

5. Consultation

This section discusses the engagement undertaken to date for the proposal and the consultation proposed for the future. The engagement strategy and approaches used to consult on the proposal are described along with the results of engagement with the Aboriginal community, the wider community, and relevant government agencies and stakeholders to date.

5.1 Engagement strategy

Engagement has been managed as part of the community and stakeholder engagement strategy for the wider program to upgrade the Great Western Highway between Katoomba and Lithgow. Transport has developed a community consultation and stakeholder engagement plan (communications plan) to guide consultation activities. The Great Western Highway Upgrade Program (GWHUP) communications plan identifies key objectives and outcomes of consultation activities with the community, stakeholders and government agencies.

The consultation objectives are to:

- Ensure the Blue Mountains community, Central West communities and the broader NSW community, including key stakeholders and interest groups, are aware of and involved in consultation opportunities about the proposed duplication
- Provide targeted information to the community and other stakeholders, and to clearly communicate whether we are providing information or seeking feedback so that expectations are clear
- Ensure the proposed concept designs are developed appropriately, incorporating and acknowledging feedback and concerns of the local community and stakeholders
- Collaborate with government agencies and local councils to ensure a whole-of-government approach to managing issues and providing consistent messages
- Ensure that the communications and engagement approach and key messages align with Transport Road Network and Corridor Planning, and Future Transport strategy
- Monitor and evaluate stakeholder feedback and communication activities to review planning as required
- Engage in a manner that is open and transparent, collaborative, innovative, responsive, adaptive and sustainable
- Build stakeholder and community confidence in Transport and its decisions
- Ensure that members of the local community have sufficient opportunity to provide feedback, in light of fluid COVID-19 advice and restrictions on community consultation.

The following sections outline the consultation that has been carried out specifically for the proposal.

For further information on community consultation carried out as part of the wider program to upgrade the Great Western Highway between Katoomba and Lithgow, refer to Transport's website:

nswroads.work/gwhd

5.2 Community involvement

5.2.1 Proposal development

The NSW Government first announced an upgrade from Mount Victoria to Lithgow in May 2008. The first stages of community consultation commenced in June 2008 with identification of an initial study area. Community engagement was identified by Transport as an essential component of the proposal development. Since then, and throughout the options assessments and proposal development, substantial consultation has been undertaken with the community and relevant stakeholders.

A summary of the consultation activities at each stage of the proposal's development is provided in Table 5-1.

Table 5-1 Engagement activities undertaken during each stage of the proposal development

Development Stage	Engagement activities
Study area investigations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thirteen stakeholder meetings and briefings were held with NSW Government agencies, local Aboriginal land councils, organisations and local councils • An introduction to the proposal was provided through four community meetings and four staffed displays in June 2008 • A community meeting to identify transport needs of the Central West was held in June 2008 • Four constraints workshops were held with the community in August 2008 • A presentation was provided at the general meeting of the Dargan/Bell Residents Association in August 2008 • A stakeholder meeting/workshop was held with local council, government agencies and organisations on the Newnes Plateau corridor option in September 2008 • A community meeting/workshop was held on the Newnes Plateau corridor option in September 2008 • Public exhibition of the Mount Victoria to Lithgow Background and Proposed Project Development Report (RTA, 2008) in June 2008
Corridor options in which routes may be feasible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public exhibition of the Study Area Investigation and Corridor Identification Report (RTA, 2008) and the Strategic Evaluation of the Newnes Plateau Corridor Report (RTA, 2008) in November 2008 for community submission • Distribution of a community update in November 2008 outlining the key findings of the two studies to more than 12,000 residents in Blackheath, Katoomba, Mount Victoria, Lithgow, Hampton, Jenolan, Little Hartley, Hartley Vale, Oberon, Newnes, Clarence, Dargan, Marrangaroo and Bell • Letters to more than 650 landowners in the study areas • Direct mail to about 150 stakeholders, including local councils, government agencies and local community groups enclosing copies of the Study area investigations and corridors identifications report (RTA, 2008) and the Strategic review of a Newnes Plateau corridor report (RTA, 2008) • Email notification to stakeholders in the proposal database advising of updated information available on the proposal website

Development Stage	Engagement activities
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advertisements during November 2008 in the Blue Mountains Gazette, Lithgow Mercury, Oberon Review, The Land, Sydney Morning Herald, Daily Telegraph, The Koori Mail and The National Indigenous Times to advise the community about upcoming meetings, workshops and displays • Online recording of the Newnes Plateau corridor presentation • Media release in November 2008 • Provision of a dedicated proposal information toll free number, email address and website to distribute information and receive feedback • An additional 26 CD copies of the two November 2008 reports to individuals (following requests).
Confirmed corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A total of 462 submissions were received in response to the exhibition of the Study area investigations and corridor identification report (RTA, 2008) and the Strategic review of a Newnes Plateau corridor report (RTA, 2008) • Announcement of confirmed corridors (community update) • Community meetings • Community route option development workshops • Aboriginal focus group meetings and drive throughs • Public exhibition of the four modified corridors in the Submissions Report – corridors in which routes may be feasible (RTA, 2008) released in April 2009 • Public announcement of the preferred corridor in August 2009.
Route options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property owners within the route options areas and those no longer affected by the route options were individually contacted via mail • Over 10,000 community updates were distributed via unaddressed mail and over 1,500 were sent to those registered on the mailing list • Information on route options was put on public display at six publicly accessible venues • Information was updated on the proposal website • Public exhibition of the Route Options Report (RTA, 2009) and associated working papers in October 2009 for community submissions.
Preferred route selection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Announcement of preferred route (community update) • Staffed displays • Aboriginal focus group meeting • A total of 3,691 submissions were received in response to the Route Options Report display. This included 3,678 from individuals and 13 from government agencies, local councils or organisations • Four community members from along the proposal alignment were selected to participate in the value management workshop who reported back to the community on the process and outcomes at a community meeting in November 2009 • Public exhibition of the Preferred Route Report (RTA, 2010) in May 2010 for community submission.

5.2.2 Great Western Highway Upgrade Program consultation

In November 2019, the strategic corridor for the Great Western Highway Upgrade Program between Katoomba and Lithgow (of which the proposal forms part) was announced and put to the community for feedback.

The proposed upgrade was displayed to the community between Thursday 7 November and Monday 16 December 2019 at locations including Katoomba, Oberon, and Bathurst and Orange libraries.

The display locations and website link were included in advertisements in the Central Western Daily, Bathurst Western Advocate, Lithgow Mercury, Blue Mountains Gazette and Oberon Review. They were also advertised on the NSW Roads Facebook page.

Twelve community information sessions were held in Katoomba, Medlow Bath, Blackheath, Mount Victoria, Hartley and Lithgow, and were attended by 1045 people. The community was invited to view the proposed corridor at staffed information sessions which provided an opportunity to learn more, ask questions and have their say.

During the consultation period, Transport received 1759 pieces of feedback from members of the community, businesses and stakeholders. Of this feedback, 446 were forms (hard and soft copy), 756 were via email and 557 were pinned comments on the online map.

The main issues from consultation and a summary of Transport's responses follow.

Table 5-2 Summary of issues raised by the community

Aspect	Issue raised	Response / where addressed in REF
Options	The community would like to see rail options explored for freight.	The Highway upgrade is being developed alongside long term rail options as both road and rail solutions are required to meet future demands, ease congestion and increase safety. The rail line is being upgraded to allow for modern trains to provide service all the way to Lithgow.
	The community queried why Bells Line of Road did not appear to be considered as an alternate route for development, given its connectivity to the Castlereagh Highway, and the potential to avoid impacts to Great Western Highway townships.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Great Western Highway is a key transport corridor through the Blue Mountains, which is already at capacity during certain periods. Traffic volumes are expected to continue to grow. If the Bells Line of Road was upgraded significant traffic volumes would still remain on the Great Western Highway. An upgrade of Bells Line Road, which crosses extremely challenging terrain, could significantly impact the World Heritage Area and would not achieve the same local benefits for the highway townships. Upgrading Bells Line of Road remains a longer term priority for the NSW Government.
	Some community members believe the speed limit should remain a consistent 100 km/h to support current and future demand for an efficient connection from Sydney to the Central West.	The Great Western Highway will need to cater for through traffic mixing with slower moving local traffic as it remains the key route between communities in the Blue Mountains. As the corridor design is progressed, including further community consultation, Transport will consider opportunities to improve travel times and deliver a more consistent speed limit along the route.

Aspect	Issue raised	Response / where addressed in REF
Environment	Concerns were raised for the environment and protecting cultural and historical heritage of the townships along the Highway and the World Heritage Area.	Transport aims to maintain local heritage in the Blue Mountain and avoid impacting heritage listed items and places wherever possible. There will be no direct impact on the Greater Blue Mountains World Heritage Area and Transport is committed to minimising impacts to the natural environment, local heritage and property.
	Anticipated noise and pollution created from the completed upgrade was a concern for community members living along the Highway.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A detailed noise assessment (refer to Section 6.3 Noise and Vibration) has been carried out as per the Environmental Protection Authority's <i>Road Noise Policy</i> in conjunction with Transport's <i>Noise Criteria Guidelines</i> and <i>Noise Mitigation Guidelines</i> • Transport understands air quality is important to the community and is committed to improving air quality by effectively managing the NSW roads and traffic system. Air quality impacts have been considered further in Section 6.13 Air Quality.
	Concerns were raised about the potential impact on the natural surroundings and visual amenity of the area.	Transport is sensitive to the area's natural environment and the recreational value of the area. Community consultation will be ongoing throughout the Program and will help the proposal team to continue to identify and respond to these sensitive and highly valued areas. Impacts to landscape character and visual amenity are considered further in Section 6.9 Landscape Character and Visual Impact.
Road use	Concerns were raised about the safety of road users, including cyclists, as a result of a perceived increase in the number of heavy vehicles and changes to the speed limit.	Transport appreciates the concern community members raised about potential increased heavy vehicle traffic. During the road design process, Transport has incorporated safety principles to ensure the upgraded highway meets road safety standards and that the risks to all road users including pedestrians and cyclists are minimised. The Program will complement the existing investment on pedestrian and cyclist safety as part of the Great Western Highway Safety Upgrades program.
	Concerns were expressed about increased traffic congestion in towns where congestion is already an issue.	The Program is being designed to reduce congestion along the entire route, including through all the villages between Katoomba and Lithgow, and will separate long distance from local traffic where possible.
	Concern was raised about the size of freight vehicles moving through communities which want to preserve tranquillity and reduce pollution.	The highway is being designed to carry the safest and most productive heavy vehicles, which means fewer heavy vehicles on the road and a safer road environment for local communities and motorists. This includes B-doubles up to 26 metres and more modern, productive vehicles up to 30 metres long.
	Potentially impacted property owners are concerned for their	Transport understands that some property owners have concerns about potential impacts including future property values. If a property is required for the program, compensation

Aspect	Issue raised	Response / where addressed in REF
Property and business	homes and businesses and want to understand what can be expected from the property acquisition process.	is assessed under the provisions of the <i>Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991</i> . Transport uses professionally qualified industry-based valuers to assess compensation. The process allows for both owners and Transport to have valuations completed so that an agreement can be reached.
	Concern was raised from business owners that the upgrade will impact on their livelihood if their businesses are lost due to acquisition or impacted by a decline in tourism.	The Great Western Highway Upgrade Program is designed to make mountain communities more accessible and boost tourism and the Program will take every opportunity to increase the liveability of towns along the corridor. Our bypassed towns initiative has been proven to provide social benefits to towns in NSW (refer to Section 6.10 Socio-economic and Technical working paper – socio-economic (Appendix M)).
Community consultation	Some community members shared interest and support for the Program.	Transport acknowledges the benefits this Program will bring to those travelling in, around and through the Blue Mountains. Community feedback is vital in shaping the Program and the final route designed.

5.2.3 Targeted consultation

Targeted consultation has been undertaken throughout 2021 with communities along the proposal alignment including the Hartley District Progress Association and the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The purpose of this consultation was to:

- Introduce the proposal to the community including any changes that have been made to the proposal since the last community consultation in 2019 (refer to Section 5.2.2)
- Explain the future consultation for 2021 with the REF public display planned for November 2021 (refer to Section 5.6)
- Provide an opportunity for the community to ask questions about the proposal.

5.3 Aboriginal community involvement

Consultation is underway in accordance with the PACHCI and in accordance with Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (DECCW) consultation guidelines (DECCW 2010a). The stages of Transport's PACHCI procedure and the consultation activities undertaken during each stage is summarised in Table 5-3.

Table 5-3 Summary of Transport Procedure for Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation and Investigation

Stage	Description	Consultation activities
Stage 1	Initial Transport assessment	<p>Stage 1 of the PACHCI activities undertaken for this assessment involved a desktop risk assessment and internal Transport action to determine whether the proposal would potentially impact on Aboriginal cultural heritage and therefore require further assessment.</p> <p>This stage did not involve any consultation activities.</p>

Stage	Description	Consultation activities
Stage 2	Site survey and further assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of key Aboriginal stakeholders. This involved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A search of the National Native Title Register was carried out in November 2019 to identify registered native title claimants or native title holders for the assessment area. Two native title claimants were identified – Identifying the Local Aboriginal Land Councils (LALCs) relevant to the proposal area. These included Deerubbin LALC and Bathurst LALC as well as Darug Tribal Aboriginal Corporation and Gundungurra Tribal Council. • Engagement of Aboriginal stakeholders to undertake an archaeological survey. Nominated representatives for Deerubbin and Bathurst LALCs, Native Title and Traditional Owner Groups were engaged to participate in the archaeological survey where the proposed route corridor traversed their boundaries • Carrying out the archaeological survey in consultation with nominated representatives of the LALCs and Traditional Owner groups. Key Aboriginal stakeholders provided comment on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The potential for Aboriginal cultural material to be present within the proposed route corridor – The cultural significance of any Aboriginal cultural heritage sites identified during the survey – The proposed management recommendations, including recommendations for further assessment. • Preparation of the cultural heritage survey report with involvement from Aboriginal stakeholders. Deerubbin and Bathurst LALCs were asked to provide a cultural heritage survey report to Transport advising on Aboriginal cultural heritage issues that may arise as a result of the proposal. These issues are summarised in Table 5-4.
Stage 3	Formal consultation and preparation of a cultural heritage assessment report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of Aboriginal people with cultural knowledge. In August 2020 letters were sent to organisations seeking the details of Aboriginal people who may have an interest in the proposal and who hold cultural knowledge about objects and places relevant to the proposal. Based on these responses a list of 46 Aboriginal groups or people with potential cultural knowledge was compiled. • Notification of Aboriginal people with cultural knowledge. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – In August 2020, a letter of notification was sent to all the Aboriginal groups or people identified at that time inviting them to register their interest in the proposal. – Advertisements inviting Aboriginal groups or people to register their interest in the proposal were placed in the public notices section of multiple newspapers. • Preparation of a register of Aboriginal parties (RAPs). A RAPs for the proposal was prepared based on responses received from the letter and newspaper advertisement. Thirty-four RAPs registered their interest in the

Stage	Description	Consultation activities
		<p>proposal and Heritage NSW and local Aboriginal land councils were notified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hold an Aboriginal Focus Group (AFG) meeting. Invitations to an AFG meeting were sent to all RAPs along with an agenda and relevant proposal documentation. The AFG meeting was held in April 2021 during which the proposal details and draft archaeological methodology were presented to participants and feedback was sought. Meeting minutes from the AFG meeting were provided to participants. • Finalisation of archaeological methodology. Comments from RAPs and Heritage NSW were incorporated into the archaeological methodology and finalised. • Engagement of Aboriginal site officers for test excavations. Aboriginal site officers for the test excavations were selected from the attendees at the AFG meeting. • Development of an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (ACHAR).
Stage 4	Implement environmental impact assessment recommendations	<p>A copy of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (ACHAR) provided in Appendix G was provided to Heritage NSW and all RAPs for the proposal for review and comment. Following a review period of 28 days a second AFG meeting was held to provide a forum for the discussion of the proposal impacts and proposed management recommendations documented in the ACHAR in Appendix G and summarised in Section 6.4 of this REF.</p> <p>During future stages of the proposal, RAPs would be consulted about significant design or consultation changes in a manner consistent with the relevant guidelines.</p>

5.4 ISEPP consultation

Clause 13 to 16 of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) (ISEPP) specify the requirements for consultation with councils and other public authorities for infrastructure development carried out by or on behalf of a public authority. Appendix B contains an ISEPP consultation checklist that documents how ISEPP consultation requirements have been considered as part of this REF. Consultation is required in relation to specified development or development that impacts on:

- Council related infrastructure or services (clause 13)
- Local heritage (clause 14)
- Flood liable land (clause 15)
- Public authorities other than councils (clause 16).

Transport has consulted with the following agencies about the proposal in accordance with the ISEPP:

- Lithgow City Council in accordance with the requirements of clause 13, 14 and 15
- National Parks and Wildlife Service in accordance with the requirements of clause 16
- State Emergency Services (SES) in accordance with the requirements of clause 15AA.

Issues that have been raised as a result of this consultation are outlined below in Table 5-4. A copy of the letters sent, and the response received are provided in Appendix S.

Table 5-4 Issues raised through ISEPP consultation

Agency	Issue raised	Response / where addressed in REF
National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS)	<p>General environmental matters to be considered</p> <p>Refer to Developments adjacent to National Parks and Wildlife Service lands for guidance on the range of environmental matters to be considered during the preparation of the REF for works adjoining park.</p>	<p>The proposal has considered <i>Developments adjacent to National Parks and Wildlife Service lands</i> as part of the preparation of the REF. Section 6 assesses the environmental impacts of the proposal with consideration of the environmental issues identified in the document.</p>
	<p>Ensure the conservation values of the park are recognised in the preparation of the REF. Useful references include the Hartley Historic Site Plan of Management (NPWS 1994) and the Hartley Historic Site Conservation Management Plan (NPWS 2002).</p>	<p>The Statement of Heritage Impacts has considered the conservation values of Hartley Historic Village identified in the <i>Hartley Historic Site Plan of Management</i> (NPWS 1994) and the <i>Hartley Historic Site Conservation Management Plan</i> (NPWS 2002) and proposed adequate management measures to ensure the proposal is in accordance with the conservation values. Refer to Appendix H and Section 6.5 Non-Aboriginal Heritage.</p>
	<p>The construction and operational footprint of the Great Western Highway Upgrade is to be identified in relation to the existing legal boundary of the highway corridor and NPWS managed lands (including areas of park proposed for revocation).</p>	<p>The construction and operational footprint relative to the NPWS managed lands boundary is provided in Figure 1-2.</p>
	<p>An adequate description of the proposed activity and a complete scope of works is provided. The description must clearly specify what works (if any) will directly affect park. This includes the true extent of any landform modification (cut and fill) requirements of the proposal.</p>	<p>A description of the proposal and construction methodology is provided in Section 3. A description of the impacts on NPWS land is provided in Section 6.11 Property and Land Use.</p>
	<p>Appropriately scaled figures (maps) are provided to support the activity description and the construction and operational footprint of the proposal.</p>	<p>An overview of the proposal is provided in Figure 3-1. A summary of the key features of the proposal is provided in Figure 3-2. The proposal construction footprint is provided in Figure 3-3.</p>

Agency	Issue raised	Response / where addressed in REF
	<p>Remediation of the park interface should include suitable methods to stabilise exposed cuts and batters, to be applied where cut/fill is proposed proximate to the park. The addition of native vegetation is recommended where viable.</p>	<p>An Urban Design Plan will be prepared to support the final detailed proposal design and implemented as part of the CEMP.</p> <p>The Urban Design Plan will present an integrated urban design for the proposal, providing practical detail on the application of design principles and objectives identified in the environmental assessment. The Plan will include the location and identification of existing vegetation and proposed landscaped areas, including species to be used.</p> <p>Native vegetation will be re-established in accordance with <i>Guide 3: Re-establishment of native vegetation of the Biodiversity Guidelines: Protecting and managing biodiversity on RTA projects</i> (RTA, 2011).</p>
	<p>No unauthorised works, access or encroachments are permitted</p> <p>Where the development encroaches into the park and revocation of NPWS land is proposed for the works to become permissible, the REF should provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a full account of the biological, cultural and other values (such as recreational, public use and park management assets) protected by the reservation, including those identified in the Hartley Historic Site Plan of Management (NPWS 1994) and the Hartley Historic Site Conservation Management Plan (NPWS 2002) • an evaluation of the contribution of the affected land to the cultural and other values protected by the reservation and the impact of the loss of these lands from the NSW reserve system • details of any compensation proposal, consistent with the NPWS Revocation, Recategorisation and Road Adjustment Policy, including an assessment of the biological, cultural and other values of potential compensatory land (noting that it may not be possible to publicly 	<p>The Statement of Heritage Impacts has considered the conservation values of Hartley Historic Village identified in the <i>Hartley Historic Site Plan of Management</i> (NPWS 1994) and the <i>Hartley Historic Site Conservation Management Plan</i> (NPWS 2002) and proposed adequate management measures to ensure the proposal is in accordance with the conservation values. Refer to Appendix H and Section 6.5 Non-Aboriginal Heritage.</p> <p>A Biodiversity Development Assessment Report has been prepared for the proposal and is provided in Appendix D and summarised in Section 6.1 Biodiversity. This considers the impacts of the proposal on biodiversity.</p> <p>Compensatory lands will be acquired by Transport with the agreement of NPWS to ensure that the land has equal value both financially and ecologically to the area that will be acquired by Transport from NPWS.</p>

Agency	Issue raised	Response / where addressed in REF
	disclose the location of specific land), financial contributions for land management, restoration or rehabilitation, and/or any other forms of proposed compensation.	
	Alternative options that have been explored to avoid the park and a clear justification of any on-park components of the proposal infrastructure where revocation is proposed.	Section 2 provides a summary of the options development process.
	Ensure clear direction is provided as part of the REF and all operation documents that the park is classified as a restricted area, and that environmental safeguards are in place to protect the interface between the park and the proposal's works.	Mitigation measure PR04 in Section 6.11 ensures that all personnel will be made aware that they are not permitted to enter NPWS land and that demarcation between the construction site and park is established.
	Apply procedures to ensure demarcation of the park boundary occurs before works commence and that such demarcation remains a visually obvious barrier during all operations. This demarcation could take the form of temporary fencing or flicker tape with signs posted to reduce the risk of accidental encroachments or damage to park.	Exclusion zones will be set up to ensure a clear demarcation between the proposal and NPWS land in accordance with <i>Guide 2: Exclusion zones of the Biodiversity Guidelines: Protecting and managing biodiversity on RTA projects</i> (RTA, 2011).
	Ensure staff and contractors are adequately briefed on park boundary management protocols and procedures and restrictions applying to the protection of the park before commencement of works.	Prior to the commencement of construction, personnel will be briefed through inductions and toolbox talks on NPWS park boundary management protocols and procedures and restrictions applying to the protection of the park.
	Ensure all operational documentation contains clear procedures for incident management should issues arise on the interface or directly affecting park. Procedures should include emergency reporting via the Environment Line on 131555 and in writing to the Manager, NPWS Kanangra Area.	Operational documentation would contain clear procedures for incident management and would include a provision that emergency reporting would be via the Environment Line on 131 555 and in writing to the Manager of NPWS Kanangra Area.

Agency	Issue raised	Response / where addressed in REF
	<p>No ancillary construction related facilities or access are to be provided on park.</p>	<p>No ancillary construction facilities or site access tracks would be provided within NPWS land.</p>
	<p>Tree protection and felling techniques</p> <p>Apply tree protection on the park interface in accordance with Australian Standard 4970-2009 Protection of Trees on Development Sites, to prevent adverse long-term damage. Particular care is to be taken with significant, old-growth and hollow bearing trees on the park interface.</p>	<p>Tree protection would be applied to trees within the park interface in accordance with Australian Standard 4970-2009 Protection of Trees on Development Sites.</p>
	<p>Employ controlled directional, soft and sectional felling techniques on the interface of the park under the direction of a qualified arborist to avoid direct impacts to park, reducing the risk of any tree (or partial tree) being felled into park.</p>	<p>Vegetation and habitat removal will be undertaken in accordance with <i>Guide 4: Clearing of vegetation and removal of bushrock of the Biodiversity Guidelines: Protecting and managing biodiversity on RTA projects (RTA, 2011)</i>.</p> <p>All tree removal would be undertaken by a suitably qualified arborist to avoid impacts to adjacent trees and structures.</p>
	<p>Sediment and erosion control</p> <p>Ensure application of adequate sediment and erosion control is utilised to limit the movement of sediment across the park interface in accordance with recognised standards such as the 'Blue Book'.</p>	<p>Erosion and sediment control measures would be implemented and maintained in accordance with <i>Managing Urban Stormwater – Soils and Construction, Volume 1 (Landcom, 2004) and Volume 2D (DECC, 2008)</i>.</p>
	<p>Stormwater management systems are designed and function to limit adverse impacts to surface water flow and water quality associated with the upgrades during construction and operation.</p>	<p>Construction phase sediment basins and permanent dry biofiltration basins are proposed to ensure runoff meets the relevant water quality criteria.</p> <p>Operational drainage and water quality treatment infrastructure are outlined in Section 3.2.3.</p>
	<p>Amenity impacts on the historic heritage values of the Historic Site</p> <p>Cultural (historic heritage) values are to be identified, and likely impacts are assessed accordingly. Such values are</p>	<p>The Statement of Heritage Impacts has considered the conservation values of Hartley Historic Village identified in the Hartley Historic Site Plan of Management (NPWS 1994) and the Hartley Historic Site Conservation Management Plan (NPWS</p>

Agency	Issue raised	Response / where addressed in REF
	<p>detailed in NPWS plans including the Hartley Historic Site Plan of Management (NPWS 1994) and the Hartley Historic Site Conservation Management Plan (NPWS 2002).</p>	<p>2002) and proposed adequate management measures to ensure the proposal is in accordance with the conservation values. Refer to Appendix H and Section 6.5 Non-Aboriginal Heritage.</p>
	<p>Where impacts to historic heritage values of the park are assessed, appropriate mitigation measures are to be considered and implemented. Any necessary mitigation measures are to be located off park.</p>	<p>The Statement of Heritage Impacts (Appendix H) and summary in Section 6.5 Non-Aboriginal Heritage assesses the potential impacts of the proposal on historic heritage and proposes a number of measures to mitigate these impacts.</p>
	<p>Park and public safety</p> <p>Ensure risks to park visitors are considered and identified risks are addressed appropriately. Traffic management solutions should be sought and implemented to mitigate any identified risks.</p>	<p>A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will be prepared and implemented for traffic as part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for the construction phase of the proposal. This will include site specific traffic control measures to manage and regulate traffic movement and ensure the safety of visitors to NPWS land.</p>
	<p>Hygiene protocols</p> <p>Ensure hygiene protocols are established and implemented for machinery, vehicles, equipment and materials to limit the introduction of foreign soil, plant matter or pathogens.</p>	<p>A Flora and Fauna Management Plan will be prepared in accordance with Transport's Biodiversity Guidelines: Protecting and Managing Biodiversity on Projects (RMS, 2011) and implemented as part of the CEMP. It will include protocols to manage weeds and pathogens.</p> <p>Weed species will be managed in accordance with Guide 6: Weed management of the Biodiversity Guidelines: Protecting and managing biodiversity on RTA projects (RTA, 2011).</p> <p>Pathogens will be managed in accordance with Guide 2: Exclusion zones of the Biodiversity Guidelines: Protecting and managing biodiversity on RTA projects (RTA, 2011).</p>
	<p>Use the Hygiene Guidelines for Wildlife (DPIE 2020) to assist in designing appropriate protocols for the proposal works.</p>	<p>A Flora and Fauna Management Plan will be prepared in accordance with Transport's Biodiversity Guidelines: Protecting and Managing Biodiversity on Projects (RMS, 2011) and implemented as</p>

Agency	Issue raised	Response / where addressed in REF
		<p>part of the CEMP. It will include protocols to manage weeds and pathogens.</p> <p>Weed species will be managed in accordance with Guide 6: Weed management of the Biodiversity Guidelines: Protecting and managing biodiversity on RTA projects (RTA, 2011).</p> <p>Pathogens will be managed in accordance with Guide 2: Exclusion zones of the Biodiversity Guidelines: Protecting and managing biodiversity on RTA projects (RTA, 2011).</p>
	<p>Visitors and NPWS access to park</p> <p>Ensure park visitor entry roads and management trails remain open, unless subject to prior arrangement with the Manager, NPWS Kanangra Area.</p>	<p>Access to NPWS lands would be maintained at all times during construction.</p>
	<p>The Traffic Management Plan should demonstrate that there will be no long term or protracted loss or delay to park access during construction.</p>	<p>During construction the proposal would not result in any long term delays for visitors accessing NPWS lands.</p>
	<p>Ensure NPWS maintains access to all lands it manages post construction.</p>	<p>Access to NPWS lands would be maintained during the operation of the proposal.</p>
	<p>Ensure adequate community notification occurs of any programmed closure of any access to visitor precincts to limit impacts on the public.</p>	<p>Access to NPWS lands would be maintained at all times during construction.</p>
	<p>Access to reliable clean drinking water supply and related infrastructure</p> <p>Ensure that water quality of the River Lett is not impacted by any of the activities outlined in the proposal. This should be addressed by the REF.</p>	<p>An assessment of the potential impacts of the proposal on water quality has been undertaken and is provided in Appendix I and summarised in Section 6.6 Soils and Surface Water. Safeguards and mitigation measures have been proposed to prevent any impacts to water quality including the establishment of erosion and sedimentation controls in accordance with <i>Managing Urban Stormwater – Soils and</i></p>

Agency	Issue raised	Response / where addressed in REF
		<i>Construction, Volume 1</i> (Landcom, 2004) and <i>Volume 2D</i> (DECC, 2008).
	Ensure access will remain available to NPWS infrastructure. If this is unachievable, alternate solutions should be found prior to works restricting access to the site. Discussions should be undertaken with the Manager, NPWS Kanangra Area prior to any agreement on a solution. This could include upgrading of the station, and pipe network or development of new infrastructure in a suitable location.	Access to NPWS lands would be maintained at all times during construction.
	<p>Ongoing communication with National Parks and Wildlife Services and the public</p> <p>Provide a copy of the final REF once determined by Transport, for NPWS records.</p>	A copy of the REF will be provided to NPWS once the REF has been determined.
	<p>Ensure notification from Transport occurs at least one week before works commence adjacent to park. The notification should include relevant contact details of the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport communications team and direct website links to the proposal page to assist in the management of any public enquiries received regarding the proposal • Transport project coordinator as the primary contact for NPWS during proposal delivery • Onsite primary contractor delivering the project works adjacent to the park, to assist in any incident management 	Transport will ensure that NPWS are notified prior to the commencement of any works that are adjacent to NPWS land. This will include the details of the relevant point of contact for any public enquiries.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take appropriate steps to inform the community and any relevant key local groups about the proposed works, well in advance of the works commencing. 	Transport is committed to ongoing consultation with the community and key stakeholders regarding the proposal. Further information regarding ongoing consultation is provided in Section 5.6.1.

5.5 Government agency and stakeholder involvement

Various government agencies and stakeholders have been consulted about the proposal, including:

- Lithgow City Council
- National Parks and Wildlife Services
- Hartley Crown Land Management Board
- NSW Rural Fire Service
- NSW Trainlink
- Lithgow Buslines
- Utility providers (Endeavor Energy, Telstra/NBN)
- Hartley district Progress Association
- Central Tablelands Mountain Bike Club.

Issues that have been raised as a result of consultation with these agencies and stakeholders are outlined below in Table 5-5. Across all proposal stages, Transport have also consulted with Lithgow City Council and relevant public authorities in accordance with and in addition to the obligations of the ISEPP framework. In addition to the inter-departmental consultation required under ISEPP, Transport has consulted with relevant agencies, including OEH, during the development of the proposal and obtained feedback on their potential future involvement.

Consultation with Lithgow City Council has been conducted throughout the development of the proposal and will continue during detailed design. Initial feedback from Lithgow City Council has been considered and incorporated into the concept design where agreed. The design refinements resulting from this consultation are detailed in Section 2.

Transport will continue to consult with government authorities and agencies and consider any issues raised where reasonable and feasible. Formal notifications to relevant authorities will be provided where applicable.

Table 5-5 Issues raised through stakeholder consultation

Agency	Issue raised	Response / where addressed in REF
Lithgow City Council	Design, landscape character and visual impacts, environment, road maintenance, economic development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 6 • Appendix L: Urban design, landscape character and visual impact assessment • Appendix M: Socio-economic Assessment
National Parks and Wildlife Services	Revocation of land	Section 4.2.5 and section 4.4

Agency	Issue raised	Response / where addressed in REF
Hartley Crown Land Management Board	Acquisition of Crown Land	Section 6.11
NSW Rural Fire Service	South Bowenfels Fire Brigade shed access, highway access during fires	Section 6.2, section 6.11 and Appendix E: Traffic and Transport Assessment
NSW Trainlink	Bus services along the route during trackwork and train emergencies	Appendix E: Traffic and Transport Assessment.
Lithgow Buslines	Bus routes and bus stop locations from Little Hartley to Lithgow	Section 6.2 and Appendix E: Traffic and Transport Assessment.
Endeavour Energy	Powerline relocation and adjustment	Section 3.5.
Telstra/NBN	Telecommunications relocation and adjustment	Section 3.5.
Hartley District Progress Association	Concept design, safety, access, speed limit, heavy vehicle rest areas, environment, consultation	Chapter 3 Section 6.2 and Appendix E: Traffic and Transport Paper Chapter 5.
Central Tablelands Mountain Bike Club	Recreational cycling	Section 3.2.

5.6 Ongoing or future consultation

5.6.1 Ongoing consultation

Transport would continue to work closely with the community and relevant stakeholders through all stages of the proposal. The following consultation would be ongoing throughout proposal development and construction will include, but not limited to:

- Provision of information via print, online and face-to-face means
- Provision of regular information updates via the project web page and virtual portal
- Provision of regular information updates via media releases and proposal advertisements in local media
- Face-to-face and online consultation/drop-in sessions
- Targeted engagement with local stakeholder groups, Lithgow City Council, utility providers and other government agencies
- Pop-up displays
- Production of a community consultation and general issues response summary report

- Provision of information and project updates at key stages during design finalisation
- Engagement with affected landowners and community stakeholder groups about the project and key design decisions that may impact them
- Follow-up meetings to discuss and agree access arrangements with directly affected landowners prior to and during construction
- Engagement and coordination with transport and other infrastructure providers, particularly around project interfaces and in relation to cumulative impacts
- Engagement with the local community about construction timing, impacts and mitigation

Should the proposal proceed, the construction contractor would develop a Community and Stakeholder Involvement Plan to keep residents and road users up to date about construction progress. This would include:

- Consultation with community stakeholders to help manage impacts during construction
- Notifying residents when work is proposed to start
- Notifying residents of night work
- Notifying residents of access issues

5.6.2 Display of REF

The REF will be on display between 22 November 2021 and 21 December 2021. The document will be accessible via various different ways as outlined on the Display of the REF page at the start of this document.

The REF will be open to public submissions and will be managed in accordance with the Transport Privacy Statement.