

# Meeting Notes

<b>Purpose of Meeting</b>	<b>Western Brisbane Transport Network Investigation Community Liaison Group (South)</b>		
<b>Project</b>	Western Brisbane Transport Network Investigation	<b>Project No</b>	QI99706
<b>Prepared By</b>	Western Brisbane Transport Network Investigation Community Engagement team	<b>Phone No</b>	(Toll free) 1800 636 896
<b>Place of Meeting</b>	Jindalee Function Centre, Jindalee Hotel	<b>Date</b>	6 February 2008
		<b>Time</b>	7:00 PM
<b>Present</b>	<p><b>Facilitator:</b> Callum Campbell</p> <p><b>CLG Members:</b> Trevor, Oxley Resident Bruce, Pinjarra Hills Resident Resident, Brookfield Resident, Fig Tree Pocket Rachel, Pullenvale The Hut Environmental &amp; Community Association Resident, Toowong Resident, North Booval Resident, Bellbird Park Stuart, Karalee, ASPO-Australia David, Upper Brookfield, Western Brisbane Bypass Action Group John, Sherwood, Centenary Bikeways Group</p> <p><b>Western Brisbane Transport Network Investigation:</b> Norm Peter J Peter P Jane Stephen Stephanie Wendy</p> <p><b>Queensland Transport:</b> Helen</p>		
<b>Apologies</b>	<p><b>CLG Members:</b> Kathryn, Esk, Esk Kilcoy Community Support Association; Ray, Tivoli, Resident; Resident, Richlands; Resident, Paddington, Resident, Chapel Hill</p>		

ACTION ITEM	Who?	When?
-------------	------	-------

- 1) **Welcome and housekeeping**
  - Discussion was held regarding the inclusion of members' names in the meeting notes as well as comment attribution. It was agreed that members could choose to have comments attributed directly or to remain anonymous.

**Response:** Members were comfortable with how this matter had been resolved.

- A resident from Toowong asked who were the relevant Ministers that the investigation team was reporting to.

**Response:** The investigation team advised that they reported to Hon John Mickel MP, Minister for Transport, Trade, Employment and Industrial Relations, and kept Hon Warren Pitt MP, Minister for Main Roads and Local Government and Hon Paul Lucas MP, Minister for Infrastructure and Planning informed on the study and its progress.

- David from Upper Brookfield, Western Brisbane Bypass Action Group asked whether the 2026 Base Case fact sheet was available on the investigation's website.

**Response:** The 2026 Base Case fact sheet will be available for download on the investigation's website from 7 February 2008. Should CLG members require additional copies for distribution to members of their respective community groups, they can contact the investigation team.

- Stuart from Karalee, ASPO-Australia, commended the investigation team on their willingness to provide information to the community since the project's inception.

## 2) **Investigation Update**

- The investigation team provided an update on progress and outlined some of the communication activities planned for 2008.

## 3) **Assessment Framework overview**

- The investigation team provided an overview of the Assessment Framework.

## 4) **Workshop**

- The investigation team provided an overview of the purpose and rules of the workshop. CLG members indicated their understanding of the process. CLG members were divided into two groups to achieve a balance between individual residents and community groups.
- The following issues were raised by members during the workshop to be taken into account when reviewing the Assessment Framework:

### **Environmental**

- Visual impact on landscape (both urban and natural)
- Connectivity of habitats
- Impact of the changes on land use, plus flow on effects.
- Protection of water courses and water supplies

### **Social**

- Easy access and availability to public transport (PT) and active transport, in a viable way
- Regional accessibility – people, goods, services
- Reduce congestion – especially at Toowong during peak times
- Peak travelling conditions – commuters
- Travel time
- Convenience and reliability
- Weekend travel – lack of PT

- Local area issues – Toowong / Moggill
- Will rail be included? What opportunities do we have to put rail (light and heavy) on corridors?
- Opportunities to put services / utilities along the corridor together with transport including Mobile phone towers
- On road capabilities for bikes on the carriageway
- Viability – genuine real choices, not tokenism / attractive. e.g. PT source frequency
- Opportunity to allow differential pricing
- Improvement of existing rail services. e.g. Put more services on, better park'n'ride facilities
- Greater integration between modes. e.g. bus and rail
- Rail is supported more strongly than buses
- Efficient service provision
- Integration
- Social equity (location, age, disability)
- Climate change – greenhouse gas targets / reduce existing emissions
- Security & personal safety
- Health
- People focussed system (ticketing etc)
- Social cohesion – (local community identity)
- How disruptive during implementation?
- How well a strategy serves the community it's impacting on.
- Infrastructure usage and under-usage
- Look into issues occurring throughout the day – not just at peak times
- Needs of schools, education, transport provision / access & safety
- Impact on lifestyle and health of the community
- Severance of communities
- Pedestrian access – time and safety / walking connections
- Consideration of emergency services

#### **Economic**

- Employment (building the economy / job creation)
- New technologies – fuels, engines
- Lifecycle analysis (efficient use of resources for long-term benefit)
- Robustness
- Private cost / user cost
- Adaptability (w/technologies and environmental change). Retrofitting
- Private costs (car capital / running costs)
- Local economy and employment benefits
- Speed of implementation
- Efficiency – energy
- Durability / longevity (sustainability)
- Oil dependence
- Effectiveness at completion
- Innovation / new technologies
- Incentives and subsidies

#### **Government policy/strategic fit**

- Must fit with policy of current and future governments
- Should have a long term perspective e.g. 2026 and beyond

5) **Assessment Framework review**

The investigation team gave a presentation on the Assessment Framework. The groups were then shown a sample Assessment Framework.

Discussion was then held between the two groups regarding their thoughts on the sample Assessment Framework. The following are comments made during the discussion.

- David from Upper Brookfield, Western Brisbane Bypass Action Group, suggested that when looking at the effects, public transport accidents need to be considered in addition to private vehicle accidents.
- Rachel from Pullenvale, The Hut Environmental and Community Association Inc, emphasised the importance of the impacts of climate change on biodiversity. She also referred to a paper by Tim Low titled Climate Change and Brisbane Biodiversity.
- Stuart from Karalee, ASPO-Australia, raised the point that when evaluating alternatives, the issue of opportunity cost needs to be considered.
- Bruce from Pinjarra Hills discussed the issue of advances in technology regarding cars and the potential impact on the investigation's modelling. He mentioned that he had seen media reports predicting that vehicles will be controlled by computers within the next 10 years. He suggested that traffic flow would be more constant and could possibly allow for a reduction in lane width.

**Response:** The investigation team added to Bruce's point regarding technology advancements and advised that such advancements could be modelled a part of sensitivity testing.

- Steven from North Booval said that he had seen a media report indicating that emergency service vehicles use a beacon to change the traffic lights to enable them to pass quickly through intersections and hence manipulate traffic conditions.
- Sam from Toowong asked how the Assessment Framework is scored?

**Response:** The investigation team advised that each of the five (5) objectives is broken down into effects. Each effect is scored individually based on its own measures. Some effects, such as number of vehicle crashes can be evaluated easily, however, other effects such as the impact on visual amenity has a more subjective evaluation. The investigation team also advised that rules are developed to guide this process as well as detailed descriptions as to what exactly each effect is.

- Sam, Toowong then asked how the Assessment Framework's social and environmental objectives are compared.

**Response:** Each of the Assessment Framework's objectives has effects that are evaluated equally against each other. By evaluating each effect and listing them out, a sense of which effects are more favoured can be developed. Community opinion is also a key factor. A large sample of community opinion is obtained through surveys and other feedback mechanisms and this assists the investigation team to evaluate the framework.

- Bruce from Pinjarra Hills raised the point that there are a lot of local area issues around Toowong and Moggill Road that need to be addressed. He

noted that these issues should not be lost in this study.

6) **Date for next meeting**

- The next meeting will be a workshop involving both the south and north groups. It is scheduled for Saturday 5 April 2008.
- Meeting closed 9.30pm.