



CCF TASMANIAN OFFICE

ABN 64 619 501 898

Level 4, 116 Bathurst Street

HOBART TAS 7000

P (03) 6240 4854

E ccftas@ccftas.com.au

www.ccftas.com.au

REF: CCF25/09

30 October 2020

via email: tw@parliament.tas.gov.au

Hon Tania Rattray
Chair
TasWater Legislative Council
Select Committee

Ms Natasha Exel
Inquiry Secretary
TasWater Legislative Council
Select Committee

CIVIL CONTRACTORS FEDERATION SUBMISSION TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL SELECT COMMITTEE ON TASWATER

Dear Ms Rattray,

The Civil Contractors Federation Tasmania (CCF) is the voice of Tasmania's civil construction industry, representing the interests of over 46 civil construction businesses across the State of Tasmania.

We believe that this Inquiry is timely and welcome the opportunity to make a submission.

We have already raised the issues contained in this submission directly with TasWater. However, we are providing them to your committee for its edification and consideration.

We would welcome the opportunity to appear before the Committee, although given the sensitive nature of the information should we be invited to give evidence we may request that it be heard in-camera.

TasWater established the Capital Delivery Office (CDO) to manage TasWater's Capital Works Program from inception to completion including the planning, design, procurement and delivery phases.

The core business of the TasWater CDO is to ensure cost effective and timely delivery of quality capital works projects for TasWater that will meet the needs of TasWater's business and those of the Tasmanian community. In reality, it is a very different picture.

CCF members deal with TasWater every day. No one knows TasWater better than our members.

We have absolutely no confidence in TasWater.

In particular, we have no confidence in TasWater's leadership and TasWater's partnership with the CDO Alliance.

We believe that if urgent action is not taken by TasWater's owners, the Board and senior management, the civil sector in Tasmania will suffer considerable damage.

This Select Committee must call for immediate action to minimize the damage being done to our members.

Unfortunately, for such a significant utility there appears to be little accountability and as a consequence, TasWater is grossly under-performing.

The appendix to this submission contains detailed examples of very serious issues regarding TasWater and the CDO. Below is a summary of the concerns of our Membership, covering four main areas:

1. Design & Approvals
2. Pre-Contracts
3. Unrealistic Compliance Requirements and Misunderstanding of Local Market
4. Lack of Communication and Transparency

DESIGN & APPROVALS

Members have expressed considerable concerns that recently released packages (or tenders) are subject to re-design work and some are not constructable as tendered. This is a significant issue and highlights just how deeply flawed the current process is. The fact that one of the State's major utilities is issuing unconstructable tenders is an incredibly serious issue.

Members have raised concerns that the CDO is taking designs from one contractor and asking other contractors to incorporate that IP into their bid. This practice is causing significant issues in the industry.

Furthermore, a recently awarded package of works has been stalled waiting for a DA approval, which was not sourced before works were released for tender. Again, this demonstrates a fundamental inability in the understanding of local planning and market conditions and creates uncertainty for contractors.

PRE- CONTRACTS & PACKAGE DELIVERY

The CCF has engaged with its Membership extensively and understands two significant dam projects are still on hold. Originally tendered in 2018, the works were retendered in mid-2019. Both projects are still stalled with non-COVID related issues delaying works on the ground.

Tenders are not being released to the market in an effective and transparent way. For example, CCF has been made aware that a long-awaited project at Longford listed in the Capital Works program has been awarded to a Queensland company, Aquatec Maxcon Pty Ltd in July 2019, with little to no opportunities provided to local businesses to tender the works. We accept the initial tender pre-dates the formation of the CDO, however CCF members have never received an adequate explanation as to why this project wasn't released to the broader market and a company that went bankrupt, then rebranded was awarded this contract.

Furthermore, our Membership has continued to express significant concern with the unfair risk allocation. CDO contracts allocate risk to the sub-contractor, which does not align with typical Tasmanian industry conditions.

Lastly, Membership has highlighted significant confusion about the role of tender panels. This confusion includes:

- Panels being dissolved and reformed

- Misunderstanding who can tender for what projects
- Confusion over the difference of working for TasWater or the TasWater CDO due to very different requirements
- TasWater Minor Works and the TasWater CDO panel – The market is unclear on the split of works
- Why non-panel providers are being selected to undertake works
- Lack of notification to panel members that works are being tendered
- Lack of communication and transparency of upcoming panel projects available for panel members to consider

COMPLIANCE & MISUNDERSTANDING OF THE MARKET

Members have also raised concerns surrounding the levels of compliance placed upon them in order to register, tender and complete works for the CDO. Our members have demonstrated excellent quality, safety and environmental systems that have historically served TasWater and other local Government agencies well.

The market is concerned with the added cost of complying with systems that are designed for significant 'Tier 1' style packages of work, however these impositions are being implemented for even the smallest projects, including requests to change door handles on site buildings before works can commence.

Some members estimate that these requirements are adding up to 40 per cent to the total cost of some projects, for little to no demonstrable benefit to Tasmanians.

Compliance is important, however a review of what's necessary for the size and nature of CDO projects in Tasmania should be considered and a more 'fit for purpose' approach adopted. More importantly, consideration of contractors existing systems should be an option.

LACK OF COMMUNICATION AND TRANSPARENCY

The strategy and overall direction of the CDO is unclear in the market. The CCF notes Industry briefings are limited, with no transparency in processes being communicated. Contractors are unable to plan for TasWater work as information provided is not clear and dates continually slip out.

CONCLUSION

The issues our Members have highlighted are having a severe impact on businesses within Tasmania.

Without immediate improvement and change within the CDO, many of these issues will affect the viability of many of the businesses owned by our Members.

The CCF's intention in raising these issues and concerns is that we wish to see a more streamlined, fair and efficient process for project delivery where contractors can make a fair margin without accepting unreasonable risk. We remain committed to working collaboratively in addressing the concerns of the Industry.

We look forward to an opportunity to expand on our submission in person.

Yours sincerely,



Rachael Matheson, CEO



Hugh Maslin, President

FEEDBACK

APPENDIX



CCF MEMBER

1. Request to re-tender through the CDO for service connections, ended up not proceeding this tender

In December 2017, TasWater invited Contractors to tender for provision of installation of service connection installation services for both water and sewer services commencing on the 22nd of January 2018 for a period of one year, with an option to extend the contract by a further two year term.

CCF MEMBER was awarded the Work Package in February 2018 and has been carrying out service connection installation works since then.

On the 19th of December 2019, TasWater CDO invited CCF MEMBER to submit a quote for the Service Connection Package, the closing date and time of this quote was 5pm 1st February 2020. It took the CDO **nearly seven months** to notify CCF MEMBER about the outcome, with the CDO notification below:

TasWater CDO: UNSUCCESSFUL TENDER - [0000-MW-CS-0027 - Service Connections]

Thank you for your company's offer in relation to the above listed tender.

Following a detailed review undertaken by TasWater in regards to new Service Connections, the decision has been made to transfer the engagement and management of contractors for service connections to TasWater's Development Services Department. The Department is currently working through the transition plan.

Therefore, while we are sorry for any inconvenience, we advise the Capital Delivery Office is no longer proceeding with this tender.

Please direct any questions in relation to Service Connections being transferred back to TasWater to Allan Richardson, Project Advisor - Service Connections Transformation, via email [REDACTED] or phone [REDACTED]. Otherwise a representative of TasWater's Development Services Department will make contact with you over the coming month to explain its strategy, process and direction for Service Connections.

Thank you again for your participation in this tender.

Yours sincerely,

XXXXX XXXXXXXX

Contracts Administrator - Programs

2. The poor-quality design of Booth Ave

The design drawings provided by the CDO were not constructable, therefore it was extremely difficult for CCF MEMBER to price for without suggesting an alternative methodology. The below highlights issues drawn from the drawings:

- From the design drawings, several sections of pipeline were required to be horizontal directional drilled (HDD), however, the CDO, with lack of understanding about HDD technique, had inappropriately determined the locations of entry and exit holes for HDD.
- Based on the design drawings, depth to invert level shown at the creek crossing was approximately 2.0m. With the requirement of 600mm sleeve across the creek, the bore hole needs to be 900mm thus leaving only 1.1m cover which is not sufficient for drilling. Again, this demonstrated a lack of understanding and consultation from the CDO before carrying out designing. Further, when CCF MEMBER

discussed this issue with the CDO, the CDO did not appear to understand the issue and requested CCF MEMBER to provide a sketch showing a cross section view of the drilling section.

- “All PE joints and connections to be butt welded”: this requirement is not possible due to the fact that the majority of the connections have to be carried out in a trench.

3. The extended award time of Maydena

The original closing date and time for the tender was 15 May 2020 but was then extended to 22 May 2020. It took the CDO nearly 3 months to notify all unsuccessful Tenders.

4. The ridiculously long approval to start time for flow meter installations job

TasWater requested a quote to install 4x precast concrete pits at 4x locations as below:

- Yarram Street, Bellerive
- Ormond Street, Bellerive
- Howard Street, Glenorchy
- Elwick Road, Glenorchy

Each pit will house an insertion flow meter.

The request for quote was on 5 November 2019 and CCF MEMBER submitted the quote on 21 November. TasWater accepted the quote on 26 November however to date CCF MEMBER has not been able to mobilise to site due to the following reasons:

- CCF MEMBER submitted all safety documentation to TasWater, however, TasWater did not respond until CCF MEMBER sent a follow up email on 25 March 2020. TasWater responded on the same day advising that approval was required from local Councils and requested CCF MEMBER to submit an updated traffic controlling SWMS.
- The TasWater Project Engineer who was looking after the job advised on 18 May 2020 that he was confused as originally the job was running through a purchase order with TasWater’s standards. However, TasWater was implementing the new CDO measures and work could not proceed until their team has obtained approval from Council and sent letters out to the surrounding properties.
- The scope of work for the 2x pits at Glenorchy has been changed so TasWater directed CCF MEMBER not to install the pits at those locations.
- After numerous time exchanging emails back and forth trying to get approval from TasWater CDO regarding SWMS, to date CCF MEMBER has not received any confirmation from the CDO. TasWater advised on 26 May 2020 that *“Although this is running as a PTC, we are still required to conform to the new CDO standards”*
- CCF MEMBER quoted the works under TasWater specifications and contractor requirements. The CDO contractor requirements place additional expectations on contractors which were not costed in

5. The amount of effort and delay to queries to register for Damstra

Following a CDO information session for contractors on 2 August 2019, CCF MEMBER commenced planning to accommodate all of the CDO requirements. This included registering all Mobile Plant and all Employees on the Damstra system.

It is understood that CCF MEMBER was one of the first contractors to access the system, with significant problems being encountered. The Damstra support team were apparently based in the Philippines which presented language issues when trying to resolve matters. On one occasion, there was an on-line chat for over 1.5hrs as there was a total misunderstanding of what our requirements were. Over the past 12 months there have

been many instances where the support team have not understood what was being asked and therefore repeat requests had to be made.

Intervention was sought from CDO directly to try and resolve some of the blockages that were being experienced through the Damstra team.

Even now, there are additional aspects of the Damstra process that are required, for example Site Inductions that need to be booked, and which we have no information on how to go about that. Overall, it has been a very frustrating and time-consuming experience and for zero gain.

It should be noted at that this time, **12 months** after the information session, CCF MEMBER has only been on 2-3 CDO sites with no direct contracted works allocated to CCF MEMBER. The 12-month investment in the Damstra registration process, direct and indirect cost, has effectively been wasted.

6. TasWater CDO Contractor Handbook

On being introduced to these requirements early-mid 2019, CCF MEMBER commenced implementation of training, communication and other strategies to effectively gear up our organisation to align with the One HSE Culture and to ensure that our work practices delivered on the CDO Contractor Handbook requirements.

Version 1 of the Contractor Handbook had a large number of conflicting instructions. CCF MEMBER eventually found who in CDO questions on this could be forwarded to for clarification and, with the response timely and well received. Interactions with the CDO Safety team have been very positive and helpful.

Where the concern is, is that CCF MEMBER were delivering works under TasWater specifications and TasWater Contractor requirements. The expectations of TW supervisors varied job to job with one practice not permitted (under the new CDO requirements) whilst another supervisor didn't worry (old TW). This created significant confusion on-the-ground, with CCF MEMBER's take being: *operate at the higher level, all the time*. This wasn't always possible nor practicable as some CDO requirements were not costed in or planned for a TasWater job.

Culturally, these wavering expectations of whether we were operating under TasWater requirements or CDO requirements, created conflict within our operations which has to date, not been resolved.

7. One HSE Culture

As above, CCF MEMBER has put significant effort (time and cost) into aligning our organisation with One HSE Culture. This has included externally facilitated workshops, realigning our performance management process and other practices.

Whilst we can see the benefit of this approach, there is nil evidence of this working in practice on TasWater jobs; and we are yet to experience a full CDO project.



TasWater Feedback Received by CCF Tasmania

We employ ten Tasmanians and at the moment we are “hanging on like grim death”, we wish to remain anonymous as the risk of being exposed could have detrimental consequences for future work.

Overview:

We have been advised not to sign the contract by our Lawyer. We have no power under the contract UGL are a part of the CIMIC Group (Leighton Thiess etc.) in any dispute we can't fight this conglomerate.

There are so many issues with this contract, for instance to be dismissed without notice or cause without any recourse is unethical and can and will destroy people lives and everything they have worked for in the past 40 years (in our case). To be at the mercy of an organisational culture, which seeks to remove itself from accepting any responsibility, with an agenda to pursue the service provider at all costs with the full knowledge that they cannot respond is almost criminal behaviour under the Trade Practices Act. This is the classic “ÄNT and the ELEPHANT” analogy.

A recent example of the delays in awarding contracts is, we tendered for a project in September 2019 with a written commitment at the time of tendering, that the contract would be awarded prior to Christmas December 19, 2019, it was awarded at the end of May 2020 with no explanation.

We are desperate for work at the moment and when I read letters from Mike Brewster, with statements like this, it is disappointing “Since the pandemic emerged in March, our primary aim for the CDO has been to provide shovel ready projects to the market at the earliest possible opportunity while building a portfolio of projects we can take to the market in the current financial year. This strategy provides significant benefit for the State’s economy through the provision of contracts to the local market at a time of major economic disruption”.

It appears that there is no accountability on TasWater or its shareholders, to allow such an unethical contract to be submitted on their behalf, that does not have the best interests of its customers and or the Tasmanian community.

The other issue that raises concern is the profit share arrangement, this is based on so called estimates, acquired by way of Expressions of Interest, used as the bench mark and when the tendering process is finally completed, the difference between the estimate and the tendered price if less than the EOI is split 50/50 TasWater UGL. If this is true, the incentive for UGL is to accept the cheapest price, often not the best outcome for the client TasWater or the Tasmanian Community.

Ref	Document	Clause/Section	Exception	Proposed Amendment	CPB UGL JV Response 31/08/2020
1	Warranties we assume this is for plant and equipment	Clause 9			No amendment agreed Clause 9 is an overarching warranty for the works and services completed under the contract
2	Nature of Contract Provisional Sum and Variation	Clause 3.4/34.1/34.2	Need to go arbitration in case of dispute		No amendment is agreed The dispute resolution under this contract is set out in clause 46 Arbitration is considered under the contract but there is a formal resolution process which must be followed prior to elevating any disagreement to arbitration
3	Proportionate Liability	Clause 14.4	Proportionate Liability cannot be written out of a contract		Contracting out of Proportionate Liability Legislation is permitted in Western Australia, New South Wales and Tasmania AB & P are responsible for the actions of any subcontractors engaged by AB & P in the completion of work under the contract, it is not unreasonable CPB UGL JV require the agreed contract conditions prevail
4	Insurance	Clause 18	We have provided this information to our Insurance Provider their response in attached Proposal Document		Noted: CPB UGL JV agree in principle to amend to require only that the interests of CPB UGL JV and the Principal be noted however final JV legal approval is required before contract can be issued
5	No Warranty	Clause 20.3	If CPBUGLJV is preparing the scope it has some responsibility	This Clause would need to be negotiated at the time as it depends on the specific project	No amendment agreed Clause 20.3 refers to the amenities and services provided by CPB UGL JV The Site services and facilities to be provided by CPB UGL JV, if any, will be detailed in the Work Package Instruction for each tender CPB UGL JV will ensure all services and facilities detailed are provided but cannot be accountable for any subjective view of the Contractor on the fitness, condition, suitability, adequacy or performance of those services and facilities Prior to pricing any tender package, if CPB UGL JV are providing any facilities as part of the works, the Contractor is welcome to make a time to view the facilities prior to providing a final pricing submission and price any additional or upgraded facilities deemed may be required above and beyond those provided by CPB UGL JV
6	Works Contract Quality, Safety, Health and Environment	Clause 25, 25.1-6	Lymington Investments does not have ISO Accreditation	We propose that projects under 300k don't require ISO Accreditation, therefore our labour rates and hire rates remain as they are currently The cost of accreditation and maintenance of the ISO System will require a significant investment, to fund this additional level of compliance we propose to increase our labour rates by twenty percent as outlined in 3a Schedule of rates	No change agreed CPB UGL JV will not direct the Contractor to use their own Quality Management System or Environmental Management System; under this Contract the Contractor must comply with CPB UGL JV's Quality and Environmental Management Systems Details of the requirements are set out in the Project Management Plans listed in Annexure B under Project Management Plans, copies of which were issued with the tender documents It is the Contractor's responsibility to ensure these documents have been reviewed and the responsibilities understood and allowed for in any tender submissions made by AB
7	Emissions and Energy Data	Clause 26.2	We have no technical expertise in collecting this data within the business	To be negotiated for each individual project / option third party employed costed as a variation	Contractor, being CPB UGL JV, must report on greenhouse gas emissions and energy consumption and CPB UGL JV cannot meet our obligations under legislation unless the information is provided by AB & P This is not an onerous amount of paperwork, the NGER reporting form is a one page document which asks for a monthly estimation of the amount of fuel and greases used by AB & P in completing works under the contract
8	Specific Reporting	Clause 26.3	We can provide information in relation to our Scope i.e. Quality, Safety compliance the level of detail would need to reflect the size of the project	To be negotiated for each individual project	Comments are noted but no change is agreed CPB UGL JV must be able to seek additional information from our Contractors where required
9	Release	Clause 38 - 38.3	The time frame of 10 days for complex projects will need to reflect the scope of work	To be negotiated for each individual project	Can you please clarify the concern or amendment? Clause 38 refers only to the Deed of Release at Substantial Completion Any existing dispute under the contract must already have been raised under the various notifications required The clause is not asking that any disputed sum listed on the Deed of Release be agreed within 10 Business Days, only that AB & P notify CPB UGL JV in writing that you don't
10	Independent Auditor	Clause 41	Only by an order from the Magistrates or Federal Court of Australia	Legal advice to the legality of this action	Can you please clarify the requested amendment?
11	Default or Insolvency	Clause 42	The Legislation regarding Default and Insolvency will prevail	Legal advice to the legality of this action	Can you please clarify the requested amendment?
12	Termination Without Cause	Clause 43	Need to go arbitration in case of dispute	Legal advice to the legality of this action	Can you please clarify the concern or amendment?



CCF MEMBER

Project Name **Bryn Estyn Civil Works**

Advertised Date of Tender: **04/02/2020**

Date Tender Awarded: **approximately late May**

Overview of Project (Issue):

The project was to complete part demolition of fencing, outbuildings, and installation and construction of a hardstand, new fencing and minor services associated with the plant upgrade works. We submitted our tender including an alternative offer which basically offered material supply from our local quarries with an alternative pavement design. This gave us a distinct pricing advantage offer conforming materials request and their pavement design. This was submitted on the 14/2/2020.

- We were invited to a bid clarification meeting on site on the 26th of February in which the following topics were discussed:
 - CCF MEMBER sub-base was to be used with Base “A” on top,
 - We asked whether the ring main road was to be sealed by the CDO in the future which would affect materials offered,
 - CCF MEMBER was asked to send through our material specs,
 - We discussed our alternative offer with the cost advantages and better pavement design,
 - We suggested applying a deeper sub-base with the use of Geofabric as a backup to soft sub-grades,
 - CCF MEMBER expressed concern about using Damstra when we had our robust system of tracking machinery and training compliance,
 - CDO said the start date would be 4th of June,
 - The CDO representatives inferred to both myself and Simon Turbett (our civil engineer) that CCF MEMBER were the preferred contractor and that they were awaiting board approval.
- We waited three weeks after supplying the requested material specs from our quarries and heard nothing,
- Upon enquiring through William Wait from the CDO about the progress he informed us that they had revised their position on the tender as they thought that their specification was lacking in technical detail and that they intended to, once the revision was produced, go back to the top three tenderers for a re-price, I am not

sure on the timing of this conversation but it was over three weeks from the meeting,

- On the 24/04/2020 we received a request to re-price the works after receiving the attached technical pavement specification and greatly changed quantity schedule.
- What was concerning at this point in time is the wording of the Aconex request which clearly sets out to everyone that alternative pavement designs would be strongly considered, as we see it, shopping our alternative submittal,
- We were then contacted by another CCF MEMBER and asked for material costing from our local quarries, something they hadn't done previously. In a phone conversation with them they stated they had a meeting with the CDO sometime back in which they were told that they would be the preferred supplier for the project and the size / scope was outlined. In the same meeting they asked the other CCF MEMBER to complete budget estimates for them on various sections of the project, and the inference was that providing this assistance to the CDO would be beneficial if they wanted to take part in the the project. I cannot confirm the exact pricing, but I believe we may have been slightly cheaper than the other CCF MEMBER but as I had by then, smelt a rat, I assumed they would be awarded the project. My assumptions have been confirmed.

Design

Again, the design was very grey and didn't have a firm and clear specification of the works.

How could tender have been handled better?

At the pre-tender site visits no notes were taken by the CDO team and such no minutes were issued to contractors. During this tender process a memo sent out by the TW CEO stated quite clearly that projects tendered to contractors would only be priced once. This is clearly not what the CDO are doing. [Refer to TasWater CEO memo to Contractors dated 16 April 2020](#)

Closing 08/05/2020 5 00 00 PM AEST (GMT +10 00)

Addendum No	Subject	
10	Requests for Additional Site Visits	30/04/20 12:57 PM
9	Internal Update Only - No Action Required	30/04/20 10:36 AM
8	Request for Revised Submission	24/04/20 1:08 PM
7	Reminder: Tender Close 14/02/2020 5.00pm	13/02/20 2:10 PM

0002-WC-CI-0052 - Bryn Estyn Early Works – Site Works

Addendum 8: 24/04/20 1:08 PM

To CCF MEMBER Constructions Pty Ltd

Subject Request for Revised Submission

Dear Contractor,

Please see attached addendum to the site early works package at Bryn Estyn WTP.

Please complete & submit the tender schedules with your proposals, and return via Aconex by the closing date nominated.

In addition to a conforming offer and pricing schedule, Tenderers are also invited to submit an alternative pricing schedule with a non-conforming earthworks cross section & specification, of which the tenderer is to propose & detail with their submissions.

Please email any enquiries to:

[REDACTED]

Regards,
TasWater CDO

Invitation Details

Previous Value

Closing Date 14/02/2020 5:00:00 PM AEDT (GMT +11:00)

Initiator Contact	Verida Manson - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
	Megan Haylock - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
	Kirsty Heron - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
	Sharon Archer - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
	Loreena McCabe - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
	Victor Archer - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
	Thomas Grainger - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
	Rod Flynn - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
	Paul Pattison - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
	Ben Quagliata - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
	James Sands - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
	Chris Teo - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
	Ben Isbill - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
	William Wait - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
	Scott Moore - TasWater Capital Delivery Office

Initiator Contact

Paul Pattison - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
Ben Quagliata - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
James Sands - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
Chris Teo - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
Ben Isbill - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
William Wait - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
Scott Moore - TasWater Capital Delivery Office

Initiator Contact	Rod Flynn - TasWater Capital Delivery Office Paul Pattison - TasWater Capital Delivery Office Ben Quagliata - TasWater Capital Delivery Office James Sands - TasWater Capital Delivery Office Chris Teo - TasWater Capital Delivery Office Ben Isbill - TasWater Capital Delivery Office William Wait - TasWater Capital Delivery Office Scott Moore - TasWater Capital Delivery Office	Thomas Grainger - TasWater Capital Delivery Office Rod Flynn - TasWater Capital Delivery Office Paul Pattison - TasWater Capital Delivery Office Ben Quagliata - TasWater Capital Delivery Office James Sands - TasWater Capital Delivery Office Chris Teo - TasWater Capital Delivery Office Ben Isbill - TasWater Capital Delivery Office William Wait - TasWater Capital Delivery Office Scott Moore - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
-------------------	--	--

Paul Pattison - TasWater Capital Delivery Office	Rod Flynn - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
Ben Quagliata - TasWater Capital Delivery Office	Paul Pattison - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
James Sands - TasWater Capital Delivery Office	Ben Quagliata - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
Chris Teo - TasWater Capital Delivery Office	James Sands - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
Ben Isbill - TasWater Capital Delivery Office	Chris Teo - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
William Wait - TasWater Capital Delivery Office	Ben Isbill - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
Scott Moore - TasWater Capital Delivery Office	William Wait - TasWater Capital Delivery Office
	Scott Moore - TasWater Capital Delivery Office

Documents (0)

File	Document No	Rev	Title	CDO Doc Type	Type
No documents attached					

	File	Filename
--	------	----------

https://au1.aconex.com/Logon?mainTarget=%2FListTenderAddendum%3FtenderRevisionId%3D949133621468473912%26_action%3DshowAddendumWithAddendumList%26tenderId%3D949133621468387632%2... 1/1



HPE ref: 20/29828

16 April 2020

Dear Contractors and Consultants

Coronavirus (COVID-19) and Capital Delivery Office update

I would like to provide you with an update on the Capital Delivery Office (CDO) and let you know what we are doing in light of the current Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic.

We have received feedback from you, our suppliers and stakeholders, and as a result we have been reviewing opportunities for improvement.

TasWater and the Capital Delivery Office (CDO) partners have listened to your feedback and we are addressing the concerns that you have.

As a result, we are improving the planning and execution of our projects. This will mean:

- **Contractors will only have to quote once on a specific project**
- Given greater rigour now applied at the project scoping stage, companies choosing to tender can be more confident that their resource projections will better reflect the actual project delivery requirements
- We are informing local contractors of project requirements in the early stages
- The issued contracts will be more robust and better protect the interests of all parties.

The core business of the CDO is to ensure cost effective and timely delivery of quality capital works projects, that will meet the needs of the Tasmanian community for years to come.

Of course, we need to ensure this is balanced with our ongoing commitment to ensure our customers receive value for money.

To date, the CDO has issued 34 tender packages to the market. So far, we have awarded 12 contracts with 84 per cent of those awarded to local suppliers, representing a \$27M investment in our local economy.

A further 15 packages of work have already been tendered and will be awarded to the market over the next 4 to 6 weeks, amounting to almost \$25M. There are 17 more packages on our tender list under preparation that will go to market over the next 6 to 8 weeks.

The CDO has also been working on delivering legacy TasWater projects, completing more than 30 smaller projects. These initial works have benefited local communities by improving infrastructure and represent more than \$4M flowing back to local contractors and the Tasmanian economy each month.

Tasmanian Water & Sewerage Corporation Pty Ltd

GPO Box 1393 Hobart Tas 7001

Email: enquiries@taswater.com.au

Tel: 13 6992

ABN: 47 162 220 653

We are also working on many larger projects like the Longford Sewerage Treatment and Prince of Wales Digester upgrades, Mikany Dam upgrade, Henderson Dam remediation and associated works on Flinders Island.

The Bryn Estyn Water Treatment Plant (BEWTP) upgrade is the largest single infrastructure project undertaken in TasWater's history, with an expected investment of up to \$200M over the next three years.

As an outcome of the CDO review, in early March we invited 16 Tasmanian contractors to the BEWTP site for a project briefing, representing local civil, building, mechanical and electrical businesses. By partnering with local companies in the early stages of projects, together we can better understand the project and each other's requirements.

Given the current uncertainty surrounding the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, we understand that you are looking for certainty for your business and employees, and we want to reassure you that the work associated with the CDO activity will continue as planned.

TasWater and the CDO partners are trying to get as much work out to market as possible and we anticipate the number of work packages will increase over the next few months. The team will continue to review future projects, identifying opportunities to accelerate the contract award process.

The work done by the CDO to date, and the review process which is well underway, forms a solid base for us to successfully deliver the program of works together, in a timely and cost-effective manner, for the Tasmanian community.

We will continue to keep you updated as the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic progresses but for now, we are doing everything we can to support you through this crisis.

Kind regards

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Brewster", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael Brewster
Chief Executive Officer



CCF MEMBER

Project Name **King Island Water Infrastructure Project (D and C)**

Advertised Date of Tender: **08/07/2016**

Date Tender Awarded: **22/12/2016**

Overview of Project (Issue):

The project was awarded for 5.74 million and was based on an alternative design route based on pre-tender investigation works. This presented with a lot less construction risk and was some three kilometres shorter than the original TW investigated route. We were involved in pre-design and process meetings before the project was awarded and there was a great deal of pushback on the treatment process which was nominated by TW which involved the use of a brand specific (Pentair Spiral wound membranes) Nano filtration. Both the preferred treatment plant contractor, whom had just completed the same plant design and construction on Flinders' Island, and the TW Project Manager disagreed with this process as it was a substantially more expensive construction cost compared to more simple designs. (additional 1.5 million) TW was already having trouble with this system on Flinders' Island as the poor quality of the raw water was increasing the wastewater stream to up to 52% of the raw water supply which was jeopardising supply of raw water to the plant. This has meant that a dam upgrade was required as Flinders' had run out of water with additional costs of water cartage (over a Million dollars) also incurred. Water supply had never been an issue previously. The TWPM submitted an internal memo to Dharma Dharmabalan, General Manager Works Delivery, querying the nominated process only to be ignored by his management. At the time there were only four to five water treatment plants of this brand and nature operating in Australia, two in Tasmania which were both having issues. Of more concern than the initial higher expense of this brand and type of plant was the ongoing operational cost increase over conventional treatment methods which was also raised and ignored.

Design

Design ran smoothly with very few issues arising.

Compliance

Being responsible for all compliance for the water pipe transfer system we had established a very concise Stakeholder Management Plan which enabled smooth delivery of the project. We worked for the first twelve months on site without any direct TW supervision.

Attempted Resolution / Resolution with TasWater to-date

We were called into a meeting with the General Manager of Works Delivery before award of the contract to review our design prior to engagement. Dharma threatened CCF MEMBER directly as he stated that CCF MEMBER were incapable of offering a better concept design than what TW had provided and stated that he didn't believe that alternative was buildable. When he was questioned as to whether he had even looked at our very detailed alternative he stated "no". He then directly threatened CCF MEMBER with imposing changes to the contract conditions to further impose risk onto us. The behaviour of Dharma was highly inappropriate and bordered on bullying. This issue was raised again with the CEO to which no action was taken. CCF MEMBER having raised valid construction and cost issues at every corner possible found themselves being scrutinised in detail, including stop work notices, including being shutdown completely at one point after a damaged underground service incident for over a week. whilst every effort was made to provide revised work procedures to enable work continuation TW continued to delay approvals to these changed procedures even when their direct TW Project Manager whom was on site had given his approval.



CCF MEMBER

Project Name **Margate Stage 2**

Advertised Date of Tender: **09/12//2015**

Date Tender Awarded: **17/03/2017 (15 months delay)**

Overview of Project (Issue):

The project was awarded for a contract value of approximately 1.9 million. Final project costs were 3.6 million and this only relates to contractor values and doesn't include TW on costs which assume would be around twenty percent. This equates to close to a doubling on administration costs which with the project delivery issues surrounding this project would be a conservative estimate. The original project delivery schedule was for a six-month construction period with this ending up being thirty-three months for the trunk main with another seven months for the completion of the associated retic which had been missed of the original design.

Design

The project was plagued with design changes, some eight to nine major issues that both caused delays and price escalation. This was caused in the majority by the inclusion of the sewer pressurised rising main from Margate to Blackmans Bay within the existing Watermain easement. Cost escalation of the design would have been apparent and construction delays were considerable.

Attempted Resolution / Resolution with TasWater to-date

Met directly with the TW CEO to discuss the concerns of the direction of the project and the impending cost escalation that would affect both the sewer and the water main project. There had been a lot of adverse publicity surrounding the sewer project which was putting at risk the continuity of both projects which we considered to be manageable with the right people engaged. The CEO's response was disappointing with a rejection of this companies' offer to help with stakeholder management and control of cost increases. His exact words were "Unfortunately TasWater will suffer collateral damage in regard to cost whilst we are transitioning from a Southern entity to a Statewide organisation"

We arranged joint project meetings with all project delivery and contractor personnel with a view of passing on our knowledge as to how our stakeholder management process's had arrived at agreed, approved, and documented construction ready schedule only to be ignored and told that TasWater didn't require help. They instructed their sewer contractor to start works only to find that they were issued with a stop work notification from the Council because it was deemed, they didn't require approvals as we advised, affectively delaying both pipelines for some months. The collateral damage continued.



CCF MEMBER

Project Name **Various Taswater Projects**

Overview of Issues:

CCF Member has been a contractor to Hobart Water, Southern Water and TasWater for over twenty- two years. In that time we have completed many civil and pipeline works, including slip repairs, road works, site excavations, Design and Construct pipeline systems, MSCL welded and rubber ring joint pipeline installation, retic upgrades, vegetation management works, dam investigation works and dam upgrade projects. Works have always been completed to a high standard with a focus on value for money for the client. Our working relationship with TW staff has always been one of collaboration and our business is held in high regard internally. In 2015 CCF MEMBER started the installation of Margate Stage 1 and 1B 508 MSCL welded pipeline from Mertonvale Court to Howden Road after a delayed start due a major route design change. This was completed in just over eight months and had some forty odd affected Stakeholders, the majority being operation businesses. CCF MEMBER and TasWater received excellent stakeholder feedback on the delivery of this project and with a glowing letter of thanks from the friends of Peter Murrell Reserve. This was largely down to the open and honest approach from the TW Project Manager whom went out of his way to ensure good communication was delivered and listening to stakeholders' concerns. This pipeline went through the extremely sensitive Parks and Wildlife area of the Peter Murrell Reserve for which the Friends of the Peter Murrell Reserve act as custodians.

CCF MEMBER were successful with the next stage of the 508 MSCL welded pipeline section called Margate Stage 2. The project manager for these works was nominated as the same as for Stage 1. CCF MEMBER had delivered at the point of tender a construction ready proposal which had considered all the permit and compliance issues that would be required for the project approval. Through communication with the TW Project Manager we were alerted to the Balckmans Bay Sewer rising main being constructed in the same easement as the new trunk main. This presented numerous construction challenges with major design changes being required to the water main which started to cause considerable construction delays. The TW project manager tried to circumvent delays by communicating with the Sewer management team from TW, trying to help them with known permit application process's, stakeholder management issues, and technical support. The TW sewer team did not accept any of this

information and acted in what could only be described as arrogant. They headed in their own direction, ignoring any advice given, and blatantly tried to bulldoze their way through the approval process and actively lied to Stakeholders along the proposed route. This caused substantial delays in the construction of both projects, numerous design changes, and stoppages due to stakeholders refusing to allow access through properties after they were lied too. The CEO was informed directly of the issues surrounding this approach from both the TW Watermain PM, CCF MEMBER, and stakeholders but did nothing to correct the poor behaviour of the TW Sewer team. At one-point CCF MEMBER were called into a meeting with the then acting Margate stage 2 PM whom had been appointed whilst the permeant PM was on holidays along with the TW Project Delivery Manager. CCF MEMBER were instructed to start the project immediately, without IFC drawings, without all approvals, and this was done without the permanent TW's Project Manager's knowledge.

The sewer TW team instructed the Sewer pipe laying contractor to start the works in the joint pipeline easement, ignoring advice from the TW Watermain PM that they didn't have the correct approvals to proceed, only to find they were issued with a stop work notice from Kingborough Council. They were delayed for over two months which also caused delays to the watermain. During this time both CCF MEMBER and to a larger extent the TW Watermain PM were subject to bullying tactics from the other SM internal staff and the Project Delivery Manager.

The project was plagued with Stakeholder issues with constant mistruths being given to them which again meant that the respect that CCF MEMBER had gained at pre-tender negotiations was quickly eroded.

Noting we are not sure on the exact timing, but CCF MEMBER were awarded the King Island works the pipeline project considered a relatively straight forward project. It was at this point we started to be concerned about the wellbeing of the PM, the same as for Margate Stage 2. He was pushing back on Upper Management's insistence to use the Pentair Membrane system and dealing with the issues on the Margate project. He at this point, was responsible for over 20 million dollars' worth of work with no internal assistance. He had been putting in far too much time on design issues for which others were wholly responsible. His management ignored requests from him to assist in the delivery of the works and pushed back hard on the design issues he raised.

I watched his health deteriorate over a number of months with no internal support forthcoming to the point where he was having blackouts and unable to continue work. TW management pushed him aside and where more concerned about their legal position than the persons suffering.

I watched TW Management isolate, bully, ignore concerns for an individual's health and professional knowledge. This was not unfortunately an isolated case with internal moral at a very low point, noting to date this is still the case.



CCF MEMBER

Project Name: Dams in the North of Tasmania and General Issues with TasWater over past years

Advertised Date of Tender: - not applicable

Date Tender Awarded: - not applicable

Overview of Project (Issue):

CCF Member employee around 25 people mostly full time employees.

Our core business was with Taswater completing numerous projects from large pump stations, rising mains both sewer and water, general watermains and maintenance works.

We generally had two to three crews working full time for Taswater with an annual turnover of around \$2 – 3 million per year until the CDO come into operation.

In early August 2019 we registered with the CDO and had conformation that we were accepted to work for them.

In August we were invited to attend a briefing session at the Door of Hope in Launceston where the CDO outlined their position in the delivery of works.

The CDO detailed to all representatives in the room to gear up as we would not be able to cope with the influx of work to come out.

As of this date we have not seen any works involving our company with the CDO.

CCF Member emailed one of the CDO managers regarding this matter and didn't even get the courtesy of a return e-mail.

Tenders:

CCF Member submitted a tender to the CDO for a panel agreement for Minor Works in 2019 which included works on Dams in the North of Tasmania.

CCF Member were successful with their tender, but as of today no works have been issued even though the CDO still request our insurance updates each year.

Tenders for service connections were called for in December 2019 by the CDO and closed in January 2020. We received a notification on the 24th of July that the service connections will now be transferred back to TasWater for undertaking. We were completing around 2 service connections per week up to September 2019 but have not performed any since September.

Discussions were held with TasWater / CDO staff where prior to the CDO a TasWater project manager or supervisor would have been looking after a number of jobs. But on a CDO project it will be likely they will only look after 1 job each, with a full time presence onsite . Or on slightly larger jobs there will be multiple CDO staff per project onsite. This will force the civil contractor to employ more project managers to match the CDO numbers and the cost of projects will balloon.

As an owner of this medium size business I feel that in times of uncertainty we do not need an organisation with such a big budget that works are not being delivered to the people of Tasmania. I would like to know the money paid to the CDO to date and what actual works have been completed in ground. I feel that some years ago the local content was doing a great job in delivering the works including consultants from within Tasmania. I would be interested if the people of Tasmania know of the cost and money wasted on non deliverables paid to the CDO to date.

I would also like to raise concern of the amount of CDO spending leaving the state. The government is making efforts to increase and promote local spending but the CDO is using mainland companies for tasks which have been, and could still be performed in Tasmania. I am concerned the CDO use of mainland companies could increase even further to take work away from my business.

Recently one of our crews hit a 20mm domestic house connection whilst doing a small watermain for Taswater. Taswater closed the whole site down for 5 working days while they completed their investigation. This is absolute waste of time and costs the contractor thousands of dollars for something that would normally be fixed in 10 minutes 2 years ago.



CCF MEMBER FEEDBACK – CONSULTANTS

Consultant Feedback

Overview of Issue:

Observations from Consultants;

Workload

- The TasWater CDO was formed to accelerate the capital spend for TasWater's ambitious capital program. There was a belief that the local industry could not deliver the capital spend, and hence they needed to partner with a large tier 1 consultant to enable resources to be accessed to then achieve that spend.
- Since the CDO formed in Dec 2018, opportunities for consultants dried up significantly, and for some consultants who worked on the front end strategy and planning, the workload disappeared altogether, with this work then handed to the new tier 1 partner.
- For the remaining consultants in the detailed design sector, opportunities have been slim since the formation, and visibility for workload is close to nonexistent.
- Visibility of workload needs to be both visible, and credible. Credibility of the workload is a finely balanced attribute, and requires a consistent approach, a predictable timeframe for opportunities to come to the market, and a predictable timeframe to then have the project bid assessed and awarded.
- With visibility and credibility of workload, a higher degree of confidence is created in the industry which drives growth in the market, and with growth also drives competition, which will benefit TasWater, and the community as a whole.

Terms and Conditions & Project Scope "catchall clauses"

- Current terms and conditions for consultants are challenging to accept on both an insurance risk liability, and overall risk apportionment.
- A "True" alliance is good at understanding risk, good at apportioning risk, and good at then taking the risk that it can control. The current alliance does not appear to want to take any risk and is highly risk adverse.
- Insurance risk, and no limit on liability clauses creates a challenging environment for consults.
- The level of insurance for not only head consultants, but also sub consultant work for them, is high and for the current market, will mean many smaller consults who have traditionally worked for TasWater, cant work for the TasWater CDO, or the head consultants, as the CDO wants complete visibility and traceability of insurance through the entire supply chain.

- The project scopes being issued by the TasWater CDO have “catchall clauses” such as*and anything else as directed by CPB/UGL JV*. These clauses for small projects pose little risk, but for larger more technical complex projects, these clauses pose a huge risk to the consultant, and effectively allow the TasWater CDO to ask for anything and as often as they like.
- This impacts on the risk profile of the project, and forces pricing up.

Project Management & CDO Staffing

- The TasWater CDO stated that all TasWater CDO team members would be based in Tasmania, and position descriptions state that the roles are based in Tasmania and relocation is required.
- The experience however is considerably different with members of the TasWater CDO team, being located out of the state, even before COVID 19, but it has become even more evident during COVID 19, that team members did not relocate as required, but were in fact operating on a fly in/fly out basis. They now struggle to get back into the State with current travel limitations.
- To grow the industry and increase capacity and capability, a fly in / fly out model will not work, unless the project team operating on this basis are coupled with team members based full time in Tasmania. This is not occurring.
- The project management approach seems to follow a “Content Free Approach” where the project management is solely based around discrete deliverables, and time frames, with no questioning or discussion around costs, technical solution or risks.

Two Clients – One industry

- With the formation of the TasWater CDO, a “Two Client – One Industry” situation has occurred, where it is critical to understand if you’re working for either **TasWater** or the **TasWater CDO**, as they have many differing requirements as follows:
 - Different Safety requirements
 - Different induction requirements as part of the two safety systems
 - Different payment terms and timeframes
 - Different drafting requirements and systems
 - Different communication requirements & systems
 - Different risk appetite & understanding
 - Different level of skill and understanding of the projects being delivered
 - Different contractual approach
- These differences are important as at times your dealing with both clients on one project, and both have differing views, approach, and direction.

Broader Industry

- The TasWater CDO was created to increase capacity, capability, and safety in the water industry. A large part of the industry sits outside of the main capital works program which TasWater delivers, and these sit with developers and are called “gifted assets”

- These assets are being designed, managed, and delivered by the broader industry, and assessed and reviewed by the TasWater Development team. The development team are highly under resourced but achieve a significant output to keep the broader industry going.
- The development team need recognition for the job they do, and resourced in an appropriate manner, as this team is currently delivering more capital assets than the TasWater CDO.
- To achieve TasWater's goals across the broader industry, they need to ensure workload to those consultant and contractors delivering the "Gifted Assets" through the TasWater system, as this will increase not only the quality and safety of the assets being created in TasWater's capital program, but also to the broader industry, which is a critical item for TasWater.
- With TasWater capital projects now being planned, managed and supervised by only TasWater CDO team members, then the broader industry benefits will not be realized.

Closing Remarks

- TasWater have an amazing opportunity to lift the capability and capacity of the entire water industry and make significant inroads to delivering increased safety outcomes.
- Capacity and capability will only be realized if a true and genuine focus on local consultants (with the right mainland support where required) is a true objective of TasWater.
- The safety outcomes must be driven by a broad industry acceptance and "doing it the TasWater way", which will drive a cultural change around safety. The focus must be on a company's safety systems and culture.



CCF MEMBER FEEDBACK RECEIVED – STAFF RETENTION

Key resources from local contractors being employed by the CDO

Overview of Issue:

After TasWater announced the upcoming pipeline of works and told the civil construction industry to get ready and be prepared – CCF MEMBER went out recruiting for experienced Senior Project Managers. Specifically looking for those with proven capability to deliver TasWater's capital works program.

XXXX and XXXX were both hired as Project Managers from the mainland and relocated their families to Tasmania. CCF MEMBER supported them in this transition and paid tens of thousands in recruitment fees. Both ended up work on road projects with CCF MEMBER as the TasWater/ CDO pipeline stalled. XXXXX has now taken a position with UGL in the CDO.

He was known to senior UGL people in the CDO. The offer was better and the hours less. CCF MEMBER also lost XXXXXXX who has taken a position with CPB in the CDO where the offer was better. XXXXXXX was known to senior CPB people in the CDO.

CCF MEMBER also lost XXXXXXXXXX (HSE Advisor) to UGL. XXXX applied for a position, but the offer was significantly higher and fewer hours so no chance of competing. XXXX has experience in water projects.

CCF MEMBER lost XXXXX (Project Manager) to WSP, he was approached about the job and was not looking to move (he has a background in water). The offer was better than what he was on at CCF MEMBER and less hours.

XXXXXXX left CCF MEMBER and went to UGL, he knows people inside TW & CDO and there were discussions between them. The offer was significantly more than what he was on and the 37 hour week is much less than what contractors typically do. There is a pattern of the high salary and reduced working hours that makes it hard for Tasmanian contractors to keep people who have water experience. If the skill and capacity of local contractors is a concern for the CDO then taking key people away from contractors to build CDO capacity seems work against the objective upskilling Tasmanian Contractors. In some way, the Tasmanian contractors are indirectly providing the capacity to the CDO.

Difficult to prove 'poaching' but typically recruiters scan LinkedIn and make contact discretely and encourage people to apply. Was the intent to bring in capacity or absorb locals at inflated rates of pay (for Tasmania) and deplete contractors ability to manage complex TasWater work.



CCF MEMBER – OVERCHARGING ISSUES

Overview of ISSUE

Hi XXXX

If this is the case, the price from XXXXXX is completely unrealistic, there is less than a \$900.00 of materials in the job and 6 hours of work a realistic price is in the order of \$3,000.00 + GST job.

It appears your engagement process for the “ approved contractors” is creating a situation which allows for dramatically inflated and unacceptable prices.

This cannot be in the best interest of TasWater and is certainly not acceptable or in the best interest of your customers.

I will not be using XXXXXX and suggest that it would be in TasWaters best interest to have a process in place to avoid this type of blatant overcharging.

FYI have arranged for the works to be done by XXXXXXXX at a cost of \$3,500 + GST.

In Relation to TasWater costs for the Loose Supply of the Water Meter, the DN 100 Butterfly is not required the valve assembly , check valve and bypass are supplied as a complete unit, with all fittings to TasWater Specifications, the only additional work required is to fit the 25mm Meter supplied by TasWater to the Bypass.

Can you please forward a revised connection quotation for the Loose Supply of Meter, Loose supply of the Abloy Lock and Key and plant, materials and Labour for the Mains Shutdown.

Kind Regards

CCF MEMBER

Thank you for your email.

I can confirm the quote issued for the works at XXXXXXXXXX is for the scope of work listed in the amended Certificate for Certifiable Work.

- Supply & installation of a new DN150mm property water connection from existing main to the site boundary only.
- Loose supply Abloy lock and key, meter and equipment for fire assembly (TasWater responsibility side)

If this is no longer the scope of work please supply an amended plan detailing the work required. To discuss the quote from our contractor, please contact XXXXX on 03 XXXXXX. If an negotiated price is agreed upon, XXXXXX will notify us and we will issue a revised Non-Standard Connection Quote.

Kind regards

Development Support Officer



Have I been helpful? Please provide feedback by clicking [here](#).

From: > CCF MEMBER

Sent: Wednesday, 10 June 2020 9:57 AM

To: TasWater Development Mailbox <Development@taswater.com.au>

Cc:

Subject: RE: Loose Supply Meter/s Non-Standard Quote - NC 2020/00116-GCC - 22 XXXXXXXXXX

Hi XXXXX

The quote is not accepted it is not for what is required or agreed.
A simple 150 dia. connection from TasWater main to the constructed fire connection
and the 25mm Water Meter with nuts and tails are all that is required.

Could you please give this the utmost urgency as this is McKay Timbers Fire main,
currently they do not have the fire protection they require. This connection by TasWater
is the only item that is outstanding to complete the system.

Kind Regards
CCF MEMBER

From: TasWater Development Mailbox <Development@taswater.com.au>

Sent: Wednesday, 3 June 2020 4:24 PM

To: CCF MEMBER

Cc:

Subject: Loose Supply Meter/s Non-Standard Quote - NC 2020/00116-GCC - 22 WRIGHTS AVENUE
GLENORCHY

Dear CCF MEMBER
Apologises for the delay.

Please find attached a Loose Supply Meters - Non-Standard Connection Quote for Loose Supply of meter
parts and Abloy lock and key and Non Standard Water connection as requested XXXXXXXXXX. Our
contractor XXXXXXXXXX will perform the water connection.

If you wish to proceed with your loose supply request, please complete the 'Authorisation' section of the Loose Supply Meters - Non Standard Connection Quote form and return it to development@taswater.com.au by no later than close of business Friday 19th June 2020. Once we've received the completed form an invoice will be issued. As soon as payment has been received we will notify you when components are ready to be pick up from our stores.

Please note, if acceptance of the quote is not received by Friday 19th June 2020 your application may be withdrawn. Once an application is withdrawn you will need to reapply for the connection/s.

If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact development@taswater.com.au

Note: TasWater requires you to complete, with photos, the Water Service Disconnection and Connection Completion sheet for the new meter(s). Please complete and return the completed sheet with photos in PDF format to TasWater via e-mail to Development@taswater.com.au The form will be issued with the stores requisition form upon payment.

Kind regards

Development Support Officer



New Connection Quotation

TASWATER DETAILS			
TasWater reference no.	TWNC XXXXXXXXXX	Council planning permit no.	
Contact	XXXXXXX	Phone no.	XXXXXXXXXX
Date	3 rd June 2020		
DEVELOPMENT DETAILS			
Property ID	7855108		
Address	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX		
Proposed Scope of Work	Non Standard Water connection + loose supply meter parts & Abloy lock and key		
Loose Supply Water Meters Cost - (Inc. GST)	1 x 25mm iPerl Water Meter, 1 x 25mm nut & tails and 1 x DN100 Butterfly Valve \$794.03		
Loose Supply Abloy lock and key Cost - (Inc. GST)	1 x Abloy lock and key \$214.50		
Water Connection Details*	Supply & installation of a new DN150mm property water connection from existing main to the site boundary only.		
Plant, Materials & Labour Cost - (No GST)	Water connection to site boundary, including permit, vac truck, service locations and mobilisation costs \$9,494.00 (XXXXXXXI)		
Sewer Connection Details*			
Plant, Materials & Labour Cost - (No GST)			
Shut down – Other Works	Mains shutdown		
Plant, Materials & Labour Cost - (No GST)	\$506.80		
Total Cost	\$11,009.33 (includes shutdown costs)		
<i>*Additional variation costs may apply but not be limited by: water or sewer excavation depth deeper than 1.5 metres, if rock is struck on any excavation, high hazard situations, higher levels of traffic management and the presence of asbestos.</i>			
STATEMENT/BILLING DETAILS - Please ensure that the details below are correct to ensure that the correct responsible party is issued the TasWater statement. On receipt of payment, work will then be scheduled.			
On receipt of this authorisation a statement will be generated by TasWater. On receipt of payment, work will then be scheduled.			
Business/Customer name			
Address	A		
Authorisation - Please complete, sign and return to authorise the works and next steps			
I, hereby make application and authorise TasWater to charge me for the above works:			

Name			
Signature		Date	
Phone		Email	
TASWATER CONTACT DETAILS			
Phone	13 6992	Email	development@taswater.com.au
Mail	GPO Box 1393 Hobart TAS 7001	Web	www.taswater.com.au