

**Further Additional information**

# **Special Meeting**

**Wednesday, 20 October 2021**



---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>PAGE NO</b>
4.1	<b>SUNSHINE COAST MASS TRANSIT OPTIONS ANALYSIS</b>	
	ATTACHMENT 2 FURTHER ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.....	5



## Related Report / Additional Information Request

<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Special Meeting</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>20 October 2021</b>
<b>Requesting Councillor:</b>	<b>All Councillors</b>		
<b>Item:</b>	<b>Sunshine Coast Mass Transit Options Analysis – OSCAR request</b>		
<b>Circulation</b>			
<b>Officer (title):</b>	<b>Program Director Urban Growth</b>	<b>Approving GE (title):</b>	<b>Acting Group Executive Liveability and Natural Assets</b>

In response to questions received, please note the following additional information for your consideration.

The answers to the questions posed by OSCAR in their emails to all Councillors and the Chief Executive Officer are provided below.

**Question 1:**

*Why the submissions from 30 organisations (Appendix 1) were deemed to be “outside of these engagement activities” and appear only to be reflected in the revised OA in the form of summary dot points (pp 36-39)? Why were these submissions (with one exception) not published in full? Was it stated in the community engagement process that only those responses to the official engagement process would be considered in detail?*

**Answer:**

The submissions summarised in Appendix 1 of the Engagement Report were outside of the engagement activities described in the body of the report. These submissions were neither requested nor invited by Council but were nonetheless welcomed by Council, which compiled the summaries presented in Appendix 1 based on a thorough analysis of each submission.

Because these submissions were unsolicited, the organisations and individuals involved in preparing the submissions would not have expected their submission to be made public. It would therefore be inappropriate for Council to publish these submissions. This is consistent with the limits to disclosure contained in the Information Privacy Principles (Schedule 3) of the *Information Privacy Act 2009*:

*“An agency having control of a document containing an individual’s personal information must not disclose the personal information to an entity, other than the individual the subject of the personal information unless:*

- *The individual is reasonably likely to have been aware or to have been made aware, under IPP 2 (data collection) or under a policy or other arrangement in operation before the commencement of the IP schedule that it is the agency’s usual practice to disclose that type of personal information to the relevant entity; or*
- *The individual has expressly or implied agreed to the disclosure.”*

**Question 2:**

*Why do the 1015 submissions (with names, addresses and signature of submitters) presented to Council by MTAG appear not to have been considered despite assurances from Council staff, verbally and in writing (from James Coutts), that all submissions, irrespective of their format, would be considered in the community consultation evaluation? Note: These are not pro-forma*



*submissions and even if they were they should not be ignored. Were you aware of these and have you sighted them?*

**Answer:**

A number of the feedback forms provided by MTAG, did not contain information about the person providing the feedback – addresses were not included on some forms or only an email contact was given. Notwithstanding this, the MTAG feedback forms were reviewed by Council, and the themes referenced in the engagement reporting.

When compared with the comments provided in response to the questions asked in the Council's surveys, it was apparent in this process of review that many of the written comments in the MTAG feedback forms were very similar and in some cases identical, suggesting that much of the feedback was following a proforma, the content of which was well known to Council and the engagement consultants.

Although it was not possible to determine how many people completed both Council's survey and MTAG's feedback form, it appears that many completed both. An audit of the completed MTAG forms revealed duplicates.

The analysis of MTAG's submission is included in Appendix 1 of the Engagement Report.

**Question 3:**

*Why is the MTAG submission the only one of the organisational submissions that has been included in the OA (Appendix 5) and why were its survey responses not included in the community consultation outcomes?*

**Answer:**

As indicated in Question 5 below, Appendix 5 also contains information about the ePetitions lodged by Beach Matters with the Legislative Assembly on 15 June 2021, so MTAG is not the only group to be mentioned in Appendix 5 of the Options Analysis Engagement Report.

Appendix 5 reports on community consultation activities that were conducted separately by groups; activities that either came to or were drawn to Council's attention. MTAG's submission, which included MTAG's analysis of the feedback forms it received, is included in its entirety in that appendix.

The MTAG feedback forms were reviewed, and the themes referenced in the engagement reporting. When compared with the comments provided in response to the questions asked in the Council's surveys, it was apparent that many of the written comments in the MTAG feedback forms were very similar and in some cases identical, suggesting that much of the feedback was following a proforma, the content of which was well known to Council and the engagement consultants. Although it was not possible to determine how many people completed both Council's survey and MTAG's feedback form, it appears that many completed both. An audit of the completed MTAG forms revealed duplicates.

The analysis of MTAG's submission is included in Appendix 1 of the Engagement Report, along with the other submissions provided outside the formal engagement process.

**Question 4:**

*Were there other submissions about which the community is not aware, that the Council has not accounted for/reported on?*

**Answer:**

Council has reported on all the submissions from organisations received outside of the formal engagement process.



Other means of providing feedback that were outside the formal engagement process, such as the sending of letters and emails by individuals, although again not requested or invited by Council, were welcomed, and reviewed by Council. The matters raised in these letters and emails were found to be consistent with the matters raised in the formal engagement activities.

**Question 5:**

*Are you aware that there were 3859 signatories to 3 e-petitions to the State Government opposing light rail? Are you aware Minister Bailey's response to these petitions said in part:*

*"SCC committed to undertaking a meaningful community engagement process as part of delivering the options analysis before more detailed investigations are undertaken during development of a detailed business case. ... I look forward to being updated by the SCC on the outcomes of the community consultation which will consider the community's feedback and the outcomes from the broader options analysis that will be followed by the development of a business case."*

**Answer:**

Council officers were aware of the various ePetitions lodged by Beach Matters with the Legislative Assembly on 15 June 2021 and of Minister Bailey's response. It was an oversight that only one of the petitions was mentioned and this will be corrected in the finalised version of the Options Analysis to be provided by Council's Chief Executive Officer to the State and Commonwealth Governments, should Council endorse the Options Analysis.

**Question 6:**

*Have you read the Sunshine Coast stories (Appendix 13, drawn from Q20 from the Council's Survey)?*

**Answer:**

The engagement team have read the stories which make for interesting reading and express a range of varied views about the Sunshine Coast.

**Question 7:**

*Have you ever explained to your constituents the likely cost to ratepayers of the Council's contribution to the 5 preferred transport options and how this will be funded? Do you know what % contribution to capital the Council may be asked to contribute?  
(The Gold Coast provides good evidence of the amount involved for each of its light rail stages and how their Transport levy increased dramatically to fund these.)*

**Answer:**

The consideration of the potential for Sunshine Coast Council to contribute to the capital cost of delivering the mass transit system will only be able to be undertaken with any certainty when the outcome of the Detailed Business Case is known and the cost of procuring the delivery of the preferred system is determined. Accordingly, the extent of any potential contribution from Council is not known at this time.

It is understood that the City of Gold Coast based its decisions on the contribution it would make to the cost of the various stages of Gold Coast light rail when the overall cost of each stage was known.

**Question 8:**

*Why has nothing substantial changed in the revised Options Analysis report - same five options, same route, and same timeframe – despite the community consultation?*

**Answer:**

The Options Analysis has been substantially reviewed, with changes made throughout to reflect the feedback received during the community engagement process. The feedback has not provided a basis for changing the recommended options or the business case timeframe, but the recommendations point to the benefit of some matters (such as the route between Maroochydore



City Centre and Mooloolaba) being subject to further consideration during the preparation of the Detailed Business Case.

**Question 9:**

*Why is light rail the least preferred mode in the Survey results yet remains in the mix and gets the highest ratings on Council's multi criteria assessment and economic appraisal results (including key Tables 47, 49 and 99)?*

**Answer:**

Questions 9 to 13 of Council's Mass Transit survey sought the views of respondent about the benefits or impacts of each of the five mass transit options – Bus Rapid Transit, Trackless Tram, Light Rail, Wireless Light Rail and Quality Bus Corridor.

The responses to these questions were open-ended in nature, so the reporting converts the answers into measures of sentiment – positive, negative, or neutral. Positive sentiment about the options fell in a narrow range between 18% and 27%, with the exception of Light Rail, which attracted a positive sentiment of 13%. Negative sentiment about the options fell in a narrow range between 27% and 36%, with the exception of Light Rail, which attracted a negative sentiment of 45%. No option therefore drew a majority of positive or negative sentiments.

The proportion of respondents who expressed a neutral sentiment, or didn't express a view, also fell in a reasonably narrow range between 42% and 53%, but comprised by far the greatest proportion across all options, with the exception of Light Rail, for which the neutral sentiment or no expressed view percentage was slightly exceeded by the negative sentiment.

By the time survey respondents arrived at question 14, which asked how satisfied they were that the five recommended options were the best options to be considered in the Detailed Business Case, the neutrality and uncertainty had almost entirely disappeared (together representing only 9% of the respondents' views) and the satisfied and unsatisfied represented 45% and 46% of respondents respectively.

Notably, neither group of respondents represents a majority so it cannot be said that the community has overwhelmingly endorsed or overwhelmingly rejected the five options on the basis of the survey conducted by Council.

The survey results do not provide the only indicator of community attitudes toward the recommended mass transit options. The engagement activities that involved more deliberative processes (i.e. during which participants took part in more in-depth consideration of the options and related outcomes, such as the appropriate location and form of urban consolidation), produced strongly positive sentiments toward the recommended Mass Transit options.

In addition, the qualitative multi criteria assessment (MCA), transport outcomes scoring, and the economic appraisal are conducted on the basis of the requirements of the business case process. The survey responses obtained during the community engagement process (to the extent that they were relevant to the attributes, criteria or cost items against which the options were evaluated in the qualitative MCA, the transport outcomes scoring and the economic appraisal) did not give cause to reconsider either the evaluation process or the outcomes contained in the Options Analysis.





**Question 10:**

*What is the urgency for progressing this without the questions above been answered?*

**Answer:**

Ever since the Mass Transit engagement process concluded, many in the community have been asking for the results of the engagement process and the associated changes to the Options Analysis to be made available. Council has ensured this proceeded as soon as possible.

The questions raised by OSCAR have been answered.

**Question 11:**

*Why are the requirements of Infrastructure Australia dictating the timing and quality of the OA? What is the problem if a post 31 December 2021 IA submission would need to comply with the requirements of IA's new business case framework, particularly if these are more rigorous and therefore more likely to lead to a robust evaluation of the costs and benefits of the MT project relative to IA assessment criteria? Is a rigorous assessment not in the best interests of Council and ratepayers given our responsibility for meeting some proportion of the project costs should it proceed?*

**Answer:**

The Options Analysis was produced as soon as practicable following the analysis and reporting of the community engagement process and on the basis of the feedback received during the process.

The advice in the Council report about the impending refresh of Infrastructure Australia's Assessment Framework therefore has nothing to do with the timing of Council's consideration of the Options Analysis. It simply draws attention to the potential for the refreshed the framework to necessitate rework if the Options Analysis is provided to Infrastructure Australia after the end of 2021. Infrastructure Australia has indicated that its refreshed framework will include a range of changes:

- A simpler, four-stage process that aligns with state and territory frameworks
- A clear and transparent definition of what makes a proposal nationally significant
- Removing duplication. After Stage 1, there are no templates to complete, only detailed checklists to assist with submissions
- Standardising the terminology in the Priority List
- Improved guidance on options analysis, including the use of multi-criteria analysis, rapid and detailed cost-benefit analysis
- Encouraging wider application of post completion reviews
- Recommending, but not requiring, that a business case includes at least two options in addition to the base case
- Identifying in the Priority List which stage each proposal has reached, in line with the Assessment Framework stages.

(See <https://www.infrastructureaustralia.gov.au/listing/newsletter/launch-infrastructure-australias-refreshed-assessment-framework>)

At this time, the exact nature and extent of the effect these changes would potentially have on the structure and content of the Options Analysis is not known.

**Question 12:**

*Can you identify, during the 2020 Council elections, where you campaigned on, or supported, the Council's MT project generally and/or light rail in particular?*

**Answer:**

To be answered by Councillors.

**Question 13:**

*If you support, and therefore endorse, this version of the OA, do you think you will be able, in conscience, to make any criticism of components of the project into the future?*



**Answer:**

To be answered by Councillors.

**Answer:**

**Question 14:**

*Council's own Community Engagement Policy Statement (page 1) states "Genuine, inclusive, fit-for-purpose and transparent community engagement" In the true spirit of Community Engagement and noting particularly the Guiding Principles of Inclusivity and Transparency, surely all contributions would be welcome in whatever format people chose and should be reported on at least and included at most.*

- *Was the community advised that ONLY those official engagement activities would be considered?*
- *Which level on the International Association for Public Participation Framework and Spectrum was the Mass Transit engagement process based?*

**Answer:**

The community engagement process for the Mass Transit Project was extensive and broad ranging and the reporting of the process and its outcomes has been thorough and extensive.

All contributions to the engagement process were welcomed in whatever format people preferred and were subsequently reviewed by Council.

In answer to the dot-pointed questions:

- The community was not advised that only the official engagement activities would be welcomed. Other means of providing feedback that were outside the engagement activities, such as sending letters and emails, although not requested or invited by Council, were welcomed, and reviewed by Council. The matters raised in these letters and emails were found to be consistent with the matters raised in the formal engagement activities.
- The Mass Transit engagement process incorporated aspects of the first three levels in IAP2's spectrum – "Inform", "Consult" and "Involve". At the "Involve" level (consistent with IAP2's description of the features of that level), Council has worked with the community to ensure that its concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed (i.e. in the updated Options Analysis) and provided feedback on how public input influenced the decision (as set down in the Public Interest Statement Chapter of the Options Analysis (Chapter 15)). The Enquiry-by-Design Workshop and Intergenerational Forum exhibited aspects of the "Collaborate" level of the IAP2 Spectrum in that these activities looked to the community for advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporated that advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible (again consistent with IAP2's description of the features of that level) .