

# PUBLIC

## THE PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS MET AT THE CRADLE COAST AUTHORITY FUNCTION ROOM, BURNIE, ON WEDNESDAY 20 SEPTEMBER 2023

### Old Surrey Road and Massy-Greene Drive Upgrades

**The Committee met at 2.00 p.m.**

**CHAIR** (Mr Valentine) - Welcome to this hearing of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works in relation to the Old Surrey Road/Massy-Greene Drive upgrade. For the record, the members of the committee are Tania Rattray, Rob Valentine and Simon Wood, with secretary Scott Hennessy and James Reynolds from Hansard. The opportunity today is for us to examine the information that is before us, but first we will have the secretary read the message from Her Excellency the Governor in Council referring the project to the committee.

**Mr HENNESSY** - Pursuant to section 16(2) of the Public Works Committee Act 1914, the Lieutenant-Governor refers to the undermentioned proposed public work of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works to consider and report thereon. Pursuant to section 16(3) of the act, the estimated cost of such work being completed is \$20 million, Old Surrey Road Massy-Greene Drive upgrade.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. We are in receipt of one submission from the Department of State Growth. Can we have a member move a motion that the submission be received, taken into evidence and published? Thank you, Mr Wood - and seconded? The motion is carried.

**Mr SIMON READING**, PROJECT MANAGER, PROGRAMMING & DELIVERY, STATE ROADS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH; AND **Ms VANESSA KING**, MANAGER PROGRAMMING & APPROVALS, PROGRAMMING & DELIVERY, STATE ROADS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much for providing us with the onsite briefing this morning. We really appreciated that. As I always say, we can't sit in judgment on these things unless we have the fullest of the information and it is very important for us to have that. Thanks for appearing at the hearing today as well.

Before you commence your evidence, it is important that we inform you that this hearing is a proceeding of parliament. That means it receives the protection of parliamentary privilege, an important legal protection that allows individuals giving evidence to a parliamentary committee to speak with complete freedom without fear of being sued or questioned in any court or place out of parliament. It applies to ensure parliament receives the very best information when conducting its inquiries. It is important to be aware that this protection is not accorded to you for statements that may be defamatory, repeated or referred to by you outside the confines of the parliamentary proceedings. It is a public hearing, which means members of the public and journalists may be present and this means your evidence may be reported. Do you understand?

**Ms KING** - Yes.

# PUBLIC

**Mr READING** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Would you like to make an opening statement?

**Ms KING** - We would. Today we are seeking consideration of the Old Surrey Road / Massy-Greene Drive upgrade project that's supported by a \$20 million commitment from the Australian and Tasmanian governments.

Tasmania has an integrated freight strategy which considers freight across the state, unsurprisingly, and the connections to interstate. One component of the road network which is addressed by that integrated freight strategy is the Burnie truck route, and that is the subject of the project we're putting up today. That Burnie truck route is part of the important connection between the west coast through to Burnie and then further from Burnie through other highways to Launceston and Hobart. The movement of freight between the north-west coast of Tasmania to other cities, or including all the way to Hobart, is really important in supporting the agricultural, forestry, mining and manufacturing industries in the state and, as I said, the Burnie truck road is an important part of that of that corridor.

In 2021 the department undertook a freight efficiency study for this corridor. Objectives of the study included identifying barriers and opportunities for freight productivity along the corridor and developing a list of upgrade options to improve freight productivity and safety.

The corridor we are talking about today is, in road names, a little complex to describe. It starts at the Bass Highway where a road called Massy-Greene Drive intersects with the Bass Highway. Massy-Greene Drive then continues south, there is a short section of Old Surrey Road which is included in that Burnie truck route, and at the southern end it connects to the Ridgley Highway. The project also is looking at works along Mount Street, which runs more or less parallel to Massy-Greene Drive. Some of the transport needs between those two roads cross-interact and we will explain that as we go through the presentation.

The freight efficiency study concluded that there were substantially two categories of need for improvement in this environment in this location. One was to improve the physical road environment and another was to improve the governance of the road environment, which in this case means the road ownership and management. We will talk through both of those, starting with the physical stuff.

The work that we undertook through this freight efficiency study looked at a lot of the parameters of the road and how it works. We investigated traffic volumes and heavy vehicle travel times. The traffic volumes were annual and at peak hours particularly focused on the intersections. We looked at bridge capacity, some of that work outside the freight study but in parallel to it. We looked at the road geometry, both the horizontal curves and the vertical curves or grades, because some of it is pretty hilly through there. We looked at accesses along Massy-Greene Drive, safety, crash data, and considered pedestrian and cyclist movements as well as powered vehicle movements. We also considered future service needs, for example, introducing higher productivity freight vehicles and larger trucks.

**Ms RATTRAY** - Larger loads.

**Ms KING** - Larger loads and larger vehicles, yes. We looked at all these aspects of making sure it is a suitably efficient and safe road environment.

As part of that freight efficiency study, some early stakeholder engagement was undertaken, including an investment logic mapping workshop with Burnie City Council. There were some other attendees invited to that workshop who were not able to attend, but that workshop produced a list of issues which could basically be summarised as inconsistent and noncompliant safety barriers; faded, missing and incomplete line marking and signage; pavement cracking and deformation in some locations; non-standard and noncompliant pedestrian crossings; and passing opportunities for heavy vehicles.

They were the issues identified. The issues were reviewed against the objectives for the corridor and 18 proposed actions were recommended. There was work to prioritise those 18 actions.

We used a technique called the multiple criteria assessment, which involves scoring each of the proposed actions for alignment with the objectives: Would they contribute to achieving the objectives? Each of the actions was scored for achievability. What's the cost? What's the timing? How difficult would it be? Of this option, how good is the result and how hard is it to achieve that?

The team who worked on that included State Growth, Burnie City Council, National Heavy Vehicle Regulator, the Tasmanian Transport Association and Transport Tasmania. It was not just us. We were working with people who bring a great deal of knowledge and experience on that road.

Those options were scored and ranked. The top ranked options were taken forward for implementation. In a moment I will hand over to Simon to discuss what that meant and which options are picked up. Are there any questions about the work we have undertaken to identify the needs in this area?

**CHAIR** - What we normally do is work through the report page by page and we will pick them up on the way through.

**Ms KING** - Sure.

**CHAIR** - It has been useful to hear that.

**Ms KING** - Concerning governance, that second area of need, some sections of road on this route that the heavy vehicles drive along are currently under council ownership. The middle is state government-owned, but each of the ends is under council ownership. We believe that is not the best governance arrangement for management of the road.

**CHAIR** - Because of getting approvals?

**Ms KING** - Yes. Getting approvals is a problem for the heavy vehicle industry, particularly if there is an oversize load that needs permission from the council, then us, then the council and then us as they go onto the Ridgley Highway or come off the Ridgley onto the Bass Highway; but from an asset management perspective, if there is one asset with a user base of heavy vehicles, it is better if the asset is managed by one entity.

That is why we are here. We are seeking your support to help us address those challenges.

**CHAIR** - Okay. Anything further you wish to say?

**Mr READING** - Thanks, Vanessa. Following on from our initial investigations that Vanessa has spoken about, the department further assessed and prepared some concept designs for the improvement opportunities that were identified in the freight efficiency study. A project team created a priority list by weighting each opportunity against some specific criteria, namely against safety improvements, the implementation expense, freight efficiencies and future road usage. During this review the team identified a further three road safety opportunities that were associated with the Old Surrey Road-Mount Street road swap. This meant that the project, from a wholistic point of view, was now considering 14 elements to address the freight efficiency study's recommendations. All 14 opportunities now make up the project that we are discussing today.

This project is diverse with many elements but the main outputs are to: formalise an existing truck rest area, complete with covered seating and washroom facilities; strengthen the two bridges that we saw today on our road visit on Massy-Greene Drive and install new safety barriers on those bridges; upgrade intersections at several locations on the truck route to prioritise heavy vehicles where possible; install new roadside barriers at various locations on the truck route; replace antiquated signage; do new line markings with the vision to prioritise heavy vehicles; and renew sections of existing road pavement in key locations on the truck route.

As an integral part of the project, the department and the Burnie City Council are working through a road swap arrangement to exchange Mount Street, known as 'the old truck route', with sections of Old Surrey Road, known as 'the new truck route'. Vanessa has alluded to where they intersect. Having the new truck route exclusively under state government will assist in streamlining freight movements, lessen red tape for HV users and streamline management aspects around maintenance. Having Mount Street exclusively under Burnie City Council will allow the road to function as a local and collector road, meeting the needs of local community and improving strategic roadway planning into the future.

The sub-projects identified within the road swap are: construction of the new roundabout at the intersection of Mount Street and Thorne Street; upgrading and installing new traffic signals and pedestrian crossings at the Mount Street and Roslyn Avenue intersection, to not only help with traffic flow but also assist with pedestrian movement, especially since they are near a public school; compiling a detailed structural assessment report on the extensive Mount Street retaining walls; and, where possible, improving any structural deficiencies that are found, to ensure that the Burnie community is not unfairly burdened with future maintenance expenses that may be associated with the road swap.

The project is forecast to expend just under the \$20 million budget, inclusive of contingency and expected cost escalations. We submit that the project is an important safety upgrade that will improve freight efficiency on the Burnie truck route by reducing the red tape associated with heavy vehicle general access, removing the need for chaperone vehicles or the need for vehicles to slow to crawl speed over the bridges. It will assist the local community by returning a community road to council ownership in a much-improved state. It will improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists in several key areas, and will provide a truck rest area giving truck drivers a place to rest and check loads.

## PUBLIC

As a key member of the project team, I advise that the team is committed to engaging with the community on all aspects of this project, ensuring that the community is an integral part. We recognise the significance of the stakeholder engagement for the success of this project. We have engaged, and will continue to engage, with stakeholders to ensure key objectives of the project are delivered while remaining mindful of the available budget. We further submit that the estimated costs are appropriate for the works being considered. In conclusion, I strongly advocate that this project is a good use of taxpayers' money.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. We will go to the submission and work our way through. On pages 2 and 3 we have the introduction and need for works. Do members have any questions about those pages?

**Ms RATTRAY** - I will place on the record that the bridge closure would impact people heading up Massy-Greene Drive. We had a site visit this morning, which was very useful for a non-resident of this area. I am interested in the work that is being done around the bridge strengthening and replacement of the railing. There are also weed management issues and a brick building -

**CHAIR** - Pump house.

**Ms RATTRAY** - Pump house. What is happening there, moving forward?

**Mr READING** - Sure. The project team and consultants have discussed this with TasRail. The pump house is within its rail corridor. Negotiations are still underway as to what may transpire with that. The pump house is not heritage-listed. It is an unused building at the moment, so negotiations are still underway as to what would transpire there.

We can continue the works of this project without entertaining anything to do with that pump house; it's just the obvious matter that we do have resources mobilised and onsite at the time. We may be able to work with TasRail if they have something that they want to extend off that.

Regarding the road closure for the bridge work, we have consulted with all the businesses that are going to be affected. We have discussed a future weekend to lessen the impact, and we've looked at alternate road avenues to get in and around Burnie. There are two options available to heavy vehicle users as well as local residents.

**Ms KING** - Can I just reinforce that it is a temporary road closure. It's not a permanent road closure.

**CHAIR** - Basically, it's a two-day road closure, is that right? Two or three?

**Ms KING** - That's the current plan.

**Ms RATTRAY** - We had 24 to 48 hours.

**Mr READING** - Yes, 48 hours. We did look at potentially only doing one side - pouring concrete on one side of the bridge, letting that cure and then doing the other side - but the engineers said if it is poured as one, it will be much stronger and the longevity will be improved.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - Yes. With TasRail's usage of the rail that the bridge goes across, there are no issues - they're happy with the timing?

**Mr READING** - Yes. We do have to work in with their train-running aspect. We will have a representative from TasRail on the ground. We will cease works in that short period when it's needed, when a train does go underneath the bridge, just for additional safety. We will obviously try to do the pour around a gap in their timetable, which are quite significant, really.

**CHAIR** - On the site visit this morning, you were explaining what the pump might have been used for earlier, but that it's no longer being used at all.

**Mr READING** - That's correct.

**CHAIR** - And not needed.

**Mr READING** - Correct.

**CHAIR** - It's not like it's occasionally used or whatever, it's just not used?

**Mr READING** - No. We believe it is an old slurry pump from further up the hill, moving woodchips out to the port or something like that. It's no longer in use, and that was confirmed by TasRail, early days.

**CHAIR** - Okay, so it wasn't for a TasRail purpose?

**Mr READING** - No.

**CHAIR** - It was just on their reserve.

**Mr READING** - Correct.

**CHAIR** - Okay. I'm with you. Any other questions on page 3?

**Ms RATTRAY** - Chair, if I might add, there's a line here about the need for work - that 'the upgrade of Mount Street is needed to ensure that this section of road facilitates safe and efficient local pedestrian, cyclist and vehicle traffic'. Obviously, there's some ongoing negotiations with Burnie City Council around the transfer of infrastructure for those roads.

We've talked about some of the aspects of the retaining wall, and council wanting more information before they agree to the Mount Street component of that. Can you give the committee some understanding of where those negotiations are?

**Ms KING** - We worked with council to understand their perspective on what works well and what could be improved along Mount Street. We've also worked with some of the key adjoining users. We're particularly focused on some intersections - Roslyn Avenue and Thorne Street, and particularly at Roslyn Avenue. There's been quite a bit of engagement with the school to understand their perspective, as a generator of peak traffic volumes.

## PUBLIC

That's the background for that safe and efficient perspective. Does that answer your question? That's how we've come about identifying the need for works along Mount Street - by engagement with the local community, a traffic engineering perspective and a perspective of the users.

**Ms RATTRAY** - I'd like you to actually talk about the Burnie City Council and their expectations.

**Ms KING** - Where we're up to? Sure.

**CHAIR** - I was just going to say we can deal with it under Benefits.

**Ms RATTRAY** - That will be fine.

**Ms KING** - Or even under Stakeholders, because we've got a bit on page 7, too. Whenever suits.

**CHAIR** - Okay. Is there anything else on that lead-in? Going to page 4, in the third paragraph under Materials, you say these aggregates include the crushed rock used to build the underpinning structure of the road, the pavement, as well as stone used in sealing when mixed with bitumen, and used in concrete elements when mixed with cement water. Is it an all-weather chip seal, or is it hot mix service that is going to be replaced there?

**Ms KING** - Have you got a seal design yet?

**Mr READING** - We do not have a seal design as yet. We do have an option paper for our consultant and there are three options that have been identified.

**CHAIR** - What would they be?

**Mr READING** - That is a chip seal, an overlay and a full pavement reinstatement.

**CHAIR** - With trucks, heavy vehicles -

**Mr READING** - And that is the consideration.

**CHAIR** - Is a hot mix arrangement not desirable, as opposed to a chip seal, which would perhaps give better drainage? I do not know.

**Mr READING** - The options paper does consider the capacity of the heavy vehicle usage on that particular part of Massy-Greene - particularly where they come down the hill, because the pavement that exists there at the moment is only eight to nine years old and, as we saw today, it is starting to break away. They have taken that on board within the options paper and said, whatever we did last time, we need to consider that going forward.

At this stage we do not have a solution, but we do have options to consider, and they are going to be further investigated.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - Yes. How do they deal with that? Is it just the substrate that is a problem? Is it the fact that the road does not have a really good base and it just needs rebuilding from the bottom up?

**Mr READING** - My limited understanding is that if they make it too firm, too solid, then there is some reactive bouncing and - I suppose - waves that go back up through the substructure into the bitumen, and that is what initiates some cracking. There is a lot more in it than I understand. We just take advice from the engineers on that aspect.

**CHAIR** - Of course you do. We take advice from all sorts of people. We know what it's like.

**Ms RATTRAY** - And your good selves, here today.

**CHAIR** - That is exactly why you are here.

**Ms KING** - Some of that advice comes from consultants the department engages. We have inhouse specialists within the department who can review and comment on the advice we get from consultants, so that we can get to a balanced technical perspective on the best options.

**CHAIR** - Anything else on page 4?

**Ms RATTRAY** - I know this is a perennial question that gets asked around materials, but for the specifications under the licence in an arrangement with Transport Victoria, it says here, 'with appropriate modifications'. Are those modifications in place for this project?

**Ms KING** - Yes, they are standard State Growth specifications. The Transport Victoria specifications need some local Tasmanian modifications. Some of those modifications reflect legislation. The specification refers to a piece of Victorian legislation; well, we cannot have that in the Tasmanian document. There are some technical modifications, I think.

**CHAIR** - Probably to do with temperature and all that sort of stuff.

**Ms KING** - And the slightly different geology, which means the quarries are slightly different, so the quarry products are slightly different to Victoria's. That is what we are talking about there. We are in a position to avail ourselves of a larger state and the work that they have done. We do not have to reinvent the wheel, but we do need to finetune those specifications to make sure they are appropriate for Tasmania.

**Ms KING** - Does that address your question?

**CHAIR** - Yes. Will it be locally sourced material from local quarries? What is the longest distance that you might be taking resource away from, to where you need it?

**Ms KING** - The decision on which quarry to use is made by the construction contractor. We do not tell them which quarries to use. The quarries tend to be a trade-off, from the contractor's perspective, about where they can buy suitable materials at a suitable price and not spend too much transporting it to site.

**Mr READING** - But it will be a local contractor.



## PUBLIC

**Ms KING** - It will be a Tasmanian-based business.

**CHAIR** - You don't dictate that local quarries are to be used wherever possible?

**Mr READING** - We couldn't.

**Ms RATTRAY** - We have a buy Tasmanian local policy.

**Ms KING** - Yes, but nobody is shipping quarry materials from interstate. For the quarry materials the economics simply solve that problem.

**CHAIR** - No, but local. We are not bringing it from Hobart?

**Ms KING** - No. Again, the economics address it. On past projects, for example, I can think of one where some of the tenderers talked about bringing materials a certain distance. One of the tenderers considered expanding the functioning of a nearby quarry to get the materials from that quarry. That is an example of something that has happened in the past. We can't tell you what will happen on this because it is up to the construction market to come up with the most efficient solution to the materials handling problem.

**Ms RATTRAY** - That is the same with the concrete used for the bridge strengthening? In the past we have had New Zealand concrete brought into Tasmania.

**CHAIR** - New Zealand cement to mix with aggregate.

**Ms RATTRAY** - We have. It says here that concrete is manufactured in Tasmania.

**Mr READING** - In Railton, yes.

**Ms RATTRAY** - We can rely on that being used around drainage culverts, for example.

**CHAIR** - Page 5, you are wanting to explore that a bit?

**Ms RATTRAY** - Yes. I am interested in those negotiations with Burnie City Council. One might think this is a great deal for Burnie City Council. Where are you with those negotiations in the transfer of assets between the state Government and the council? It says, 'the upgrade to Mount Street is needed to ensure the section of road facilitates' and those various aspects of it - safe, efficient and local.

**Mr READING** - The retaining walls we mentioned this morning -

**Ms RATTRAY** - Are they the sticking point?

**Mr READING** - Yes. We have concept designs around the other elements of the project. We have a high-level retaining wall report, but that was a visual report only, without any destructive investigation works. We presented that to the Burnie City Council and asked what they thought of it. The council reviewed the report and said, 'It doesn't spell out our liability for potentially taking on these retaining walls'. If one of these more significant retaining walls were to fail, for whatever reason, they could be up for many millions of dollars to repair.

## PUBLIC

They requested that we consider doing a more detailed, more invasive report about the structural integrity of the retaining walls. There's some negotiation around what that means. We don't want to be upsetting stakeholders or residents who border those retaining wall edges, so we are still at high-level negotiations around that aspect. In principle we have agreement. We have a way forward once we've come to a conclusion on the scope of works for the retaining wall assessment report. We'd table it at a meeting with Burnie City Council and say, 'This report recommends (a), (b), (c). Do you agree that this is sufficient to get us a deed transfer of road name?'

**CHAIR** - Clearly it's a bit of an unknown. You've coped with that by providing a certain degree of funding. I know you can't say what the funding is because it is not for tender yet. Can you give us an understanding as to how extensive the funding is in relation to that?

**Ms KING** - We can talk about some aspects of it. We can't give you a construction estimate for the reasons that you have outlined. If we look at page 10 of the report, you will see we have given you a base estimate, which includes the investigations, design, community engagement, approvals, acquisition - of which there is a small amount we can touch on -, project management and the construction. The next line down is the contingency amounts for this project. Those contingency amounts -

**CHAIR** - That's for the whole project?

**Ms KING** - That's for the whole project. The contingency amounts are there to address risk, to address things that we might reasonably forecast at this point could be a challenge, but we don't know yet how big a challenge they are.

**CHAIR** - Is it fair to say you would have significant funds set aside?

**Ms KING** - Yes. That contingency amount under the P50 estimate is \$3 million in 11.

**CHAIR** - For the whole project?

**Ms KING** - Yes. Under the P90 estimate it's \$7 million. That's a suitably generous allowance for us to be confident that we can manage the risks within the project budget.

**Mr READING** - The visual assessment of the retaining wall structures that we have looked at hasn't identified anything of concern. Normally with a retaining wall that's starting to fail, you will get some identification. On this road, there'd be dips in the road, there'd be failures of the wall, there'd be drainage issues. We are reasonably confident that there's nothing major that is going to come out and bite us, but we can't give you any guarantees.

**CHAIR** - If it were to happen then you have funds.

**Mr READING** - There are significant contingencies set aside for that aspect.

**Ms RATTRAY** - You still haven't settled on the breadth of the high-level report that is going to be undertaken yet?

**Ms KING** - On the detailed report?

## PUBLIC

**Ms RATTRAY** - Yes, on the detail.

**Mr READING** - One of the reasons we haven't is that we want to engage with the residents and have that stakeholder interaction. We need to get some guidance and clarification back from those stakeholders as to their thoughts and ideas on what might unfold once we start this work.

**Ms RATTRAY** - Is the transfer of assets a deal-breaker for the project?

**Mr READING** - No.

**Ms RATTRAY** - If it doesn't happen, will the project still proceed?

**Mr READING** - Absolutely. Elements of the project will still go forward. The road swap is one element -

**Ms RATTRAY** - Of the 13 or 14 other aspects?

**Mr READING** - Exactly.

**CHAIR** - The retaining wall is simply another component which may or may not happen, depending on the negotiations?

**Mr READING** - Yes.

**Ms KING** - In the conversation about the interactions and engagements with Burnie Council today we have talked quite a bit about the retaining wall. We're working through a number of other topics with Burnie Council. As far as I understand, they're all aligned. It's easy to focus on the stuff we haven't got sorted yet. We have sorted out many other issues with the Burnie City Council on this project.

**CHAIR** - Looking at all of those dot points, the safe and efficient freight connection, my thoughts go to airbrake noise. This morning you said that major trucks don't use Mount Street as a transport route.

**Mr READING** - Correct.

**CHAIR** - There's no change to the vehicles using the different routes, is there?

**Mr READING** - Not really, no.

**CHAIR** - So, we are not introducing any change that would cause residents an issue?

**Mr READING** - No, that is correct.

**Mr WOOD** - Or increased use of Mount Street for heavy vehicles?

**Mr READING** - Correct.

**CHAIR** - I wanted to clarify that it was the case. We know about the increased road and bridge capacity, the improvement in road safety for all road users. You did mention this morning - sorry, in your lead-in - safety for pedestrians and cyclists in several key areas. I presume you are talking mainly about the roundabout and the light systems on Mount Street, but for the record, there is that one section on Massy-Greene Drive where there is a crossing, which I believe very few people use - but you are going to put some signage in place to make sure cyclists don't try to use Massy-Greene Drive. You might explain a bit about that and the pedestrian aspect of it.

**Mr READING** - We had a look at that. It is not a very nice location for pedestrians to get out of, across into the lakes area. We considered an underpass. We considered an overpass. We looked at a couple of different concept designs, and again spoke to local residents and to council about how many people were using that. Because of the topography, there is no way we could make that DDA compliant - the angles of approach into the road were so significant. That angle of approach into Massy-Greene ended up looking like 30 metres high on the other side. We were talking well in excess of six figures to consider an overpass there, given the height restrictions on heavy vehicles and so on that were needed.

At this stage of the game, we are looking at a bit of a redevelopment. We have a concept about putting some non-slippage on the concrete approach, and some additional fencing to make sure no-one can spill out onto the roadway.

**CHAIR** - Someone coming down in a wheelchair.

**Mr READING** - Slipping, falling.

**CHAIR** - Is it possible for wheelchair crossings, or stuff like that? I suppose you wouldn't want that?

**Ms KING** - It is very steep before and after the road crossing. There would be other impediments to people with a disability using that access, not just that you are crossing a truck road.

**CHAIR** - You have barriers that stop people from falling onto the road?

**Mr READING** - Absolutely.

**CHAIR** - Or running out onto the road with their kids?

**Mr READING** - That is correct. You have already alluded to the pedestrian access around the roundabout, and the traffic light treatment for Roslyn Avenue. There are some high-level discussions around nice-to-have aspects for Mount Street - maybe lengthening foot paths, things like that - but it is still at very early stages. It may not materialise.

**CHAIR** - Is it achievable to connect the footpaths up? I know 80 metres of roadside doesn't have a footpath on it, but it has a retaining wall from one of the properties that blocks that footpath. Is it a possibility that this could be negotiated, or not?

**Mr READING** - Absolutely, it is a possibility. However, we can't commit to anything like that until we understand this retaining wall issue. While we don't expect there is going to

## PUBLIC

be any massive undertaking that is going to jump up and bite us, we do have to keep a reserved stance. Once we do understand where we are situated with those elements, we will then go back to Burnie City Council and discuss aspects like that.

**CHAIR** - Okay. You also mentioned passing opportunities in your lead-in. What sort of passing opportunities are we talking about? I didn't see any extra lanes being put in or anything like that.

**Ms KING** - Yes, it was part of the freight efficiency study. Could I have a moment? The conversation could move on and I could come back to this.

**CHAIR** - Yes, you can. You have a few other questions?

**Mr WOOD** - I had a question about one of the intersection upgrades at Thorne Street you mentioned this morning - that there will be no right-hand turn out of it, what was it?

**CHAIR** - Out of the southern entrance.

**Mr WOOD** - Into that roundabout. You have spoken to residents about that?

**Mr READING** - Yes, Bathurst Street empties onto Mount Street.

**CHAIR** - That is coming from a southerly direction?

**Mr READING** - Correct. Again, because it is offset to Thorne Street, and the topography, there is a problem with sight lines and distances.

**CHAIR** - It is on a crest?

**Mr READING** - It is on a crest. We have spoken to residents on that intersection and specifically into Bathurst Street. They have advised us that they don't try to turn right out of that street because it is far too dangerous. One of the council members we have been talking with lives in that street and said all the residents go in another direction downwards from the intersection, because it is safer to empty their vehicles out onto Mount Street further down. All we are really doing -

**Mr WOOD** - Using traffic lights.

**Mr READING** - Yes, further down, back onto Mount Street. We are effectively putting no-right-turn signs on the end of Bathurst Street. We are implementing for a known problem and putting safety over everything else.

**Ms KING** - We are supporting the existing behaviour of the drivers. We are not undermining the behaviour.

**Ms RATTRAY** - A question about the heavy vehicle rest area upgrade. That component now has a strong focus for State Growth when they are upgrading roads, and particularly this one, which is a heavy-vehicle usage road. Can you walk the committee through what is proposed there? There was some discussion on our site visit today on where that might be located. We originally felt it was going to formalise something that is already in place; that

appears not to be the case, given that there are some TasNetworks lines there that might need to be moved. Can we have on the record what is actually proposed for that heavy vehicle rest area upgrade, with their toilet facilities as well?

**Mr READING** - After our site meeting this morning, I made a few phone calls to confirm various aspects. The nominated site - and it is early days, as I mentioned previously - is still very close to where we believed it was going to be. However, it is situated slightly north, towards the plantation trees. It is yet to be determined whether the TasNetworks pole will need relocation. It is very close. As we progress further into detailed design, that aspect will be considered then.

My further understanding is that there is a design of heavy truck rests being put together by, if it is not DSD, it is Australia-wide, HV. They are trying to pull them together so they sort of mirror each other. A rest stop is a rest stop for the heavy vehicle industry. I am not 100 per cent sure where that is in its design aspect, but our intent is to follow the guidelines of that.

**Ms KING** - Is that potentially a national standard design?

**Mr READING** - Yes, that is how our consultant was explaining it to me - as a national standard design for a heavy truck rest area. Obviously, there are going to be constraints around that, given locations and volumes, et cetera. The wash and toilet facilities on this particular truck rest is still to be determined.

**Ms KING** - The location of them - but we are having a toilet?

**Mr READING** - Yes, we definitely are.

**Ms RATTRAY** - We don't know whether there are going to be toilet facilities on both sides of Old Surrey Road, or only on one side?

**Mr READING** - Again, they are looking at the national standard, which is in early days, but my understanding is that there will be a single toilet, a single shower, and a single rest and seating area. Which side is yet to be determined.

**CHAIR** - A shower as well; that is interesting.

**Ms RATTRAY** - Because they are rest areas.

**Mr READING** - They do have to take into account a number of considerations - existing services, septic locations and things like that. The concept design has not progressed far enough to give you additional detail on that.

**CHAIR** - We did ask whether it was a septic or sewer. I don't know if you managed to find out.

**Mr READING** - Yes, it will be a septic.

**CHAIR** - So there's every reason to believe that a septic on either side of the road could be the case?

## PUBLIC

**Mr READING** - Implemented, yes.

**CHAIR** - If needed.

**Ms RATTRAY** - Is it firm that there will be a rest area? We started off with a firm 'yes' in the area that was upgraded between Longford and Westbury, and then it just got taken out of the mix because it became too expensive and too hard.

**CHAIR** - That's right.

**Ms RATTRAY** - We can approve this after our conversations, but then we have no way of being able to confirm that that would be the case, and I don't know how much comfort you can provide the committee today.

**Mr READING** - All I can say is that within the freight efficiency study that bore this project, the truck rest aspect was in the top three priorities.

**Ms RATTRAY** - But was it for Longford as well, to some disappointment -

**Mr READING** - Absolutely.

**Ms RATTRAY** - for heavy vehicles to have to drive into Longford and try to find somewhere to park to use toilet facilities -

**CHAIR** - For a B-double, it doesn't work.

**Ms RATTRAY** - Yes, because we have female drivers as well, who can't just stand behind or between their trailers.

**Mr READING** - I can't comment on that, I'm on a different project, but my understanding is that this truck rest area is one of the highest priorities of this project and the fact that the informal area already exists and based on its usage, I can't see it wavering.

**CHAIR** - It's two hours from the west coast, maybe. It's a pretty important thing for a driver. They have to go somewhere.

**Mr READING** - And they know those curves and the descent so if their load has shifted or if they are tied down or something has slipped, that will be the place to check before they try to negotiate the city.

**CHAIR** - Negotiate the city.

**Ms RATTRAY** - In or out.

**Mr READING** - Absolutely.

**CHAIR** - You were saying earlier that when you went up there this morning there were a lot of trucks on the left on the way out of Burnie on that park.

**Mr READING** - Correct.

## PUBLIC

**Ms RATTRAY** - Checking their load.

**Mr READING** - Yes, it is heavily utilised. I can't see it wavering.

**Ms KING** - I am able to answer your earlier question on passing lanes if you are interested.

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Ms KING** - Of the 18 issues that were identified in the freight efficiency study, one of them was there were no passing opportunities along the route. The proposed action for that was scored as 16 out of 18 in the prioritising technique that was used, so that didn't make the cut-off for this project. The potential action was to provide passing lanes on the approach to the incline/decline over the Emu Bay Railway underpass. That's not the railway crossing we stopped at, it's the other one that we drove over around the curve. It was considered but it was considered a much lower priority than the things that we're implementing.

**CHAIR** - Those truckies look after each other, generally speaking. I suppose if they were coming down the hill and they were going very slowly and someone was behind them, they could pull over into the truck stop and let them pass.

**Mr READING** - One of the elements that we were weighting these aspects against was cost of implementation, and as you saw this morning with that Emu Bay Bridge area, the earthworks alone that would be needed to install a passing lane there would be cost-prohibitive.

**Ms KING** - That was that bit where we curved around that big water tank.

**Mr READING** - Up the hill.

**CHAIR** - Yes, I know where you are. Out of interest, say you have a very wide load on a truck coming from the south into Burnie - can they pull over in that truck rest area? Does it cope okay with a wide load?

**Mr READING** - The concept design allows for two trucks side by side.

**CHAIR** - Okay.

**Mr READING** - So there should be enough -

**CHAIR** - So if you had something designated a wide load - can't be wider than probably one and a bit lanes - you've got to have somewhere to go if you're coming the other way -

**Ms RATTRAY** - They'd have an escort as well.

**Mr READING** - They'd have an escort -

**CHAIR** - They'd have an escort, but if they wanted to stop and check things, would that rest area be wide enough for them to be able to pull right over out of the lane and check their load?



## PUBLIC

**Mr READING** - Absolutely. Obviously we can't guarantee that it's going to be available for them.

**CHAIR** - No.

**Mr READING** - If they've got an escort, they could radio ahead and I'm sure that they use CB radios -

**CHAIR** - Yes, move people on.

**Mr READING** - Yes, but absolutely it will be wide enough.

**CHAIR** - Okay. Thanks for finding that out. The other aspect was with the roundabout at the school. You were going to clarify whether the school association had been consulted with or whether it was just the principal.

**Mr READING** - Correct.

**CHAIR** - The traffic lights, was it?

**Mr READING** - Traffic lights and pedestrian crossing, yes. What happened was that our consultant wrote to the school and met with the principal. That was a week after the principal had time to discuss it with the association and people, but we did only meet with the principal. The next step for community engagement is to actually attend an association meeting.

**CHAIR** - Okay.

**Ms RATTRAY** - At our site visit outside of the school, we also talked about the department if funds allowed, and there was a need to have a drop-off point as well. Is that something that may be discussed when you go back to full consultation with the school community?

**Mr READING** - Yes, absolutely. Again, it's difficult to discuss that as a reality simply because of the unknown factor of these retaining walls. It's really been a thorn in the side of this project being able to commit, but if things sort of -

**CHAIR** - Pan out.

**Mr READING** - pan out the way that we're expecting and there's no great issues, then we'll be back with the Burnie City Council and the school association and saying, 'Can we assess this area?' As we discussed this morning, there's a very small number of schoolchildren attending that school via bus at the moment and that was another option that we considered; maybe we can increase that number somehow by working with a better timetable and things like that.

**Ms RATTRAY** - Because you said there were only two bus times, 8 a.m. and 9 a.m.

**Mr READING** - Yes, which is one too early and one too late.

## PUBLIC

**Ms RATTRAY** - Some have had no breakfast and some have had breakfast and are going to be late for school.

**CHAIR** - Fair enough. Okay. Is there anything else on the progress to date that you -

**Ms RATTRAY** - No, all good.

**CHAIR** - Geotech investigations? You've completed those?

**Mr READING** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Land surveys. What about the possibility of land acquisition? We talked a little bit about that this morning. It seems it's only in relation to council lands as opposed to private lands.

**Mr READING** - Not exactly. There are some very minor acquisitions still being assessed but we believe at this stage that there are some very minor acquisitions to be undertaken. We discussed at the Thorne Street roundabout, to get our minimum size of the roundabout we may have to acquire a metre of a resident's front yard retaining wall. We have discussed with that resident and they were very happy and -

**CHAIR** - Sorry, is that the footpath one you were talking about?

**Mr READING** - Yes, Thorne Street. At the Bass Highway - Massy-Greene intersection, we've got a very minor land acquisition on the corner transitioning left towards Burnie. Downhill from where we stopped this morning, there's a minor acquisition there of just one or two metres and that property owner is happy as well. They know they'll be compensated by the OVG and that was in regard to -

**CHAIR** - That is the Valuer-General?

**Mr READING** - Correct. The reason for that particular land acquisition was to help the larger trucks better negotiate the turn and then move into the flow of traffic. At the moment, it is very tight and you will often see them mounting the footpath with one or two tyres. There is nothing significant in regard to buildings or homes that we are looking to demolish and upset anybody or anything like that. It is reasonably minor.

**CHAIR** - You were talking about improved connectivity and safety for active transport users, so cycleways. Is that from Mount Street?

**Mr READING** - Yes. Again, a lot hinges on this retaining wall detail assessment as far as financial aspects and where we can take the project from there, but we do have that pedestrian access across Massy-Greene Drive. That will be improved slightly so that people can move there. There is a subdivision being undertaken further up the road near Old Surrey and Massy-Greene and the DA for that is being referred back to us. At the moment, we haven't sighted it but that is also going to have some footpaths incorporated into it - it's a pretty big subdivision up there - so we may end up helping out in various bits and bobs there. However, that is still very high level and yet to be determined.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - At least people who are looking at buying land there will know what they're getting themselves into when it comes to the heavy trucks.

**Ms KING** - It's another example of how we're working closely with Burnie City Council to ask what's going on in their world and to tell them what's going on in our world, and trying to problem-solve together.

**CHAIR** - That's good. You have said on those benefits in the last paragraph that whilst this is not an overly strong benefit-cost ratio result, the methodology is to assess the numerous project elements in isolation and from an economic position only. Why choose that method if it is only looking at the economics?

**Ms KING** - There is a technique of doing the benefit-cost ratio work that the Australian Government prefers -

**CHAIR** - Okay, and you have to follow the rules?

**Ms KING** - Well, we need to do the BCR in a submission that we need to give them, so we prefer to just do it once and use their technique. We're confident that this is one of those items where, when you put it all together, you get a wholistic benefit. That is not easy to measure and calculate, but we're comfortable that it's the right thing.

**CHAIR** - Did the desktop heritage assessment of Aboriginal and historic come up with anything?

**Mr READING** - We've referred our desktop assessment to the Aboriginal Heritage Unit and they've come back and confirmed that there is nothing likely to come up. Obviously, within our tender documents there will be stipulations about if anything untoward is found, all work ceases and is to be reviewed.

**Ms KING** - An 'unanticipated discovery plan' is the phrase that we use.

**CHAIR** - Anything else on the progress to date that members are interested in? We spoke about property acquisitions. Page 8, potential noise impacts to nearby properties; actions implemented to date: 'engaged with adjoining property owners and provided an opportunity to comment on the proposal'. What is the result there? Any particular issues that have been identified when it comes to the noise side of things?

**Mr READING** - No specific issues have been raised. All of the property owners that we've engaged with thus far, and I think it's spelled out in the interim consultation report, have been very supportive of the project. There has absolutely been no issues raised whatsoever at this stage.

**CHAIR** - Well, it says 'no concerns raised about construction noise'.

**Mr READING** - Correct.

**CHAIR** - There were no other concerns raised about operational noise either because, I suppose, nothing is changing.

## PUBLIC

**Mr READING** - Nothing is changing, correct.

**CHAIR** - Okay, engagement with businesses. I have a note here that says 'engaged with businesses on Massy-Greene Drive, close to Bass Highway and Havenview Primary School; agreement with all parties that weekend and night works are the best solution to minimise disruption; no ongoing impact on school access during peak periods'. There is no change in the use of the road, so I suppose there is not likely to be any extra impact for the school as such.

**Mr READING** - Correct, and if it looked like there was some sort of sports event or something like that on, we would reschedule. We plan these things well in advance.

**CHAIR** - Okay - environmental and heritage?

**Ms RATTRAY** - It talks about the plantation originally planned to be harvested in 2020, so is there an update on that?

**Mr READING** - Yes. You would have seen the size of the trees this morning. The landowner is looking to maximise his return on those trees and my understanding is that he is leaving it to the last minute to fell those trees and get best value for dollar.

**Ms RATTRAY** - But that won't impact -

**Mr READING** - No, it won't impact the project. I mean -

**CHAIR** - There is nothing much to be taken out to do your work, but it's possible that you might have to take some trees?

**Mr READING** - There is a minor land acquisition there for the truck rest stop; however, the property owner we have been engaging with has no issue with the land acquisition and has mentioned to us that he's going to drop those trees and have the opportunity to sell those at best value. If he'd dropped them in 2020, as per his original intent, he would have lost three years of growth, so we're not looking to put a spade in the ground on this project until June next year so he's probably going to try to get a few more months of growth out of those trees and maximise his return.

**CHAIR** - Burrowing crayfish in Romaine Creek? Are they yabbies?

**Mr READING** - Freshwater crayfish.

**CHAIR** - How big?

**Mr READING** - Very.

**CHAIR** - Okay, I wasn't sure they were the same.

**Mr READING** - They're formally protected, just in case you're thinking otherwise.

**CHAIR** - I'm well and truly aware they're fully protected, but I just wasn't sure. I know what the big freshwater crayfish is but I wasn't sure whether they were the same thing.

**Mr READING** - Yes, it is.

**CHAIR** - Invasive species - you talk about minor removal of foraging habitat for the eastern barred bandicoot, reduction in habitat, and blackberry thickets adjacent to the truck rest area could come out. It is an interesting one, isn't it, that the eastern barred bandicoot, which is a species that is a bit threatened, uses another species that ought to be threatened, ought to be taken out.

**Ms RATTRAY** - So what happens there?

**Mr READING** - That will be incurred into the tender documents and it will marry up with our weed management plan it goes out with. I believe they have put up exclusion zones around the construction area and there are people on site keeping across those areas and making sure that no-one wanders in or out of those zones. We've done an extensive natural values assessment report on all elements of the project and it's very clear on stipulations.

**CHAIR** - So when you talk about 'size of foraging area extensive and site relocation considered', you're talking about the site relocation of your truck stop?

**Mr READING** - Correct, yes, not the eastern -

**CHAIR** - Not the relocation of the blackberries and the eastern barred bandicoot.

**Mr READING** - Some people love blackberries; I'm not one of them.

**CHAIR** - They do, I can understand that too.

**Ms RATTRAY** - The fruit is okay, the blackberries themselves are a bit of a nuisance. Obviously TasRail hasn't identified that problem in its rail corridor, at the first bridge.

**Mr READING** - They are everywhere.

**CHAIR** - Funding and costs. We have the table there, the P50 and the P90. That all adds up, except the total on P50 should be \$15.94 million, not \$15.9 million; but P90 is \$20 million, the escalation is over -

**Ms RATTRAY** - Is over 10 per cent.

**CHAIR** - Is over 10 per cent for that P90.

**Ms KING** - There are a couple of things with the escalation. One is that it is another item in which we're required to use the federal approach to escalation. We're going to tender on this job very early next year. There's not much more time for inflation -

**CHAIR** - For it to change.

**Ms KING** - For inflation. We all know that pricing has been 'interesting' -

**CHAIR** - That's one word for it.

## PUBLIC

**Ms KING** - in the last few years, but -

**CHAIR** - Almost doubling on one project.

**Ms RATTRAY** - Hard to follow.

**Ms KING** - This is a fairly recent estimate with current prices. We're going to tender fairly soon, which is as soon as we can, in February. We will not be going to tender in January.

**CHAIR** - Before you give it the tick?

**Ms KING** - Assuming we get all the approvals required, including the one from this committee, it is not long until we go to tender. On this project we have room to manoeuvre in those contingency items, as we discussed.

**CHAIR** - Is it fair to make a correction to \$15.94 million on the table of P50?

**Ms KING** - Or you could round it \$15.9 million.

**CHAIR** - Or you could round it down.

**Ms KING** - The 0.04 is \$40 000.

**CHAIR** - We just look at what's on the books.

**Ms RATTRAY** - They have to add up because we have an expert who likes to do the sums. Can I have an indication of how much the federal government is contributing and how much will be from the state Government?

**Ms KING** - I believe 80:20 on this one.

**CHAIR** - Federal is \$16 million, the state is \$4 million.

**Ms RATTRAY** - I got fixated on the escalation.

**CHAIR** - Looking across the page at the timing, Australian Government funding approval is early 2024.

**Mr READING** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Why so early on this submission? You need this slotted away before you can apply?

**Ms KING** - No. We tend to run them in parallel. We didn't want to come to this committee too late this year and be running up hard against Christmas.

**CHAIR** - Okay. Sometimes when there are too many unknowns, it makes it difficult for us to be able to say yes. You tell us it's good value for money, but there's opportunity for change.

## PUBLIC

**Ms RATTRAY** - We've been burnt a couple of times, to be frank.

**CHAIR** - Brighton High School we always talk about. It came in at \$39 million and ended up more than \$70 million.

**Ms RATTRAY** - It was \$74 million. The same with the Longford upgrade between Longford and the Westbury turn-off. We were of the understanding we were approving a rest area that included rest -

**CHAIR** - Toilet facilities.

**Ms RATTRAY** - Toilet facilities. They got taken away.

**Mr READING** - We've had those project elements costed by various consultants. We're reasonably confident in the numbers that they're giving us at the moment.

**CHAIR** - Look at that timing, on the last paragraph, 'These works are being presented to the Public Works Committee at this time and the design is reasonably well developed and preliminary stakeholder feedback is known'.

One thing we look at is the opportunity for showstoppers to happen after this point. Are you confident that you are not likely to have any such showstoppers on this project?

**Mr READING** - No. The reason being is we have consulted with the key project stakeholders. Those people we know who are directly impacted by the project elements have been directly contacted multiple times. They've been given various avenues to raise their concerns. Wholistic community feedback is to start on 4 October. That will be the final engagement with the community in regard to moving to detailed design. We believe we're very close on almost all the elements. We just need that final key to the puzzle.

**CHAIR** - Do members have any other questions before we go to the conclusion and the recommendations?

On page 12, it says 'the Old Surrey Road - Massy-Greene Drive upgrade works are considered fit for purpose and value for money'. I will ask you five questions in a minute. 'Value for money solution to address the existing community need of improving freight efficiency and safety on the Burnie truck route- - the safety aspects are probably more specific to the Mount Street component rather than the truck route. Is that fair?

**Mr READING** - Guardrails are supposed to protect the trucks from rollover and going further into the nether land. The existing barriers are regarded as antiquated and are to be upgraded.

**CHAIR** - Because of age?

**Mr READING** - The bridge barriers where pedestrians walk over the bridge need to be upgraded as well to benefit the community.

**CHAIR** - Is the Armco likely to be taller?

## PUBLIC

**Mr READING** - Yes, I believe that the latest standard is for a slightly taller Armco.

**Ms RATTRAY** - Is it to be hard-up to the road pavement on the bottom? Or is there going to be a gap underneath, given that you have a lot of trees on those road verges, particularly at the top?

**Mr READING** - I will have to take the question on notice.

**Ms RATTRAY** - What I have seen in the new approach is that you have them hard against the road pavement. When you have significant wind and weather events, like we have had, rubbish is all over the road and you can't sweep it off because you can't get under. You'll need a road sweeper machine to come through and take everything off. It's probably okay close to Burnie. When you are talking 100 kilometres from Launceston, it's not going to happen very often.

**Mr READING** - From my understanding, the guardrails that go to the ground, one of the reasons is to protect motorcyclists from sliding under.

**Ms RATTRAY** - They only have to be this far off the ground. A motorcyclist is not going to go under there. It gets rid of all the debris. At the moment, you can't sweep anything away.

**Mr READING** - Correct. I agree. I will have to take that question on notice. It would be in regard to the Australian Standard, the heavy truck industry, whatever they dictate. I will get back to you on that, if I may.

**CHAIR** - Motorcyclists won't be using that route, so we don't need to worry about motorcyclists on that route.

**Mr READING** - No.

**Ms RATTRAY** - They won't fit under this anyway, no matter how small they are.

**CHAIR** - That's right.

**Ms RATTRAY** - You only need this far off the ground to let the debris go. At the moment, there is nowhere to go, only onto the road pavement.

**CHAIR** - Okay, I will go to the standard questions that we have. Is there anything else you wish to add?

**WITNESSES** - No.

**CHAIR** - Is there anything else you wish to add, in closing, before we ask the questions?

**Ms KING** - No.

**CHAIR** - Okay. Our questions are based on the provisions of the Public Works Committee Act 1914. The first is: do the proposed works meet an identified need or needs or solve a recognised problem?



## **PUBLIC**

**Mr READING** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - And I need a clear yes.

**Mr READING** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Are the proposed works the best solution to meet identified needs or solve a recognised problem within the allocated budget?

**Mr READING** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Are the proposed works fit for purpose?

**Mr READING** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Do the proposed works provide value for money?

**Mr READING** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Your report tells us it does.

**Mr READING** - Absolutely.

**CHAIR** - Are the proposed works a good use of public funds?

**Mr READING** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. As I advised you at the commencement of your evidence, what you've said to us here today is protected by parliamentary privilege. Once you leave the table, you need to be aware that privilege does not attach to comments you may make to anyone, including the media - even if you are just repeating what you said to us. Do you understand that?

**Ms KING** - Yes.

**Mr READING** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Thank you for your evidence.

**Ms KING** - Thank you for having us.

**Mr READING** - Thanks.

**CHAIR** - The hearing is now closed. Thank you.

**THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.**

**The Committee adjourned at 3.21 p.m.**