

## MINUTES

### Burrill Lake Co-Design Committee - Meeting Five

Date	9 November 2021		
Time	6pm – 9:24pm		
Venue	Microsoft Teams		
Chairperson	Julian Watson (JW), Transport for NSW (Transport)		
Committee Members	Andrew Destry	AD	Transport
	Julie Lacy	JL	Transport
	Scott Wells	SW	Shoalhaven City Council
	Peter Johnston	PJ	Shoalhaven City Council
	Ian Carroll	IC	Burrill Lake Community Association
	Paul Mitchell	PM	Ulladulla & Districts Community Forum
	Barrie Wilford	BW	Milton Ulladulla Historical Society
	David Swarts	DS	Lake Tabourie Ratepayers and Residents Association
	Cheryl McMahon	CMc	Resident
	Richard McLoughlin	RMc	Resident
	Ron Cox	RC	Resident
	Simone Chee	SC	Resident and business owner
	Kirra Dowling	KD	Resident and business owner
Additional attendees	Tricia Wunsch	TW	KJA – Lead facilitator
	Veronica Kooyman	VK	KJA – Facilitation and Secretariat Support
	Nicky Sutherland	NSu	KJA - Secretariat
	Nicole Stevenson	NS	Transport – Subject Matter Expert
	Sarah Webb	SW	Transport – Subject Matter Expert
	Scott Ferguson	SF	Transport – Subject Matter Expert
	Jamie Caldwell	JC	Transport - Emergency Management – Subject Matter Expert
	Con Tsitsos	CT	Transport – Noise – Subject Matter Expert
Apologies	Niree Creed	NC	Lions Club and Farmers at Burrill Markets

These minutes are a summary of the Committee's discussions with no reference to any specific characteristics of the alignments under review, which Transport deems to be currently confidential. The community will be provided with a detailed report at the conclusion of the Co-Design process, including the Committee's recommendations.

Ian Carroll and Ron Cox do not support these minutes and are of the view that they are not a true and correct record of the meeting and not in accordance with the Terms of Reference for this committee.

Transport is committed to providing timely and transparent information to the wider community as soon as outcomes are known. At the end of the Co-Design process, the wider community will be provided with a detailed report, including the Committee's recommendations and Transport's preferred option.

At times, Transport may be required to remove some details of discussions, including features or alignments of unconfirmed options. Transport does this to ensure any unconfirmed option with potential impacts to the surrounding community does not create unnecessary concern. Transport recognises the proposed highway upgrades will have impacts on surrounding communities and they are committed to minimising concerns as much as possible. This requires them to be careful and considerate, and ensure only feasible options are presented to the wider community.

Throughout a project's development, Transport will regularly consult with targeted stakeholders and these discussions may also remain confidential until a feasible or recommended option is identified.

<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome – Julian Watson</b>
1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting open and welcome</li> <li>• Acknowledgment of Country</li> </ul>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Meeting agenda, actions and Committee correspondence – Tricia Wunsch (Facilitator)</b>
2.1	<p>The facilitator outlined the agenda for the meeting and confirmed the meeting would run to time.</p> <p>The facilitator confirmed Transport is now permitted to hold face to face meetings and identified a suitable venue for the final Committee meeting to ensure adherence to COVID safe guidelines. Two Committee members will need to dial in.</p> <p>The Committee were informed Andrew Destry and other members of the project team would be attending Burrill Lake next week and are available for informal discussions and site tour.</p> <p>The facilitator thanked the Committee for their comments on Meeting Three minutes and noted that Meeting Four minutes were distributed to the Committee the previous day with feedback due by Monday 15 November.</p> <p>A review of the actions from Meeting Three was provided.</p>
2.2	<p>The Committee was invited to ask questions. The following topics and concerns were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Committee member asked if the Committee will be able to review the Meeting Three minutes after Committee comments had been incorporated and be given an opportunity to dispute the final minutes. The facilitator confirmed they will see the final minutes and if Committee members did not agree, the disclaimer assigned to Meeting Two minutes could be included.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Committee member questioned if Transport owns property south of the Burrill Lake bridge and Transport agreed to provide details of any property ownership.</li> <li>• A Committee member questioned how follow up comments to Transport's responses in the correspondence log would be addressed. The Facilitator confirmed any comments will be included in the subsequent correspondence log.</li> <li>• A Committee member queried what will happen with the correspondence log at the end of this process and asked if it will be made public. It was noted by Transport and the Facilitator that this wasn't the intention of the correspondence log but they would take the question on notice.</li> </ul>
2.3	<p><b>Actions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport to provide details of any property owned south of the Burrill Lake bridge</li> <li>• Transport to advise what will happen to the correspondence log after the Co-Design process has been finalised</li> <li>• Transport advised they will provide a formal response to a Notice of Dispute received from selected Committee members by Friday 12 November.</li> </ul>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Bushfire and emergency services network resilience – Jamie Caldwell</b>
3.1	<p>Jamie Caldwell is Senior Manager, Emergency Management from Transport. He presented a high level overview of the functions of his team and how the transport network responds in emergency situations. He touched on the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outline of the emergency management team's role in responding to emergencies and his previous experience in managing disruptions to the transport network</li> <li>• Methodology and arrangement used by Transport when dealing with incident and emergency management and disruptions, and the benefits and constraints of each option</li> <li>• More options for keeping the network moving around the disruption and ways in which they support the emergency services and managing the consequences of incidences</li> <li>• Looking at options to increase the network resilience to hazards and incidences. Factors to consider include; space for contraflow arrangements, using hard shoulders, secondary networks (local roads), future proofing the network to be better prepared, clear road reserves, and large road shoulders to be better prepared for emergency situations.</li> <li>• Acknowledged that he was not involved in the preparation and review of options as presented to the Committee, and therefore did not have a detailed understanding of the components, but welcomed questions from the Committee</li> </ul>
3.2	<p>Jamie Caldwell invited the Committee to ask questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Committee member asked if Transport prefers to leave local roads in place and divert traffic to the bypass in the case of an emergency. Transport responded that their incident response planning and the broader emergency management plans take a holistic approach to the entire network and both State and local roads are utilised to create community resilience.</li> <li>• A question was raised as to whether there was a view on which of the proposed options for the highway upgrade at Burrill Lake would respond better</li> </ul>

	<p>during an emergency. Transport responded the two options that include a new bridge were preferable. New assets (additional bridge at Burrill Lake) to the network delivers greater resilience as they provide greater opportunity for contraflow and other incident response methods. It was noted that the scope of the Committee represents three to four kilometres of the network, and Transport looks at network resilience from a holistic viewpoint.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Committee member commented it would be beneficial if the proposed options had been assessed for their resilience and presented to the Committee to assist with their assessment.</li> </ul>
3.3	<p><b>Actions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport to provide advice for emergency management resilience specific to each option. This detail to be provided in the coming days.</li> </ul>
4.	<p><b>Noise impacts – Con Tsitsos, Senior Environment Officer (Noise), Transport for NSW</b></p>
4.1	<p>Con Tsitsos, Senior Manager, Environment and Sustainability is from Transport for NSW.</p> <p>Transport presented the following topics to the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An explanation about how increases to the volume and speed of traffic impacts on decibel level. He also explained the impact by decibel rating on noise levels and what this translates to for nearby residents (how much louder this is perceived as).</li> <li>• A map was presented outlining the potential noise impacts for each option. It was noted that the decibel ratings mapped did not include any considerations such as topography or mitigations that could be considered such as noise barriers. To that effect, all figures had been overstated and were worst case scenarios.</li> <li>• Impacts of engine brake noise (which is already experienced in Burrill Lake). Trucks moving through a free flowing alignment reduces engine brake noise.</li> <li>• Maintaining existing speed and the existing bridge has a minimal impact on decibel levels but the existing issues with engine braking at roundabouts would remain. In addition, the southern intersection for the Milton Ulladulla bypass may create additional noise at the northern end of Burrill Lake.</li> <li>• Noise mitigation methods for future consideration include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Design of the road e.g. alignment and cut-ins for roads;</li> <li>○ Noise barriers, noise mounds, architectural treatments, low noise pavements and road design;</li> <li>○ Architectural treatments for houses including upgrading windows and door perimeter seals;</li> <li>○ Noise impacts under or near a bridge – the design can assist creating a barrier effect.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Questions are also asked about electric vehicles and their generation of noise when comparing traveling at lower and higher speeds. Transport responded that at speeds between zero and 60 kilometres per hour, electric vehicles have a lower noise impact due to the quieter engines. When reaching speeds of 70 kilometres per hour and higher, tyre noise becomes the greater noise generator and there is no difference between electric and 'regular' vehicles. It was also noted that an increased in the use of electric heavy vehicles would result in lower noise levels, in the longer term.</li> <li>• Transport advised the information presented was a preliminary analysis, and did not take some specific factors into consideration such as topography, noise</li> </ul>

	absorption, and other influential factors. Typically, detailed noise modelling is undertaken once a preferred option is selected.
4.2	<p>The Committee was invited to ask questions. The following topics and concerns were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option 1: A Committee member asked about the impacts to the north eastern part of the road which had not been shown. Transport advised the alignment had been moved away from the existing highway and therefore the decibels would decrease in some locations and would potentially increase on the western side.</li> <li>• Option 2: A question was raised about the speed environment of the proposed Milton Ulladulla bypass (MUb). Transport advised it expects the bypass to be a 100 kilometre per hour speed environment, with a reduction to 80 kilometres per hour as the bypass connects with Burrill Lake at the northern end.</li> <li>• Option 3: A question was raised as to how the area adjacent to a new local access road saw no increase in decibels. Transport advised the local road would see no truck movements, however, pointed out that houses immediately facing the highway may experience small increases in noise. Transport also agreed to add potential noise impacts to the material provided to Committee members for assessment.</li> <li>• A Committee member asked if there are criteria for acceptable noise increases. Transport advised criteria is decided by the Environment Protection Agency (EPA). An example of criteria was provided which noted that anything above a two decibel increase to acceptable levels (in this example, 60 decibels for daytime and 55 decibels during the night), would require consideration of mitigation options.</li> <li>• A question was asked if there is a plan to conduct noise monitoring to assess current levels. Transport advised that once a preferred option has been identified, in the next stage of design development, further studies including noise monitoring and modelling and traffic counts will be carried out to inform a calibrated model to predict potential noise impacts.</li> <li>• A Committee member commented on existing noise heard by local residents as heavy vehicles approach the roundabout. The noise impact is significant and local residents would welcome options that removed roundabouts on the highway to decrease noise. This comment was noted by Transport.</li> <li>• A Committee member requested Transport share noise estimates for the areas shown on the maps surrounding the existing roundabouts. Transport responded it is difficult to correctly quantify the noise levels in these areas. Transport also commented that noise levels vary depending on factors such as exhaust systems, and brake types and age.</li> <li>• A Committee member asked what level of noise reduction can be achieved by using cuttings within the design. Transport advised that cuttings can result in a reduction of noise, however, there are many variables to consider during the design phase.</li> <li>• A request was made for noise studies undertaken during the design of the Burrill Lake Bridge to be provided to the Committee, and Transport agreed to provide these reports.</li> <li>• A Committee member asked if noise frequency impacts the results of noise mitigations strategies such as installing noise barriers. It was noted that noise barriers are more effective with mid and high frequencies and noise barriers are less effective at reducing noise generated by heavy vehicle braking. In the longer term, compression braking should see new technologies coming into the market in Australia, improving the negative impacts of engine brake noise.</li> </ul>

4.3	<p><b>Actions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport to provide with Committee with the presentation with updated information to incorporate feedback from the Committee and basic design elements of the options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Potential noise impacts for properties on the north eastern side of the Princes Highway</li> <li>○ Updating decibel estimates to reflect cuttings and other topography</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Transport to provide the noise studies undertaken during the design of the Burrill Lake Bridge.</li> <li>• Burrill Lake Bridge – Review of Environmental Factors (REF) documentation, including Appendix G – Noise and Vibration Assessment can be downloaded from Transport’s webpage: <a href="https://roads-waterways.transport.nsw.gov.au/projects/burrill-lake-crossing/project-documents.html">https://roads-waterways.transport.nsw.gov.au/projects/burrill-lake-crossing/project-documents.html</a></li> </ul>
5.	<b>Dinner break</b>
6.	<b>Presentation of any outstanding Committee options – Andrew Destry</b>
6.1	Andrew Destry (Transport) discussed the options to be considered during this Co-Design process, including traffic modelling.
6.2	<p>The Committee was invited to ask questions throughout the presentations. The following topics and concerns were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Committee member enquired about details for the MUB intersection treatments (grade separation and/or roundabouts) to assist the Committee in assessing the options. Transport advised that planning for MUB is in the design phase and details are not yet confirmed. Once confirmed, this information will be provided to the wider community.</li> <li>• At a Committee member’s request, Transport explained the term ‘grade separation’ as it refers to the road level at an intersection. ‘At grade’ describes the connection points at an intersection being all at one level. ‘Grade separation’ introduces a second level or grade, separating the main traffic from the intersection. A grade separated intersection treatment generally reduces friction and conflict points leading to better traffic performance (than other types of intersections). Examples of an ‘at grade’ intersection were given as a roundabout, and ‘grade separated’ as a typical interchange.</li> <li>• A question about the viability of options that may include potential land acquisition of high dollar value. Transport acknowledged some options may require more investment than others, and that process involved in potential property acquisitions can have an impact on project planning and once a preferred option is identified for the Princes Highway upgrade at Burrill Lake, Transport will continue its planning of the project, and any property acquisition costs will need to be included in the funding proposal.</li> <li>• A Committee member enquired if the property buffer zones will be included in the maps being provided in the final assessment documentation. Transport confirmed this would be the case.</li> <li>• It was noted by a Committee member that the intent of a variation to an option had not been translated as intended. Transport agreed to discuss this with the individual Committee member to ensure to the option is correctly amended for re-presentation to the Committee.</li> <li>• Discussion about an option that may result in some of the shops on the north side of Burrill Lake Bridge being moved to the south side prompted queries</li> </ul>

	including how replacement of shops would be funded. Transport stated it could not confirm the specifics of any arrangements at this stage. However, it would seem likely the land would require rezoning and any development would then be sold on the open market.
	<p><b>Actions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport to check the traffic data presented and confirm the information for one of the options is correct.</li> <li>• Transport to contact the relevant Committee member to refine the intent and design of the variation put forward.</li> </ul>
<b>7</b>	<b>Options to be carried forward for assessment</b>
7.1	Transport had intended to ask the Committee if they wanted to shortlist the options to take forward for final assessment at the last Committee meeting on 23 November. However, during meeting five, actions were taken for Transport to provide additional information on emergency management and noise impacts for the proposed alignments. At this point the Committee did not have all the information required to shortlist. Transport will update the details, and will provide the Committee with an updated information pack for shortlisting of options.
7.2	<p>The discussion prompted questions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A request for Transport to provide level / section information in the assessment pack to enable the Committee to understand height impacts for walls / barriers / retaining walls etc. Transport confirmed this will be included in the final packs and it will include the instructions on how to read cross sections.</li> <li>• Some Committee members expressed concern about their ability to shortlist and assess option and suggested the Committee meet (outside a Committee meeting) to discuss.</li> <li>• Transport asked the Committee if it would be beneficial for Transport to provide an opinion on the shortlist of options for assessment. A Committee member expressed that Transport should disclose their opinion on options for shortlisting. Transport highlighted that there are a number of factors to consider when assessing the option, including cost, and suggested the Committee assess options for the benefit of the wider community of Burrill Lake.</li> <li>• It was agreed that the Committee needs the final assessment pack before shortlisting can occur.</li> </ul>
7.3	<p><b>Actions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members of the Transport project team will attend Burrill Lake in the coming week, providing Committee members with the opportunity to walk the study area and ask questions in an informal environment. Transport will advise those arrangements in the coming days.</li> <li>• Transport will consider how to seek feedback from the Committee around shortlisting the options, taking the Committee's views into account.</li> <li>• Transport to advise when the assessment pack will be available by the morning of Thursday 11 November.</li> </ul>
<b>8</b>	<b>Clarification of assessment criteria – Andrew Destry &amp; Julian Watson</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of the assessment criteria and opportunity for any further questions or discussion</li> </ul>
8.1	The meeting ran out of time for this agenda item to be presented in full, however discussions from the previous item moved into the method of assessment, in particular the scoring of options. Transport and the Facilitator reconfirmed that the assessment of options is subjective and should reflect the different views of the Committee. It is not the intention to simply quantify a result and the Committee will have the opportunity to also discuss the qualitative aspects of their assessment for the preferred option.
<b>9</b>	<b>Next steps and meeting close</b>
8.3	The Chair thanked everyone for their participation and closed the meeting at 9.24pm.