MEETING SUMMARY

1.  WELCOME, MEETING PURPOSE AND PROCESS
Linton Pike (workshop facilitator) welcomed participants to the meeting, outlined the process and explained that the meeting purpose was to:
   • Provide a project update; and
   • Consider key discussion topics from earlier meetings.
The meeting agenda is provided at Attachment One.
A list of meeting participants and apologies is provided at Attachment Two.

2.  PREVIOUS MINUTES AND ACTIONS ARISING
Comment was invited on the minutes of the previous CRG Meeting.
   • No changes were requested.

The following actions arising from the previous meeting were reported:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Identified at 2/12/13 Meeting</th>
<th>Response at 10 February 2014 Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Park Excision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The process will be developed by MRWA with this group informed along the way;</td>
<td>• Chris to address later in this meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It will be progressed in a timely manner;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some lots under private ownership are under ongoing negotiation; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Future updates at subsequent meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION: Kugan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Walkways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Regional Park is a significant recreational area and the movements through the area need to be understood;</td>
<td>• To be addressed by Paul later this evening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We will conduct a workshop session at a future CRG meeting to consider this;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION: Linton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Dickie Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I would like a better understanding of the impacts during construction - noise, parking areas, plant access, haulage routes, works areas.</td>
<td>• Some will be covered tonight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chris explained that documents will cover that to minimise impacts and CRG input to the contractor can result with input to the clauses at a future meeting.</td>
<td>• Other information closer to SWTC for inclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION: Chris</td>
<td>• This will come back to this group progressively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Hassett Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider noise screening at Hester Avenue please. Chris Raykos explained that Main Roads’ noise policy focuses on the area immediately adjoining the freeway only with minimal attenuation applied to open space and intersecting local roads.</td>
<td>• To be addressed later in this meeting by Paul.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Paul Fisher to consider length, height and extent to inform the SWTC. Once appointed the Contractor will be required to complete their own assessment as part of the detailed design with SRG part of the design review process.</td>
<td>• MRWA will be consistent with current policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION: Paul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. PROJECT UPDATE
Chris Raykos, Main Roads WA, provided a brief project update noting the following.

Concept Design/Traffic Studies:
- Concept design for the road and structures is complete.
- Noise modelling has been completed. GHD will present noise wall requirements (minimum heights) and their locations to the group today.

Geotechnical Investigation:
- Stage 1 to Hester completed…reports being finalised.
- Geotech Reports for inclusion in SWTC.
- Stage 2 to Romeo to follow…not critical.

Environmental Studies:
- Level 2 Flora (Spring) Survey almost complete.
- Level 2 Fauna study including Fauna Movement Study has been completed.
- Meeting end-February to discuss the final Fauna Movement Study Report and fauna management measures.

Federal Approval Under EPBC Act
- Federal referral to Department of the Environment (DotE) under the EPBC Act was submitted on 6 December 2013.
- Arrangements are in place to secure offset land. This is in addition to the offset land that was set aside during MRS amendments. A map indicating the offset land was sent to CRG members January 2014.
- Federal Referral outcome has been received. The Project is to be assessed by preliminary documentation.
- Conditions to be set….offsets….include in EMP.

State Approval
- Neerabup Road referral for deferred factors (under Section 38 of Environmental Protection Act) – Concept Plan, Park Management Plan, Fauna Movement Study and outcome of the Spring Survey. Also the framework for various Management Plans covered under Ministerial Statement 629 as part of the referral document (Vegetation and Fauna Management Plan, Construction Management Plan).
- A discussion with local environmental groups is required prior to Environmental Protection Authority (State) referral which is anticipated February 2014 after receiving the Fauna Movement Study Report.
- It is expected to submit the State referral in March 2014.

Quarry Access Road
- BCG quarry SE quadrant of Mitchell Fwy/Hester Ave interchange.
- Access to the BGC quarry falls within the Hester Avenue road reserve…interferes with Hester Avenue duplication.
- Main Roads has commenced discussions with the relevant stakeholders on relocating the current access road where it interferes with the Freeway/Hester Avenue works.
- Relocation of access will involve environmental approval requirements.
Land Acquisition/Environmental Offset

- A map indicating the location of the environmental offset land (for both the Mitchell Fwy Extension and the extension of the railway line) was sent to CRG members in January 2014.
- Two lots to be purchased however the land is securely set aside for incorporation into Neerabup National Park and will not affect the progress of the Project.
- Main Roads is keen to finalise the purchase of these lots to close off this outstanding issue.

For Inclusion in the SWTC/Project Deed

- Communication and Consultation Strategy – provided to the Group for review and comment (copy of the Strategy provided at Attachment Three).
- Landscape Strategy – to be developed by GHD. The CRG will be asked to contribute to the finalisation of the Strategy.
- Public Art Strategy – A Public Art-Coordinator will engage with Main Roads, key stakeholders and the CRG to develop an Artist Brief that will go to public tender to secure an Artist to develop the artwork. The CRG will be asked to contribute in the development of the Brief and assist the selected Artist in finalising the artwork…subject to internal approvals.

Chris concluded noting that:

- The project is progressing well generally and we hope to call for Expressions of Interest (EOI) during April. This will allow us to progress to formal Request for Proposal in August 2014 and subsequent award early 2015. This would see design works commencing after award of the delivery contract (Design and Construct contract), construction commencing early 2016 and completed by the end of 2017;
- MRWA will not be seeking Public Environmental Review and this is supported by the federal environmental assessment;
- We will form an Environmental Working Group soon to discuss relevant matters and to assist in the preparation of the referral including Fauna Movement. The referral is likely to be lodged in April 2014;
- BGC quarry access in Hester Avenue road reserve needs to be resolved with some land take required to resolve this with some local area environmental impacts;
- The proposed land offsets were presented to the previous meeting. Two lots are required with negotiation progressing with affected landowners;
- Comment on the proposed Consultation Strategy is welcomed for inclusion as an important project document;
- The Landscaping Strategy has progressed and is consistent with earlier stages with CRG input included;
- Public art inclusions will be made to an agreed and appropriate budget within reason with CRG input during design when the public artist is appointed;
- Other Scope of Work and Technical Criteria (SWTC) matters include:
  - Extent of consultation;
  - How many meetings;
  - Design review process; and
  - Clearing measures – possibly including ground truthing with CRG input.
- The SWTC is not required until August 2014 at RFP stage.
The following actions arising from the previous meeting were reported:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Identified at 2/12/13 Meeting</th>
<th>Response at 10 February 2014 Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Is it likely that the Marmion Ave and Hester Avenue slip roads have created potential for rear end crashes with limited sight/stopping distance?  
- MRWA hasn’t seen the current configuration and will take this up with the relevant LGA’s.  
- Chris Raykos to follow up if necessary. | ACTION: Chris |
| Rocks have been placed at trees to protect them at the 10th Light Horse parking bay. There is nowhere for trucks to pull off as a result. Can we provide somewhere for them to do so.  
- MRWA to follow up with CoW. | ACTION: Kugan |
| Where are the land offsets for the project?  
As part of the MRS amendment land was set aside for various project inclusions – road and rail, etc.  
- We are trying to get additional land possibly near Gingin for Cockatoo habitat.  
- Kugan to provide information to David Wake, Steve, Tim, Hayden and Thomas. | ACTION: Kugan |
| Can we create a wetland component as part of the drainage solution?  
- Drainage basins are required. We didn’t consider it as part of the drainage strategy with a conventional solution proposed. Local ingress with revegetation would probably result. We will retain as an idea for the future subject to drainage viability. Paul to review indicative numbers. | ACTION: Paul |

Questions arising from this session are summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>What form would the public art inclusions take?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The public art inclusions can be diverse and influenced by this group. It is project dependent and may include abutment wall and/or noise wall patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Could we involve ECU’s Art Department to contribute to the public art component? Maybe we could use existing templates or resources from other projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>MRWA’s public art component is currently delivered via an existing panel contract arrangement and it is unlikely that this would change but it will be considered. ACTION: Chris to consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Were the Joondalup Lakeside artwork done by MRWA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>No, it wasn’t done by MRWA. Our normal approach is to appoint a public artist to present some ideas for review by this group with CRG ownership sought. The chosen public art must complement and be consistent with the local area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Can we really influence clearing lines in ground truthing or other processes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>MRWA takes it seriously and trees close to clearing lines will be protected if possible. Those in the middle of the freeway will be removed. We also consider tree root impacts and seek to protect trees where possible and understand the impacts of tree removal on the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Were the two project lots purchased as a cost to project or separate?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A  We are seeking separate funding via Treasury if possible.  If funding is not available it must come from the existing budget.

4.  TRAFFIC STUDY UPDATE AND KEY PROCESSES
Paul Fisher, GHD presented the traffic study update noting the following:

The traffic modelling process is explained below.

**Modelling process**

- Regional Model – Land use & network
- Calibrate – Traffic counts
- Analyse - Sidra
- Options – Intersection improvements
- Report – 600+ pages

**2021 Freeway extended to Hester - Improvement options**

Options for improving traffic at the intersection of Hester/Connolly are shown below. Each possible solution shown in the left hand column has been assessed as either:

- No – not suitable;
- Maybe – Potentially suitable; or
- Yes – suitable for this intersection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>2021 AM</th>
<th>2021 PM</th>
<th>2031 AM</th>
<th>2031 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing intersection</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn slip</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metering</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn slip + Metering</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiral</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiral (three lanes westbound)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiral + Metering (3 lanes westbound)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic signals (with left turn slip)</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic signals (with two left turn lanes)</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some are shown diagrammatically over the page.
Questions arising from this session are summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>A lot of assumptions are made in the traffic forecasting eg 3.5% growth could be more. How do we deal with that?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The MRWA ROM model is a metropolitan wide model. A sensitivity test could be done to test a few “what ifs?” with population limits in the area with an effectively “capped” population. We are fairly confident that the forecast volumes are about right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Are there forecasts for 2017 when it is due for completion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2021 is 7 years away and only four years after opening as good base line. The ROM has figures for 2016, 2021 and 2031 only. It is unlikely that any major change would result between 2017 and 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>There are a number of conditional statements with regard to other local road interventions eg Marmion Avenue and others. Are these committed? Will there be a consolidating strategy for subsequent strategies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>No, there is no commitment to other subsequent interventions and investment is required. The consolidating strategy is an issue for State and Local Government to address. Available solutions will be considered at the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Does the study look at all modes of transport including non-vehicle, commercial, single occupant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>We categorise the forecasting for light and heavy (&gt;8t) vehicle categorisation. We need a minimalist network that encourages the desired behaviours and effective transport. High occupancy vehicles, on shoulder running, ramp metering, ITS and other supply side measures are also available. The scope of this project is fixed and the items above are part of the broader network planning undertaken by the Department of Transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>In the last project the studies showed capacity to 2031 around Burns Beach Road and other links and it is already struggling. A multi factored approach is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Various road links come under pressure at different times and will suffer a level of congestion under peak load. This includes Burns Beach Road and other links. We do not take a “predict and provide” approach with constant building of new roads and lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>We need to encourage alternative travel behaviours such as cycling with greater provision of the supporting facilities and infrastructure to use public transport in a holistic solution. Cycling, high occupancy vehicles, bus transfer stations, improved public transport and other mechanisms to promote integration as a sustainable solutions is needed. A small group to investigate options beyond the scope of this project would be welcomed with specialist input and involvement of the key players provided it does not put this project at risk and should be dealt with as a separate initiative. Changes to behaviour will be difficult to deliver.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We are in the project delivery stage now with a Business Case funded for $300M. Things such as the inclusion of a veloway go beyond the scope of this project, as funded, and need sound justification on a whole of network planning level. The project team and the CRG will support an initiative of this type.

**ACTION:** Chris

The following actions arising from the previous meeting were reported:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Identified at 2/12/13 Meeting</th>
<th>Response at 10 February 2014 Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Hester/Connolly</td>
<td>• Addressed above by Paul Fisher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Enormous 4 way intersection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Spiral roundabout with metering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to slow movement to allow others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to occur - 3 lanes from Hester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similar to Mandurah.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Connolly will become 4 lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dual carriageway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The cycle lane ends and should</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continue through the roundabout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a detailed design consideration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pedestrians and cyclists can't cross now at this intersection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A proper bike transfer station at railway stations would help.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o MRWA to consider as a design and policy issue that reflects the realities for traffic volumes - pedestrians and cyclists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTION:</strong> Chris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will bus rerouting occur with modified train stations? This also applies to cycling transfer stations.

• It is a consideration to be addressed as the design progresses.

**ACTION:** Chris

**5. NOISE MODELLING UPDATE**

Paul Fisher, GHD presented noise modelling update noting that:

![Noise Modelling Process Diagram]

**Noise targets / noise limits**

State Planning Policy 5.4 - a whole of Government approach to managing noise from transportation sources.

Policy requires:

• Mitigation to achieve **LIMITS** must be **INSTALLED**
• Mitigation to achieve **TARGETS** must be **CONSIDERED**
Outdoor noise criteria, dBA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of day</th>
<th>Noise limit LA Eq</th>
<th>Noise target LA Eq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day (6.00 am to 10.00 pm)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night (10.00 pm to 6.00 am)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noise Contours

- 2013 Noise Contours
- 2031 Noise Contours – No Freeway
- 2031 Noise Contours – no mitigation
- 2031 Noise Contours – mitigation to limits

Noise Mitigation

Mitigation options

- **Road surface**
  - Freeway: Open graded asphalt
    - 2.5 to 5.5 dBA reduction
  - Other roads: Dense graded asphalt

- **Noise Walls / barriers**
  - On boundary, near carriageway or both
    - Up to 4.8m high
Paul also noted that:

- GHD’s Traffic Report has been lodged and the Noise Report is at draft stage with preliminary information presented;
- Noise limits must be achieved and we will consider the best way to achieve the targets;
- A 3dB increase in noise levels effectively doubles the noise level. A 5dB reduction target is challenging and requires extremely high walls;
- The red lines on the mapping shows noise levels greater than 55dBA;
- The numbered rectangles show receptor locations or data points where we have placed monitors;
- Houses along the freeway will not exceed 55dBA at 2031;
- Other side roads revert to close to 2013 levels;
- South of Burns Beach Road the wall heights will increase in some areas; and
- At a future CRG meeting we will seek feedback as to preferences. A timely response will be needed to maintain agreed timelines. The wall will be painted to an agreed palette.

Questions arising from this session are summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Is train noise considered as well as part of the noise modelling?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>It is included in the modelling but is an intermittent and relatively short period of impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Are there other noise attenuation options such as bunds or lowering of the road?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bunds are an option but space hungry and increase the project footprint. The vertical geometry is set by the level of the railway line and tie ins to intersections and bridges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Will a noise wall be provided where open space abuts the freeway reserve?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A | No, it will extend far enough to achieve noise targets for sensitive area targets.

Q | Will the noise walls be provided along the PSP?

A | The concept design indicates that noise walls will be placed along property boundaries (this may change as part of detailed design) for a number of reasons:
- They are effective;
- Walls on the PSP create a closed area with potential security and anti-social problems at the rear of houses;
- Emergency access to these spaces becomes problematic; and
- Walls on the PSP become a maintenance issue with access a problem.

Q | Are the noise receptors placed inside or outside of houses?

A | They are placed outside.

Q | What traffic modelling was completed?

A | Modelling was completed for 2031 forecasts. The traffic report is comprehensive and is a public document.

Q | Is double glazing an option?

A | The noise targets are set for outside conditions at the nearby buildings as a condition of approval. Residents may choose to install double glazing as a measure of their own to further attenuate inside noise levels.

Q | Is it ever necessary to increase the wall heights after the completion of works?

A | Yes, in some cases but rarely and aesthetics are important too and for that reason we go with noise heights that are supported by the modelling.

Q | Once painted who maintains the noise walls after construction?

A | The owner maintains the wall on the residential side. MRWA maintains the freeway reserve side.

6. KEY INTERSECTION TREATMENTS

Kugan Kugananthan explained the possible treatments for key intersections of local roads in the area. Kugan noted that:
- The information to be presented tonight is provided for information only with lots of challenges remaining to be addressed; and
- The intersection of Murdoch Drive and South Street is a good example of the type of solutions that may result if people would like to see a potentially similar treatment.

The intersection treatments are shown on the following pages.
6.1 Marmion Avenue and Hester Avenue Intersection

Works by City of Wanneroo are currently nearing completion. The peak load signals are yet to be completed.

Other discussion noted that:
- There is no funding for peak load signals. This will be sought from MRWA by LG; and assumes the freeway is eventually extended to Romeo Road.
6.2 Wanneroo Road and Hester Avenue Intersection
The work has been completed. Further improvement will take place when Hester Ave is duplicated as part of the Mitchell Freeway Extension works. This will be based on the outcome of the traffic studies.

Configuration required for 2021; no change required in 2031

The possibility of installing a roundabout was discussed and noted and potentially marginally cheaper but more space hungry and not good for pedestrians.
6.3 Anchorage Drive, Marmion Avenue and Neerabup Road Intersection
A new intersection is being constructed further south (approx. 300m) of the roundabout along Marmion Ave. City of Wanneroo is currently investigating the impact at the roundabout.

Connectivity for cyclists is available “at grade” or as a vehicle in the traffic lanes.
6.4  **Marmion Avenue and Edinburgh Avenue Intersection**  
Delineators/rubber rumble strips have been installed and final draft report completed for the safety initiative taken. City of Joondalup is currently monitoring.

6.5  **Burns Beach road and Connolly Drive Intersection**

Discussion noted that:
- Metering or lights required.
- Traffic reduction will result.
- This becoming a LG priority.
The lane metering report is done and has been forwarded to MRWA. It is proposed for Black Spot funding in 2015/2016.

**6.6 Burns Beach Road and Sunlander Drive Intersection**

City of Joondalup is currently investigating the options. Data collection of traffic movements is proposed to take place.

Discussion noted that:
- It may be best to close the right turn and use the roundabout further along Burns Beach road for this vehicle movement;
- When the freeway extends it may be an option; and
- Sight distance is limited with median obstacles a problem.
6.7 Burns Beach Road / Mitchell Freeway Intersection
This work has been completed. No further action is required.

Discussion noted that the left turn into Burns Beach Road from the freeway is a problem currently.

6.8 Burns Beach Road / Joondalup Drive Intersection
The line marking allows one dedicated left lane and shared left turn and right turn to allow both movements. The traffic studies indicate that the roundabout is currently working satisfactorily. Long term solution is to include a additional left slip from Burns Beach Road to Joondalup Drive north.
6.9 Wanneroo Road / Joondalup Drive
City of Wanneroo is yet to commence investigation.

Intersection configuration 2031
Consider network changes and grade separation OR widen Joondalup Drive, Wanneroo Road to four lanes in each direction and provide additional turning lanes
6.10 Wanneroo Rd from Joondalup Dve to Hall Rd
One of the improvements currently underway is relocating Flynn Drive intersection with Wanneroo Road.

6.11 Marmion Avenue / Burns Beach Road
Other discussion noted that:

**Wanneroo Road / Flynn Drive**
- Council approved tender and award soon and will be signalised in the new location.

**Hester Avenue / Connolly Drive**
- Add lane from east and two right turn lanes and slip lane;
- We can widen in or outside to keep separation and for drainage;
- It could be metered in the long term;
- Pedestrian and cycle crossings required and looking for best solutions;
- Lots of vehicles and conflict points;
- Schools to the south will also use this with increased numbers;
- This will manage the resultant traffic volumes forecast to reflect the greatest movements; and
- This treatment will be finished before the freeway.

Questions arising from this session are summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much of these works is funded by this project?</td>
<td>None and we are pressing for other funding sources for these initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has allowance been made for daily student movements with around 3,500 students in this area?</td>
<td>The traffic counts collect the associated vehicle movements for all local destinations. Pedestrian movements will be considered in due course and prior to award of the major contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we encourage greater use of Shenton Ave instead of Burns Beach Road?</td>
<td>The traffic will find the best routes over time and establish a point of equilibrium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the intersection of Connolly and Hester Avenue intersection be finished before the freeway works?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>What about Ridgewood Boulevard volumes as an existing rat run.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>We don't provide a median break to address it and it is the same on the BP Service Station site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **PSP PROVISIONS – LOCATION AND CONNECTIVITY**

Paul Fisher, explained the proposed PSP provisions to be included as part of these works using the following diagrams:
Paul noted that:
- The PSP will commence from the Currambine Station link;
- It will pass over Burns Beach Road via a dedicated pedestrian and cycling bridge;
- The first link will be provided near Water Authority;
- No detailed connections pending Structure Plans at northern extremity of houses;
- The PSP passes under Neerabup Road with links up to Neerabup Road;
- A station entry path and suburban link will be required;
- Two links to suburbs will be provided south of Hester Avenue; and
- A shared path will be provided along Neerabup Road.

Questions arising from this session are summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Is there potential for overlooking to result from the footbridge at Burns Beach Road?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes, with an underpass considered but discounted as it resulted in an extremely long tunnel due to topography. Detailed design will assess sight line and a screen wall on the structure or other option possible. A concept design of the screening structures will be provided to this group for comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Tim Argus raised concern that the cycling link is convoluted and requires further thought and should match what is provided on the freeway for cars and trucks.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The grade is 3% maximum grade which is the same as the freeway. It is straight and direct with some more difficult configuration at intersections. A Veloway will not be included in this project but will be presented to MRWA planning group for their consideration for future projects. It is a planning consideration with potential delays to pursue an option of this type. More information is required to provide a basis for discussion as a DoT issue with Tim’s input.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTION:** Chris

8. **KEY RECREATIONAL WALKWAYS – PROCESS TO COMPLETION**

Paul Fisher explained that:
- Key recreational links through the National Park have implications for fauna underpass locations. DPaW and MRWA have completed work to count kangaroo movements through the area. This identified a preference to ridges and high lands. Topography suits lower lying land;
- Raising the road to provide smaller underpasses is possible but expensive;
- It may be possible to divert some walk trails by 50 or so metres to establish an archway solution. A separate meeting will be established to consider this further.

9. **PRIORITY ACTIONS AND NEXT STEPS**

The next meeting is scheduled for late April/early May 2014 to be confirmed when more information is available. Next steps include:
- The establishment of a number of working groups to consider the environment, alternative transport modes, walk trails and fauna movements;
- Comment on the Communications Strategy (provided at Attachment Three) is welcomed via Linton.

Linton thanked CRG members and the workshop closed at 8:35pm.
ATTACHMENT ONE
MITCHELL FREEWAY EXTENSION - BURNS BEACH ROAD TO HESTER AVENUE
COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP
AGENDA CRG MEETING #4

Mitchell Freeway Extension: Burns Beach Road to Hester Avenue
Community Reference Group Meeting #4

Venue: Joondalup Reception Centre, 102 Boas Avenue, Joondalup
Date: Monday 10th February 2014
Arrival time: 5:45pm for 6:00pm start

Meeting Coordinated by: Don Scott, Community Relations Representative and Estill and Associates
Independent Facilitator: Linton Pike, Estill and Associates

The purpose of this meeting is to:
• Provide a project update; and
• Consider key discussion topics from earlier meetings.

AGENDA

5.45  Arrival - Light supper provided

6:00  Welcome and introduction - meeting purpose and process  Linton Pike

6:10  Previous minutes and actions arising  All

6:15  Project update – environmental, heritage, native title and land acquisition  Chris Raykos

6:30  Traffic study update and key processes  Paul Fisher

6:40  Noise Modelling update – location, and height and cross section  Paul Fisher

7:00  Key intersection treatments:
• Intersection improvement update (Refer Attachment One);
• Marmion / Hester intersection;
• Connolly / Hester intersection;  Kugan Kugananthan

7:20  PSP provisions – location and connectivity  Paul Fisher

7:55  Key recreational walkways – process to completion  All

8:05  Key strategies – landscape, public art and community consultation (Refer Attachment Two)  Chris Raykos

8:25  Agree priority actions, next steps and next meeting  All

8:30  Close
**ATTACHMENT TWO - WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation/Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim Argus</td>
<td>Northern Districts Combined Community Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Curry</td>
<td>Joondalup Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Luplau</td>
<td>Kinross resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Dickie</td>
<td>Butler - Brighton Estate Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Morgan</td>
<td>Alkimos resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Wake</td>
<td>Quinns Rock Environmental Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Massam</td>
<td>Connolly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Denton</td>
<td>Wanneroo Business Assoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Spray</td>
<td>Kinross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Hassett</td>
<td>RAAFA Cambrai Retirement Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabine Winton</td>
<td>Lake Nowergup/Carabooda Valley Cty Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Farquhar</td>
<td>Kinross Residents Assoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Thompson</td>
<td>Steelers Ridgewood Rise Lifestyle Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Roberts</td>
<td>Department Environment &amp; Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Blair</td>
<td>City of Wanneroo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nico Claassen</td>
<td>City of Joondalup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Tan</td>
<td>Public Transport Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Bennett</td>
<td>LandCorp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation/Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Raykos</td>
<td>Main Roads WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kugan Kugananthan</td>
<td>Main Roads WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Scott</td>
<td>Main Roads WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Lenton</td>
<td>Main Roads WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Fisher</td>
<td>GHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linton Pike</td>
<td>Facilitator, Estill &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Apologies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation/Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elise Darsow</td>
<td>Ridgewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Burton</td>
<td>Clarkson, Somerley Primary School P&amp;C President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole James</td>
<td>East Butler Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Clarke</td>
<td>Kinross Residents Assoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Simmons</td>
<td>Burns Beach resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Rippingale</td>
<td>Ridgewood resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Miles</td>
<td>MLA Member for Wanneroo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Norberger</td>
<td>MLA - Member for Joondalup</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 Executive Summary
The planned extension of Mitchell Freeway to the Clarkson will be a major two-year construction project delivering greatly improved transport efficiency in Perth's far northern suburbs, but having a number of possible impacts on the community in the Project area.

This Communication and Consultation Strategy has been designed to ensure clear and consistent messages reflecting the objectives of the State Government, Main Roads and the Mitchell Freeway Extension Project Team, are presented to stakeholders in the Project and to the broader community.

The strategy will direct the communications of the Project Team and the Contractor to ensure a steady flow of accurate and timely information to community and stakeholders, thereby minimising the risk of negative issues arising from misinformation and enhancing community support for the Project.

Through a comprehensive community engagement process, newsletters, the internet, displays, public liaison, media liaison, paid advertising and stakeholder briefings, Main Roads will keep the community up to date with project developments. The success of the measures outlined in this strategy will be important in establishing a sense of shared purpose between Main Roads and the community, leading to the timely delivery of the Project, providing transport benefits for all.

2.0 Project Overview

2.1 Background
The first stage of the Mitchell Freeway, from Narrows Bridge to Sutherland Street, West Perth, was completed in 1973. Since that time, Perth's northwest metropolitan corridor has grown rapidly and Mitchell Freeway has become the principal component of the road network servicing the northern suburbs. The Freeway has been extended in stages over the past 30 years to its current termination point in Joondalup, approximately 30 kilometres north of the Central Business District. Since the last extension was completed from Hodges Drive to Burns Beach Road (4km), the City has continued to expand northwards with residential and commercial development in suburbs such as Joondalup, Currambine, Clarkson, Kinross, Merriwa, Ridgewood, Butler and Alkimos. With numerous vehicles entering or exiting the freeway at Burns Beach Road and continuing northwards, increased pressure has been placed on local roads that were not designed to carry the current volumes of traffic.

2.2 Early Consultation
In early 2012, the State Government formed the Community Working Group (CWG) to develop a strategic business case for improvements to transport infrastructure in Perth's North-East Corridor. A newspaper advertisement called for public nominations for the CWG and a panel consisting of State and local Government representatives made the final selection of 22 people. The group consisted of a broad cross section of the community including residents, schools, interest groups and business people. Additional representatives of State Parliament, local government and Main Roads were appointed to manage and participate in the process.

The Community Working Group held seven group meetings and three value management workshops between May and November 2012. It developed and considered a number of options before agreeing on Value Engineered Option F. This Option recommends extending Mitchell Freeway by approximately 11km to Romeo Rd,
Mitchell Freeway Extension

Alkimos and various other network improvements under a staged delivery program, with a total estimated cost of $392 million.

A report outlining the Group’s recommendation (Mitchell Freeway Extension Strategic Business Case 2012 (Business Case)) was presented to the State Government and in December 2012 funding of $315 million was announced to extend the Mitchell Freeway from Burns Beach Road, Joondalup to Hester Ave, Clarkson (representing Stage 1 works outlined in the Business Case).

The CWG will continue to operate under a new Terms of Reference with a focus on securing funding in order to achieve Stage 2 & 3 works.

2.3 Scope of Works
Stage 1 works involve extending the freeway by approximately 6km from Burns Beach Road, Joondalup to Hester Avenue, Clarkson. The extension will consist of two lanes in each direction, with capacity for expansion to three lanes when justified by traffic volumes. The scope of works consists of:

- Extension of Mitchell Freeway from Burns Beach Road to Hester Avenue including Principal Shared Paths (PSP);
- Extension of Neerabup Road east from Connolly Drive to Wanneroo Road;
- Hester Avenue duplication east from Hidden Valley retreat to Wanneroo Road;
- Pedestrian underpasses at Neerabup Road and Hester Avenue;
- Pedestrian underpasses (east and west) at Currambine Train Station;
- Grade separated interchanges at Burns Beach Road, Neerabup Road and Hester Avenue;
- PSP bridge at Burns Beach Road;
- Service relocations; and
- Reconfiguration of Flynn Drive/Wanneroo Road/Neerabup Road intersection to the ultimate configuration and necessary tie-ins along Wanneroo Road to dual two-lane carriageway.

2.4 Project Objectives
The primary objective of the Project is to provide safe and efficient road access for all road users that will enhance social, economic and regional development.

Key planning objectives include:
- Improve road transport efficiency and reduce costs through alleviating congestion;
- Provide improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists;
- Improve amenity; and
- Ensure that the Project is consistent with longer-term, sustainable transport planning that enables efficient network operations to be maintained into the future.

In delivering the Project, Main Roads seeks to achieve the following specific objectives:
- Minimise the financial cost to the government while realising a net benefit to the community and all stakeholders;
- Undertake the Project in an environmentally and socially sensitive manner;
- Complete the Project in accordance with Main Roads’ requirements and standards;
- Work in collaboration with the Cities of Wanneroo and Joondalup to ensure their needs and expectations are addressed;
- Ensure a high level of community and stakeholder support for the Project;
- Encourage an innovative approach to the design and construction of the Project and resultant works; and
2.5 **Project Benefits**

Extension of the freeway will deliver a number of key benefits, including:

- Improved connectivity between business and employment nodes such as Neerabup Industrial Area, Joondalup Strategic Centre and other commercial and industrial areas in the Perth metropolitan area;
- Reduced pressure on Wanneroo Road, Marmion Avenue, Connolly Drive and Burns Beach Road;
- Enhanced opportunities for job creation within the north-west sub-region, notably the Neerabup Industrial Area;
- Improved industrial, commercial and business investment potential in the north-west sub-region;
- Greater investment and intensification of surrounding developments; and
- Reduced travel times for private and commercial traffic.

2.6 **Communication Objectives**

The key communication objectives for the Mitchell Freeway Extension are:

- Encourage a shared vision and commitment to the Project among key stakeholders, including Government agencies and Government decision-makers;
- Ensure key stakeholders are well informed on the Project’s scope, impacts and benefits;
- Facilitate active and positive co-operation with local government authorities in the relevant area, as well as key community and industry groups (largely through the CRG process);
- Raise community and industry awareness of the Mitchell Freeway Extension Project including results of the design process and the schedule of construction;
- Provide accurate and regular information to the communities, including residents and businesses, adjacent to the freeway extension throughout the design and construction processes;
- Identify and address any stakeholder, community and industry concerns or opposition to the Project;
- Address the specific concerns of communities adjacent to the freeway extension;
- Promote the benefits of the Mitchell Freeway Extension to the local community and to the people of Perth; and
- Monitor community perceptions through the media (local, metropolitan and State) and through direct liaison with the public.

3.0 **Situation Analysis**

3.1 **Known Community Issues**

Knowledge of community issues in relation to the Mitchell Freeway Extension will remain limited until a planned public consultation process involving a broadly based Community Reference Group is completed. However, it is possible to anticipate some issues based on experiences during previous projects and early public feedback to Main Roads since the Government announced funding for the Project in December 2012.

**Absence of Third Freeway Lane**

There has been criticism from members of the public about the decision to build the freeway extension as two lanes rather three. This is based on lengthy delays experienced by commuters for many years on the existing freeway due to a ‘bottleneck’ at Hepburn Avenue, where three lanes merged into two. The issue has been highlighted by the recently completed $30 million project to widen the freeway to three lanes from...
Hepburn Avenue to Hodges Drive. In light of this work, some observers have commented that the same ‘mistake’ is about to be repeated on the extension to Hester Avenue. This is likely to remain an issue for the duration of the Mitchell Freeway Extension Project and beyond.

**Noise, Dust and Vibration**
Noise dust and vibration are always issues for residents and businesses near major road projects. On the Mitchell Freeway Extension, these issues are likely to be heightened due to the large number of homes in close proximity to the freeway alignment.

**Other Likely Issues**
- Trucks using suburban streets;
- Possible traffic congestion and delays;
- Proximity of freeway to homes;
- Schedule for completion of the Project;
- Height, location and appearance of noise walls;
- Height of the freeway in relation to homes;
- Height and structure of interchanges and their proximity to homes;
- Pedestrian and cyclist access along the freeway;
- Destruction of vegetation;
- Landscaping and revegetation;
- Impact on wildlife in the freeway reserve;
- Impact on adjoining Neerabup National Park; and
- Freeway operational noise.

### 4.0 Stakeholders
Project stakeholders are individuals, organisations or groups external to Main Roads who are likely to be affected by the freeway extension project. Stakeholders should be advised about relevant aspects of the Project before the construction contract is awarded and be informed about progress, issues and impacts as the Project progresses. Communication with the stakeholders listed below will be required. The list may be updated as community interest in the Project develops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Contact</th>
<th>Stakeholder Position and Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Buswell, MLA</td>
<td>Hon. Minister for Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Transport Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LandCorp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Parks and Wildlife (ex – DEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Environmental Regulation (ex – DEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Blair</td>
<td>Director of Infrastructure, City of Wanneroo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nico Claassen</td>
<td>Director Infrastructure Services, City of Joondalup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State &amp; Federal Parliamentary Representatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Paul Miles, MLA</td>
<td>Member for Wanneroo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jan Norberger, MLA</td>
<td>Member for Joondalup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Albert Jacob, MLA</td>
<td>Member for Ocean Reef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon, Ian Goodenough, MHR</td>
<td>Member for Moore (Federal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 Communication and Consultation

A Media Statement was issued by the State Government on Sunday 2nd December 2012 announcing their funding commitment of $315 million to extend Mitchell Freeway from Burns Beach Road to Hester Avenue. The resulting broad media coverage has created low-level general awareness of the freeway project in the community. However, most people will not be aware of the finer details of the Project, such as the planned location of interchanges, possible impacts on residents, the Project timeframe and the community consultation process. A broad range of awareness raising initiatives will be required to increase community understanding of the Project.
5.1 Community Reference Group
Main Roads is committed to seeking broad community input on the proposed freeway extension prior to construction. To achieve this, a Community Reference Group (CRG) has been established as part of the consultation process. The CRG consists of 25 members representing a mix of local community, key State Government and Local Government stakeholder organisations.

Nominations for community representatives were sought through advertising in *The West Australian* and various local newspapers from the following suburbs comprising the Project area:
- Joondalup
- Currambine
- Kinross
- Clarkson
- Ridgewood
- Merriwa
- Butler
- Alkimos

A number of members of the Community Working Group responsible for the development of the *Strategic Business Case* also nominated and were accepted onto the Group to capture knowledge and inform ongoing discussions.

The purpose of the CRG is to provide an interactive forum for stakeholders and the local community to work closely with Main Roads and offer input to the development of the preliminary design for the Mitchell Freeway Extension. It also acts as a conduit of communication between Main Roads and the groups and organisations the CRG members represent.

Once the consultation process has concluded, the results will then be collated into a report that will be made available on the Main Roads Project webpage: [Mitchell Freeway Extension - Main Roads Western Australia](#).

5.2 Communications Methods and Tools
Main Roads will use a broad range of communication methods and tools to raise awareness of the Project in the community. Any and/or all of the below methods and tools may be used.

**Public Liaison**
The Project Team has appointed a Community Relations Representative to handle general public enquiries and stakeholder input regarding the Project. The nominated person’s telephone and email contacts will be included in all Project communication materials. The representative will, where appropriate, refer enquiries to relevant members of the Project Team.

**Project Overview**
A Project Overview document will be produced and made available to the general public on the Main Roads Project webpage and via City of Wanneroo, City of Joondalup offices; and to CRG members to disseminate information to their respective groups and organisations.

**Public Display**
A portable public display may be produced for placement at suitable venues within the Project area to provide key information about the Project development. Venues may include libraries and shopping centres. Staffing of the display may be required on occasions.
Newsletter
A key vehicle for communication with the community will be a newsletter to be produced at least twice per annum and delivered directly by Australia Post to relevant residential and business addresses located within the Project area. The newsletter will inform the community about developments on the Project, including the progress of consultation.

Paid Advertising
Newspaper display advertising may be used when the Project Team believes important information needs to be disseminated. Priority should be placed on papers distributed within the Project area, but consideration should also be given to The West Australian and Sunday Times in cases where the message is considered appropriate to a wider audience.

Internet
A Project webpage has been created on the Main Roads website: https://www.mainroads.wa.gov.au/BuildingRoads/Projects/UrbanProjects/Pages/Mitchell-Freeway-Extension and is updated regularly to provide the latest information.

Media Liaison/Issues Management
All media enquiries will be referred to Main Roads Public Affairs to manage. The Community Relations Representative will be responsible for seeking any required media coverage of important project developments. Efforts will be made to engage the media at every opportunity as a means of raising awareness about the Project.

Briefings
Briefings will be conducted for members of State Parliament as requested and as per Main Roads policy.

Regular Project briefings will be offered to both:
- City of Joondalup; and
- City of Wanneroo.

Internal Project briefings will be provided as and when requested.

Reporting and Community Feedback
The Community Relations Representative will keep a register of all contacts made with the public regarding the Project including name, contact details and nature of complaint, concern or interest. The updated register will be made available to the Project Team at fortnightly meetings and any issues of concern will be highlighted for discussion and possible action.

Internal Communication
Communication within the Main Roads Project Team is vital to the successful implementation of this strategy. The Community Relations Representative will be the main contact for the community and, as such, will have a detailed understanding of community concerns regarding the Project. It is essential that the Representative keep the Project Director, Project Manager and other team members up to date with those concerns so they are prepared for community or media contact and can make decisions on an informed basis.

6.0 Key Communication Messages
Key communication messages are developed to ensure consistency in all Project related communication materials. These messages should be continually evaluated, refined and, where appropriate, expanded to address changing community perceptions of the Project.

Messages include:

Scope and Benefits
• Mitchell Freeway will be extended by 6km to Hester Avenue;
• Construction will start in late 2015 and be completed late 2017;
• There will be two northbound and two southbound lanes;
• Traffic studies show a third lane is not justified at this stage;
• There will be interchanges at Burns Beach Rd, Neerabup Rd and Hester Ave;
• There will be a Principal Shared Path for cyclists and pedestrians;
• Various key intersections in the Project area will be upgraded before the freeway extension opens;
• The freeway extension will ease congestion on the local road network, improve road safety, reduce transport time/costs and encourage further residential and commercial development; and
• Project budget is $315 million;

Community Consultation/Information
• There will be a detailed community consultation process through a broad-based Community Reference Group (CRG) prior to finalising the design and construction;
• Community members can provide comment through their local CRG representatives;
• The contractor will be bound by the CRG’s recommendations;
• Information will be provided to the public through regular newsletters, the media, press advertising and displays; and
• A Community Relations Representative is available to answer questions from the community.

Environmental Impacts
• Main Roads and the contractor will seek to minimise community and environmental impacts including noise, dust and vibration;
• Main Roads and its contractor will retain as much natural vegetation as possible and will undertake extensive landscaping where appropriate;
• Significant wildlife in the freeway reserve, such as kangaroos and snakes, will be moved to a safe location prior to construction;
• Main Roads is undertaking a Fauna Movement Study to identify fauna underpass/overpass requirements;
• Main Roads will consult with local environmental groups in relation to impacts through Neerabup National Park;
• A Traffic Management Plan will be put in place to minimise the impact of the Project on local road users; and
• Main Roads plans to open the full extension at one time rather than in stages to prevent traffic problems at Neerabup Rd.

7.0 Timetable
To be completed

\^ Value Engineered Option F (Option F)
\^ Mitchell Freeway Extension: Strategic Business Case 2012