

PUBLIC

**PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS MET IN
COMMITTEE ROOM 2, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART, ON WEDNESDAY 9
NOVEMBER 2011**

MUD WALLS SECONDARY ROAD, ROAD REINSTATEMENT

Mr GUNADASA GINNELIYA, DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, ENERGY AND RESOURCES, **Mr DION LESTER** AND **Mr JUAN LEE**, PITT & SHERRY, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR (Mr Harriss) - Thank you, gentleman.

Mr GINNELIYA - Chairman, I will start with background and objective, what we have done and where we are. Juan Lee, design manager, will run to more details of the design works carried out so far. In terms of the development application and environmental issues, flora and fauna and other issues, Dion Lester will touch on them.

It was a council-owned road and it was transferred to the department in 1999. Since early 2000 the department spent nearly \$10 million for various rehabilitation work and some safety improvement work such as replacing some of the existing post and wire fencing with guard fencing and some culvert replacement and also maintenance of the road.

The department also introduced a load limit to restrict heavy vehicle movement through this road. There is the load limit between the Midland Highway and just before the secondary road commences. That is primarily to prevent the movement of heavy vehicles on that road.

Prior to the 2010 election there was a local community group who actively lobbied for a commitment to improve the deteriorating condition of the road. As some of you are aware, the conditions are appalling, especially a section north of the Colebrook rail crossing. In January 2010 the Government announced an election commitment of \$8 million to improve the condition of the road. Subsequently, the Mud Walls Road project was included into the community road and west coast road programs. This is in the public domain. I am happy to table as a document the community roads and west coast roads program. Mud Walls Road is one of the projects in that program.

Subsequently in December 2010 Pitt & Sherry were commissioned to commence the concept design right through to detailed design and tender documentation. The primary objective of this project, as highlighted in the community roads program, is restoration of the pavement, structural capacity and road surface condition on the northern section of the Mud Walls secondary road to address deteriorating and failing pavement. With that objective we started the project. In the early stages, various assessment options and investigations were carried out. After going through several options we were able to come up with the most cost-effective and value-for-money option. While doing that, the project divided into two sections, as you may have seen in the report, sections 1 and 2 or

PUBLIC

A and B. One section commences from the rail crossing to Lovely Banks junction and the next section commences from Lovely Banks Road to Ringwood Creek culvert.

As a part of the design process, potential consulting engineers were requested to produce a statement of departure from the design standard. It is a standard practice within the department now that if a road is not being designed to the current relevant standard, a document has to be prepared highlighting what other standards we are not able to meet in terms of the geometric improvement et cetera. It has to be assessed by the department and signed by various parties, including the general manager. I should be able to table that document as well.

The justification not to implement any geometric changes was primarily based on justifications given in that report: low traffic volumes, a low accident history and status of the road - primarily a category 5 local road.

The concept design was presented to the local community, as agreed at the very beginning, for comment. There were a few people who turned up to submit their comments. Some expressed that they are unhappy that we are not upgrading and there are no geometrical improvements to the road. However, they were pleased to see that at least the road condition is being fixed compared to what it is now, especially that 10 kilometres north of the rail crossing.

All service authorities - Telstra and Aurora - have been contacted about service relocation, which is underway already, and agreements have been signed with those parties. Landowner discussions have been held, including with the consultants, and all issues raised by landowners have been taken into consideration in the design.

We will commence the tender process as soon as approval is given by this committee. With that in mind, we expect to award the contract, subject to the approval of this committee, in late January 2012 or early February. Definitely we will not be able to complete the job in one summer because we will be almost finished with this summer. We will be able to complete the project in two summers. The likely completion will be the end of 2012 or early 2013. Funding of the community roads program is spread over two or three years.

The consultants have revised the estimate since it was given to this committee. The latest solution shows a pre-50 estimate. Pre-50 means we are saying with 50 per cent confidence that we shall be able to deliver that project within that given cost. I will table those revised estimates to the committee now.

CHAIR - Can you mention the revised estimate?

Mr GINNELIYA - The original estimate submitted to this committee was primarily a concept design which was not refined. Since that time the consultant has done more design work and we have had more site visits and discussion with the department, with the project sponsor. Various steps have been taken to revise those estimates so with that, the cost of the cement, the P50 estimate has now landed at \$8.2 million and the P90 estimate has landed at \$8.880 million.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Therefore the expectation is that the project will be less than that which was considered in the Governor's message to us today.

Mr GINNELIYA - Correct.

CHAIR - That is encouraging.

Mr GINNELIYA - That is primarily my side of it. Because we did not have time to visit the site, I have some photographs if anybody is interested in having a look at them.

CHAIR - We may yet decide to. That may yet be a consideration of the committee but we thought that this was a productive process in the first instance because of the Legislative Council sitting and so Greg and myself being here and being able to get Kim and Rebecca on the telephone. It may yet be a consideration, yes.

Mr GINNELIYA - With that, Mr Chairman, I hand over to Juan Lee to deliberate more about the design issues.

Mr LEE - The project, as Gunna said, is about 10 kilometres split into two pieces from the rail crossing just north of Colebrook through to some dams between Colebrook and the Midland Highway. We looked at several options including overlays, widening on both sides and widening on one side and various options of different overlay thicknesses to refine the costs and get them within budget. It was determined that the best way forward would be to widen on one side, which would reduce the amount of acquisitions and make the construction process a little bit easier.

The acquisitions total about 6.5 hectares and are mainly on the western side but there is a little bit towards the end of the project on both sides but all the widening is contained to one side. Further to that -

Mr BOOTH - Could I just ask a question there, Chair?

CHAIR - Yes, go ahead, Kim.

Mr BOOTH - Thank you. It is a little bit difficult to hear but I think I have most of it but effectively then it is only widening and no actual road realignment project?

Mr LEE - That is correct.

Mr BOOTH - Would there have been a case that there should have been realignment?

Mr LEE - Yes. We did look at realignment and the justification for not doing so - all of the things that needed to be done were outlined in the report that Gunna just tabled, which is the design exception report, showing all of the curves that needed to be fixed, et cetera. We are removing trees from both sides of the road to reduce the incidence of collision with obstacles and the other primary objective of this project was to fix the drainage because the road is predominantly falling apart due to the fact that water is flowing underneath it and deteriorating the road pavement. So we are upgrading all of the culverts and providing table drainage on both sides.

PUBLIC

Mr BOOTH - How much work are you doing on the reconstruction of the foundation of that 10-kilometre section? I suppose the question is, effectively, is it virtually a new build in that sense?

Mr LEE – We believe the existing pavement is quite sound down below 200 millimetres so we are going to mix up the top section of road and recompact it and then overlay it with more base A, so there will be full pavement reconstruction on the widened section but not over the existing section of the cross-section.

Mr BOOTH - By doing it that way would that make the construction considerably cheaper than if you had realigned the road in a more appropriate position perhaps? What if there were fresh construction on a more appropriate alignment, what would be -the difference in cost?

Mr LEE - Because the pavement was so out of shape it was easier to widen and excavate only one side and do all the reshaping rather than trying to reshape and dig out little bits on both sides. So you are digging out a lot of one side and nothing on the other side, which reduces the construction costs so you're not dealing in little areas.

Mr BOOTH - What's the ballpark difference then in terms of a total reconstruct in a better location or reconstruct this one the way you're doing it?

Mr LEE - I don't have those figures with me.

Mr GUNNELIYA - It is in that report – various options of costs. We looked at six or seven options including widening on both sides. I can give you the dollar values of those options.

Mr BOOTH - What I'm really interested in is a figure of the difference of a reconstructed road that might be aligned and therefore give a better road than this one. I am interested in the different ballpark figure, Gunadasa.

Mr GUNNELIYA - There were seven options and the cost varies from \$12.37 million to the lowest of \$9.2 million. That is also excluding any of the alignment. It is just to fix the pavement with some minor widening without realignment.

Mr BOOTH - Okay.

Mr HALL - And without land acquisition as well. That would have been another cost for realignment.

Mr GUNNELIYA - Yes, another cost to be added.

CHAIR - Anything else, Kim?

Mr BOOTH - No, thank you, Chair.

Mr LEE - I have spoken to the landowners along the road and all seem to be happy with what's been proposed. Quite a number have mentioned drainage issues, which we've tried to fix, and I think that's about it.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Go on with that then, Greg, and then we'll come to Dion in a moment with the flora and fauna. Greg has a question.

Mr HALL - I did note that the design speed is to be 80 kph. So is it going to be speed-limited to 80 kph? Is that what you're saying?

Mr LEE - No, we don't put posted speed signs up but we do have kerb warning signs on the deficient kerbs. We do what's called a 'speed model' on the existing road and it tells you what speed, theoretically, people could and would travel on that road. So we don't post the actual speed limit but we know there will be restrictions at certain corners.

Mr HALL - At certain corners, yes, so obviously the remainder is 100 kph.

Mr GUNNELIYA - Through you, Mr Chairman, I can add one more point that this road is one of the candidates for the rural speed reduction program.

Mr HALL - As you say, not yet decided.

Mr GUNNELIYA - No, not decided yet. It is one of the prime candidates, I am advised, under the rural speed reduction program to bring it down to 90 kph.

Mr HALL - Okay, that's a debate for another day. If I could, Mr Chair, you talked about some of those corner kerbs and Mr Booth asked about any potential for realignment. Are there any particularly bad corners there that could have been costed in there that could have been realigned and still fall within the budget figures? I think you mentioned before that you were going to come in under the - it couldn't be done?

Mr LEE - No. The figures for just fixing up the road, alone, put us way over budget. That is why we're providing the speed warning signs on those particular corners and chevron alignment boards. They're the yellow ones with the big arrows.

Mr HALL - Will you have a centre line marking as well, as some councils do, to warn people that that's coming up as well?

Mr LEE - Yes.

Mr HALL - A continual centre line marking?

Mr GUNNELIYA - Yes.

Mr HALL - Righto. The other question with the road was this: obviously we have some to the south going towards Colebrook and then some going to the north back towards the Midland Highway. Obviously it was prioritised that these were the worst bits. My memory is even if you come off the Midland Highway it is not all that flash either so what is going to happen? Is there any intention to do any further works on those, that is another project I suppose?

Mr GUNNELIYA - That is simply another project but again, I will not be able to give a commitment here, however, I can mention that, subject to getting a good tender price, it

PUBLIC

could be decided at the tender box. This is an estimate that we have given here at the moment but if we get a very fair enterprise the likelihood of demanding some continuous money for additional works is likely.

Mr HALL - On either end?

Mr GUNNELIYA - Either end, yes. But it is again based on what we get at the tender box. Looking at the current construction climate the contractors are very hungry for work these days so they are sharpening their pencils very well.

Mr HALL - We might be able to save the State budget yet.

Mr LEE - I guess the other thing I neglected to mention as well was the section between the railway line and Lovely Banks Road will not be widened; it will just be selected dig-outs of pavement or suspect pavement and replacement and then a full reseal over the top.

CHAIR - We are now on to Dion I think with the flora and fauna and the other environmental assessments.

Mr LESTER - Thank you Chair. The roadside environment is relatively benign along this area. What items are there or were discovered during the background surveys have also largely been avoided. There is no threatened species or flora species impacted by the roadworks. There are a couple of hundred square metres of tussock skink habitat that will be impacted and beyond that the majority of the site is suffering from fairly heavy weed infestation. So the main environmental flora and fauna issue associated with this road is actually appropriate pre-treatment of the construction site for weeds.

From an Aboriginal heritage perspective the site was also surveyed. There were no Aboriginal heritage sites discovered. There were three areas of potential archaeological sensitivity located adjacent to the road. There is a very marginal impact on those areas and the vast majority of them will be marked as exclusion areas so they will not be impacted by the proposed works.

There were two historic heritage listed sites towards the northern end of the job. In both instances there will be some very minor roadworks associated with the drainage and some land acquisition but no impact on any heritage features. Both those heritage properties are listed by virtue of items that are quite some distance from the road.

There is one other site that is not listed called the 'Ringwood' property that is thought to be associated with an 1830s inn and there is some potential for archaeological sensitivity there but, again, the roadworks have managed to avoid any impact on that site.

From a permit point of view no development application was required. The Southern Midlands Council planning scheme has an exemption for roadworks of this nature. The impact on the two heritage-listed properties was granted an exemption from a works application under the Historic Cultural Heritage Act. No permit was required under the Aboriginal Relics Act and there has been a permit issued to relocate any tussock skinks prior to construction works. Beyond that it is pretty much improved agricultural land along there, so that is it from me.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - That is the content of the submissions from the three witnesses currently at the table. Are there any questions now to Dion in terms of the matters he mentioned - flora, fauna, Aboriginal and historic heritage?

Mr HALL - I notice under property impacts it talks about 11 landowners and there is some acquisition of land - is it much? Very small bits and pieces obviously but what are they?

Mr LEE - It is a thin sliver right off the front. It totals 6.5 hectares but it is just a thin trim off the front to realign the fences.

Mr BOOTH - Chair, it is not the Aboriginal heritage position that I am interested in but with regard to bicycle passage on the road - do you have a bike lane provided?

Mr LESTER - No.

Mr HALL - I am with you Kim, I would like one but the cash side might preclude that.

Mr BOOTH - Yes, it is an interesting thing because I noticed in regard to the submission justifying why the works are needed that it does mention two-wheel vehicles being subject to a fair bit of danger on that road or words to that effect. I notice they are referring to motorbikes as well as cars. It is a growing transport mode and it would be a damn good road for a pushbike.

Mr GINNELIYA - I have occasionally seen some cyclists there. But what we are doing in this job is consistent with what we have done in the past on Mud Walls Road. It is not the first section we are rehabilitating. We have rehabilitated a number of sections, one section south of Colebrook, another section north of Colebrook and some other repairs, pothole repairs et cetera. This is very inconsistent with what we have done and we do not intend to widen more to provide - because the minimum lane width requirement for cycle lanes is 2.5 metres for the standard. That would require further widening and further acquisition and additional costs incurred.

Mr BOOTH - It would only be for that section of the road anyway, as you say.

Mr GINNELIYA - It becomes inconsistent if we have done it for one section and we have not done it for the rest of the section we upgraded recently.

Mr BOOTH - I understand, okay.

CHAIR - Anything else, Kim?

Mr BOOTH - No, I think that is about it, thanks Chairman.

CHAIR - Can I go to you, Dion, with regard to the Aboriginal cultural heritage issues and the submission from the department addresses those matters. The fact is there has been a desktop assessment so far and there has also been a field survey but the submission goes on to say that there are some specific locations where there is an elevated potential for Aboriginal heritage sites to be present. What is the significance of that, this potential for elevated Aboriginal heritage sites to be identified or discovered or whatever, because I cast my mind back to the Brighton Bypass, where with all of the best intentions, with all

PUBLIC

of the best preliminary assessment, there were no significant Aboriginal heritage issues which were identified. Yet history shows us that it was an immensely important or significant Aboriginal heritage site. I want to go to that specific question as to where these locations are and what the impact of any significant find might be.

Mr LESTER - The field survey did not discover any visible items of Aboriginal relics. One of the aspects that they do in association with the field survey is characterise the landscape and the environment based on what they understand about the traditional use of the land and where certain spots are more attractive or otherwise. So there are three places towards the northern extent of the road where there are, I guess you would call them, relatively flat elevated areas that have potential for archaeological deposits. Nothing was noted in the field survey and it was deemed by the archaeologists and confirmed by Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania that there was no value in undertaking subsurface surveys which would ordinarily be the process that you would do because there are very shallow soil deposits there. These areas have been highlighted by the archaeologists as somewhere where potentially there was some traditional use but that there was no value in investigating it further. If we are talking on scales of significance it is relatively minor. There might be a relic or two. Instead the way that they are being dealt with is the impact has been minimised in those areas to less than three metres, nibbling away from the edges because it is fairly minor roadworks. Plus there are unanticipated discovery finds in place for the contractor. So that if anything is discovered through the construction then there are management measures in place through their contract to deal with that.

Mr BOOTH - Paul, I wasn't able to hear properly what you asked there, but did you inquire as to whether any of the heritage assessments are being done at the moment? Do you have access to an Aboriginal Heritage officer? I understood they had a moratorium on any more assessment work because of the Brighton Bypass.

Mr LESTER - There have been Aboriginal surveys undertaken by an archaeologist and an Aboriginal heritage officer recognised by the community. They were originally slated for about a year and a half ago and they were put on hold by the department in respect of the request by the two Aboriginal Heritage groups, TAC and TALSC, that no further works occur. That request continued for some time and what has happened in reality is that the vast majority of practitioners have returned to work without any particularly strong message from those two groups, TAC and TALSC. The lion's share of practitioners in this area have returned to work within the last three months, and that was about the point in time when the investigations for Mud Walls occurred. The investigations for Mud Walls road were delayed from an Aboriginal Heritage perspective for more than 12 months on the basis of respecting that moratorium.

Mr BOOTH - What status do those heritage officers have with regard to acceptance by TALC, TAC and so forth?

Mr LESTER - I know that TALSC is engaging with developers and Aboriginal Heritage officers in relation to development matters. I am not aware whether TAC are or not. All the other Aboriginal community groups are, so for example Aboriginal Heritage officers are undertaking work for other community organisations as we speak. There has effectively been an end to that moratorium by virtue that the Aboriginal community

PUBLIC

groups themselves, the remainder around the State, are actively involved in investigations.

Mr BOOTH - So if there is a discovery on site, say an undetermined discovery or whatever, there would be an appropriately qualified person with certified knowledge by the Aboriginal community as being able to deal with that if it comes up?

Mr LESTER - Yes, there are statutory requirements in the Aboriginal Relics Act around that and around notification of Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania, plus an appropriate Aboriginal community group. There is a well-defined process within that act that needs to be followed which, as you quite rightly point out, involves a person who is recognised by the community and with the appropriate qualifications to inspect that find. Then it is up to the Aboriginal community and the Regulator, Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania or the Director of National Parks to determine the way forward.

Mr GUNNELIYA - That clause has been added to the draft in the document. The contractor has to stop work and then the procedure for the Aboriginal Relics Act is followed.

Mr LESTER - We recognise it is an important issue so obviously all contractors would abide by the law of the day. We have placed additional specific requirements within the tender specification to ensure that these matters are dealt with appropriately.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.

Cr TONY BISDEE, OAM, MAYOR, AND Mr ANDREW BENSON, ACTING GENERAL MANAGER, SOUTHERN MIDLANDS COUNCIL, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Tony, I presume you will be making the lead contribution on behalf of the council.

Mr BISDEE - Thank you, Chair and members of the committee. Our submission is totally in support of the project. I think there has been a lot of publicity about the Mud Walls Road and the Pass and I think for those people who have travelled it acknowledge the unsafe condition of the road and this was a commitment by the Government at the last election, as DIER have pointed out. We think it is an appropriate expenditure of public moneys for a number of reasons and of course safety is one. It is an important link road between the eastern shore and the Hobart Airport and the north of the State and it is used a great deal by freighters and residents of the eastern shore.

Also, I think the Coal River Valley is a very important part of our municipal area. It is certainly a growth area for us and the great expansion of the viticultural industry is there as well as the stone fruit industry and the orchards. There has been a huge investment of funds in that area and I believe that the investment warrants the upgrading of the road as the northern part of entrance to the Coal River Valley.

Also it is a very important irrigation area with the Craighourne Dam now delightfully full after 10 or so years of drought and being empty. All that has been resurrected and is playing its rightful and beneficial part in the development and agricultural production of that area.

From the tourism industry's point of view, linking the historic towns of Oatlands and Richmond and onwards to Port Arthur is very important. While a lot of tourists hire cars in the State, they are not allowed to travel on gravel roads and I believe that there has been some dissatisfaction by tourists about the state of that road when using hire cars. GPS systems will usually take the shortest route to any destination and if that destination happens to be on the eastern shore or south of that area, the GPS will pinpoint that as the appropriate road to travel rather than coming to Bridgewater and down the National Highway onto the Brooker Highway and into Hobart and then out over the Tasman Bridge.

I think those aspects are very important for us and of course we want to see that take place. Personally, I just have a couple of issues. One is about what upgrading is going to take place at the Lovely Banks Road intersection and whether that is going to be upgraded because that is very much a substandard intersection where the traffic does not align with the highway. They are coming uphill onto the highway and it is quite a dangerous intersection.

Also the DIER engineer pointed out that there is going to be no realignment. There is an extremely bad corner by the old Ringwood shearing shed. There is a shearing shed very close to the existing road and there are two very bad corners there. I accept that most of the other parts of the road could suffice without major realignment but I think in this particular area it would be a small deviation to make to cut off two of the worst corners north of the Colebrook railway line. While they have not incorporated that in the design,

and I am sure that that would increase the cost of the project, I think it is something that perhaps should be looked at. To do that I would sooner see perhaps that section shortened a little to compensate financially for the cost of this realignment, particularly this corner and that one, because the rest of it is okay.

Mr BENSON - The road is a major route and it is flagged by, as we know, a wine route and a heritage route. It is part of what could be termed the Pugin Trail if people are following from an historical perspective the Pugin church in Oatlands, down to Colebrook and certainly there is an impact on the Richmond church as well, so it is a heightened area for tourist travel. That was probably the main reason. Given the Southern Midlands focus on heritage issues, having the largest number of intact Georgian buildings in the country in a village setting, people are drawn from Richmond to Oatlands as an alignment that is preferred for people following that sort of historical perspective.

Certainly the road does need a lot of work. It is hard to think that \$8 million does not go too far these days but certainly the community would be most appreciative of this contribution of the State Government to upgrading this particular portion of road.

Mr HALL - Given that a lot of people have avoided this road in the past because of its condition, given that freight volumes may well increase, particularly coming out of the Coal River Valley and also that tourism volumes may increase - even I used to use it once as an alternative route - do you think what is being spent here is going to be sufficient and do the job as designed?

Mr BISDEE - Probably it is not the ultimate but in this day and age and considering fiscal restraints, perhaps it is the best we can get. With the freight component, there is a load limit on the road at the moment.

Mr HALL - Is it 20 tonnes?

Mr BISDEE - It is 20 tonnes and it is up to DIER as to whether they leave that in place. I expect they will. What we had problems with before were huge B-doubles travelling that road to the Tasman Peninsula with stock feed from Longford. There were also some log trucks on it but that has stopped all of that. The road just could not stand it and something had to be done, so the 20-tonne limit was placed on the bridges. Whether DIER will leave that in place is a decision for them. They could probably tell us today but I have no indication as to whether they are or not. As to the question of whether it is going to be enough, I have a personal concern that we've heard from Juan that the top 200 mm of the road is going to be reinstated, but in an earlier statement he did mention that water is causing the problem because of drainage, and hopefully improved drainage will fix that. Just the same, like all rural roads it is really the foundation that is a problem in a lot of cases, not the travelling surface. Obviously with the process of stabilisation with the addition of lime and things like that it is certainly improved. While I would like to see parts of the foundation replaced, I am sure the cost of that would be prohibitive. I can only accept the engineer's advice that what is proposed will provide a sufficiently robust road and travelling surface that won't have to be repaired in three or four years time because something has failed on it. To me, some of the areas should be dug out and replaced - I am talking about the foundation - but is prohibitive cost-wise.

Mr HALL - Is the 20-tonne load limit going to remain in place?

CHAIR - The submission indicates it is.

Mr BISDEE - That is fine. Also, we must acknowledge that this is only a part of the road. DIER has upgraded two other sections, as Guna referred to, and they have stood up very well; they have done a very good job with those. They were shorter sections and a lot of the sub-base was replaced and there was also realignment. I have a reservation that 10 kilometres is a long way and \$8 million isn't much money, but I am in no position to say, 'Let's not do it'. I accept the design and I would hope that the issue of the corners, two in particular, would be addressed within the budget and that the Lovely Banks junction be upgraded to a safer junction, again within the budget. I think from that point of view I accept the engineer's assessment that what they are going to do will provide a much better travelling surface and a sounder foundation for the road.

CHAIR - On the basis of what the mayor has contributed I refer to this matter of the Ringwood corners, if I can refer to them as that. Guna, I go to page 10 of your submission, which indicates that the community roads program will be providing \$8 million for the project and that in the financial year 2013-14, coming out of the capital investment program, will be a further \$2 million. Has the further \$2 million the capacity to address the matters which the mayor has indicated in his evidence?

Mr GINNELIYA - The mayor said there are two issues: realignment of the Ringwood corners and the upgrading of the junction. One option to look at is to cut down from there and do the junction and the realignment of the curves. However, it doesn't look good and is not value for money. We are leaving some potholes in certain areas to upgrade the junction and the curves. If you look at the accident history of the junction, there has been no accident in the past. An entire section of 10.2 kilometres has reported five accidents over the last five years. Accident history is very low, traffic volumes are very low, so based on that is the DIER assessment that although there is a deficient inside distance it just does not rank, compared with other junctions within the State, as a place of priority for safety upgrading. In the original assessment in the early days when we were looking at options we considered that it would cost in the order of \$400 000 to upgrade the junction only. We had to acquire more land on one side to realign the junction, we would need to remove a crest to improve the sight distance, so it will cost us money similar to upgrading of that junction.

To go back to your question of whether we can get that extra \$2 million, I would not be able to give you a commitment now because at that time when we attributed \$10 million we were tossing around the question - budget is \$8 million and at that time our cost estimate was \$10 million so how do we deal with this project. Then the asset management section said yes, we may be able to rearrange some of the projects in 2013-14 financial year and should be able to reallocate funding. It meant that we may have to stop some of the line marking or something else in 2013-14 to reallocate funding.

It is not the original money that we were getting from the Treasury, it is rearranged funding within the forward program to finish the job. We are confident to tell you of the project within \$8 million, but whether I can still get that \$2 million I need to go back and talk to the divisional manager. At the same time there will be more design work, more time, more acquisition issues and we will not be able to go to tender as we planned or scheduled. If the funds are found we may be able to go to tender in May, June, July in

2012 and we will be postponing, possibly, the program by another six to nine months. That will be the situation, Mr Chairman.

CHAIR - I think that we will leave it to the mayor and his council to lobby you on that process as to access to a further \$2 million. I do not know that this committee can take it any further but I thought that it was worth investigating with you that issue. I recognise that your projection was out to 2013-14 financial year. That has answered my question.

We thank you all for your evidence. We will now take some time to deliberate. Again, thank you for your attendance. We will ask you to leave when you have packed up you various bits and pieces of paper and we will spend some time in camera as we must.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.