



Gold Coast Rapid Transit

22 Consultation and
Communication



Contents

- 1 Introduction 4
- 2 Introducing the Gold Coast Rapid Transit Project to the community 6
- 3 Providing inclusive and regular opportunities for stakeholders and community members to participate in consultation 12
 - 3.1 Project Newsletter 12
 - 3.2 Community Reference Groups 13
 - 3.3 Business Taskforce 16
 - 3.4 Community Information Sessions 17
 - 3.5 Queen Street (west) consultation 19
 - 3.6 Submissions 21
 - 3.7 Project Website 22
 - 3.8 Project Email 22
 - 3.9 Staffed 1800 Hotline 22
 - 3.10 Static Displays 23
 - 3.11 Draft CDIMP Consultation 23
 - 3.11.1 Draft CDIMP Distribution 23
 - 3.11.2 Appointments to view draft CDIMP 24
 - 3.11.3 Submissions received during the draft CDIMP consultation 24
 - 3.11.4 Telephone Calls 25
 - 3.11.5 Emails 25
 - 3.11.6 Website 25
- 4 Gaining stakeholder support and community acceptance 26
- 5 Obtaining positive media coverage and maintaining a positive project identity 27
- 6 Pre-empting and proactively managing issues to minimise the impact on project timelines and outcomes 28

Table Index

Table 22 – 1 Stakeholder Briefings January – February 2007	6
Table 22 – 2 Project Newsletters	13
Table 22 – 3 Helensvale to Southport Community Reference Group Membership and Attendance	14
Table 22– 4 Southport - Broadbeach Community Reference Group Membership and Attendance	16
Table 22 – 5 Community Information Sessions – Locations and Number of Attendees	18
Table 22 – 6 Summary of Media Coverage of the Gold Coast Rapid Transit Project	27
Table 22 – 7 Summary of Issues Raised by Community and Stakeholders	28

Appendices

- H Heads of Agreement
- I Memorandum of Understanding
- J Stakeholder Letter
- K Fact Sheet October 2006
- L Fact Sheet February 2007
- M Newsletter 1
- N Newsletter 2
- O Terms of Reference Helensvale - Southport Community Reference Group & Terms of Reference Southport - Broadbeach Community Reference Group
- P Consultation Report December 2007 & Consultation Report May 2007

1 Introduction

The design and development of the Gold Coast Rapid Transit (GCRT) project has been influenced by community input and local knowledge, including improved environmental and social outcomes.

Over 300,000 households, residents, interested parties or key stakeholders have been informed of the project via the newsletters, community information sessions, briefings, static displays or reviewing the project's webpage.

The communication and community engagement strategy was designed on two levels:

- high level, city wide information and strategies, such as newsletters, webpage, fact sheets and media coverage; and
- detailed engagement with key stakeholders and impacted residents including one to one briefings, provision of detailed property information and community information sessions.

From launching the project in October 2006 through to the impending final phase of consultation the issues of concern for the community have remained constant:

- support for improved public transport for the city;
- minimal impact to the traffic and road network;
- park and ride facilities;
- minimal property impacts; and
- integrated city wide public transport services.

This report outlines the key processes and outcomes of the communication and community engagement strategy for the GCRT from October 2006 to December 2008.

A rapid transport solution has previously been debated and discussed on the Gold Coast over a number of years, which necessitated a robust communication and engagement strategy to manage community expectation and consultation.

The Communication and Community Engagement Management Plan for the Gold Coast Rapid Transit Project was developed in October 2006 and was the guiding document for the strategy. The broad objectives of the communication and engagement program for the project were to:

- introduce the Gold Coast Rapid Transit project to the community (Section 2);
- provide inclusive and regular opportunities for stakeholders and community members to participate in consultation (Section 3);
- gain stakeholder support and community acceptance of the proposal (Section 4);
- gain positive media coverage and maintain positive project identity (Section 5); and
- pre-empt and proactively manage issues to minimise the impact on project timelines and outcomes (Section 6).

The strategy was implemented in four phases:

Phase	Focus	Date
Phase One	Introduce the program	October 2006 - January 2007
Phase Two	Stage One – Section 2	March 2007
Phase Three	Stage One – Section 3	October 2007
Phase Four	Release of draft CDIMP	October 2008

Until January 2007, the communication and engagement strategy was undertaken by TransLink Marketing and Communication Division. A locally based Communications Manager and staff were operating from March 2007.

2 Introducing the Gold Coast Rapid Transit Project to the community

In October 2006 a Heads of Agreement (Appendix H) between the Gold Coast City Council (GCCC) and State of Queensland was signed by the Honourable Paul Lucas, Minister for Transport and Main Roads and Gold Coast Mayor, Ron Clarke. The Agreement reflected the desire of the State and GCCC to work in close partnership to develop a Business Case and Concept Design and Impact Management Plan (CDIMP) for the GCRT project.

Further details of the partnership were recorded in a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed by Dale Dickson, Chief Executive Officer of the GCCC and Luke Franzmann, General Manager, TransLink in February 2007. The MoU (Appendix I) recorded the roles and responsibilities of the State and Local Government in designing and delivering the project.

Following the confirmation of the partnership arrangement to progress the CDIMP, key stakeholders received correspondence introducing the project and the Project Director, Ken Deutscher, in December 2006 (Appendix J), accompanied by a fact sheet (Appendix K). An invitation to meet with the project team was extended to key stakeholders and a total of 23 briefings were undertaken in January and February 2007 to further promote the key features of the project. During these briefings stakeholder issues of concern and opportunities were recorded and provided to the technical team for consideration in the design of the GCRT.

Table 22 – 1 below summarises the stakeholder briefings that were undertaken between January and February 2007.

Table 22 – 1 Stakeholder Briefings January – February 2007

Name	Letter	Briefing	Issues
Australia Fair 14 January 2007	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ potential impacts on current pedestrian overpass and parking ▶ safety at Scarborough Street bus stops ▶ difficulties in leasing shops on Scarborough Street ▶ impact of LRT overhead wires on awnings fronting Scarborough Street ▶ concerns for efficiency of construction
Chambers of Commerce:	X	X	<p>Broadbeach 22 January 2007:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ current bus interchange is slow and causes delays ▶ concerns for construction and disruptions <p>Burleigh Heads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ GCRT does not address the needs of western communities; need to connect with private vehicle transport by providing park and ride facilities <p>Gold Coast North</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ parking and signage during construction <p>Southport</p> <p>Surfers</p> <p>Burleigh Heads 31 January 2007:</p>

Paradise			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ concerned the highway is too narrow to support a rapid transit system ▶ advocate for a tunnel from 2nd Ave Burleigh Heads to Tallebudgera Drive <p>Gold Coast North 21 February 2007:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ President does not support project ▶ President does not believe the community will use the service <p>Southport 7 February 2007:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Chamber had no view on the project but noted several issues of concern: overhead wiring, cost to taxpayers, managing current congestion, preference for tunnelling/ overhead system, LRT too inflexible, lack of information on BRT ▶ transparency of CDIMP and the financial viability of the system ▶ Southport businesses want to be consulted and provide input <p>Surfers Paradise 19 March 2007:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ balance of costs between State Government and GCCC ▶ how to link the RT system with parking and Smartcard opportunities ▶ how will RT system solve Bundall Road traffic problems ▶ limited road network upgrades apart from Smith Street ▶ will there be upgrades to Ferny Avenue
Conrad Jupiters 17 January 2007	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ ability to purchase fares for staff ▶ visitor friendly service – languages other than English, staff on board the system
GECKO 9 February 2007	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ fuel source and emissions ▶ cyclist safety ▶ would like a full EIS rather than a CDIMP
Gold Coast Airport 13 February 2007	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ would like an integrated transport solution ▶ check-in facilities at RT station ▶ possibility of a RT stop at airport terminal and the heavy rail station ▶ improved storage facilities on RT to cater for tourist luggage ▶ private vehicle access during and post construction

Gold Coast Convention & Exhibition Centre 31 January 2007	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ LRT too inflexible and can't redirect route as you can a BRT ▶ must have a pedestrian overpass or underpass to ensure no pedestrians attempt to cross at road level ▶ businesses in Broadbeach would prefer a pedestrian underpass ▶ station must be on western side of highway
Gold Coast Tourism 18 January 2007	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ branding to complement 'very GC' campaign ▶ visitor friendly service – luggage storage, staff on board the system ▶ tourists won't be able to access theme parks on the RT system
Griffith University 24 January 2007	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ does not support BRT between university and hospital site – master plan to create an urban village with public activity and accessibility ▶ Olsen Avenue has limited room for further development ▶ important that services run 24 hours/ day ▶ master planning in progress jointly funded by Queensland Health
Harbour Town Shopping Centre 13 December 2006	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ opportunities to connect the RT system with Harbour Town and offset costs via financial contribution ▶ would like to actively engage in consultation process
Indy 22 January 2007	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ no plans to change the Indy track ▶ access difficulties outside the Marriott hotel due to narrow area ▶ Cypress and Ocean Avenue are heavy pedestrian areas during Indy ▶ need to reach agreement on access to peripheral areas for media vans and loading areas
Oasis Shopping Centre 22 January 2007	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ GCRT not providing an east-west link ▶ availability of on-street parking and drop-off zones during construction ▶ interest in Broadbeach station location as will need to accommodate shopping centre patrons
Pacific Fair 17 January 2007	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ car park already being used as a park and ride facility with increase in cars since parking prices increased ▶ need for feeder services to bring people to the RT stations ▶ would like to improve the pedestrian access on Hooker Boulevard

Property Council of Australia 9 February 2007	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ concerns raised that procurement process may impact on meeting construction for Phase One by 2011 ▶ the current transport system is at crisis point and restricting the city's potential
Queensland Events 27 February 2007	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ GCRT is an opportunity to re-align highway and join up parklands therefore reducing the pedestrian crossing across the highway ▶ marathon will still be conducted through construction stages and project will need to take this into consideration ▶ September 2009 world triathlon will be held on the Gold Coast on the Broadwater
Queensland Health	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ coordination with master planning process for the new hospital site ▶ loss of one street parking from current hospital site
Southport State School 27 March 2007	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ access to set down at front of school ▶ concerns with station location ▶ safety of the system ▶ noise and pollution ▶ concerns about overhead wires ▶ concerned about construction timeline
Surfers Paradise Management 18 January 2007	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ need integrated signage for the system ▶ buses are currently overloaded and queues of buses waiting for loading zone availability ▶ Aqua Duck causes traffic delay and can block lanes ▶ need to ensure minimal disruption to the precinct during construction ▶ precinct with heavy pedestrian use ▶ construction should be avoided in the 2nd half of the year – busiest time for precinct
Urban Development Institute of Australia 29 November 2006	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ enquiry about extension to Robina ▶ interest in project timelines
Westfield Helensvale 2 February 2007	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ concerns with young people loitering at the Helensvale railway station, particularly on Thursday evenings is a cause of concern to shoppers and centre management

-
- ▶ railway station does not have security service
 - ▶ overcrowding at the station in times of special events including Indy
 - ▶ limited patronage on the buses due to the proximity of the bus station to the shopping centre
 - ▶ no taxis or taxis phones located at the centre
-

Letters were also sent to Queensland Rail, RACQ, Surfside Buslines and TransInfo. Additional briefings were provided to Councillors Crichlow, Molhoek, Saraoff, Douglas and Young, the Gold Coast City Council's Coordination Committee and Regional Economic Development Advisory Board, Regional Manager's Coordination Network and Gold Coast Showgrounds.

The project was invited to speak at the February breakfast meeting of the Urban Development Institute of Australia. This provided an opportunity to introduce the project to a wide audience of locally based developers and was attended by in excess of 100 people. The breakfast was such a success the Institute invited the project back to the 2008 February breakfast to provide an update on the project presented by both the Minister for Transport and General Manager, TransLink.

Informing the wider Gold Coast community of the Gold Coast Rapid Transit project was as important as briefing the key stakeholders. The project services the coastal corridor however it is a key platform in TransLink's ten year plan for an improved and integrated transport system for the whole city. With this in mind the October 2007 fact sheet was updated and distributed to 160,000 households via the Gold Coast Sun Newspaper during February 2007 (Appendix L).

At the conclusion of the consultation to introduce the project to the community the key issues for consideration by the project included:

- ▶ strong support for the concept and the need to significantly improve public transport in the city;
- ▶ desire for improved understanding of the mode options (bus rapid transit and light rail transit);
- ▶ tourist market will be significant for the rapid transit system provided it is legible and easy to use;
- ▶ opportunities to work with developers to improve access to transport services (for example, Pacific Fair and Harbour Town);
- ▶ concern for traffic impact and reduction in on-street parking;
- ▶ need to coordinate with other capital works projects to minimise disruption; and
- ▶ need to demonstrate the benefits to those communities not directly serviced by the system.

It is important to note that the project was introduced as being two Stages as Helensvale to Broadbeach and Broadbeach to Coolangatta, based on the South East Queensland Infrastructure Plan and Program. For further information on the staging of the project refer to Chapter 5, Project Staging.

3 Providing inclusive and regular opportunities for stakeholders and community members to participate in consultation

Guided by the Queensland Government's *Engaging Queenslanders: A guide to community engagement methods and techniques*, the project established a number of mechanisms for stakeholders and community members to participate in the project. These include:

- ▶ project newsletters;
- ▶ community reference groups;
- ▶ community information sessions;
- ▶ submissions;
- ▶ project website;
- ▶ project email address;
- ▶ staffed 1800 hotline; and
- ▶ static displays.

These planned activities were used during Phase Two and Three of the communication strategy and were the primary mechanism for obtaining feedback on the route, alignment and impacts of the proposed rapid transit system.

3.1 Project Newsletter

A key communication tool was the newsletter. Two newsletters were produced during the life of the project and all provided project contact details, timeline for the project and a tear off slip to provide feedback to the project team.

Newsletter 1 (Appendix M) and Newsletter 2 (Appendix N) were distributed along the entire length of the corridor from Helensvale to Coolangatta to homes and businesses within a 1Km radius of the rapid transit corridor. Copies were also distributed to community groups, shopping centres, schools, and local Members of Parliament.

Table 22 – 2 below provides a summary of the Project Newsletters.

Table 22 – 2 Project Newsletters

	Coverage	Content	Feedback forms received
Newsletter 1 Distributed March 2007	85,000 copies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ route options for Helensvale to Griffith University and through Southport; ▶ modes of transit. 	Total 790 feedback forms received
Newsletter 2 Distributed October 2007	91,000 copies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ update on project; ▶ Southport to Broadbeach route; ▶ route through Southport; ▶ cost of travelling on system; ▶ property impact. 	Total 465 feedback forms received

3.2 Community Reference Groups

The aim of the Community Reference Groups (CRG) was to provide the project with a cross section of viewpoints and community concerns to achieve a balanced approach to issues associated with the project. Two CRGs were established to reflect the geographical reach of the project:

- ▶ Helensvale to Southport; and
- ▶ Southport to Broadbeach.

Both groups assisted the project team to identify community concerns and ideas regarding the GCRT, functioned as a reference body to consider route options, benefits and impacts and acted as a conduit to interest groups and the local community. The CRGs are guided by the Terms of Reference (Appendix O).

An independent party was engaged to facilitate the two CRG's and this allowed project staff to participate in the meetings and provided an objective process to the meetings. Bruce Fleming, a former senior public servant with experience in infrastructure projects and community engagement, was initially engaged to facilitate the groups. Mr Fleming had to retire from this role in September 2007 as he had taken up a full time role within Government. Dale McArthur was appointed as the facilitator.

The Helensvale to Southport CRG was established in February 2007 with various stakeholders and community groups contacted and invited to join the group. The membership reflects the groups and stakeholders from Helensvale to Southport and special need groups' dependent on public transport.

The group met monthly, although on occasion the meetings were postponed due to a guest speaker not being available or project information not finalised for presentation.

Agenda items were generated by the project team and from items called for by the membership. Items discussed included:

- ▶ Route Stage One: Section One and Two; Helensvale to Southport;
- ▶ transit modes;
- ▶ Helensvale – Southport Corridor Option Assessment Criteria;
- ▶ GCRT modelling;
- ▶ outcomes of community consultation;
- ▶ precinct planning through Southport;
- ▶ social impact assessment;
- ▶ 3D animation;
- ▶ parking in Southport;
- ▶ Concept Design and Impact Management Plan – In Brief;
- ▶ Integrated transport – improved bus network;
- ▶ station designs;
- ▶ patronage – that is, who will use the system; and
- ▶ Business Case.

Issues raised by the CRG for consideration by the project included:

- ▶ cost of fares on the system;
- ▶ loss of parking;
- ▶ provision of park and ride facilities;
- ▶ guarantee that no decisions on the project had already been made and that genuine community engagement would be sort and included in the decision making process; and
- ▶ concern that community feedback was adhered to (for example, the route through Southport).

Table 22 – 3 provides a summary of membership and attendance for the Helensvale - Southport CRG.

Table 22 – 3 Helensvale to Southport Community Reference Group Membership and Attendance

Membership	Number of Meetings Attended
Helensvale Residents Associations	11/11
GECKO	7/11
Southport Chamber of Commerce	4/11

Parkwood and Arundel Residents Assoc	11/11
Regional Disability Council	8/11
Gold Coast Mobility Office	9/11
Seniors Advisory Council	5/6
Representative advised in October no longer able to attend meetings due to competing commitment – continued to receive minutes and attends briefings	
Griffith University	2/11
Southport State School	8/11
Connect the Coast	9/11
Australia Fair Shopping Centre	6/11

The second CRG represented the issues and interest from Southport to Broadbeach and followed the same format as the Helensvale to Southport CRG. The group was to hold its first meeting in May 2007 but due to delays in the project timeline the meeting was not held until July 2007, prior to the public consultation period for Section 2. Agenda items were generated by the project team and from the membership. Items discussed included:

- ▶ proposed community consultation for Section 3;
- ▶ Stage One Section Three Route: Southport to Broadbeach;
- ▶ Surfers Paradise preferred traffic arrangement;
- ▶ Surfers Paradise route options;
- ▶ Broadbeach precinct plans;
- ▶ social impact assessment;
- ▶ Concept Design and Impact Management Plan – In Brief;
- ▶ integrated transport – improved bus network;
- ▶ patronage – that is, who will use the system;
- ▶ station designs; and
- ▶ 3D animation.

Issues raised by the CRG for consideration by the project included:

- ▶ park and ride facilities;
- ▶ access loading bays and ability of service vehicles to operate in Surfers Paradise Boulevard; and
- ▶ lack of information available to the community.

Table 22– 4 below provides a summary of the membership and attendance for the Southport - Broadbeach CRG.

Table 22– 4 Southport - Broadbeach Community Reference Group Membership and Attendance

Membership	Number of Meetings Attended
Art and Craft on the Coast	8/8
Broadbeach Chamber of Commerce	1/8
Broadbeach Management Assoc	4/8
Chevron Island Village Assoc	6/8
Friends of MacIntosh Island and Narrowneck*	6/8
Gold Coast Convention and Exhibition Centre	3/8
Jupiters Casino	0/8
Main Beach Progress Assoc	3/8
Main Beach Tedder Ave Assoc	5/8
Pacific Fair	2/8
Paradise Island Residents Assoc	6/7
the management committee of the Association resigned in May 2008 and so were not represented at future meetings	
Paradise Waters Action Group	5/5
invited to join group December 2007	
Queensland Police Service	5/8
Surfers Paradise Chamber of Commerce	2/8
Surfers Paradise Management Group	2/8

* Mr Don Magin represents the Friends of MacIntosh Island and Narrowneck. Mr Magin stepped down from the role during the 2008 local council elections as he was a candidate for Division 7. This resulted in his absence of one meeting; the group's proxy did not attend the meeting.

3.3 Business Taskforce

After the second period of community consultation (October – November 2007), a loosely formed Business Taskforce lead by Commerce Queensland and the Combined Chambers of Commerce was formed. The original intent of the taskforce was to meet with the project and discuss issues of concern

with the route through Surfers Paradise. Both the project and the business taskforce saw the value of this group and continued to hold monthly meetings with the project reviewing issues including:

- ▶ Gold Coast Rapid Transit Project;
- ▶ Stage One: Section One, Two and Three;
- ▶ Traffic Modelling;
- ▶ Patronage;
- ▶ Integrated City Wide Transport;
- ▶ Mode Evaluation Framework;
- ▶ 3D visual animation;
- ▶ bus tour of the rapid transit corridor was undertaken.

The group was formalised and no Terms of Reference were developed. Organisations who regularly attended the meetings included:

- ▶ Commerce Queensland;
- ▶ Gold Coast Combined Chambers of Commerce;
- ▶ Surfers Paradise Chamber of Commerce; and
- ▶ Property Council.

3.4 Community Information Sessions

Community information sessions were used to promote and display the features of the rapid transit system including:

- ▶ modes of transit;
- ▶ route options and maps;
- ▶ integrated transport system;
- ▶ proposed traffic arrangement for Surfers Paradise Boulevard;
- ▶ Broadbeach precinct plan and context plan.

The sessions, running from two to four hours, in various locations along the corridor, were designed to provide the public with access to the project's technical and design teams. Stakeholders could speak directly with these staff on a one-to-one basis and ask specific questions and seek information on issues most relevant to them.

Details of the community information sessions were advertised in the Gold Coast Bulletin and the Gold Coast Sun newspapers over a two-week period.

Table 22 – 5 below provides a summary of the locations and number of attendees at the Community Information Sessions.

Table 22 – 5 Community Information Sessions – Locations and Number of Attendees

Date	Time	Location	Attendees
Thursday 22 March 2007	6 – 8pm	Pacific Pines High School	22
Saturday 24 March 2007	9 – 11am	Southport RSL Club	77
	1 – 3pm	Southport Sharks AFL Club	51
Thursday 29 March 2007	6 – 8pm	Labrador AFL Club	26
Saturday 31 March 2007	9 – 11am	Arundel State School	24
	1 – 3pm	Helensvale Senior Citizens Centre	27
Thursday 11 October 2007	5 – 8pm	Gold Coast Arts Centre	49
Saturday 13 October 2007	10am – 2pm	Courtyard by Marriott	87
Saturday 27 October 2007	10am - 2pm	Broadbeach State School	65

Key issues of concern identified during the community information sessions included:

- ▶ car parking arrangements along the corridor in particular Southport and Broadbeach;
- ▶ potential impact on two threatened frog species near Griffith University; and
- ▶ levels of emission produced by the rapid transit system.

To complement the general community information sessions, an additional four information sessions were offered to the business communities of Southport and Broadbeach.

In conjunction with the Southport Chamber of Commerce, two business information sessions were held on 5 November and 7 November 2007. A total of 35 people attended the two sessions from an invitee's list of up to 300.

The sessions formed part of the engagement process for the Concept Design and Impact Management Plan to provide an overview of the Southport precinct plan including:

- ▶ character and landscape;
- ▶ accessibility and linkages;
- ▶ infrastructure and integration;
- ▶ rapid transit mall; and
- ▶ bus interchange.

Common concerns raised at the information sessions included:

- ▶ loss of on street parking;
- ▶ impact of transit mall/bus interchange on café/dining environment; and
- ▶ changes in traffic arrangements for Southport.

Another two information sessions were planned and offered to the 243 traders of Australia Fair but were cancelled due to lack of interest.

An information session was held on 3 December 2007 for the Broadbeach businesses and traders and was attended by 25 people. The session formed part of the engagement process for the Concept Design and Impact Management Plan to provide an overview of the Broadbeach precinct plan including:

- ▶ route;
- ▶ character and landscape;
- ▶ accessibility and linkages; and
- ▶ options for bus interchange.

Areas the business stakeholders sought changes or improvements included:

- ▶ preference for an overhead pedestrian bridge, connecting the Gold Coast Convention and Exhibition Centre;
- ▶ proposed pedestrian linkage and station location limits access to Victoria Avenue; and
- ▶ park and ride facilities and improved parking in the Broadbeach area is required.

A second information session was offered on 5 December 2007 to the residents of Broadbeach and Broadbeach Waters. The project sought the community's views on the proposed bus interchange and on the loss of green space at the proposed location. A total of 6,634 letters were delivered to residents in the Broadbeach postcode however only three people attended the information session.

3.5 Queen Street (west) consultation

The rapid transit system travels from Griffith University to Nerang Street via Queen Street (west), home to the Southport general cemetery, state school, kindergarten, sport and community facilities. A station was proposed outside the Southport State School.

At its narrowest point Queen Street (west) is only 19 metres wide and has created challenges for the design team. The rapid transit corridor requires 32 metres for a dedicated corridor, existing traffic lanes and a station. In conjunction with the Gold Coast City Council three concept designs were developed, investigated and proven to be feasible for the rapid transit system to travel along Queen Street (west):

Option A

The new rapid transit system, with the retention of existing traffic arrangements and acquisition of as few residential properties as possible. However, this option would have significant impacts on the Queen Street Cemetery, affecting more than 100 plots.

Option B

The new rapid transit system, with the retention of existing traffic. However, this option would require full or partial resumptions of up to 60 properties on the south of Queen Street.

Option C

Considering these factors and previous feedback from residents and stakeholders in the area, a third option (Option C) has been developed to minimise land acquisitions on both the cemetery and residential properties. However, this option will require changes to existing traffic arrangements. Option C would introduce a one-way traffic flow by the removal of the east-bound general traffic lane between Beale Street and Wardoo Street. This change will mean:

- ▶ the existing two-way general traffic arrangement from Nerang Street to Beale Street will remain;
- ▶ general traffic will only be able to travel west bound between Beale Street and Wardoo Street;
- ▶ general traffic will not be able to cross the rapid transit corridor (except emergency vehicles); and
- ▶ entry to and exit from streets on the southern side of Queen Street (between Nerang and Wardoo streets) will be on a left-in, left-out basis only.

While Option C causes changes in local access arrangements, it will also result in a reduction in the volume of through traffic in Queen Street.

On 26 April 2008, 1300 letters were hand delivered to households in Queen Street and the surrounding 17 streets advising them of the consultation process and timeline, and the three route options being considered by the project. Letters were sent to property owners who did not reside in the property.

Correspondence was also sent to community members who had previously contacted and registered their interest in this alignment with the project. An electronic version of the correspondence was provided to the School for circulation to families, in addition to an article in the school newsletter.

To ensure the wider Gold Coast community were aware of the consultation process a media release was circulated to the local outlets on 26 April. This resulted in significant media coverage.

Feedback was received from the community up to the 30 May 2008. The community are not supportive of the proposed alignments and took the opportunity to register their opposition to the options more so than their preference. Of the three design options, Option C – one way traffic arrangement, was the favoured design.

While 166 contacts were received from the community only 71 people registered their support for a design option:

- ▶ Support Option A: 17;
- ▶ Support Option B: 5; and

- ▶ Support Option C: 49.

The School circulated a petition, seeking the re-location of the station from outside the school. In response to the strong community sentiment towards relocation of graves and resuming further property, Option A and Option B were not considered feasible design options. In consultation with the school community the final design saw the re-location of the station from Queen Street (west) to Wardoo Street and a reduction in the footpath widths therefore providing for two way traffic arrangement and a reliable transit system.

3.6 Submissions

Community members and stakeholders provided written submissions to the project detailing their support or concerns for the project. Eight submissions were received during the Phase Two consultation process for Sections One and Two and 50 during the consultation process for Section Three. A total of 12 submissions received commenting on the draft CDIMP. Submissions were from a range of stakeholders including resident groups, organisations and individuals.

- ▶ 16 out of the 50 submissions received during the consultation process for Section Three were from Paradise Waters;
- ▶ seven out of the 50 submissions received during the consultation process for Section Three were from impacted stakeholders in Southport; and
- ▶ 2 of the 12 submissions were from individual stakeholders not previously known to the project.

All submissions received as part of the Section Three and draft CDIMP consultation were reviewed and a written response forwarded addressing the issues raised in the submission.

Issues of concern raised by the submissions included:

- ▶ route preference (for example, Harbour Town/Parkwood and Scarborough Street/Marine Parade);
- ▶ mode preference;
- ▶ preference for other modes of transit including monorail and elevated structure and tunnelling;
- ▶ change in traffic flows as a result of the rapid transit system;
- ▶ influence of the Indy event on the route option; and
- ▶ raising the height of the new GCRT bridge over the Nerang River.

Detailed reports were produced on Phase Two and Three Community Consultation (Appendix P). Stakeholder details including contact details, issues raised, and response provided was recorded in Consultation Manager. Consultation Manager is a web based stakeholder management database with the ability to track stakeholders and issues during the project, to monitor emerging issues and follow up assigned actions.

3.7 Project Website

A comprehensive project website was regularly updated to provide interested stakeholders with detailed information about the project including:

- ▶ proposed route;
- ▶ fact sheets;
- ▶ project timelines; and
- ▶ details on consultation events.

From January 2007 – December 2008 the project website has attracted 85,958 visits. The vast majority of the visits to the website were made in 2008 with 57,381 visits recorded from February – December.

The three most popular pages visited to date are:

- ▶ homepage – 47,660 visits;
- ▶ CDIMP documentation – 3,901 visits; and
- ▶ 3D animation videos – 3,036 visits.

The project website is located at www.translink.com.au/gc_rapidtransit.

3.8 Project Email

Community members requested information or provided feedback via the project email address (gc_rapidtransit@transport.qld.gov.au). The email system provided for consistent, current and accurate information to the community. A total of 596 emails, from a total of 476 distinct stakeholders, were received with the main topics of interest

- ▶ preference for route option H1 via Harbour Town;
- ▶ Queen Street (west) consultation;
- ▶ changes in traffic flows;
- ▶ stakeholder project update;
- ▶ LRT preference; and
- ▶ monorail preference.

All emails were responded to by providing the information requested, acknowledging the content/ suggestions of the email or referring the email to another appropriate agency.

3.9 Staffed 1800 Hotline

The 1800 hotline was a popular way for the community to make contact with the project. A total of 1168 calls were taken, from a total of 908 distinct stakeholders, with the bulk of the contacts being made during periods of public consultation. The 1800 phone line centralised the contacts through one point enabling accurate recording of the issues and stakeholder and referring on to other project team members if required.

Although there were a wide spread of issues discussed in the calls, the main topics of interest were:

- ▶ property enquiries;
- ▶ preference for route option H1 via Harbour Town;
- ▶ construction impact and project timeline;
- ▶ preference for LRT; and
- ▶ Queen Street (west) consultation.

3.10 Static Displays

During periods of public consultation static displays were exhibited in local libraries, shopping centres, Griffith University and Council Chambers. They displayed information on the project, route options and details of the community information sessions. Newsletters were available at these display sites. Again, the details of the displays were advertised in the Gold Coast Bulletin and Gold Coast Sun Newspaper.

3.11 Draft CDIMP Consultation

The draft CDIMP was released for review by the community and key project stakeholders in October 2008. The final stage of consultation provided the community with the opportunity to review the full documentation and design of the project and in particular the inclusion of previous feedback.

The formal review period occurred from 13 October to 24 November 2008. As feedback continued to be received by the project up until 31 December 2008, this is included in the summary below.

The Gold Coast community was notified of the draft CDIMP release through:

- ▶ Quarter-page colour advertisements in both local papers: 11 October, 23 October in Gold Coast Bulletin; and 15 October, 29 October and 19 November in the Gold Coast Sun;
- ▶ City-wide distribution of postcards to 231,265 addresses inviting people to view the draft CDIMP by accessing documentation online, phoning the 1800 enquiry line to make an appointment to view the hard copy document, or requesting to be mailed a computer disk containing the document. Postcards were distributed by Australia post during the week beginning 20 October 2007;
- ▶ On 17 October, approximately 2000 letters and 960 emails were sent to members of the general public who had previously expressed an interest in the project and asked to be kept informed of updates; and
- ▶ Approximately 100 of the project's key stakeholders ranging from local councillors and MPs, business leaders and Government agencies were sent copies of the draft CDIMP In Brief and computer disk containing the full document, for their review and comment.

3.11.1 Draft CDIMP Distribution

The project provided a total of 549 copies of the draft CDIMP on computer disk to a variety of stakeholders: 281 to general community stakeholders, 118 to key project stakeholders, 30 to the

Vol 2 Chp 22 - 23

project's Community Reference Group members, and 120 to industry delegates at an Industry Briefing on the project.

A total of 368 copies of the draft CDIMP In Brief were distributed to interested stakeholders comprising: 100 general community stakeholders, 118 key project stakeholders, 30 Community Reference Group members, and 120 industry delegates.

3.11.2 Appointments to view draft CDIMP

The project made 14 appointments with stakeholders wishing to view the draft CDIMP in hard copy. Again, most of the 14 appointments were made with local residents who had previously made contact with the project. The most common areas of interest were the mode evaluation between light rail and bus rapid and the route maps including commentary on the route. Generally, stakeholders were surprised by the volume of material available to them and the detail included.

Of note was the review of the documentation by Mr Doug White, President of the Loders Creek Catchment Association. In the early stages of planning the project, the Loders Creek Catchment Association highlighted certain areas of environmental concern along the route. After detailed consultation with this group, in early 2007, the design was refined so that these environmental impacts would be negated. Mr White commented that he was pleased about the work that was done with the Association, and that these outcomes were mentioned in the draft CDIMP.

The project also was contacted for the first time by Marine Queensland, when the President, Mr Charles Dixon attended the office to view the draft CDIMP. Mr Dixon raised an issue about the clearance required for the new rapid transit bridge to be constructed over the Nerang River. The project was requested to consider a higher clearance to enable easier access for large marine vessels. This request prompted a formal meeting between the project, Maritime Safety Queensland and the Gold Coast City Council. It was determined that due to the estimated lifespan of the existing Nerang River (Sundale) Bridge, and the visual amenity impact occasioned by two adjacent bridges of different dimensions, the rapid transit bridge would be constructed in accordance with the existing bridge specifications.

3.11.3 Submissions received during the draft CDIMP consultation

Throughout the final consultation period through to 31 December 2008, the project received a total of 12 submissions from interested stakeholders.

Only 2 of the 12 submissions were from individual stakeholders not previously known to the project. The other 10 submissions were from either key project stakeholders (who were formally encouraged to provide comment) or from stakeholder groups and individuals whose issues were already known to the project through regular engagement.

New issues or comments arising from a review of the draft CDIMP include:

- Criticism of the timeline for the light rail extension to Gold Coast Airport – suggested this needs to be fast-tracked due to forecast passenger growth and airport development (raised by Gold Coast Airport);

- ▶ Need to manage and protect archaeological remnants and recognise the importance of public art in enhancing and preserving public spaces (raised by Gold Coast City Council);
- ▶ Consider opportunities for future infrastructure, such as laying conduits along rapid transit infrastructure for telecommunications (raised by Gold Coast City Council);
- ▶ Whether existing bus stops throughout the route will remain in place as they are generally 200m apart whereas GCRT stations will be approx 800m apart (raised by Gold Coast City Council); and
- ▶ Interchanges to be investigated between bus and rapid transit at stations other than main interchanges, such as at Main Beach for passengers travelling to and from Sea World (raised by Gold Coast City Council).

3.11.4 Telephone calls

293 calls were received from 285 distinct stakeholders over this period. The project staffs an 1800 enquiry line to provide information to stakeholders with general questions or comments about the project or more specific property enquiries.

Of the 293 phone calls from stakeholders, 274 callers requested that draft CDIMP material be mailed to them. 23 callers had specific property enquiries, and other issues of interest from callers included construction timelines, station locations and queries about the current status of the project.

3.11.5 Emails

166 emails from 150 distinct stakeholders were received throughout this period. Emails were sent to the project regarding a wide range of topics with the predominant topics being requests for project material (91 emails), specific property enquiries (27 emails), and project update enquiries (10 emails).

3.11.6 Website

On 13 October 2008, the draft CDIMP was uploaded onto the project website. The website was viewed more than 16,000 times during the consultation period. The draft CDIMP documentation was viewed more than 3,900 times as at 31 December 2008. These were encouraging figures for the project, as the website recorded its highest ever hits through this period.

4 Gaining stakeholder support and community acceptance

As a significant infrastructure project for the Gold Coast it was important to gain stakeholder support and acceptance for the rapid transit system. Support was sought from parties along the corridor, across the city, within Government and the business community.

The aim of engagement was to generate support, community acceptance and ownership of the project by providing sufficient opportunities for input and feedback into the planning process. To achieve this, the project developed key messages that captured the essence of the project and were included in all material produced for the project.

The messages, while delivered in various forms and format, remained consistent through the life of the project: fast, frequent and reliable services.

The project's identity was established early within the community through the project title, colour scheme and images. The ability to create a strong identity within the community was assisted by a locally based project office in Southport that opened in December 2007, with a large number of project staff residing on the Gold Coast. From October 2007 the Communications Manager was the designated media spokesperson for the project therefore providing timely responses and information to media outlets.

The Community Reference Groups were effective in gaining support from the community and assisted in improving the community's understanding of the project and processes.

Since the commencement of the project in October 2006 the project has held 361 meetings and briefings, engaging with a total of 524 distinct stakeholders.

5 Obtaining positive media coverage and maintaining a positive project identity

The Gold Coast has a small media community with one daily paper (Gold Coast Bulletin) and a free weekly paper (Gold Coast Sun), local news via Channel Nine and five radio stations.

The media coverage of the project has been varied, with few stories and coverage during Phase One and Two and significant but inaccurate coverage during Phase Three.

The size and complexity of this major infrastructure project coupled with the introduction of new technology, proved a challenge for the media outlets to comprehend and consequently report. The media's poor baseline knowledge of the project was further exasperated by the rotation of journalists who established an understanding of the project only to then be re-assigned rounds. In addition to this, until October 2007 all media enquiries were managed centrally and outside of the local project office.

Media releases were issued to mark key milestones of the project, including signing of the Head of Agreement, launching community consultation and announcements of route and mode. The bulk of the media coverage reported the following issues:

- ▶ route decision;
- ▶ transit mode;
- ▶ property impacts; and
- ▶ consultation process.

Table 22 – 6 below provides a summary of the media coverage of the Gold Coast Rapid Transit Project to end December 2008.

Table 22 – 6 Summary of Media Coverage of the Gold Coast Rapid Transit Project

Media	2006-2007	2008	Total
Newspaper	103	226	329
Radio	23	176	199
Television	11	26	37
Other	0	4	4
Total	137	432	569

6 Pre-empting and proactively managing issues to minimise the impact on project timelines and outcomes

The proactive communication and engagement strategy identified the emerging issues and information needs of the community, which the project was able to respond to through the provision of information or refining the concept design.

Table 22 – 7 below provides a summary of the issues and project's response to issues is listed as a summary of the community and stakeholder issues during the project.

Table 22 – 7 Summary of Issues Raised by Community and Stakeholders

Issue	Project Response
Strong support for the concept and the need to significantly improve public transport in the city.	Continue to gauge community support for improved transport. Key messages promote the provision of reliable public transport on the Gold Coast.
Need to demonstrate the benefits to those communities not directly serviced by the system.	Chapter 9, Integrated Network Strategy outlines the linkages between the GCRT system, bus services and heavy rail. Key features of the integrated transport network include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ new routes; ▶ improved bus services frequencies; ▶ heavy rail services increase to 15min frequencies from 30 minutes; and ▶ bus priority and high occupancy vehicles lanes along the coastal strip and servicing east-west corridor
Concern for traffic impact.	GCRT will have impacts on the traffic flow, intersection operation and road rules. Chapter 8, Transport and Traffic Impacts details the impact of the GCRT and the mitigation strategies to minimise these.
Reduction in on-street parking (Park and ride facility).	Chapter 8, Transport and Traffic Impact details the impact of the GCRT and the mitigation strategies to minimise impacts to parking. A Southport Parking Working Group was established to assist in the development of strategies to address the loss

Vol 2 Chp 22 - 28

	<p>of parking post the construction of the GCRT. The Council developed a seven point parking plan, addressing parking issues during construction and operation.</p> <p>The project is guided by TransLink policy Park and Ride Facilities. Consistent with this policy Park and Ride facilities will not be provided in densely settled sections of the route. 'Kiss n ride' facilities will be provided in the vicinity of stations where space and access requirements permit. Potential sites considered for future development as park and ride include Carrara Stadium and Parklands.</p>
<p>Cost of fares on the system.</p>	<p>GCRT system will adopt the TransLink integrated ticketing system and zone fare system.</p> <p>Chapter 7, Operational issues details how the GCRT system will operate.</p>
<p>Preference for other modes of transit including monorail and elevated structure and tunnelling.</p>	<p>Other modes of transit were not investigated based on the findings of previous studies including: 2004 Gold Coast Light Rail Feasibility Study and Evaluation of BRT and LRT Options for Southport to Broadbeach and the Preliminary Assessment Report completed in 2006.</p> <p>Chapter 2, Alignment Selection details the history to the mode selection.</p>
<p>Concern that community feedback not adhered to; route through Southport.</p>	<p>A multi-criteria evaluation framework was adopted for key decisions associated with the project such as mode of transit and route options.</p> <p>Community and stakeholder support was one of seven criteria of the two route options through Southport.</p> <p>Full details of the report and process can be found in Chapter 2 Alignment Selection.</p>
<p>Opportunities to work with developers to improve access to transport services (For example, Pacific Fair and Harbour Town).</p>	<p>TransLink and the GCRT team have been in discussion with Pacific Fair on the design and location of the bus interchange.</p> <p>In conjunction with GCCC a policy paper on the interaction with developers was produced to guide dealings between parties along the GCRT corridor.</p>

<p>Tourist market will be significant for the rapid transit system provided it is legible and easy to use.</p>	<p>Chapter 7 Operational Issues details how the GCRT system will operate and includes the features that will ensure ease of access and use by the tourist and other markets.</p>
<p>Desire for improved understanding of the mode options (bus rapid transit and light rail transit).</p>	<p>Project ensured ongoing distribution of material and information.</p> <p>Distribution of fact sheet on mode and series of media articles over viewing the transit options was undertaken in July 2008.</p>
<p>Guarantee that no decisions on the project had already been made and that genuine community engagement would be sort and included in the decision making process.</p>	<p>Community feedback influenced the design of the system and provided improved outcomes in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Surfers Paradise Boulevard; ▶ Ferny Avenue; ▶ Queen Street (west); ▶ Scarborough Street; ▶ Nerang Street; and ▶ Parklands Drive.
<p>Access loading bays and ability of service vehicles to operate in Surfers Paradise Boulevard.</p>	<p>Loading bays and service vehicle access including taxis are included in the design of the rapid transit system.</p> <p>Details can be found in Chapter 8, Transport and Traffic Impact.</p>
<p>Lack of information available to the community.</p>	<p>The staged nature of the project limited the information available to the community.</p> <p>The draft CDIMP is a full and detailed report of the project and will be available for public review once the business case is approved.</p>
<p>Potential impact on two threatened frog species near Griffith University.</p>	<p>Following discussion with the Loders Creek Catchment Association the alignment was refined to avoid any impact of on frog habitat.</p>
<p>Levels of emission produced by the rapid transit system.</p>	<p>Environmental impacts and fuel systems are detailed Chapter 15, Air Quality.</p> <p>In summary LRT vehicles will be highly energy efficient and powered by electricity drawn from overhead contact</p>

	<p>lines with no local emissions.</p> <p>The BRT vehicles would be powered by the cleanest available energy source.</p> <p>Emissions from BRT vehicles will not exceed the stringent levels set by the Queensland Environmental Protection Agency and the National Environmental Protection Council of Australia.</p>
<p>Influence of the Indy event on the route option</p>	<p>Negotiations with the Indy event were held to create a design that minimised the impact on both the rapid transit system and circuit.</p> <p>This resulted in the Indy track being shortened to eliminate significant property impacts.</p>