

# MEETING NOTES



**Name of meeting:** Foxground & Berry Bypass Route Comparison Study: Technical Investigation Group  
Weekly Progress/Coordination Meeting 8

**Location of meeting:** RMS Project Office, Pyrmont

**Meeting facilitator:** Steve Zhivanovich

**Date:** 28/03/2012 **Time:** 10am

**Attendees:**

Name	Initials	Organisation
Henk Buys	HB	AECOM
Derrick Hitchins	DH	SMEC (External reviewer)
David Kennewell	DK	AECOM
Annabel Killen	AK	Evans & Peck
Chris Masters	CM	SMEC (External reviewer)
Michael Moore	MM	Evans & Peck
Ben Noble	BN	AECOM
Joe O'Brien	JO'B	RailCorp
Ken O'Neill	KO'N	Aurecon
Basil Pazpinis	BP	RMS PMO (Internal reviewer)
Raj Rajeswaran	RR	Evans & Peck
Ron de Rooy	RdR	RMS
Glen Smith	GS	AECOM
Peter Stewart	PS	Peter Stewart Consulting
Alan Thomas	AT	RMS PMO (Internal reviewer)

**Additional distribution:**

Name	Initials	Organisation
Adam Berry	AB	RMS
Stuart Dalziel	SD	AECOM
Phil Jorgensen	PJ	Evans & Peck
John Poposki	JP	RMS
Jon Williamson	JW	AECOM
Steven Zhivanovich	SZ	RMS

**Attachments:** Outstanding actions from past minutes  
Bridge cross section drawings

Item			
1.	Review and update of outstanding actions from previous minutes	Outstanding actions reviewed	Noted
2.	Design development:  Southern suggestion  Northern preferred option developments	<b>Northern preferred route: KVR interchange</b>  Potential changes to KVR interchange resulting from community consultation. Design changes to be noted however ongoing design iterations are not included where they will not have a material impact on the cost estimate.	Noted
		<b>Northern preferred route: Potential additional pedestrian bridge</b>  Preliminary design for this bridge to allow inclusion in cost estimate 80% complete	Noted
		<b>Southern suggestion</b>  Potential change to southern interchange – swap under/overpass.  SZ to confirm with GS	SZ
3.	Flood investigations and assessment  - Outcomes of discussions with Shoalhaven City Council	<b>Island embankment investigation</b>  DK has carried out flood investigation on island embankment and determined that it is likely to be technically possible with significant protection and culverts.  Investigations to be progressed:  - RdR to liaise with farmers to assess access requirements/impacts for cost estimation purposes  - RR to provide indicative information on cost impact of replacing part of super tee bridge with embankment  - HB to develop indicative risk profile covering geotech (esp. impact of soft soils)  - HB to document precedents from consideration of embankments for Kempsey/Windsor Flood Evacuation routes	DK

		<p><b>Flood investigation external reviewers</b> Briefing of Lyall Associates required.</p> <p>DH/CM to attend.</p>	RdR
		<p><b>Town Creek diversion</b></p> <p>RdR has been liaising with relevant property owners regarding this issue. RdR to advise property owners that their concerns are best addressed through the submissions process of the EA.</p>	RdR
		<p><b>“Like for like” comparison regarding flood access to town</b></p> <p>Discussion continued regarding what constitutes “like for like” with regards to flood access for the town.</p> <p>Noted that flood immune access would be provided to the town by the current design for northern preferred route. This was achieved with the addition of ramps at the KVR interchange.</p> <p>RdR discussed that RMS principle is to achieve important benefits such as this where appropriate given scale of project/expenditure. For a project of this scale it would be considered appropriate to achieve flood access for the town as part of the bypass. This was the approach applied for Belinda Street in the Gerringong Upgrade.</p> <p>Resolution reached on way forward: “like for like” to be interpreted as providing equivalent flood access for town.</p> <p>Noted that for a southern route this will require some upgrading to the existing Princes Highway between the proposed southern interchange and Kangaroo Valley Road.. DK/BN to provide information regarding extent of works required for cost estimate.</p>	DK/BN
4.	Geotech investigations (desk top)	No issues raised.	HB
5.	Geotech investigations (fieldwork)	<p><b>Update on progress of fieldwork</b></p> <p>Further progress on boreholes achieved. Drill rig has broken down however repairs are being progressed.</p>	Noted

		Specialist CPT rig is being procured for remaining CPTs.	
6.	Property severance and adjustments	Work progressing. RdR to meet with valuers 29/03. Outcomes to be prepared for inclusion in cost estimate.	RdR / AB
7.	Structures	<p><b>Bridge structures</b></p> <p>DH queries use of Super tee bridge structure as opposed to planks or similar regarding cost of option.</p> <p>KO'N discusses urban design considerations including number of piers – notes that super tee option is adopted for northern option (following community consultation) and the same urban design principles are to be followed for southern option in “like for like” comparison.</p>	Noted
		<p><b>Super tee design</b></p> <p>Designs are to provide for 1500mm deep super tee. Some designs currently provide for 1200mm super tee beams and require revision</p>	KO'N
		<p><b>Bridge configuration</b></p> <p>KO'N discusses that some bridge spans have beams low to ground and that there are instances of irregular pier configuration and that design could be improved in these areas. This issue to be acknowledged however it was agreed that the current design is sufficient for cost estimate preparation</p>	Noted
8.	RailCorp interface	<p><b>Rail/Road interface design criteria</b></p> <p>JO'B (RailCorp representative) informed the group that planning for future rail was under the jurisdiction of Transport for NSW.</p> <p>JO'B provided indicative RailCorp requirements for the South Coast Rail crossings and agreed to confirm in writing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Allowance for duplication</li> <li>- Preferably maintenance tracks either side of rail however it is likely possible to have maintenance tracks on one side only through bridges</li> <li>- Access points to rail not restricted</li> </ul>	RdR

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access for maintenance of RailCorp drainage assets under rail.</li> <li>- Provision for electrification. Electrification cannot be incorporated in overhead structures. This will require a change to the current design: bridge structure to be raised</li> </ul>	
		<p><b>RailCorp interface work cost estimate</b></p> <p>JO'B to provide estimate of RailCorp's costs for interface work to RdR for incorporation in the cost estimate.</p>	RdR
		<p><b>Possessions</b></p> <p>JO'B indicated that 3-4 long (weekend) possessions are generally available per year</p>	Noted
		<p><b>Future raising of rail line</b></p> <p>JO'B indicated that allowance for future raising of the rail line would not likely be required</p>	Noted
9.	Earthworks	<p><b>Ha-ha retaining structure</b></p> <p>AB to provide cross-section to GS from CM+. GS to determine required volume of earthworks.</p>	RdR
10	Construction methods	Construction method statements completed. PS and MM to review 28/03.	PS/MM
11	Mass Haul Analysis	<p>Mass haul analysis complete for both northern and southern routes.</p> <p>Discussed that "like for like" has been achieved with same boundaries applied (Foxground to Croziers Lane)</p>	Noted
12	Estimating	Intermediate estimate review held 21/03 on northern option	Noted
		Northern option cost estimate currently being reviewed by BP	Noted
		Southern suggestion cost estimate preparation progressing	Noted
		Intermediate review of southern option cost estimate to be held after Easter (11/4)	Noted
13	Construction Programming	Construction programming progressing.	Noted

14	Comparative report	Technical outputs are completed or approaching completion. Initial discussions AK has discussed report content with some members. Remaining initial discussions to be held by 4/4	AK
15	AOB	External reviewers held meeting 28/03 to discuss process and outputs. Reviewers working towards an interim report.	Noted
16		<p>External reviewers request reference information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Design for Berry bypass</li> <li>- Aerial photos</li> <li>- Design and maps for project (Gerringong to Bomaderry) as a whole.</li> </ul> <p>GS to forward to AK to provide to reviewers.</p>	GS
17		<p>DH queries whether northern preferred route has been subjected to a road safety audit.</p> <p>RdR advises that it has been subjected to a first level road safety audit and a second level road safety audit has been conducted but not finalised as the concept design is still to be finalised. The road safety audit will be completed once the concept design is finalised.</p>	Noted
18		The independent reviewers had met prior to this meeting.	Noted