

MEETING NOTES



Name of meeting: Foxground & Berry Bypass Route Comparison Study: Technical Investigation Group
Weekly Progress/Coordination Meeting #13

Location of meeting: AECOM, 420 George Street, Sydney

Meeting facilitator: Steve Zhivanovich

Date: 16/05/2012 **Time:** 10am

Attendees:

Name	Initials	Organisation
Henk Buys	HB	AECOM
Gillian Goldsmith	GG	Evans & Peck
Phil Jorgensen	PJ	Evans & Peck
GoranKozarski	GK	RMS
Annabel Killen	AK	Evans & Peck
Michael Moore	MM	Evans & Peck
Rebecca Lay	RL	Evans & Peck
Ben Noble	BN	AECOM
John Poposki	JP	RMS
Dan Reeve	DR	SMEC (External reviewer)
Ron de Rooy	RdR	RMS
Glen Smith	GS	AECOM
Jon Williamson	JW	AECOM
Steven Zhivanovich	SZ	RMS

Independent reviewers:

Name	Initials	Organisation
Chris Masters	CM	SMEC (External reviewer)
Basil Pazpinis	BP	RMS PMO (Internal reviewer)
Scott Button	SB	Lyall + Associates (External reviewer)

MEETING NOTES



Transport
Roads & Maritime
Services

**Additional
distribution:**

Name	Initials	Organisation
Derrick Hitchins	DH	SMEC (External reviewer)
Alan Thomas	AT	RMS PMO (Internal reviewer)
Adam Berry	AB	RMS
Ken O'Neill	KO'N	Aurecon
Peter Stewart	PS	Peter Stewart Consulting

Attachments: Outstanding actions from past minutes

MEETING NOTES

	Item	Discussion	Independent reviewer input	Action
1.	Review and update of outstanding actions from previous minutes	Outstanding actions reviewed, shown below.		Noted
2.	Comparative Report Deliverables	<p>Overall structure of report</p> <p>The structure of the report needs to be explained in the executive summary of the report.</p> <p>It was agreed that each technical expert should provide a synopsis of their investigations and results of the investigation.</p>	<p>Reviewers noted that the report contained significant technical content and it was important that the structure presented the key outcomes in a useful and accessible style.</p> <p>It was suggested that a synopsis be written for each section of the report to summarise the content to present the key results up front</p> <p>It was also suggested that a summary of the northern route be provided in the report.</p>	All
		<p>Design section</p> <p>Noted that there would be more detail included on the development of the base case routes, including clear explanation that the base case route was selected by</p>	Reviewers noted that more supporting information is required to explain the assessment criteria used to identify selection of the base case route	AK

MEETING NOTES

	Item	Discussion	Independent reviewer input	Action
		the group based on technical criteria and design parameters.		
		<p>Design section: Visuals</p> <p>Updated map required for introduction section with the final northern and southern routes.</p> <p>Updated map required of preliminary route options (blue, magenta and black routes) with improved colour contrast.</p>		GS
		<p>Flooding investigations – report section</p> <p>Technical notes to be provided to independent reviewer to provide the background on the results generated by the flood model runs.</p>	<p>Independent reviewers discussed their reviews so far of the flooding investigations undertaken.</p> <p>This has included the reviews of information relied upon from other sources such as the previous reports and Shoalhaven Council Flood levels.</p> <p>In addition, the independent reviewer discussed the extent of information that would be expected in the technical notes to allow proper interrogation of the flood</p>	BN

MEETING NOTES



	Item	Discussion	Independent reviewer input	Action
			modelling undertaken. Independent reviewer will need to be in a position to confirm that they are satisfied with the work done to date.	
		Geotechnical investigations – report section The geotechnical investigations have been completed and report preparation is underway. A peer review of interpretation of the factual findings will be undertaken by Coffey Geosciences. Coffey’s conclusions will be included in the geotechnical section of the report as a check of the TIG’s interpretations of the data. The details of the remaining work required on the geotechnical report section were discussed in meeting held 16/05/12.		HB

MEETING NOTES



	Item	Discussion	Independent reviewer input	Action
		<p>Construction methods – report section</p> <p>Earthworks CMS to be updated to include further explanation of the mass haul analysis.</p> <p>Zoning diagrams to be updated to reflect Toolijooa cut.</p>		PS
		<p>Construction program – report section</p> <p>Progress to date: summary programs have been produced for the report.</p> <p>Final conclusions regarding the necessary treatment for soft soils are required for program finalisation.</p>		HB
		<p>Cross section of cut diagram</p> <p>To better explain the approach for winning additional material from large cuttings such as Toolijooa, long and cross section diagrams should be included in the report.</p>		GS
		<p>Cost estimation – report section</p> <p>Geotechnical issues, in particular the soft</p>	Reviewers queried the level of detail on the cost estimate to be provided in the	PJ

MEETING NOTES

	Item	Discussion	Independent reviewer input	Action
		<p>soil issue, needs to be resolved in order to update the cost estimate.</p> <p>Allowance for soft soil improvement has been identified as a priority issue to be resolved. In particular, input required regarding extent of stone columns required.</p> <p>Discussion of how the cost estimate is to be presented in the body of the report. Current format of the cost estimate is presented using standard RMS breakdown.</p> <p>It has also been noted that the cost estimation process is an iterative process and therefore can only be finalised once all other issues are finalised.</p>	<p>report.</p> <p>Independent reviewer suggested that not just the high level summary be provided, but it be supported by one further level of detail.</p> <p>BP suggests that the inclusion of background information for the cost estimate section is not necessary as it can be found in the RMS estimating manual.</p> <p>BP also notes that the section regarding estimating structure should be checked for consistency with RMS estimating documents.</p> <p>The Independent Reviewer recommended that enough information be included so that the reader understands the process undertaken to come up with the estimate.</p> <p><i>Post meeting note: The reviewers discussed the need for a probabilistic risk evaluation exercise and agreed this would not be required at this time as contingencies had been applied to each major cost item based on the known</i></p>	

MEETING NOTES

	Item	Discussion	Independent reviewer input	Action
			<i>information</i>	
		<p>Presentation of provisional items</p> <p>The details regarding the mechanism of including provisional items in the estimate were discussed and unresolved issues were identified for further discussion on 16/05/12</p> <p>Further explanation of how provisional items have been addressed is required in the report and in a fact sheet for community information.</p>	<p>Independent reviewers noted that the reasons and approach to including provisional items in a cost estimate needs to be clearly communicated.</p> <p><i>Post meeting note: The reviewers discussed the inclusion of Provisional Sums and agreed that any item being required as a necessary inclusion to make a route feasible would be listed as an Adjustment Sum. Items not directly impacting the feasibility of a route would remain listed as Provisional Sums.</i></p>	PJ
		<p>Kangaroo Valley Road Interchange provisional item</p> <p>Additional provisional item to be included in the cost estimate based on a community submission with a split interchange, with ramps at Kangaroo Valley Road and ramps in the vicinity of Schofields lane. A preliminary outline design has been produced for the item.</p>		GS/RdR

MEETING NOTES



	Item	Discussion	Independent reviewer input	Action
		<p>The design needs to be finalised as a strategic design for inclusion in the cost estimate and in the report to be presented to the minister</p> <p>Drawings to be finalised.</p> <p>It is noted that the mainline and ramps are similar to the current design, however there will be impacts on land acquisition costs and an additional bridge and approximately 1 km of local road are required.</p>		
3.	Geotechnical fieldwork: interpretive report by Coffeys	Awaiting interpretive report by Coffeys. HB to incorporate Coffeys report into the geotechnical investigations report section.		HB
4.	Critical Issues Register	<p>Northern route: issue of pedestrian connectivity</p> <p>RMS to examine possible improvements to pedestrian connectivity. Need to provide cross-section of bridge to show pedestrian connectivity at Kangaroo Valley Road.</p>		GS

MEETING NOTES



	Item	Discussion	Independent reviewer input	Action
		<p>Northern route: drainage structures – main viaduct</p> <p>Resolution of the clearance at the western abutment is a matter for detailed design. JP to provide a summary of potential solutions. BN to confirm that flooding impacts are acceptable for the current design.</p>		JP &BN
		<p>Access roads and local road adjustments</p> <p>Need drawings of both sets of access provisions and local road adjustments to be completed so costs can be included in the estimates and residents can examine access provisions.</p> <p>Drawings to be finalised. RdR to provide information on cattle underpasses to GS for finalisation of the access roads and local road adjustments.</p>		RdR/GS
		<p>Casting of beams on site</p> <p>Further input required to explain</p>		KO'N

MEETING NOTES



	Item	Discussion	Independent reviewer input	Action
		<p>differences between pre-tensioned super T beams and post tensioned segmental box girder bridges including references to comparable projects:</p> <p>Windsor Bridge, Kempsey Bypass Bridge</p>		
		<p>Impact on aquifers in the Toolijooa ridge excavation</p> <p>TIG assessed the impact on aquifers and water table if the Toolijooa cutting is deepened. Results to be included in report. Input required for inclusion in register</p>		HB
		<p>Earthworks optimisation</p> <p>Preliminary information indicates that quarry just south of Tindalls Lane is not likely to be an appropriate source of fill. RdR awaiting advice from owner to confirm.</p> <p>Ongoing</p>		RdR

MEETING NOTES



	Item	Discussion	Independent reviewer input	Action
		<p>Mature tree removal</p> <p><i>Aerial study attempted however it did not manage to estimate the approximate number of mature trees requiring removal.</i></p> <p><i>Assume approximately 120 trees for the northern route; and assume approximately 30 trees for the southern route. This would be subsequently examined in greater detail for whichever route proceeded.</i></p> <p>Completed</p>		RdR
		<p>RMS design requirements for width of roadway on structures</p> <p>Discussion regarding current wording in critical issues register. Agreed that current wording does not clearly state the agreed RMS design criteria.</p> <p>All structures are to provide for maximum of two lanes in each direction and include adequate shoulder width and minimum sight distance requirements.</p>	External reviewers noted that this issue was of concern to the community and needed to be clarified in the TIG Report.	

MEETING NOTES

	Item	Discussion	Independent reviewer input	Action
		<p>Issues register to be updated. <i>Issue register updated.</i> Completed</p>		
		<p>Structures visualisations KO'N stated that community members had expressed concern with the visual impact of the structures. Visualisations of structures to be made available on the project website. <i>Graphics to be made available on the project website in web upload 22 May.</i> Ongoing</p>	<p>Independent reviewers note that this issue was of concern to the community, especially the actual heights which were difficult to ascertain from some of the drawings.</p>	
5.	Submission from community member	<p>Acknowledgement of receipt of a submission from a community member containing a new design proposal for the south route with costing information.</p> <p>The TIG to undertake an assessment of the submission's against the previously agreed design criteria and design standards before an evaluation of the</p>	<p>Independent reviewer confirmed that the independent review team had received the same submission at the 30 April community meeting.</p> <p>Independent reviewer advised the first exercise the TIG must undertake is an evaluation of whether the submission conforms to the RMS project design</p>	JP

MEETING NOTES

	Item	Discussion	Independent reviewer input	Action
		<p>differences in quantities and costs. An MX model will be produced in the first instance.</p> <p><i>Assessment of the submission has been undertaken and the design found not to be compliant. The amount of work required to make the design compliant would be significant.</i></p> <p><i>Results of the assessment:</i></p> <p><i>the submission does not comply with AustRoads guidelines, and there are no improvements or benefits to the current southern route based on the new submission. The submission aimed to achieve a better earthworks balance, however the geometry of the design was not compliant. Any changes to the geometry will also result in the loss of the earthworks balance.</i></p> <p><i>JP has produced a memo which outlines the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Does not comply with Austroads standards</i> 	<p>parameters and relevant design standards.</p> <p><i>Independent reviewers agree that if the design does not comply with Austroadguidelines, the submission should then not be considered any further.</i></p> <p><i>The Independent reviewers want TIG to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>identify the claimed benefits of the submission, and justify why they are not beneficial.</i> - <i>Determine whether any of the submission can be incorporated into the current design.</i> - <i>It has been noted that the exercise has been completed.</i> 	

MEETING NOTES



	Item	Discussion	Independent reviewer input	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Not possible to comply with alignments</i> - <i>Impact on sewage treatment works</i> <p><i>The summary of this assessment will be shown in the Critical Issues Register.</i></p> <p>Ongoing</p>		
6.	AOB	<p>Presentation of report</p> <p>The report was commissioned by RMS to investigate and review the route costs. RMS personnel participated in the investigations along with personnel from Independent consultants. To reflect the input of the various organisations, the report will be issued under a combined banner.</p>	<p>Independent reviewers to decide on the presentation of their independent reviewer report.</p> <p>Reviewers suggested that the title of the report makes clear that the cost estimates have been prepared for comparison purposes.</p>	AK
		<p>Report targets</p> <p>Final report draft to be sent to reviewers Monday 21 May COB.</p> <p>All reports, including independent reviewer reports to be finalised by Monday 28 May COB.</p>		Noted

MEETING NOTES



	Item	Discussion	Independent reviewer input	Action
		<p>Next TIG meeting</p> <p>With the main focus of the TIG to be on finalising the report it is not intended to have further scheduled TIG meetings. Specific issues regarding any section of the report will be dealt with by the relevant expert and other TIG members as required.</p>		Noted