the following range of issues:

- Concern about the impact of a new bridge on the submitter's living conditions.
- Environmental & heritage issues.
- Querying the validity & source of technical data.
- Need for heavy transport by-pass.
- Concern the RTA has already determined site and community participation is tokenism.
- Request for information re number of RTA staff directly affected by the study area.
- Needs of river users to be taken into account.
- Bridge design issues

## **2.13 Evaluation of CFG & Community Workshop Meetings**

Evaluation forms were provided at each CFG and Workshop. A summary of the responses is below. **Appendix 6 contains the evaluation forms.**

**Table 2 Analysis of Evaluation Data – October 2003 CFG & Workshops**

Statement	CFG – Number of Responses (20 forms returned from 22 participants)	Workshops– Number of Responses (7 forms from 10am w/shop – 7 attendees 8 forms from 2pm w/shop – 9 attendees 9 forms from 5pm w/shop – 12 attendees)																				
<p><b>1. The structure of the meeting allowed for adequate exchange of inform (CFG evaluation sheet)</b></p> <p><b>1. Workshop participants were allocated enough time to discuss issues and ask questions (Workshop evaluation sheet)</b></p>	<p>Yes – 19</p> <p>No - 1</p>	<table border="0"> <tr><td>1 Agree</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>5 Disagree</td><td>0</td></tr> </table>	1 Agree	20	2	3	3	1	4	0	5 Disagree	0										
1 Agree	20																					
2	3																					
3	1																					
4	0																					
5 Disagree	0																					
<b>Comments</b>	2 wanted more time; 4 stated it was a good meeting	Two comments: agree with use of independent facilitator to make process transparent; good facilitation, explanation & participation.																				
<p><b>2. The information provided at the CFG meeting allowed me to understand how the route selection will occur</b></p>	<table border="0"> <tr><td>1 Agree</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>5 Disagree</td><td>0</td></tr> </table>	1 Agree	8	2	4	3	5	4	2	5 Disagree	0	<table border="0"> <tr><td>1 Agree</td><td>15</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>9</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>5 Disagree</td><td>0</td></tr> </table>	1 Agree	15	2	9	3	0	4	0	5 Disagree	0
1 Agree	8																					
2	4																					
3	5																					
4	2																					
5 Disagree	0																					
1 Agree	15																					
2	9																					
3	0																					
4	0																					
5 Disagree	0																					
<b>Comments</b>	Four comments made relating to: more info needed; explanation of assumptions; how will issues be weighted; and feeling that site has already been selected by RTA – need independent study.	One comment: thorough information																				
<p><b>3. The Community Participation Plan indicates adequate opportunity for participation by the community in the selection of the route (CFG evaluation sheet)</b></p> <p><b>3. The Project has adequate opportunity for participation by the community in the selection of the route (Workshop evaluation sheet)</b></p>	<table border="0"> <tr><td>1 Agree</td><td>9</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>5 Disagree</td><td>0</td></tr> </table>	1 Agree	9	2	5	3	3	4	1	5 Disagree	0	<table border="0"> <tr><td>1 Agree</td><td>14</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>5 Disagree</td><td>0</td></tr> </table>	1 Agree	14	2	4	3	3	4	1	5 Disagree	0
1 Agree	9																					
2	5																					
3	3																					
4	1																					
5 Disagree	0																					
1 Agree	14																					
2	4																					
3	3																					
4	1																					
5 Disagree	0																					
<b>Comments</b>	One comment re unsure of the impact discussions will have on final outcome.	Three comments: adequate coverage in local media & letterbox drop. Workshops a great idea; yet to be discussed; seems so but will have to wait to see if it is not just tokenism.																				

Statement	CFG – Number of Responses (20 forms returned from 22 participants)	Workshops– Number of Responses (7 forms from 10am w/shop – 7 attendees 8 forms from 2pm w/shop – 9 attendees 9 forms from 5pm w/shop – 12 attendees)																				
<b>4. I believe the RTA will adhere to the commitment made in the Community Participation Plan</b>	<table border="0"> <tr><td>1 Agree</td><td>9</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>5 Disagree</td><td>0</td></tr> </table>	1 Agree	9	2	4	3	5	4	2	5 Disagree	0	<table border="0"> <tr><td>1 Agree</td><td>14</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>5 Disagree</td><td>0</td></tr> </table>	1 Agree	14	2	5	3	4	4	0	5 Disagree	0
1 Agree	9																					
2	4																					
3	5																					
4	2																					
5 Disagree	0																					
1 Agree	14																					
2	5																					
3	4																					
4	0																					
5 Disagree	0																					
<b>Comments</b>	Three comments: feeling that “proposal” for existing site rather strong; will the RTA accept decision that doesn’t fit their plans; & unsure of the impact meetings will have on decision.	Three comments: hope so-have yet to see plan; good form by RTA to date; this is fairly obvious.																				
<b>5. CFG members were allocated enough time to discuss issues &amp; ask questions</b>	<table border="0"> <tr><td>1 Agree</td><td>10</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr><td>5 Disagree</td><td>0</td></tr> </table>	1 Agree	10	2	5	3	2	4	3	5 Disagree	0	Not applicable										
1 Agree	10																					
2	5																					
3	2																					
4	3																					
5 Disagree	0																					
<b>Comments</b>	Three comments: limited time; may need more time next meeting; & some people allowed too much time.																					
<b>General Comments</b>	Seven comments: 2 indicated it was good meeting procedure to allow fair participation; too early to comment; planning should not be hijacked by minority groups; need to plan for whole of the region; need for independent studies; need to consider range of issues & info needed before meetings.	Nine comments: 3 indicated looking forward to continued involvement & opportunity to participate; well presented information; organisation is very impressive & appreciate opportunity to hear clear answers by experts; RTA is considering aspects of the community; working well at this stage; very important for Grafton & extend consultation for the best solutions; promote the CPP & protocol to participate – do another Update to all residents to stop flow of negativity & disinformation – strongly support bridge & Community Participation.																				

**Table 3 Analysis of Evaluation Data – December 2003 CFG & Workshops**

Statement	CFG – Number of Responses (13 forms returned from 20 participants)	Workshops– Number of Responses (5 forms from 10am w/shop – 8 attendees 8 forms from 2pm w/shop – 11 attendees 3 forms from 5pm w/shop – 6 attendees)
<b>1. The small group workshop provided an effective structure to express opinion &amp; to identify to the RTA important issues to be taken into account</b>	1 Agree 5 2 4 3 1 4 1 5 Disagree 2	1 Agree 7 2 7 3 1 4 1 5 Disagree 0
<b>Comments</b>	Five comments: 4 indicated not enough time with 1 of these stating heavy vehicles are the main impediment; too many self interested people.	Five comments: 4 indicated not enough time; keep workshops small.
<b>2. The short-listing exercise undertaken by the RTA, as explained at today's meeting, assisted the CFG in the selection of the locality options to be further investigated</b>	1 Agree 1 2 6 3 1 4 2 5 Disagree 2	1 Agree 5 2 6 3 4 4 1 5 Disagree 0
<b>Comments</b>	Five comments: options already decided – no access to information/assumptions before the meeting; criteria needs independent assessment; no as options 2 & 3 only proposed – my community prefers variation of locality 1; all transport comes to Grafton – the motor traffic would not need another bridge; some routes not offered but I don't support those anyway.	Five comments: very informative but need greater depth of statistics; would like to question some of the assumptions put forward; some of the heavy transport data is grey; would have liked the information beforehand; a lot more should be considered from community input before scrapping options.
<b>3.a To this stage of the Project the RTA has provided timely &amp; adequate information to the community</b>	1 Agree 4 2 3 3 1 4 3 5 Disagree 2	1 Agree 7 2 4 3 2 4 1 5 Disagree 2
<b>3.b To this stage of the Project the RTA has provided timely &amp; adequate opportunity for the community to contribute information</b>	1 Agree 5 2 2 3 0 4 4 5 Disagree 1	1 Agree 6 2 5 3 0 4 3 5 Disagree 2

Statement	CFG – Number of Responses (13 forms returned from 20 participants)	Workshops– Number of Responses (5 forms from 10am w/shop – 8 attendees 8 forms from 2pm w/shop – 11 attendees 3 forms from 5pm w/shop – 6 attendees)																				
<b>Comments</b>	Six comments: 5 requesting info before meeting – not enough time to analyse during meeting & to discuss or ask questions; there has been a severe lack of publicity.	Four comments all relating to receiving information earlier so that informed discussion can be held. One suggested that workshop be broken into 2 sessions: 1 <sup>st</sup> to receive info and 2 <sup>nd</sup> the next day or so for feedback and discussion groups.																				
<b>4. I believe the RTA is adhering to the commitment made in the Community Participation Plan</b>	<table border="0"> <tr><td>1 Agree</td><td>6</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>5 Disagree</td><td>1</td></tr> </table>	1 Agree	6	2	4	3	0	4	2	5 Disagree	1	<table border="0"> <tr><td>1 Agree</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>7</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>5 Disagree</td><td>0</td></tr> </table>	1 Agree	8	2	7	3	0	4	0	5 Disagree	0
1 Agree	6																					
2	4																					
3	0																					
4	2																					
5 Disagree	1																					
1 Agree	8																					
2	7																					
3	0																					
4	0																					
5 Disagree	0																					
<b>Comments</b>	Three comments: community has no idea of how selections have been made; they appear to be sticking to the plan – no option for deviation or change in direction; appearance of consultation but decisions made already or information presented so options already selected.	One comment: Some of us thought the RTA already favours option 3.																				
<b>General Comments</b>	Eight comments: 2 suggested the “do nothing” option – or more time for discussion; little info on construction of the approaches – need more info about process & who are the outside consultants; need independent assessment; too much talk from members who have clear interest; more publicity for the general public; very good process; better than previous meeting.	Six comments: 2 thanking the opportunity to be involved & informed; project originated from business & residents to address traffic congestion – but crossing should be examined as national importance for highway travel; don’t duplicate locality 3 due to long-term funnel effects of traffic movements; challenge popular assumption that time delays are the most compelling problem – getting the trucks out of the CBD & residential areas is the most important; maintain the present groups.																				

### Comparison between October and December CFG Meetings:

The comparison between the results from the October and December CFG is between the 11 members who could be identified by name or handwriting.

- In response to the question “**I believe the RTA is adhering to the commitment made in the Community Participation Plan** (The RTA will look to the community for participation in formulating solutions and will incorporate community comment in decisions to the maximum extent possible:”
  - 3 continued to respond to it at level 1 (agree)
  - 2 changed the response from 1 to 2
  - 1 changed the response from 2 to 1

- I continued to respond to it at 2
- I changed the response from 3 to 2
- I changed the response from 3 to 4
- I changed the response from 1 to 5 (disagree)
- I continued to respond to it level 4

### Comparison between October and December Community Workshops

The comparison between the results from the October and December Community Workshops is between the 6 attendees who could be identified by name or handwriting & attended both.

- In response to the question “**I believe the RTA is adhering to the commitment made in the Community Participation Plan** (The RTA will look to the community for participation in formulating solutions and will incorporate community comment in decisions to the maximum extent possible:”
  - 4 continued to respond to it at level 1 (agree)
  - I changed the response from 1 to 2
  - I changed the response from 3 to 2

### 3. Social Impact Assessment Interviews

During October and November 2003 interviews with randomly selected businesses and residents in Grafton and South Grafton, were undertaken by the consultant conducting the Social and Economic Impacts Report.

A total of 9 residents and 12 businesses were interviewed.

### 4. Community Participation Issues & Next Steps

To date all activities and timelines of the CPP have been delivered. The effectiveness of the activities in achieving the CPP objectives is discussed below.

The CPP objectives are:

- To ensure the community is provided with timely and adequate information about the project, including the site selection process.
- To ensure the community is provided with timely and adequate opportunities to contribute information during the site selection process.
- To maintain an effective working relationship between the RTA and the community.
- To seek a recommended preferred route by partnering with the community in the route identification and selection process.

Ensuring a community is aware of community participation initiatives for a project is a difficult task and can consume large amounts of resources for a small return.

As detailed earlier in the Report the RTA undertook numerous activities to inform the community about the CFG and Community Workshops and to invite nominations.

There was an adequate response to establish a widely representative CFG, however the number of people attending the Community Workshops was a disappointment.

As the largest percentage of people attending the Workshops could be directly affected by one of the bridge localities, it may be that the rest of the Grafton community is not sufficiently engaged to actively participate at this stage of the site selection process.

The evaluation feedback from the CFG and Workshops (see section 2.12) indicates that the majority of participants agree with the community participation process to date.

The following issues have been raised by a number of people.

- Feedback from the newspaper short-listing article indicated (including that from affected residents) a dislike for the Villiers St/Abbott St locality due to the impact on the heritage area, social impact, road traffic noise, visual impact, restriction of river use and maintenance of all traffic through the CBD.
- The short-listing of only 2 localities neither of which address the issue of removing heavy vehicle through traffic. An option should be considered that effectively removes heavy vehicles from the CBD.
- The RTA should consider an option at the Turf Street Locality. The RTA agreed to investigate this locality and present its findings at the Community Workshops in February.
- Concern over the validity of traffic counts and the assumptions used in the traffic model.
- The CFG and Community Workshops need to be longer to allow time for participants to digest and discuss information.
- All information to be discussed at the CFG & Workshops should be sent out beforehand to allow time to consider. This was partially undertaken for the second CFG with a Background Paper provided beforehand. However the Report from the Short Listing Workshop was unavailable for distribution prior to the CFG.
- Perception that the RTA already has a preferred site and the community participation is just a “smoke screen.”
- Perception that the short-listing workshop that resulted in only 2 localities going forward supported the view above.

The RTA will present a public display of route options within the short listed localities and distribute Community Update No 4 in March 2004. Following the display period and receipt of submissions a 2 day Route Evaluation Workshop will be held in which community representatives will be involved. These activities will provide additional opportunities for the community to gain information and to provide opinion to assist in the recommendation of a preferred site.



## **APPENDIX I**

Insert Community Participation Plan

APPENDIX 2

26/08 '03 TUE 14:12 FAX 026640 1005

RTA GFTN RTA

→→→ VICKI ST.LAWRENC 002

*EX*

RM ✓  
MAIL ✓  
TAMWORTH  
*Karen Smith  
Blackly*

**Focussing on site for bridge**

By HEATH GILMORE

EVER felt like helping build a bridge across the Clarence River?

If the answer is yes, then send in your application to the Roads Traffic Authority.

Nominations have been called for a Community Focus Group to help plan the next stage of developing a second Clarence crossing.

NSW Roads Minister Carl Scully said this stage would include the selection of a preferred route for an estimated \$40 million new bridge.

"The State Government is well aware of the strong community interest in the construction of a bridge across the Clarence at Grafton and we want local residents to be involved in the route selection process," Mr Scully said.

"To ensure it happens, the Government, through RTA, is inviting nominations from interested people to be part of the community focus group and community workshops."

"The group will comprise up to 20 community members who represent residents, business, environmental groups and local government."

Continued on p. 3.

**Focus on bridge**

From P1.

"The role of the Group will be to actively participate in the preferred route selection process and pass project information back to the community."

Mr Scully said those interested in becoming a member of the Group can be nominated by an organisation, an informal group of residents or they can even nominate themselves.

Nominations close on Wednesday, September 17 at 5pm.

For further information contact the RTA on 1800 005 756 during business hours.

Appendix 2 continued

26/08 '03 TUE 14:12 FAX 026640 1005

RTA GFTN RTA

→→→ VICKI ST.LAWRENC ☑001

RM  
MAIL  
TANWORTH

*Karen Smith*

*Blacky*

## Community to help in bridge route stage

NOMINATIONS have now been called for people to participate in a Community Focus group as part of the next stage of developing the second crossing of the Clarence River at Grafton.

The Minister for Roads, Mr Carl Scully, said the next stage of the project would include the selection of a preferred route for the estimated \$40 million new bridge.

"The State Government is well aware of the strong community interest in the construction of a new bridge across the Clarence at Grafton and we want residents to be directly involved in the route selection process," Mr Scully said.

"To ensure this happens, the Government, through the RTA, is now inviting nominations from interested people to take part in the Community Focus Group and community workshops.

"The Focus Group will comprise up to 20 community members that represent residents, business, environmental groups and local government.

"The role of the Focus Group will be to actively participate in the preferred route selection process and pass project information back to the community."

Mr Scully said those interested in becoming a member of the Focus Group could be nominated by an organisation, an informal group of residents from a particular area, or they can even nominate themselves. Nominations close September 17.


Expressions of interest also are invited for community workshops from interested residents.

People wanting more information or nomination forms for either the Community Focus groups or workshops can contact the RTA on 1800 005 756 during business hours.

Daily Examiner 30/8/03  
31/9/03

**Public Notices    Public Notices    Public Notices**

**ADDITIONAL CROSSING OF THE CLARENCE RIVER  
PLANNING FOR A NEW BRIDGE IN THE GRAFTON AREA**



**NOMINATIONS INVITED FOR**

- COMMUNITY FOCUS GROUP
- COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS

Nominations are invited from the community to participate in a Community Focus Group (CFG) as part of the route selection stage for the additional crossing of the Clarence River at Grafton.

The CFG will comprise up to 20 selected community members who will represent residents, business, environmental groups and local government. The CFG will operate for the duration of the route selection Stage.

The role of the CFG will be to participate in the preferred route selection process, pass on project information and gain feedback from the members' interest group.

Those interested in becoming a member of the CFG can be nominated by themselves, an organisation or an informal group of residents from a particular area.

Expressions of interest are also being called for nominations for community workshops for those who wish to become involved in the project.

These workshops aim to explain the route selection process, inform community members about the project and for the RTA to receive community feedback.

For more information or to obtain a nomination form for either the CFG or community workshops, please contact the RTA on freecall 1800 005 756 during business hours.

Nominations close at 5pm on Wednesday 17 September 2003.

Daily Examiner 4/10/2003

**Public Notices    Public Notices**

**FELTHAMS NEWSAGENCY**

Wish to advise that as from Sunday 2/11/03 delivery of Sunday papers by boys unfortunately will cease. Papers will then be delivered by contractor.

Please call or contact Felthams Newsagency on 6642 2146 to arrange your Sunday paper requirements and your account details.

**Glenreagh Markets TODAY**

**RAILINFRASTRUCTURE CORPORATION**

**Notice of Temporary Closure Railway Level Crossings between Junction Hill and Grafton**

The Rail Infrastructure Corporation is intending to undertake sleeper replacement works on the North Coast Railway from Junction Hill area to Grafton between 3 October and 17 October 2003. (Dates may alter slightly depending on the progress of prior works).

These works will require the temporary closing of level crossings to all traffic for approximately 8 hours each day, for two days. The following roads/streets will be affected:

- Carrs Peninsula Road, Junction Hill
- Pine Street, Junction Hill
- Broad Street, Grafton
- Drake Street, Grafton
- Baker Street, Grafton
- Carr Street, Grafton
- Fry Street, Grafton

The Rail Infrastructure Corporation apologises for any inconvenience caused.

John Ogilvy  
Project Manager  
Mobile 0417 841 250

**Public Notices    Public Notices**

**Clarence River Historical Society**

**190 Fitzroy Street, Grafton**

*(Open Hours)*  
Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday  
**9.00am-4.00pm**  
Sunday  
**1.00pm-4.00pm**

**Phone 6642 5212**

**ADDITIONAL CROSSING OF THE CLARENCE RIVER - GRAFTON**

**Are you interested in finding out more?**

**Ring the information hotline number:**

**1800 005 756**



**COPMANHURST SHIRE COUNCIL**

**CITIZENSHIP AWARDS**

Nominations are now being called for Citizen and Young Citizen of the Year Awards, Sports Person and Junior Sports Person of the Year Awards, which will be presented at the Australia Day function at Whiporie on 26 January 2004.

The aim of the Citizen awards is to recognise outstanding contributions to the local community during 2003.

The Sports awards are to recognise sporting achievement at local, state or national level during 2003.

For information concerning the awards and nomination contact Debbie Freagilvy, telephone (02) 6642 2855

All nominations must be received before 4.30pm on Friday, 28 November 2003.

42 Victoria Street      George Cowan  
GRAFTON NSW 2460      GENERAL MANAGER

**TAKE A SUNDAY DRIVE**



- Art Galleries
- Restaurants
- Hotels
- Clubs

**TRIVIA NIGHT**

**Appendix 2 continued**

**INVITATION TO  
COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS**



**Additional Crossing of the Clarence River  
Planning for a new bridge in the Grafton area**

Community workshops will again be held on **Thursday 11 December 2003** to update the community on the progress of the planning for a new bridge in the Grafton area and to seek feedback from residents and interested community representatives on specific localities for an additional crossing.

Please contact the RTA's free call number **1800 005 756** if you would like to attend one of the workshops.

*Vicki*

# The Daily Examiner

SERVING THE CLARENCE VALLEY SINCE 1859 *Daily Examiner* TUESDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2003 90c Per retail price including GST

## BRIDGE OPTIONS

### Possible sites reduced to two

By NICOLA KERKENEZOV

A NEW bridge at Grafton could be built at the end of Villiers Street or next to the existing structure, the Roads and Traffic Authority (RTA) has announced.

The two localities were shortlisted for further consideration at community consultation meetings held last week.

News of the proposals has brought mixed reactions from the Grafton public and businesses around the route areas.

If a new bridge was built over the Clarence River at the end of Villiers Street some residents said they would be concerned about increased traffic noise and consider moving across town.

Additional Crossing of the Clarence Focus Group member Ron Bell yesterday said he also disapproved of the Villiers Street to Abbot Street crossing option.

"I personally am not keen on the Villiers Street locality... based on the heritage value of the precinct area of the street and the congestion to the roundabout at the intersection with Fitzroy Street," he said.

"Plus I think the recreational value of the Clarence River at this point would disappear, because that stretch of the river (between the Crown Hotel and the existing bridge) is used tremendously by the po-



Y011 CHOOSF: Announced locations of two new potential bridges - one at Grafton and one at Grafton.

River at this point would disappear, because that stretch of the river (between the Crown Hotel and the existing bridge) is used tremendously by the people of Grafton.

■ Continued: P3. community feedback.

## What Villiers Street residents had to say

					
<b>KAYLEEN DENNY</b> , BP Fitzroy Street Grafton.	<b>MICHAEL FLETCHER</b> , Ampol Shop Stop Grafton.	<b>MICHELLE PAGE</b> , Quality Inn Grafton.	<b>GREG BUTCHER</b> , Conservatorium director.	<b>BRAD DICKSON</b> , Resident.	<b>CATH BREE</b> , Resident.
"I think a bridge would not change things because we get a lot of traffic past us already."	"A bridge I don't think would hurt us. I do not see how it would make a difference since we are so close to the existing bridge already."	"It is not going to do much for us because we already have traffic coming past. Indirectly it could be good for business."	"It is a big no from us because of the increased traffic in relation to students getting dropped off and noise."	"We need another bridge but I would move it comes here because of the increased traffic and noise."	"It would be good. It is noisy enough already so it wouldn't bother me."

### Bridge options

■ **From P1.**

"I believe the option put forward at the existing structure is the most appropriate."

Mr Bell also suggested the RTA investigate a crossing over Susan Island to the Turf Street locality.

"I think the RTA could look further at a link to the Turf Street area, either flying over the island or using the island as an anchor for a bridge pylon," he said.

"I personally do not see what ham (this option) could do to the environment."

But the authority said other locations between Susan and Elizabeth islands had failed to meet project objectives and would not be considered during the route selection stage.

"These localities would have high social impacts, increased traffic noise, environmental impact, potential increase in the risk of flooding and higher accident rates," a RTA spokeswoman said.

It is expected options for the new \$40 million crossing will be placed on public display next year.

■ Telephone the RTA with your thoughts about the project on 1800 005 756.

APPENDIX 3



Summerland Way

**Additional Crossing of the Clarence River at Grafton**

Dear Resident

**Nomination for Community Focus Group and Community Workshops**

The RTA completed the Feasibility Study for an additional crossing of the Clarence River at Grafton in March 2003. The NSW Government has now announced the next stage of investigations. The investigations will include the selection of a preferred route for the additional crossing.

The RTA is committed to involving the community in the selection of a preferred route. Expressions of interest are invited from the community to be involved in a Community Focus Group (CFG) or Community Workshops.

**Community Focus Group**

The CFG will comprise of up to 20 community members and operate throughout the route selection stage. It will require a strong commitment from its members for the duration of the project. Members would include representatives from local government, residents, business & environmental groups from within the study area.

The role of the CFG will include:

- Conveying project information to and from members' groups of interest.
- Participation in the process to develop the preferred route.

Persons appointed to the CFG may be nominated by:

- An organisation.
- An informal group of residents from a particular area.
- Themselves as individuals.

**Community Workshops**

Alternatively, the community workshops are information sessions that provide opportunities for community members who have nominated to attend the workshops at their convenience to:

- Understand the route selection stage;
- Be informed about the progress of the project; and
- Provide information to the RTA.



To ensure broad involvement of the community, participants will be selected to attend either the CFG or Community Workshops only. Please use the attached form to nominate for either the CFG or community workshops and return to PO Box 29, Grafton by **5pm Wednesday 17 September 2003**.

If you would like further information regarding the CFG or the Community Workshops, please contact Vicki St Lawrence on 1 800 005 756 (free call) during business hours.

Yours faithfully



Peter Collins

Regional Manager, Northern Client Services

19<sup>th</sup> August 2003

**Appendix 3 continued**

Insert CFG & Community Workshops Nomination Form

## **APPENDIX 4**

Insert Community Update No 4

**APPENDIX 5***Summerland Way***Additional Crossing of the Clarence River at Grafton****Community Focus Group Membership**

Cr	Shirley	Adams	Grafton City Council
Cr	Max	Murray	Grafton City Council
Cr	Cec	Hyde	Pristine Waters Council
Cr	Neil	Payne	Copmanhurst Shire Council
Mr	Ron	Bell	Grafton City Chamber of Commerce & Industry
Mr	Laurie	Marchant	South Grafton Residents Progress Association Inc
Mr	Kel	Kearns	South Grafton Traders
Mr	Greg	Hayes	Grafton Shoppingworld
Mr	Robert	Blanchard	Heavy Vehicle Transport
Mr	Scott	Flynn	Susan & Elizabeth Island Trust
Mr	Peter	Morgan	National Parks Association – Clarence Valley Branch
Mr	Bill	Noonan	Clarence Valley Conservation Coalition Inc
Mr	Frank	Falkenstein	Clarence Environment Centre Inc
Mr	Don	McLeod	Clarence River Yatch Club
Ms	Amanda	Steiner	Fitzroy St & wider residents
Mrs	Karen	Thompson	Greaves St & wider residents
Mr	Paul	Covington	Kent St Action Committee
Mrs	Heather	Roland	Riverside, Bent & Through St residents
Mr	Brian	Scrivener	Waterview Heights residents
Mrs	Mary	Watson	Schools
Mr	Chris	Wheelahan	Mc Hugh Street Residents
Mr	Gordon	Poynter	Clarenza Residents
Mr	Darryl	Mercy	Ngerrie Aboriginal Land Council

**APPENDIX 6**

**Community Focus Group Meeting  
Tuesday 14 October 2003**

**Evaluation Form**

Name (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

(Please circle the most applicable indicator for each statement)

**1. The structure of the meeting allowed for adequate exchange of information** Yes / No

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

**2. The information provided at the CFG meeting allowed me to understand how the route selection will occur:**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Agree				Disagree

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

**3. The Community Participation Plan indicates adequate opportunity for participation by the community in the selection of the route:**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Agree				Disagree

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

**4. I believe the RTA will adhere to the commitment made in the Community Participation Plan** (The RTA will look to the community for participation in formulating solutions and will incorporate community comment in decisions to the maximum extent possible):

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Agree				Disagree

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

**5. CFG members were allocated enough time to discuss issues & ask questions:**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Agree				Disagree

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

**6. Do you have any other comments or questions about community participation in this Project?** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Community Workshop  
Wednesday 15 October 2003**

**Evaluation Form**

Name (optional): \_\_\_\_\_ Workshop time: \_\_\_\_\_

(Please circle the most applicable indicator for each statement)

**1. Workshop participants were allocated enough time to discuss issues and ask questions:**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Agree				Disagree

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

**2. The information provided at the Workshop allowed me to understand how the route selection will occur:**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Agree				Disagree

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

**3. The Project has adequate opportunity for participation by the community in the selection of the route:**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Agree				Disagree

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

**4. I believe the RTA will adhere to the commitment made in the Community Participation Plan (The RTA will look to the community for participation in formulating solutions and will consider community comment in decisions to the maximum extent possible):**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Agree				Disagree

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

**5. Do you have any other comments or questions about community participation in this Project?** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Community Focus Group Meeting
Wednesday 10 December 2003
Evaluation Form

Name (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

(Please circle the most applicable indicator for each statement)

1. The small group workshop provided an effective structure to express opinion and to identify to the RTA important issues to be taken into account:

1 2 3 4 5
Agree Disagree

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

2. The short-listing exercise undertaken by the RTA, as explained at today's meeting, assisted the CFG in the selection of the locality options to be further investigated:

1 2 3 4 5
Agree Disagree

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

3. To this stage of the Project the RTA has provided:

a) timely & adequate information to the community:

1 2 3 4 5
Agree Disagree

b) timely & adequate opportunity for the community to contribute information

1 2 3 4 5
Agree Disagree

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

4. I believe the RTA is adhering to the commitment made in the Community Participation Plan (The RTA will look to the community for participation in formulating solutions and will incorporate community comment in decisions to the maximum extent possible):

1 2 3 4 5
Agree Disagree

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

5. Do you have any other comments or questions about community participation in this Project? \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix 6 continued

**Community Workshop**  
**Thursday 11 December 2003**  
**Evaluation Form**

Name (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

(Please circle the most applicable indicator for each statement)

- 1. The small group workshop provided an effective structure to express opinion and to identify to the RTA important issues to be taken into account:**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Agree				Disagree

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

- 2. The short-listing exercise undertaken by the RTA, as explained at today's meeting, assisted the CFG in the selection of the locality options to be further investigated:**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Agree				Disagree

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

- 3. To this stage of the Project the RTA has provided:**

**a) timely & adequate information to the community:**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Agree				Disagree

**b) timely & adequate opportunity for the community to contribute information**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Agree				Disagree

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

- 4. I believe the RTA is adhering to the commitment made in the Community Participation Plan** (The RTA will look to the community for participation in formulating solutions and will incorporate community comment in decisions to the maximum extent possible):

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Agree				Disagree

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

- 5. Do you have any other comments or questions about community participation in this Project?** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_