

23 MAY 2012

Independent Reviewers update # 2

Berry bypass review

The independent review team has produced this fact sheet in response to community requests for more transparency with regards to issues being raised directly with the Independent Review Team by members of the public. This is an update to the previously published fact sheet.

Independence and integrity of the review process

The principal objective of the Independent review team is to observe and record the nature of the process undertaken by the Technical Investigation Group (TIG) and to ensure that it is thorough and even handed. The Independent Review Team has been tasked with carrying out a detailed review of the strategic route feasibility cost estimate for the southern bypass and the technical inputs required to produce the “Berry bypass Report”.

We understand that the principles and objectives of the role of the Independent Review Team were conveyed to the Berry community at a community meeting in March. This framework is published on the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) project website.

The Independent Review Team is committed to these tasks and understands the importance of this role and the significance that the community places against our ability to demonstrate our independence in this review. To this end, we have been reporting directly to the RMS General Manager Project Development and will continue to vigorously defend our intentions to

be independent of the Technical Investigation Group.

Records of meetings held with the Independent Review Team

Following requests from the community, the Independent Review Team will include the notes from our meetings with Mr Bruce Ramsay, Hon. Gareth Ward MP and the community consultation on the 30th April 2012, as part of our independent review report.

To assist the community’s concern for transparency, a copy of these meetings notes over the next few pages.



RMS project achievements. Have a look.

www.rta.nsw.gov.au/roadprojects/resources/documents/reports/achievements_display_book.pdf

Berry bypass Southern Route – Independent Review Notes of Meeting with Mr Bruce Ramsay, 17/04/12 – 4:00pm

Present Dan Reeve and Derrick Hitchins

- 1 Meeting was arranged at the request of Mr Bruce Ramsay to brief the Independent Reviewer on the Southern Route Option that had been proposed by the community.
- 2 Mr Ramsay provided some background as to his involvement in the development of the northern option based on his engineering experience and his interest in the project. He placed into context his working relationship with Mr Stuart Coghlan who had assisted him with the costings.
- 3 Note : All information that Mr Ramsay tabled for discussion had previously been sent to the RMS / TIG for their attention. No new information was presented or received by the Independent Reviewer prior to the meeting or on the day.
- 4 Mr Ramsay went through some of the issues that he believed were of concern to the residents of Berry he had spoken to and how this had shaped his thinking and the development of the design that he had prepared and put to the TIG. He also showed the Independent Reviewer how he had developed his cost estimate for the southern route.
- 5 Mr Ramsay was concerned that the TIG was not comparing apples with apples between the cost of the northern and southern routes. He expressed the view that the southern alignment being costed by the TIG was not being refined along the way to reflect his further modifications to the design and hence not adequately reflecting the additional savings he was able to identify.
- 6 Mr Ramsay was especially concerned how the extra earthworks required for the southern route was being assessed by the TIG and how the overall available cut and fill balance for the project was being overlooked during the costing of the imported fill component in the final layout of the southern viaduct.
- 7 DR and DH reiterated SMEC's independence on this project and assured Mr Ramsay that we would undertake a robust independent review of the process to ensure transparency so that whatever the decision, the decision is made on the best information available.

Berry bypass Southern Route – Independent Review Notes of Meeting with Gareth Ward, MP for Kiama, 20/04/12 – 10:30am

Present Dan Reeve and Chris Masters

- 1 First and foremost is the need to get a bypass for Berry, this has been in planning for a long time.
- 2 No personal preference for either a northern or southern route.
- 3 Looking at best value for the taxpayer.
- 4 There has been a considerable consultation process to date especially on the northern route.
- 5 There has been an expectation from back in the 50's and onwards that the Bypass would be a northern route.
- 6 The TIG process needs to quantify if there is a saving to the taxpayer.
- 7 The community is looking for a robust process and achieve an outcome.
- 8 There was some discrepancies in the 2007 (need to check) estimate with respect to the southern route.
- 9 He is looking for a robust independent review of the process to ensure transparency so that whatever the decision, it is made on the best information available (within the time constraints).

Below are the issues raised by community members during the time allocated to address the technical specialists (TIG) and Independent Reviewers.

Issues Register – Community Consultation Evening 30 April 2012

No.	Issue	Description
1.	Survey/questionnaire	Has a questionnaire ever been carried out to capture the considerations and issues of the community?
2.	Social impacts	Are social impacts assessed or is this review purely on engineering technical aspects? If social impacts have been assessed, what was the weighting to their consideration?
3.	Technically not a “bypass”	How is a route (northern route) that bisects the town, that is a “through route” and that bisects the town for future development, a “bypass”? The southern route does not bisect the town and avoids community severance. It also prevents issues with children going to school across the Northern route highway, safety issues etc. North = “Near miss” South = “Bypass”
4.	Documents available to community	What documents are made available to the community in regards to previous submissions and previous analysis of route assessment etc?
5.	Accessibility issues with the northern route	Will ambulances have issues getting into the town with the northern route, as all hospital facilities are in Nowra which is south of Berry?
6.	Example of Seacliff Road	Why can't the route (southern) be built out and up like Seacliff Road?
7.	Kangaroo Valley Road Interchange	What amenity is gained from the large interchange at Kangaroo Valley Road?
8.	Flood event risk	The northern route creates a “flood wall” to the town in the event of a severe flood.
9.	Orientation	Why would you go north (northern route) to go south in general direction?
10.	Community consultation process	Has the extensive community outside of Berry (the people who use the highway) been asked about the route?
11.	Perception	Has the decision been made? The perception is that the decision has been made and that the northern route has been chosen.
12.	Heavy vehicles near town	Why have the fuel tankers and B-Doubles not been moved away from the town as per the northern route?
13.	TIG recognition of issues raised	How does the TIG capture issue raised and how do they recognise these? A: Issues will be recorded in the minutes of the TIG meetings. There must be a better/other way of representing these issues? A: Chris Masters said we will take back to RMS.
14.	Cost review	Does the cost review consider other elements such as heritage, social aspects etc?

Issues Register – Community Consultation Evening 30 April 2012 continued

No.	Issue	Description
15.	Safety	The town will growth to the north (high side away from flood plains), so why is the southern route not safer?
16.	Local council's preference	Does the local council have preference or did they make the decision to go with the northern?
17.	Independent Reviewers and Minister	Do the Independent Reviewers take their work and go to the Minister with a decision?
18.	Final decision	Is the final decision based only on the cost and the cheaper route chosen? North route = \$X and southern route = \$Y
19.	Southern route assessment	The northern route went through the route selection process, was the southern route even given the same assessment and critique? If assessed what were the reasons for eliminating it (to avoid acid sulphate soils (ASS)?
20.	Design parameters	Are the design parameters for the like-for-like assessment the same?
21.	Reporting hierarchy	Who do the Independent Reviewers report to? A: Separate to TIG, report to General Manager Major Projects (RMS)
22.	Timeframe	When will Duncan Gay make a decision? A: TIG finishes and then the Independent Reviewers, but no definite date? Is the timeline realistic with all the continual questioning?
23.	Community interaction with Independent Reviewer	Do the Independent Review team talk to the community directly? Can we have a contact from the Independent Reviewers? A: All community issues go through the website/hotline and no one should go directly to the Independent Review team.
24.	Flood immunity	Is access in the case of flooding the same for both routes? What level of flood protection will RMS supply? Can this be separated and identifiable in the cost estimate?
25.	Capability statement	Is there anywhere that has a profile/capability statement (examples of projects, experience etc) on the Independent Review team? A: SMEC yes, but Lyall & Associates should have similar.
26.	Bruce Ramsay's earthworks calculations	Independent review team to cross reference Bruce's folder with earthworks calculations.
27.	North Street level	Why was the decision made on the North Street level?
28.	Southern interchange	Can the southern interchange move further south?