

**THE PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS MET IN
COMMITTEE ROOM 2, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART ON FRIDAY
15 OCTOBER 2004.**

LILYDALE TO SCOTTSDALE: BRIDPORT MAIN ROAD TO OAK DENE ROAD

**JOHN WADSLEY, GHD AND LEIGH BARRETT, PITT & SHERRY WERE CALLED,
MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.**

Ms McIntyre AND Mr Millar WERE RECALLED.

CHAIR (Mr Harriss) - Thanks for being here each of you. Ms McIntyre and Mr Millar of course attended the hearing in Scottsdale and flowing from that hearing the committee asked a number of questions with regard to options other than the one which was presented in the initial submission. You are all well aware that the committee likewise requested further information and of course that has now been circulated. As the secretary has reminded me, the request was that the information be forwarded by the close of business Wednesday, which did occur, and I think I got my copy yesterday. The Legislative Council were sitting and of course Mr Best and Mrs Napier, being from the north of the State, did not receive theirs until either last night or this morning, as Mrs Napier has indicated, so there is clearly substantial further information there for the committee to consider. I think the way we probably should proceed is to ask Mr Millar and Ms McIntyre to address some of the issues in a broad sense with regard other options. The committee wanted, following Mr Bissett's submission to us last week, to look at the various options. Mr Bissett of course suggested Scottsdale A as an option which he felt this committee should seriously consider before making any decision on the project, so first of all we would like Ms McIntyre and Mr Millar to lead some discussion on that

We then I think will want Mr Barrett and Mr Wadsley to make some contributions from the engineering and environmental perspectives, as they were involved in the assessment of the various options which led to the option of Scottsdale D being presented to the committee, so clearly there will be some questions flowing from that.

Ms McIntyre - I will start. I will call on John Wadsley to assist as John was the project manager for the NETAS stage 1 and also project manager for following study on the corridor options.

CHAIR - I think it might be useful as we go through that we will have an interchange of questions as we proceed rather than leaving it all until you have made your submissions. I think we need to keep it at that level of informality so that we can keep track of our thoughts and raise questions with you.

Ms McINTYRE - We have a summary of the consultation process for the whole of the study. You did not actually ask for that, but Shane rang the other day and asked for some idea of the process involved. This is just a very brief summary of the process from the very start of the NETAS stage 1, as we call it, the big thick folder you have there and then on through the western approaches options study, so if I can table that.

CHAIR - That is fine.

Ms McINTYRE - In broad terms at the end of the stage 1 study Scottsdale option A rated the very lowest of all the other options. You have got plans for the A, B, D and existing alignment option. John can probably clarify a little bit about the process and the assessment process for those road options. At the end of the NETAS stage 1, Scottsdale A option was ranked lowest of all the other alternatives. At the end of that study the recommendations were accepted by the steering committee members - overall there are about 34 members?

Mr WADSLEY - There were, yes.

Ms McINTYRE - Then the department internally gathered together a working group to look at the western approaches project. That working group consisted of people from the planning branch. They went through the recommendations of the NETAS study and some other options and came up with a selection of routes which were further assessed in those two reports that you asked for - those two subsequent reports that the western approaches to Scottsdale. At the end of the first study Oak Dene Road or anything in that vicinity was discounted. I will get John to explain a little bit more about that before we get confused about why it was not included in the subsequent -

CHAIR - Okay. Mr Wadsley?

Mr BEST - You have minutes of all these meetings?

Ms McINTYRE - Yes, there are documented minutes.

Mr BEST - Of who was there?

Mr WADSLEY - Absolutely. In the main report, figure 10.5 has shown the various options as well as that stuff that has just been handed out by Denise -

Ms McINTYRE - That would be in the GH & D report.

Mr WADSLEY - Just before page 120. GHD's main role was to look at corridor and road improvement options over the entire corridor from Rocherlea through to Scottsdale. At this end of the project study area we originally defined Scottsdale A, B and subsequently D. Scottsdale C was effectively just a realignment of Listers Road, so that was discounted as being a major deviation; it was really a specific road project. That is why C doesn't appear although it is discussed in our main report. When we were first considering Scottsdale A we looked at an alignment of Scottsdale A going straight down Oak Dene Road to link onto Bridport Main Road. However, in discussions with the local community, and specifically the focus group that we set up for the Scottsdale area, there was a lot of opposition to that idea because of the number of private residential houses

on small blocks at the eastern end of Oak Dene Road. We then examined route options south of Oak Dene Road, moving back towards Browns and Nations roads. The further south we went the further we moved into the area of prime agricultural land, which is defined under the State policy as class 1, 2 or 3 land. Most of that area from Oak Dene Road back to Scottsdale itself is predominantly class 2 or 3 - very high quality land.

At the focus group there was a lot of opposition to any route option south of Oak Dene Road going back to Nations Road, basically because of that farmland. We then investigated options further north of Oak Dene Road and, as you can see, the route option there came out at Lauderdale Road, which was significantly further north than what was preferred by freight industry members who were on the steering committee. They also formed part of the focus group, including people like Trevor Hookway who was on the steering committee from the very beginning of the project right through to the end.

Mr BEST - You have a focus group that is separate to your steering group?

Mr WADSLEY - We had eight focus groups set up during the project. Five of them were based on local communities such as Rocherlea, Lilydale, Lebrina-Wyena and Scottsdale. We also had a specific focus group for the freight industry and one for the Tunnel-Bangor area when we were looking at linking options across to the east Tamar Highway. We had a tourism group as well, I believe. The purpose of that was to try to broaden the discussion as much as possible within the community.

Mr BEST - So you have the steering committee and the focus groups?

Mr WADSLEY - Yes. We advertised in the local newspapers for those focus group members. We got the steering committee to nominate people. We went through a very intensive process of trying to select broadly representative groups. They were not public meetings, they were never intended to be, but they were designed to have a broad cross-section of opinion.

Mr BEST - You say there were major objections to A.

Mr WADSLEY - A was the Scottsdale focus group, in terms of coming further south between Oak Dene Road and Listers Road. Also, when we were considering options up around Lauderdale Road, the local council and freight industry representatives were fairly unimpressed because it was too far north. The problem was that to get a truck from, say, Scottsdale to start travelling down the Lilydale-Golconda corridor, for it to go all the way to Lauderdale Road was a significant distance to travel, particular as Campbells Hill on Bridport main road was in the middle of that. That is quite a substantial hill if you look at it from a heavy freight point of view. Certainly it was made clear to us -

Mr BEST - About five or six kilometres, is it?

Mr WADSLEY - As part of our assessment process - and it is quite a convoluted process - we had to compare the options, to basically compare apples with apples. We had to define the length of each deviation. So from Blumont Park at the western end to the junction of Listers Road and Bridport main road, which is the eastern end of our section,

Scottsdale A option was some 13.8 kilometres - this is shown on page 120 of our main report.

Mrs NAPIER - How much of that 13.8 kilometres is the section of Bridport to Scottsdale road?

Mr WADSLEY - Approximately five kilometres. They are one kilometre grids on that map. There was also something like a kilometre just around Blumont Park where we were using the existing road. So Scottsdale A was nearly three kilometres longer than Scottsdale B. Now Scottsdale B, as shown on our maps there, effectively went from Blumont Park, coming back to the existing road at Mountain View, and then along Golconda Road and up Listers Road. The dashed-line option, which went along Nations Road, was discounted because of the fairly vehement opposition by the local farmers in that area to any road project which would affect substantial areas of prime agricultural land. That was option B. Option B, rather than going straight through onto Bridport main road, effectively came back in at Mountain View and then along Golconda and up Listers. So Scottsdale A was three kilometres longer.

If you look at the table for travel time and cost, comparing the various options, you can actually see that for heavy vehicles, the heavy vehicle operating cost across that link was 25 per cent higher than for Scottsdale B. That is a fairly substantial option if you think that is per truck, so every time a truck goes on there they were incurring costs of \$3, or 25 per cent higher than Scottsdale B. It became quite clear through our economic assessment and also through our qualitative assessment processes that Scottsdale A was really not sustainable, and certainly there was no-one whom I can recall who made significant representations to us - and there were plenty of opportunities - suggesting that Scottsdale A was the best route.

Scottsdale D, just for comparison, was an option which was flagged at the focus group meeting. We actually had not previously considered that. That was put up by Stephen Abraham who works for Padgett transport company. He was on our steering committee, and that was suggested. In fact, that was our recommended option through stage 1 of the process, but you have to understand that at that stage of this whole project we were only looking at a very strategic level in terms of engineering costs. Once they actually came to do engineering cost assessments, which Pitt and Sherry did, there were substantial costs involved to effectively creating a large embankment across the Golconda Road to link Scottsdale D with Listers. That is why we then went into that new review process where the current option that was before you came out as preferred.

Mrs NAPIER - Just comparing them, for D what is the kilometre distance of that compared to A?

Mr WADSLEY - Okay. Scottsdale D was 11.04 kilometres, again about three kilometres shorter than Scottsdale A.

Mrs NAPIER - How does D compare to B?

Mr WADSLEY - About the same length.

Mrs NAPIER - In terms of cost difference.

Mr WADSLEY - Very minimal difference. In fact heavy operating cost for Scottsdale B was \$9.51 and for Scottsdale D was \$9.44, so almost no difference at all in those things, and also for the light vehicle operating costs.

CHAIR - Page 120 in that report -

Mr WADSLEY - Scottsdale D did take slightly longer, though. It was about two minutes longer because of the climb up the hill for heavy vehicles and the climb down the hill, and in fact sometimes down the hill is worse for heavy vehicles because of the air brakes and other things.

Mr HALL - Than the existing road being upgraded?

Mr WADSLEY - Yes. So, apart from the steering committee, which was overseeing the project since we started it, we had these focus groups. In order that we could assess the projects in a completely unbiased manner and in an independent way, we actually formed what was called the road assessment panel. The road assessment panel was 12 community representatives: six from the steering committee and one from each focus group. Those twelve members met over three days, not consecutive days but three days over about a three-week period, and worked for probably eight hours each day assessing about 18 or 19 deviation projects and 66 road improvement projects. It was a really tough ask for the community. We had to do a lot of preparation work in briefing them how to go through the assessment process. We actually used a technique called the goal achievement matrix process, which assesses engineering projects in terms of qualitative rather than quantitative measures. Within the main body of the report are the actual criteria that were defined to assess each of the roads, on pages 53 and 54.

Mrs NAPIER - So this is the GHD?

Mr WADSLEY - Yes. The GAM process. I am talking about stage 1 of the whole NETAS project, which is really I suppose the fundamental basis of where we are now and of the whole process of community consultation.

The objectives and criteria that were defined under the GAM process were defined by the members of the steering committee. GHD facilitated the process but we did not define them; in fact we actually had a voting system. We went through a very convoluted process. It is fair to say that at the beginning of our study there was a lot of community opposition to any thought of road upgradings in different areas. They basically believed that the department had a game plan and we were just there as the front men to be put against the wall to be shot if no-one liked it. We made a strong point to the community, and it took a long time to win their trust, but we made it quite plain that the department had never given us any instructions over which options were to come through.

There was a lot of opposition in the Lilydale area, not so much at the Scottsdale end, and that was really based on the fact that a number of bypass options had been flagged in the Lilydale community about 10 years previously. When we started the job we were not aware about them so we walked into a bit of a bun fight on that one.

For a job that took 18 months there was a lot of heartache, not only on GHD's behalf but also by the department to win the trust of the community. I think the way we assessed the projects, both in the benefit-cost-ratio analysis, which is a purely economic analysis, and also in the qualitative assessment using GAM, it showed that in the case of Scottsdale A it ranked the worst out of those four options, both under the benefit cost ratio and under the GAM analysis. Certainly in my time there, we did a lot of advertising, a lot of publicity, a lot of encouragement to the local communities, but we had no significant representations saying to us that Scottsdale A is the only way to go.

Mrs NAPIER - How many people from the transport industry were involved in that process?

Mr WADSLEY - When we had the transport focus group there were about, I think, 20-odd members invited. I don't know if they all turned up. I think we had about 16 or 17, and that was actually held in Launceston. At the Scottsdale community focus group there were about 23 people, of which probably three or four of those were transport operators. As I said before, Trevor Hookway and Steven Abraham were on the steering committee from the very beginning. Trevor saw it all the way through to the end. He endorsed the report along with others and it was, I must admit, somewhat perplexing that so late after our project was finished people started raising these issues about Scottsdale A and the Tasman Highway as well.

When I saw Glen Moore earlier in the year I asked him specifically why didn't he get involved with the focus group and he said he was too busy at that time and that he couldn't get involved but he was certainly well aware of it and had the opportunity. It was a shame, because he is a good speaker. He made some pretty pertinent comments to us at the time but he obviously couldn't come onto the focus groups or the committee at that stage.

It is probably fair to say too that when DIER set up the steering committee there was actually an open invitation - anybody could put their name forward. From the point of view of a consultant trying to manage the process that made it difficult because we had 34 people on the committee, of which 23 or 25 regularly turned up to meetings. The meetings normally start at about 10.30 in the morning and went through until five o'clock at night, which is a long day, particularly with three hours travelling each way for us from Hobart. It was a big job and at least I suppose I was being paid for it. A lot of those people weren't being paid and they put their heart and soul into it.

At the end of the process, when we went to the draft report stage, we had four public display processes running consecutively in Scottsdale, Lilydale, Launceston and Rocherlea. Every person on the focus group was written to with the executive summary of the report and encouraged to attend the display. At the end of the process we also set up what we called the citizens jury, where anybody who was opposed to the recommendations could come and actually make a submission to the citizens jury, which effectively was the steering committee. We had one representation and that came and that was from the Bridestowe Lavender Farm. They were mainly concerned about signage and access from a potential deviation off the Golconda Road to their property, and that was resolved.

I think there was more than adequate consultation. There was more than adequate opportunity for people to make comment on the recommendations of the study. Some

people suggested that Scottsdale A was useful for people trying to get to Bridport but you do not build what is now a fairly expensive highway - and even then our estimates were \$9 million or so - for tourist traffic. Even if Bridport took off and increased by 20 per cent you are not going to have the traffic numbers to justify a road being five kilometres closer to Bridport. Scottsdale is the service centre for the north-east. That is where the substantial traffic is going to come from.

As we make a point about in our report, apart from the heavy freight issues - and we certainly recommended that Bridport main road remain open for B-double freight from Scottsdale to Bell Bay and into Launceston - there was sufficient justification for the Lilydale-Golconda Road to be upgraded on the basis of passenger and commercial traffic alone, and light trucks. It did not need heavy freight to justify an upgrade of that route.

The other advantage to the Lilydale-Golconda route was that it served a number of communities along the route. You have Underwood, Lilydale, Lebrina, Wyena, Golconda and Nabowla, and combined they represent a sizeable population that would benefit from the upgrading of the road. The Tasman Highway really services, in terms of local populations, nowhere near as substantial a population as that.

Mr BEST - So the objectives that you have set out, you are saying that was decided by the local people?

Mr WADSLEY - By the steering committee.

Mr BEST - Right.

Mr WADSLEY - On the steering committee we had council representatives like John Martin. He, as a council representative, came to nearly every meeting. He worked very hard on that group. We also had Damien Noughton from Launceston City Council. That changed later on to be Richard Burke, but both councils were involved. They were full steering committee members. Sarah Boyle and/or Stuart Baird from the department were the chairs of those committees and in the early days it was John Pauley. We had Helen Cordell from the department who acted as minutes secretary for all the steering committee meetings, so we have minutes of all those meetings available if you want to read them. It was a big project.

Mr BEST - So the wording of those objectives, there were four that were decided upon, you did not have 10 on the board? That is what they said?

Mr WADSLEY - No. I acted as facilitator.

Mr BEST - No, I am just interested in how it arrived at it. That is all.

Mr WADSLEY - We use the GAM process. We have used it on other projects for DIER, like the Tasman Highway planning study which we completed last year. We use it on land use planning studies for local councils. Most recently we have done it up at Devonport for the Quoiba-Spreyton land use study. We are about to do it next Tuesday in terms of workshopping - not necessarily GAM - these sort of approaches at Kingston Beach on the master plan down there.

The objectives and the criteria under each of those objectives were all defined by the steering committee and they were the criteria by which the road assessment panel then assessed each of the projects. It was a long job and it was difficult for those people. We had to really bring them up to speed on the way in which they had to assess those projects. We had lots of forms and they had to score them. They actually had to provide scores against each of those criteria for each of those road projects. We have large spread sheets back on the computers at work where you could see all the numbers that had to go in to end up with one number at the end of the day.

Mr BEST - So those options, then, A, B, D, are really what the focus was about but then you had other focus groups looking at other sections of the road as an overall strategy?

Mr WADSLEY - Yes. Each focus group was asked to do two things. It was asked to look strategically at the entire corridor from Rocherlea to Scottsdale.

Mr BEST - Which included the Sideling no doubt.

Mr WADSLEY - Yes. We talked about the Sideling. We talked about all the regional linking issues with the Bridport main road, Pipers River Road, Pipers Brook, Ferny Hill Road - all those linkage issues. In some cases the groups were good at that. In some cases it was harder for them to think big; they were more worried about their own particular patch. But we dealt strategically and then we got locally. We asked each focus group to look at their own local issues - for example, bad corners, where the accidents were, what were the problems for kids, school buses and things like that.

Mr BEST - So the evidence that we heard them from people objecting, I guess, when we were in Scottsdale the other day, they had ample opportunity to be part of the focus group. You are not aware of whether any of them were involved in the focus group?

Mr WADSLEY - I can tell you who was on the committee, if I can find my minutes.

Ms McINTYRE - When the detailed assessment of the options was commenced a letter went out to all potentially affected property owners along all of those routes. I guess there would have been three or four letters to the Bissetts because they were at separate addresses.

Mrs NAPIER - When would those letters have gone out?

Ms McINTYRE - There is a copy of the letter - 26 November 2002 was the date of the letter on file. That was before the actual alignment that you're looking at now was defined. That was when we were still looking at seven options.

Mrs NAPIER - And that would have been received by the Bissetts?

Ms McINTYRE - It wasn't certified mail or anything like that, but I am assuming so. Their names are certainly on the mail merge lists. As I understand, two letters were sent out to property owners during that process. To my knowledge there was no response.

Mr BEST - So really, the people who replied got a guernsey, I suppose.

Mr WADSLEY - What Denise is talking about is subsequent to that. That is a different part of the process. Some people nominated themselves: they rang up and said, 'Can we be on your focus group?' Some were nominated by people on the steering committee and some were people we contacted - for example, I think there is someone from the North-Eastern Soldiers Memorial Hospital. We genuinely try to get a representative sample. We don't care what their views are, we just want to try to get a sample. There's no point our having a meeting where everyone agrees with everything I say because that is not the purpose of what we are there for. What we did try to do was not have all the freight industry in with the community group meetings. The freight industry, naturally enough, sometimes have their own issues and important things to be discussed and they don't really want to get those messed up with community issues, so that is why we had a separate freight industry meeting.

Mrs NAPIER - So there was a separate freight industry group?

Mr WADSLEY - Yes.

Certainly option A did receive some support through the community focus group but the outcome was that they agreed that B, C or a combination of BC - at that stage C was the Listers Lane connection, so effectively B - could be a viable concern if addressed. The concerns there are about the width of the road and those sorts of issues. I suppose the difficulty from our point of view is that when you are going through a strategic planning study you don't have the opportunity to go into the detailed design that Pitt and Sherry have done in subsequent stages. So, in trying to provide cost estimates, there is a huge plus or minus factor in anything like that. As an option, D was the one we recommended but there are significant engineering costs in there. We didn't do any of the hydro-geographical work or the geotech or anything like that, so that is really where Pitt and Sherry were able to make their assessment. It was interesting, when we were asked to review the new options from an environmental planning perspective - and Pitt and Sherry did the engineering assessment - we never actually talked. I only talked to Leigh once and that was about whether we should use the name nomenclature for the routes - and we stuffed that up!

Laughter.

Mr WADSLEY - We both came up with the same route, but independently.

Mr BEST - So what you are saying is that the objectors, for some reason, didn't participate? They were written to and they chose not to, that's what you're saying.

Mr WADSLEY - Yes.

Mr BEST - And now they're not happy with the outcome because, for whatever reason, they didn't know - is that what you're saying?

Mr WADSLEY - Yes. I haven't been involved in all the property negotiations and I haven't met directly with the Bissetts. The only time I have seen them was when I was at the hearing earlier this year with the RPDC. At the end of the day - and this is my personal view and you can shoot it down - I suppose the Bissetts are directly affected by the upgrading of Listers Lane and they lose or they perceive that they are going to lose some

access across that road because of the upgrading of it. However, I think the design option that the department and Pitt and Sherry came up with minimises the impact on the prime agricultural land. Sure, there is a small land take there, but it is on a fairly steep patch of the land, and under the classification system I think it is class 3, so I think the engineering outcome is the best possible. And I also understand the department has offered stock underpasses or -

Mr MILLAR - Not underpasses, but it was offered actually to construct -

Mrs NAPIER - A dam structure.

Mr MILLAR - The dam issue is a consequence of our design, but also one of the Bissetts' concerns is the lack of access from Listers Lane now through to Minstone, and the department has offered to build a farm track within their property which would enable them to get from Listers Lane across to what would then become the old Golconda road which effectively would then come back into Minstone Road.

Mrs NAPIER - Could I ask, through your consultations whether the issue of the closure of Minstone Road has come up? That was certainly one that I received quite a few representations about, not just from the Bissetts, actually, from people associated with farming.

Mr WADSLEY - When Scottsdale D came through, there was discussion made in the project about the effects on Minstone Road and the fact that some machinery may have to go through Scottsdale. But certainly the view that we formed - and council did not see that as being a significant issue - was in terms of comparing that to the greater benefit the road would provide to the region and access. One of the really important things that we were looking for in a road planning sense in this section for the western approaches was to remove those rail crossings. By having a new deviation from Blumont Park right through to Listers Lane, we have effectively taken four railway crossings out of a major passenger and freight route, and in safety terms that is enormously important. If you talk to anybody in ARB or in federal transport circles, you will find that railway crossings are a major traffic hazard, and by taking four out you significantly improve the safety and the travel time, reducing, I suppose, the surprise.

Mr BEST - Are there many left now from Blumont to Lilydale?

Mr WADSLEY - There is one at Lebrinna and one at Lilydale.

Mr BEST - What will happen then with The Sideling? What happens there so that the focus now, should we approve this expenditure, will be on this section of road, so obviously you have sort of minor upkeep, I suppose, but -

Mr WADSLEY - This again is my view; you need to talk to Greg and Denise, I suppose, as to the department's official view there, but it is my understanding that the Tasman Highway will not have a mass limit put on it, so any truck other than B-Doubles could still use that route if they wish to. However, as I have gone over there lots of times, I am surprised that people are not killed there because of trucks going through that route. Those bends are really bad, and particularly when a truck takes those bends, its entire trailer is on the wrong side of the road. I do not know how tourists cope, but probably

they are travelling more slowly than I do and they are more cautious, but it is a dangerous road. It is a beautiful view, but it is not a good road for a transport route, but local freight can still use it if there is no mass limit applied.

Mrs NAPIER - One of the areas that was presented when we were at the hearings at Scottsdale was the issue of the freight routes should a pulpmill be situated on the north-west coast rather than at Bell Bay. Bell Bay is easy: you would use the Flinders Highway, but questions were raised about the Lilydale-Golconda Road once it is finally finished, pending money, I suppose, that there would be some antagonism to log trucks continuously going through the middle of Launceston. If I remember correctly, one of the route proposals was a by-pass of Launceston which would go basically from before you get to Rocherlea and connect up to where the Tasman Highway comes out. Did that issue come up at all in discussions?

Mr WADSLEY - At the eleventh hour of our study they had a problem with Cora Linn Bridge. We looked at Prossers Forest Road - the link there - and the fact that that was built as a forestry road by North Forest Products but because council had approved subdivisions there then the Launceston City Council is getting a lot of complaints about the fact that you have log trucks in effectively what is becoming a residential area. I think that is probably a problem for council. They probably should never have endorsed those subdivisions on a main forestry route there.

We didn't get into the ring-road option. That was not part of our brief. Certainly there was some discussion around it and other issues there but our charge was to look at getting a link from Launceston into the north-east.

My view is that even with Lilydale-Golconda being upgraded and over the entire route the Bridport Main Road link through to Bell Bay and even down the East Tamar Highway to Launceston would still be preferred by most heavy vehicle users - and particularly Bridport Main Road - because the topography is so good. Once they get about six or seven kilometres north of Scottsdale they can get into top gear and literally stay there all the way through to Bell Bay. That is certainly a problem with the Lilydale-Golconda route. We made no bones about the fact that the topography there is difficult with Clover Hill and the climb at Bacala but again there was enough justification on freight and commercial traffic alone to justify that that route should be upgraded, not including heavy freight.

Mrs NAPIER - So the point you are making is that we probably need to set aside the question of heavy freight. One of the implications will be that if eventually the pulpmill should go ahead at Burnie then we need a new bridge over the Tamar River.

Mr WADSLEY - I'm not an engineer so I don't know what the issues are with the bridge itself.

Ms McINTYRE - Are we talking about the Batman Bridge?

Mrs NAPIER - Yes, I am.

Mr MILLAR - We've made that inquiry subsequent to the last meeting -

Mr HALL - It is open for B-doubles.

Mrs NAPIER - Yes, but not with a full load.

Ms McINTYRE - My understanding is that there is no load limit. I asked the question of our -

Mrs NAPIER - Companies are told that they cannot take a full load on that bridge.

Ms McINTYRE - I'm not aware of that. That is certainly not what our bridge engineer advised.

Mrs NAPIER - I wonder whether we could - through you, Mr Chairman - just get some follow up advice to ensure that there is no restriction on load for B-doubles over the Batman Bridge. That is an issue that needs to be clarified anyhow.

Mr WADSLEY - Certainly, apart from going through Launceston, you have the option of taking heavy freight over the Batman Bridge and through the Frankford Road back onto the Bass Highway down at Birralee.

Mrs NAPIER - As long as the bridge is okay.

Mr WADSLEY - I would see that as being the better way to go if you were taking stuff to a pulpmill. I don't know where the pulpmill has got to. As far as I am aware, Gunns are looking more seriously at Bell Bay at the moment.

Mrs NAPIER - Yes, but you've got to be ready for the option, I suppose.

Mr WADSLEY - Yes, quite true. Our GH&D was involved when the Taiwanese were looking to build a pulpmill and we were actually involved with the site selection studies then which recommended Railton but that was a different company and a different time. They were a generation ago almost, now that Gunns are there.

Mrs NAPIER - If I go back to the summary, I guess you are saying that 'Nations Road probably would have been a preferable route but given the opposition to that then D is the preferred route.

Mr WADSLEY - We had the Bissetts and the Jetsons and other people at that focus group meeting who were saying that with anything between Oak Dene Road and Listers Road they would fight us on the beaches and they would be digging their trenches the next day. We were seriously looking at it. There were significant transport issues. There is quite a heavy climb up that ridge to get onto Nations Road but in a purely road planning sense that looked to be quite a feasible option but it did create a lot of problems with the climb up and down that ridge and eventually because of the opposition we dropped it and that is really why Scottsdale B came then back onto the Golconda Road and then up onto Listers Lane.

Mrs NAPIER - In terms of the eventual alignment that was chosen, we had a Mr Tubby Kettle, I think he was called, who lives in the Lietinna area. I actually went out to have a look. He lives on the west side of the Oak Dene Road connection and to be fair I think

this is more to do with the next part of the road rather than this part. However, I could see his point about the question of where the next section goes to get us eventually to connect with Blumont Park and he showed me the area where the road is proposed to go.

It is across a creek - I think it might be Sawdust Creek. I also looked at some work provided by Mr Owen Ingles in relation to whether that area along the river would take a road and they suggest that you are likely to lose most of your equipment and it will just basically sink.

Ms McINTYRE - We have actually moved on from there.

Mrs NAPIER - I have looked at some pretty impressive photos of what happens to machinery when you put it anywhere near that creek, let alone the floods that come through there, so I just wondered if this route is to succeed then I guess, as we agree to this first part, that next section becomes relevant as to whether it is feasible to get that connection through to Blumont Park. Did you have a look at that or is that more an engineering issue?

Mr MILLAR - Leigh, perhaps you could address it.

Mr BARRETT - That issue was raised with Pitt and Sherry and the river in question is actually Brid River -

Mrs NAPIER - That little creek that runs along there, is it?

Mr BARRETT - It is not a creek, it is actually the Brid River. It is not much of a river.

Mrs NAPIER - No, it does not look it.

Mr BEST - There is that Sawdust Creek that is there.

Mrs NAPIER - No, this one is further back here I think.

Mr MILLAR - Perhaps it should be clarified in that we are not committed as yet to a particular route and the information you have there deals with only one of the options that are currently, I would say, on the drawing board.

Mrs NAPIER - I guess I just need to be assured that if we approve this part that it will be technically feasible to get a good road that is not going to be flooded out and we are not going to end up with major subsidence problems and so on if we try to build a road along a creek which I would have thought would go against environmental planning orders anyhow.

Mr BARRETT - To answer your question, Mrs Napier, the Brid River - I have discussed this issue with Mr Kettle as well and he showed me the pictures of the excavator getting bogged, which were quite impressive - and I was quite concerned about that as well; that if we have to build a road across we do not end up with a section where no road can be built. I discussed this with one of the directors of Pitt and Sherry, John Eckersley-Maslin who is a geotechnical engineer and he has actually been up on site, walked along it and did some testing in terms of the sort of strength of the materials underneath and he was

not at all concerned. He said this was no different to the Deloraine bypass where they had similar issues with property owners claiming that they had lost tractors and machinery in very soft material near the river at Deloraine. In fact on the Deloraine bypass project during the geotechnical testing they lost an excavator there in similar sorts of material. It had to be pulled out by a substantially larger machine and since then we have built a 10-metre high embankment on top of those materials and it has been no problem at all.

There are issues that we have to be aware in building on those soft sediments but they have certainly been done in quite a number of other areas and they have been very successful so we did not see that there was going to be any significant issue which would prevent putting the road across those soft materials.

Mrs NAPIER - I must admit if you are heading in this line I could not see why you would not have gone up Oak Dene Road and gone in through the bush higher up on the ridge rather than going through the flat.

Mr WADSLEY - Do not forget that line there, D, is not the route they are looking at now.

Mrs NAPIER - No, I was just going from the road as I drove it. With a lot of maps it is really hard to find out where the road will actually go. I'm just an ordinary member of parliament and I'm trying to work my way through all these maps. We are being asked to approve something and we are saying, 'Where in the hell is the road going to go?' We just want to know where the road will go and, more importantly, we want to make sure it can be built.

Mr WADSLEY - We didn't get into the engineering technical details at that stage in that route selection process that we were looking at. The idea of taking Scottsdale B from Blumont to Mountain View was effectively to remove those two level crossings at Lietinna and Blumont junction. I have been involved with RPDC and the department in terms of looking at the planning and environmental issues. We have had environmental surveys done along the route corridor that is being examined now and that is all within the reports. I think the route has been modified for some threatened species issues and things like that.

Mrs NAPIER - Did it take into account water quality issues, too - even that limited issue of looking at the place near Mr Kettle's? If we are building a road along a river on finely-particled soil, which I am told and others say is a questionable place to build a road, did you look at water issues?

Mr WADSLEY - Well, certainly. In terms of water quality, that really comes down to during the construction phase and DIER requires that there is a construction environmental management plan for things like that. It is up to the contractor to ensure that water quality is maintained by not allowing sediment or erosion to occur during construction and affecting the water quality. There are issues with things like the freshwater crayfish and other species there that may be affected by too much sediment getting into the river systems.

Mrs NAPIER - That road actually goes right through where freshwater crayfish are.

Mr WADSLEY - Yes, but you can deal with that in terms of construction with culverts. There are lots of designs these days that provide fish passage and things like that in concrete culverts. The issue over sediment, erosion and things like that is very much in the construction phase and DIER has specific requirements as part of its tender process that environmental management plans and other things have to be prepared as part of the tender and have to be maintained and implemented. There are site superintendents to review that kind of work to ensure that they are complying with what they're meant to do - or what they've said they're going to do. We did not look at that particularly. Our environmental and heritage reviews looked at flora and fauna issues. We identified species such as the freshwater crayfish as being potential habitat. We didn't actually send someone out to do that. Have they actually done any inventories?

Ms McINTYRE - There is a little section through the Kettle's property and we have looked at three options through there. The current status is that if we were to go north we would have to submit an EPBCA referral to Environment Australia because there are eucalyptus ovata and some burrowing crayfish through that area. We would have to go through a national referral process and have the Commonwealth sign off.

Mrs NAPIER - You can see where the burrowing crayfish are near his front lawn - it is amazing.

Mr MILLAR - But again, that is only one of the options that are being considered. One of the other options, for instance, has already been through that process and accepted by Environment Australia.

Ms McINTYRE - We've looked at options both north and south of the river through that section.

Mrs NAPIER - So what you're saying is that at the moment that road is very tortuous - it is vertically and horizontally alignment challenged!

Laughter.

Mrs NAPIER - Are we going to get a better straightening out of the road with the connection through to Blumont Park?

Mr MILLAR - Categorically, yes.

Ms McINTYRE - And it will be nearly four kilometres shorter.

Mrs NAPIER - But you're saying that the community consultation did provide the opportunity for freight operators to have good input?

Mr MILLAR - Absolutely.

Mrs NAPIER - I was just wondering whether we might be able to get a copy of the people who made up the Freight Industry Focus Group. I notice Mr Nathan Bennett; Mr John Austin, of Lloyds North; Peter Jones, Holyman Townsend; Darren Crooke, Rayonier; Robin Gerke and Noel Gerke; Steven Abraham, Padgetts; Keith Davidson, Rayonier -

Mr STURGES - I was wondering whether we have them here.

Mrs NAPIER - I am reading them into the record - and Owen Hoffman for Gunns; and Alan Goodwin, of FT. The major part of the representations that were made the other day were about those kind of -

CHAIR - Do we have those names that Mrs Napier is referring to in any of these papers?

Ms McINTYRE - I'm not sure. Can I just have a quick look.

Mr WADSLEY - It is a difficult thing with road planning - I suppose you are faced with almost two evils. One is an enormous amount of apathy in the community and we found that with the Tasman Highway where, although we were dealing with over 200 kilometres of road, I stood in Triabunna one day for eight hours and had only three people talk to me. Because we weren't basically recommending any major changes to the highway in their patch people can be highly apathetic. On the other hand, if they are affected they can be highly engaged.

In the case of Lilydale, and I am sure you would know, the Lilydale community were -

Mrs NAPIER - They were wound up from the beginning. They have been there before.

Mr WADSLEY - I can still remember - and this is in February 2001 - going to the first or second meeting there and being accused of knowing that there was a conspiracy under way, that I was just a toady for the Government. The conspiracy was that we were going to build a bypass around Lilydale and we were just there to basically rubber stamp it. And when we actually recommended in our report at the end of the day that there should be no bypass some of these people were stunned. 'What are you doing?' I said, 'We've been trying to tell you we had an independent view on this and there is no point the department using us if we are just going to actually toe some line because it doesn't give them any useful information'.

When the Lilydale bypass up to Wyena was first considered back in 1988 or 1989, even then the costs were enormous. I think in modern dollars we are probably talking about \$30 million for a bypass which just wouldn't happen. With \$30 or \$40 million you'd still be left with problems on the road. We had a lot of people in Lilydale who were actively promoting the tunnel link across through Bangor to the East Tamar Highway because it was the old 'not in my backyard principle'. 'Let's promote that link so they won't go through Lilydale' and so we actually had to set up an additional focus group to deal with the tunnel and Bangor residents who got up in arms because all the Lilydale residents were saying, 'Go to Bangor. Take it through Bangor'. It was a long process.

Mrs NAPIER - But in relation to the particular one that we are dealing with today, the Scottsdale A issue, because that is where a lot of the representations were coming from, you are saying that that was thoroughly canvassed -

Mr WADSLEY - Yes, it was.

Mrs NAPIER - and was rejected in a relatively early stage.

Mr WADSLEY - Certainly. There were some people in favour of it. There was some talk saying, 'This will be good for Bridport. It will be good for the tourism having the road link further north' but certainly from council's perspective and the freight industry generally the impression that we built up was that it was too far north for it to be a useful route because trucks going from Scottsdale not only had to climb Campbells Hill, they then had to come down off Campbells Hill and rather than having a nice run up to Bridport they had to slow down and turn off. Truck drivers hate that and, as you can see, we were dealing with a 3-kilometre extra route compared to Scottsdale B and the existing road. And if you need it, we can show you all the workings on how the travel costs and all -

Mrs NAPIER - No, I will take your word.

Laughter.

Mr WADSLEY - A 25 per cent increase in cost and multiply that by a number of trucks in a day and it starts to mount up.

Mrs NAPIER - I thank you for your summary of the kind of consultations that occurred because I think it is important to get that on the record when we try to have a look at the question of whether Scottsdale A was thoroughly analysed as an option or not.

Mr WADSLEY - I must admit when Denise contacted me and said that people were starting to raise concerns about it, I was surprised. Trevor Hookway, for example - we went out with Trevor and Glen Moore back in January with Peter Douglas from the department. Trevor had been on the steering committee from day one and while he had concerns about the Lilydale-Golconda route, I could not understand why he had taken this view. He was more thinking about the Tasman Highway then rather than Scottsdale A. I do not recall on that trip -

Ms McINTYRE - Glen's concern is the Tasman Highway. He would prefer to see that as the -

Mrs NAPIER - That is a fair comment.

Mr WADSLEY - Yes, and certainly if you look at the Tasman Highway, the western section when you leave Launceston for the first 10 kilometres is not a bad route, when you start climbing and go around some of those hairpins, Leigh knows better than I would, but the engineering costs just to try to change some of those hairpin bends to make it a safer journey would be huge.

CHAIR - After my trip there last week I don't really want to be reminded.

Laughter.

Mr WADSLEY - No, and the environmental cost would be enormous. I think you would have quite a large bunfight on your hands from the environmental lobby about the impact on The Sideling, because on small sections of the road the amount of fill you would have to put in to fill some of those gullies is tremendous.

Mr HALL - One of the Bissetts' main concerns was the loss of prime agricultural land and no more is being made. I did ask the question of them last time, and I think the quantum of land being lost is about 21 300 square metres, which is 2.1 hectares or thereabouts.

Mr MILLAR - That is correct.

Mr HALL - And I think you mentioned that was a steeper part.

Mr WADSLEY - I don't actually have my copy here. In the NETAS stage 2 report - Western approach to Scottsdale - that we did on environment planning information, it actually has a land capability map, and you can see the red dotted area is class 2 land, and this section here is actually class 4. This alignment was obviously done before Pitt and Sherry did more work there, but certainly that is not even classified as prime land. I thought it was class 3, but it is actually class 4.

Mr HALL - Because of the gradient of it.

Mr WADSLEY - Yes.

CHAIR - That is down near the intersection with Golconda.

Mr WADSLEY - Yes. I understand Mr Bissett at the time said he would farm that in the same way he would farm the rest of his land, and he may well do. I am not a farmer. I am going to tell him how to do his job. But on the land capability assessment, which we have to work off - and this was a detailed one for Scottsdale, this had actually been done to 1:25 000 scale; the sections over here were actually at a higher scale, 1:100 000 - that shows that it is not prime agricultural land. I do not know where the existing road sits in that, but certainly I know the department has gone to great lengths to minimise the land take, and in fact as part of this report, when we were doing our assessment independent of Pitt and Sherry, the land take for prime agricultural land for the option you are looking at now was the least of all of them.

Mrs NAPIER - Of all of the options?

Mr WADSLEY - Yes, that were reviewed, apart from Scottsdale A because that just does not touch any land, but certainly in that area when you are looking at things like Nations Road and Browns Road -

Mrs NAPIER - Is that the one that went through Lette's property, was it?

Mr WADSLEY - Nations Road, yes. In fact I can probably find what the actual figures were.

Mrs NAPIER - You would probably be dealing with greater opposition if it went that way.

Mr WADSLEY - It is difficult with any road project, because if you build a road somebody is going to be affected. You just cannot get away from that fact, and we deal with it every day, and now within the department we work with it, so I feel for the Bissetts in the sense that, yes, their land is affected, but at some point you need to look at the public good versus private benefit, I suppose, that combination. Certainly in an overall strategic

sense the western approach to Scottsdale provides a huge improvement in safety and a much better link into Scottsdale at that section of the corridor. And, over time, as funding comes through and further sections of the road are improved, it will provide a much better route into the north-east.

CHAIR - That has been very thorough, Mr Wadsley. Any further questions of Mr Wadsley before we proceed to hear other evidence about the road? We might go on to some engineering matters, Denise. Is that the way you would like to proceed now? You have led into Mr Wadsley. If we need to discuss some engineering matters, maybe we can ask Mr Barrett. I suppose, Leigh, if you'd like to address the engineering challenges which confronted the various options which were put to your organisation or indeed, were the options presented to you or after the value management study did you just proceed to one option or did you look at the full range from an engineering perspective?

Mr BARRETT - Following the actual value management study and the NETAS studies carried out by GH & D, Pitt and Sherry were engaged to look at specific routes. The Scottsdale A group, which has been discussed here, was not one of those routes; we weren't asked to look at that route at all. There were approximately seven routes which we were asked to investigate and we investigated those on a number of issues: geotechnical, hydrological, road user safety, traffic management, road design benefits, road user benefits, road maintenance costs and total project costs. They are the specific issues that we investigated on those seven routes. Before going into that we investigated those separate to what GH & D were doing. We did a concept design for each of the routes and we handed those concept designs to GH & D for them to do their analysis on the environmental planning-type issues and we went off and in parallel did the engineering and costing issues.

Unfortunately, the nomenclature which was used in this study was a little bit different to the nomenclature done in the previous studies. The option which we recommended in our report, based on engineering cost issues - we call it corridor D, which isn't the same as -

Mrs NAPIER - Is that a useful page to look at?

Mr BARRETT - Corridor D, which is options 2 and 6. Corridor D is different to Scottsdale D.

Mrs NAPIER - This says corridor D in your report.

CHAIR - As Mr Wadsley acknowledged a while ago, they tried to keep the nomenclature the same but they stuffed it up.

Mr WADSLEY - Yes, we did.

Mrs NAPIER - So corridor D basically went through bushland.

Mr BARRETT - And came back onto the existing road and followed Hurst Creek and up onto Listers Lane.

Mrs NAPIER - Okay. So you've still got that Listers Lane bit.

Mr BARRETT - Yes. Since this analysis there has been a minor modification to the option we recommended after the Bissetts had made some representations on the loop off Golconda up onto Listers Lane. They were concerned about the amount of land being acquired and we basically put it straight down off Listers Lane and onto Golconda Road, across one of the dams. We removed the large loop, which significantly reduced the amount of land that would be required from the Bissetts' property. The issues that we went through in analysing each of the options: the first was geotechnical assessment - we walked along the routes with a geotechnical engineer, geologist - there were a number of issues which were picked up but there were no issues that we considered would prevent any of the options from being constructed. There were no major geotechnical issues at all. There were some things highlighted in option 2. We were going across the buffer, the clear-felled land there as is on the plan - the old photograph - that is a granite-diorised country. Granite diorite is, in its normal state, extremely hard rock and any cuttings which we would require would be obviously very expensive. We were concerned about that. We have carried out drilling tests in all of the cuttings and we have actually found that all the granite diorite is highly weathered and can easily be excavated so it would not be treated as rock. Our concerns back in the early stages have been resolved by some geotechnical testing to actually eliminate those concerns, and which is apt to reduce the expected costs.

There were no other real significant issues in any of the options. They all had issues of some minor slope stability which we would just have to deal with in detailed design but nothing of any significance. Hydrologically - again there were really no great issues for any of the options. There are a number of stream and creek crossings, and the crossing of the Brid River as well. However most of those would be a single span bridge or a box culvert, nothing that would preclude any of the options from going ahead.

The road users safety assessment: going through all the options again. Corridor options which contained option 1 or 8 we have found contain significant safety issues. Option 1 and 8 are basically the options which travel either down Nations Road or on the opposite side of the Hurst Creek gully concerned with the long steep grades -

Mrs NAPIER - These are these two red ones here we are talking about are they?

Mr BARRETT - The next red one up is option 8 and option 1, which best follows down along Nations Road.

Mrs NAPIER - Okay. Got you.

Mr BARRETT - Any options which contain those corridor options we were concerned with the safety issues on those mainly due to the long steep grades, the requirement for climbing lanes and those climbing lanes with curves. There is another issue with say coming up the hills heading in an easterly direction coming up over the crest of the hill in the morning with the sun directly in the eyes, there is a safety issue. Also corridor options containing option 4 or 4.2, could contain grade rail crossings, which again was a major safety issue.

Yes. Option 2 and option 6 which was our eventually recommended option, we did not see any significant safety issues there which we could not deal with in the detailed design.

Mrs NAPIER - So the overall plan that you are pursuing is the section that we have currently got, coming along in the existing road, and then you basically plan to leave from that point, you plan to not follow the old road but to cut across that hill where the forestry is.

Mr BARRTT - That is correct.

Mrs NAPIER - And that is why it is a contention - that area around the Brid River - because that is your take-off point. Do you go behind those houses up Oak Dene or whatever, or do you go in front of those houses to get your alignment up across that bush?

Mr MILLAR - Just from near where we cross the Brid River, on the Scottsdale side of the Brid River, to a point which on the one I am looking at is marked with a chainage of 5 000, is the area we were actually looking at two alternative options, one of which would impact on Mr Kettle's property. The one that you have in front of you wouldn't actually impact with Mr Kettle.

Mr WADSLEY - Yes, on the southern side of the river.

Mr MILLAR - And the one in front of you is the one that already has approval from Environment Australia.

Ms McINTYRE - And planning approval, planning scheme amendment.

Mr HALL - That's much better.

Mrs NAPIER - It gives us a feel for the road and I guess we were struggling for that the other day.

Mr WADSLEY - The reason it extends so far is to avoid the level crossings.

Mrs NAPIER - It makes a lot of sense and that also gets rid of a lot of your vertical and horizontal alignment challenges.

Mr WADSLEY - Within our report - even I get hit by the engineers for not getting it right and I cannot remember exactly how many individual projects; in that section of existing road there were about nine or 10 sections of road that would have to be upgraded. You are effectively upgrading nearly the entire section of the road if you didn't take any of the major deviations. So it shows you how poor that section of the road currently is to bring it up to an appropriate standard.

Mrs NAPIER - What I should understand is that whilst there is some contention about where the alignment might be in the vicinity of Oak Dene Road, thereafter it is unlikely to cause any landholder issues because it is going basically through forestry country.

Ms McINTYRE - I wouldn't say that.

Mrs NAPIER - No, okay.

Ms McINTYRE - Just in terms of negotiations with landowners, and that is what it has come down to now. From the planning scheme amendment process, the only representations made were from people who would be potentially affected by property acquisition, so that gave us a fairly good indication that we had community acceptance of the project. We had 12 representations, yes, but they were mostly dealing with specific property impact issues, apart from the Bissetts, who raised the Oak Dene Road issue. Stage 1, the project that we have come to you with, on the existing road alignment doesn't prejudice what happens past that Oak Dene Road area.

Mr MILLAR - That was the point I was trying to raise, perhaps unsuccessfully, on Tuesday; that what we put before you can stand alone anyway. As Denise says, in no way does that prejudice the alignment further to the south.

Mrs NAPIER - I did appreciate that, it is just that I thought, 'If we've got these kind of issues coming up here then is there more of the same coming down there?'

Mr MILLAR - I would suggest that, irrespective of which alignment we choose in the future, there will be an issue just in this Oak Dene-Brid River areas, depending on which alignment. You will either have one of two property owners -

Mrs NAPIER - That was the Turners, isn't it?

Mr MILLAR - That's correct. yes. So you will either have the Kettles or the Turners making representations that we have got it wrong.

Mrs NAPIER - I was going to ask a question about the connection between Listers Road and Bridport Road coming down from Scottsdale, so heading north down the Scottsdale Road coming into the intersection. We were told that there is going to be a slow-down lane available. Is there any thought of particular road signage that is to be provided to get trucks and drivers to be aware that the intersection isn't too far away and to please take it slowly. I haven't actually seen the plan of how long that slow-down section was - it might be in some of our documentation - but some of the locals who are resigned to the fact that this is where it is going to happen say, 'At least if we could get some guarantees about some signage to make sure that the slow-down lane is going to be sufficiently long so that people will not have to brake, that they will consistently be able to just take it slow from the top of the hill'. I think that would take away some of their concerns and that increased noise that they are likely to have.

Mr BEST - The other concern there is where people live on that corner. I know you are talking about the other way but I am saying on the other side as well, with people in and out of their driveway in slow down lanes.

Mr MILLAR - They are faced with the same problem at the present moment except that you have not got a slow-down lane there. You have still got vehicles turning left out of Bridport main road into Lister's Road. I think we made the point last week that the initial design did not have any left-turn lane there. It was only after people have raised these concerns with noise that we have included a left-turn lane.

Mrs NAPIER - So does that start from the top of the hill?

Mr MILLAR - No.

Mr WADSLEY - If I can just add one point, when we started the work to council advised us - this is back in 2001 - that in the fairly recent past they had actually upgraded Lister's Road.

Mrs NAPIER - Yes, they did. Quite true.

Mr WADSLEY - I did not hear any bad press about that and the fact that, although they had not changed the alignment of the road at the Hurst Creek end, they had actually upgraded the road and it was an acknowledged position of council that that should be a main entrance into Scottsdale for freight.

Mr BEST - No, I was talking about the houses in Bridport Road. I know what you mean. You are talking about the farmers and I think Sue was talking about coming the other way from the west.

Ms McINTYRE - I do not know how far this will address the issue but we are currently looking at major redirection or directional signs for this junction as part of the project, so there will be the big green and white directional signs so it will actually change

Mr MILLAR - Just to answer the question on the deceleration lane, it would be about 100 metres long, which is inclusive of the tapers leading into the lane and it has been designed for a 60 kph design standard - it is 60 kph through there anyway.

Mr HALL - Do you have to acquire any more land for that hill?

Mr MILLAR - The very corner block which is vacant - undeveloped - there is acquisition from there but not from the developed blocks with houses on them.

Mrs NAPIER - For people heading south, coming up along the Bridport Road, are you going to have a connection between faster moving traffic on the Bridport-Scottsdale Road and traffic that has come out into the intersection and will take it slowly, presumably, going up the hill, so I am looking at traffic that is moving south -

Mr MILLAR - To me I have difficulty between north and south I must admit. Is it Scottsdale-bound or Bridport-bound?

Mrs NAPIER - If traffic is coming from Bridport to Scottsdale it will be moving at a pretty reasonable pace because they are travelling from Bridport to Scottsdale. Right?

Mr WADSLEY - Where does the 60 kph zone start, though? It would be before that junction, would it not?

Mr BARRETT - Before that junction.

Mrs NAPIER - Is it?

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, LILYDALE TO SCOTTSDALE; BRIDPORT MAIN ROAD TO OAK DENE ROAD, HOBART 15/10/04 (WADSLEY/BARRETT) 23

Mr BARRETT - On the Bridport side of the junction.

Mr MILLAR - So they should be travelling at 60 kph.

Mrs NAPIER - So they are doing 60 kph, but then you will have people who will accelerate from a stop, pulling out to also head into Scottsdale, so do we need in fact two lanes to accommodate that traffic?

Mr MILLAR - We would normally not encourage that in that it is a safer operation at the junction to ensure that people coming out of Lister's Lane have come basically to a standstill and there is sufficient gap in the traffic to be able to get out onto the Bridport Road.

Mrs NAPIER - But once they have got out - I am thinking about trucks and so on coming out - they will be travelling much slower than the other cars that are coming up behind them.

Mr MILLAR - I would have to concede that. Yes, you are quite right.

Mrs NAPIER - So is there an argument for two lanes going into Scottsdale to accommodate that Scottsdale-bound traffic?

Mr MILLAR - I would suspect that if you want to get a second lane in there and still provide parking outside those houses, you would look at having to acquire some of the frontage of the houses. I just do not think that there would be enough space.

CHAIR - Mr Barrett, you might be able to address that from a road design point of view. Is that a position you can enlighten us on?

Mr BARRETT - Yes, Mr Chairman, we have designed this to allow - and we have checked the sight distances towards Bridport to the north - that people turning right out of Lister's Lane have sufficient sight distance so they can pull out safely to turn right to turn back into Scottsdale. If they pull out and then a vehicle comes over the crest from Bridport, there is sufficient room there for all the vehicles to adjust their speeds so there is no -

Mrs NAPIER - So you are saying it will be accommodated by the sight distances?

Mr BARRETT - The sight distance, yes.

Mr MILLAR - The reality is, too, that at the present moment the width of the lane for Scottsdale-bound traffic is reasonably wide. The reality is that there is not a lot of parking along that kerb line, so there is probably sufficient room there for, let us say, sensible manoeuvring of vehicles. I know we cannot always guarantee sensible behaviour, but -

Mrs NAPIER - No, but if there is really good signage there I think that would cover some people's concerns.

Mr MILLAR - I think signage is, quite honestly, the least of our worries as far as engineering terms are concerned.

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, LILYDALE TO SCOTTSDALE; BRIDPORT
MAIN ROAD TO OAK DENE ROAD, HOBART 15/10/04 (WADSLEY/BARRETT) 24**

Mrs NAPIER - But getting signs in Tasmania is fairly hard. I have been through that. You have a guy in there who does a really good job, but he is the hardest man I've ever known to try -

Ms McINTYRE - Is he with Tourism?

Mrs NAPIER - Oh, Vin's not doing it any more?

Ms McINTYRE - He's with Tourism at the moment.

CHAIR - Any further questions on engineering or environmental?

Mr BEST - Do we have a final plan?

Mr MILLAR - A final plan of the section -

Mr BEST - As I understand it, there is a moderation to the plan, isn't there?

Mr MILLAR - No.

Mr BEST - Well, it was going through the paddock but now on Listers Lane you are actually going to just curve it, aren't you?

Mr MILLAR - The final plan for the project that we have put in front of the committee is actually attached to the back of the original report.

Mr BEST - All right. And that is actually the final plan, isn't it? Yes, that is right, it is.

Mrs NAPIER - Mr Chairman, there were those key questions that I think the committee needed to get a clearer perspective on, where the road was actually going to go and why, and although I think a number of us were very aware that there had been quite a deal of consultation it was important to get on the record the kind of consultation that occurred, particularly in relation to truck and freight traffic. I think it was really important to ask those questions and get it on the record, because to them this road is going to be as important as it might be for the tourist traffic and the commuter traffic.

One we get to Blumont Park, what do you think it will cost us to get to Lilydale? As I understand it, once we have built to Blumont Park we will have spent the \$20 million, basically, that was originally allocated for the project. We were told that last time. So it has taken us \$20 million to build how many kilometres?

Mr MILLAR - In very round terms, 10 kilometres.

Mrs NAPIER - I won't hold you to this because there have been lots of figures around about what this project would cost, but what additional moneys are we likely to need to complete at least to Lilydale?

Mr BARRETT - I haven't actually done any estimates of any projects.

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, LILYDALE TO SCOTTSDALE; BRIDPORT
MAIN ROAD TO OAK DENE ROAD, HOBART 15/10/04 (WADSLEY/BARRETT) 25**

Mr WADSLEY - I can probably help Leigh out there if that is okay, Mr Chairman. At the end of our report in NETAS stage 1 we provided costings. Now remember these are estimates and because it is a strategic level study there is a high degree of variability in some of these estimates, and remember too these estimates are getting on for three or four years old -

Mrs NAPIER - So it was the 19 projects?

Mr WADSLEY - In section 12, which was the corridor strategy for the Lilydale-Golconda road, we discussed corridor funding. On page 129, we actually developed -

Mrs NAPIER - This is for this big one, I take it?

Mr WADSLEY - Yes. You can get autographed copies of it.

Laughter.

Mr WADSLEY - I should sell them, I tell you. I am sorry that we have so many maps through the study report. It is probably another mistake we made. We should have shoved all the maps somewhere else so people could actually find their way through it. We actually talked about stage 1 and stage 2, as high priority and medium priority projects and then Tasman Highway projects and then minor works. We tried very hard to develop a funding approach which gave the department and the community some scope in terms of how the road could be developed over time and certainly within that we also, on page 131, talked about a recommended construction sequence.

This is only a recommendation, and it is not our job to tell DIER when and if they build their roads, but you can see on page 132 where we actually go through the list of projects for high priority, which then had a total of \$20 million, and then we had the medium priority projects for stage 2, which had a total of \$16 million, then the Tasman Highway, which was \$250 000, and minor works which was \$400 000.

Mrs NAPIER - What inflation factor would we need to put on those to give us an idea of where we are going?

Mr WADSLEY - Particularly in the last few years there has been a significant increase in construction costs within the construction industry in Australia. You are talking normally about 3 or 4 per cent per annum.

Mr MILLAR - I would suggest construction costs are something higher than that, maybe more like the 5 or 6 per cent. I think you will find -

Mrs NAPIER - Per year?

Mr MILLAR - Yes. I would suggest it is around about double the current CPI figure - that is construction costs.

Mrs NAPIER - So what I would need to do is increase the cost of this by at least 18 to 20 per cent?

Mr MILLAR - Yes, I think so.

Mrs NAPIER - So the project we are currently dealing with is project 4?

Mr WADSLEY - Again you have to remember that at that stage we recommended Scottsdale D as the deviation for the western approaches, which has now become effectively become Scottsdale B, so there is a difference there in the costs but you can pick out the sequence of events as we saw it. What we were trying to do then was provide a construction program that over time improves sections of the road in such a way that people could see the road being developed and that they were not going to go from a really good section to a really bad section and that there was some logic to it. The \$20 million, as far as we were aware, really came up during the Federal election campaign in 2001. Both parties, Labor and Liberal, put up the \$10 million and they said it was tied to state funding of \$10 million and that is where the \$20 million came from. It was never put up as the total funding for this package. We had about \$36 million to \$37 million for the Lilydale-Golconda Road. If you had 18 per cent to it, you are still probably going to be short but remembering of course -

Mrs NAPIER - We were told it was \$60 million to \$70 million were we not?

Mr MILLAR - Yes.

Mrs NAPIER - And that did not include the ring road, did it?

Mr MILLAR - No, that was just purely the Lilydale-Golconda Road.

Mr WADSLEY - It is a shame, I suppose, with those cost increases. Back then you may not have foreseen construction cost estimates where they are at present, but certainly the economic turnaround in Tasmania is also forcing prices up because everyone is so busy. They just will not do anything so that is I think adding to the cost factor as well for the department for government generally. But there is a sequence there that you can follow through and at least there is a basis for costs and again you can see our cost estimates. For every one of those projects that are listed in that report we can give you an A3 sheet which goes through construction costs, design costs, land acquisition costs, moving dirt around costs, environmental and planning costs, DIER's construction, but I think we probably applied a plus or minus 30 per cent to those estimates then.

Mrs NAPIER - So if we look at it in the long term once this gets built, would it be fair to say that the cost of upgrading The Sideling, on the basis of the information the department has given us, would be \$40 million? I take it that is the whole of it, including The Sideling.

Mr MILLAR - Our concern is that you cannot just look at upgrading The Sideling as such on the Scottsdale side. Once you got down there you would have to upgrade from around about the Brid River into the Scottsdale boundary.

Mrs NAPIER - So the figures that you have provided to us in relation to the upgrade of The Sideling, I just wonder whether it might be useful to include them in our report because that was one of the points of contention from people who made representations. They are saying, 'Why are we doing the Lilydale-Golconda?' Given that we haven't been able

to finish or even start the Lilydale-Golconda, for Pete's sake let's go back and do The Sideling. It would be cheaper and would give us just as good a road'. I had so many people coming to us and saying, 'This road will never be built. It is not going to happen; they are just playing with us. Can't we get The Sideling road done because at least that would give us a decent road and we can get on with things'.

The figures you provided in here say that the worst section of The Sideling from Corkerys Road to the scenic outlook would be \$20 million or over. Add to that the \$1 million per kilometre section of Sideling; then the scenic lookout to the Brid River Bridge you are saying that would be worth \$7 million.

Mr MILLAR - That's correct.

Mrs NAPIER - And then you are saying you would need to spend \$8 million on the Brid River Bridge to the Scottsdale town boundary, then a 4 kilometre section north of Nunamara would be another \$4 million -

Mr MILLAR - \$59 million all up.

Mrs NAPIER - It is closer to \$60 million, so we would still need to spend as much on The Sideling.

Mr MILLAR - I would suggest that, as we tried to point out there as well, if you upgrade The Sideling you have still have the problem of getting traffic through. Mr Moore last Tuesday suggested Abels Hill-Quarantine Road; well, the reality is -

Mrs NAPIER - You are never going to get that.

Mr MILLAR - No.

Mrs NAPIER - I did smile when he suggested it.

Mr MILLAR - So you have upgraded a road into the outskirts of Launceston and have nowhere to put the traffic to get it across to, let us say, the Bass Highway for instance.

Mr HALL - That's why I asked the question at the time.

Mrs NAPIER - We built those roads through as connectors with the idea of doing the link road through Launceston.

Mr MILLAR - But you've still got to get it from, let us say, where Abels Hill Road meets with the Tasman Highway at the present moment through Abels Hill Road -

Mrs NAPIER - Down to St Leonards and across the river.

Mr MILLAR - And then up to Quarantine.

Mr WADSLEY - It is all residential through there until you get back to the connector; it is a residential road, effectively.

Mrs NAPIER - In effect it is, yes.

Ms McINTYRE - At the moment we have done so many studies in the north-east and The Sideling keeps coming up as being a lower road in the hierarchy in terms of growth potential et cetera, so we wouldn't be changing the actual categorisation of it.

Mrs NAPIER - I agree, John, with your initial comments that the real reason we are choosing the Lilydale-Golconda Road is that it is a major commuter route and there are more businesses and people and tourist projects and so on who actually live on and use that road. That is the reason we are choosing the Lilydale-Golconda Road and the issue of freight is not the key argument.

Mr WADSLEY - No. The other thing too which our sequence did provide was there was always a discussion whether, when the Golconda Road had been upgraded to Pipers Brook Road, at that stage you reassessed and upgraded Pipers Brook to take freight out to the Bridport main road or continue upgrading Golconda down to Lilydale. This sequence enabled those decisions still to be made without any detrimental impact. Some people were saying, 'Yes, Pipers Brook Road has to be freight route', but of course you have major vineyards along that as well and these days that rears its head as being part of the tourist route, the wine route.

At the same stage, you have to remember that south of Lilydale back into Rocherlea that was upgraded by the department to a category 2 standard. Substantial sections of that road are very good. In fact it was quite funny through our process because of course all the Lilydale people were saying, 'Why do you want to do up the road; it's really good into Launceston'. We were saying, 'Yes, but do you go to Scottsdale?' and they go 'No'. Well, it is crap beyond the north of Lilydale and again it is people's own view of the world. Lilydale people commuting into Launceston thought it was great but they never went to Scottsdale.

Mrs NAPIER - Another road to nowhere almost.

Mr WADSLEY - Yes.

Mrs NAPIER - Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that is helped put on the record a number of pieces of information we needed, especially as we look forward to dealing with other sections of this road.

CHAIR - I detect that questions have been exhausted. Can I say to Mr Wadsley and Mr Barrett, thank you for coming along and joining what was previously a hearing which we adjourned last Tuesday. I think what has been demonstrated by today's continuation of the hearing was that it was important for the committee to consider why various options were discounted or not further considered, either from engineering, environmental or social points of view. We have had projects in front of us in the past related to road projects which we have had to revisit. I think it is important and appropriate for me to say, as chairman of this committee, that we really do need to have in front of us, to properly consider any project, the necessary information. I think it is appropriate and not unfair to say that the document we had before us last Tuesday was scant. It was not sufficient for this committee to consider whether we approve the project or reject it.

The information we had simply did not give us that opportunity. I appreciate the dilemma for both Greg and Denise, who have been working with the project for such a long time. You were aware that various options had been discounted and you felt, I presume, justified in coming to the committee with the submission that you did because it presented the option which had been properly fleshed out by an appropriate process. We were not aware of that appropriate process. We now are and I think this has been a worthwhile exercise. This has been a valuable exercise for all of us I think to appreciate the complexity of such a project from an engineering point of view but also from a social point of view and clearly we appreciate the extra information which you have provided for us today. I get the feeling we will be in a position to make a consideration of the project before we leave here today. Our report should be issued fairly soon one way or the other.

Mr WADSLEY - I think, Mr Chairman, if I just say one thing, when the department engaged in this process and we were successful with our tender, the way the department went about trying to get the community involved was they approached it a different way. They were really open about trying to get the community involved and it was a key part of our project scope to continue that and the department invested a lot of money in actually seeing that through. The NETAS stage 1 project cost was about \$270 000 in what we actually invoiced to the department. A lot of that was in consultation and in blood.

CHAIR - Can I also say that when Mr Wadsley commenced this presentation I think the probity in this whole process has been very evident because you made it very clear that you were not given prescriptive instructions. You went out and you embarked upon a project the way you should, and I think that is to be noted. The transcript of evidence will show that anyway but I was impressed to have heard that at the outset. I was in no doubt that that was the case but it is important that that is the position and we commend you for all the work that you have all undertaken to get to this stage.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.