

**THE PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS MET
AT HENTY HOUSE, LAUNCESTON, ON FRIDAY 30 OCTOBER 2009.**

ILLAWARRA MAIN ROAD, LONGFORD

Mr STEVEN KACZMARSKI, SENIOR PROJECT MANAGER, DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, ENERGY & RESOURCES, **Mr SHANE GREGORY**, DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, ENERGY AND RESOURCES, **Mr JUAN LEE**, CONSULTANT, PITT & SHERRY AND **Mr MICHAEL EDRICH**, CONSULTANT, PITT & SHERRY, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR (Mr Harriss) - Thank you, gentlemen. As we said on the site, it's always valuable for the committee to have a look at the on-site reality of what's being proposed and we appreciate that was informative and comprehensive. We proceed fairly informally with this committee so we're happy to have an exchange with you on a first name basis. We won't be too formal about it as far as the committee is concerned. You would be aware that we are recording the proceedings of the hearing so that there will be an official record made of the proceedings and it assists with the production of our report which we will make to Parliament. With that, Steven, I presume you will lead off with some of the more salient points about the project. If there are others that need to contribute, that is fine. We will ask questions along the way, if you like.

Mr KACZMARSKI - Sure, that will be fine. What I am proposing is that I might just give a bit of an overview and be fairly succinct and Shane will provide a bit of the background to the project. I will then call upon Michael to talk about heritage and planning and perhaps how that relates to the site constraints. I will then give a few words about the stakeholders and the consultation we've undertaken to date and then just summarise. We can proceed on that basis but I'm happy to take any questions as they arise.

CHAIR - Yes, that would be good, thanks, Steve.

Mr KACZMARSKI - The Illawarra Main Road project comprises four sites along the Illawarra Main Road. Site 1 is the Poatina-Tannery Road junction; site 2 is the section from Bishopsbourne Road to Wickford; site 3 is the Midland Highway end; and site 4 is the Bass Highway end. We have identified these four sites in this parliamentary report with a particular emphasis on sites 1 and 2 because we feel that it is unlikely there will be sufficient funding to meet all four of these projects.

Site 1, in context, is called the Poatina Road roundabout. The roundabout has been proposed for many years. The junction is a high-accident location and even after further work and speed camera installation, the accidents have continued to occur. We are proposing a 50 metre diameter roundabout that is similar to the Bell Bay roundabout and this will achieve reduced speeds and safer operation with well-spaced position points and clear priority.

Site 2 is from Bishopsbourne to Wickford. The project involves pavement strengthening as well as vertical and horizontal alignment improvements. It is proposed to put in a single stock underpass to be shared by two adjacent property owners. With the pavement strengthening, the structural overlay that we are proposing will reduce maintenance costs and improve and reinstate a good ride quality on that section of road. We are proposing sealed shoulders of half a metre as this is all that we can achieve within the constraints of the boundaries and the other environmental and heritage issues along this section of road. We are proposing to realign the road margin at about change 2 010 which is about halfway along the project.

Site 3 is the realignment of Clarence Street to square up its junction at the Midland Highway and to close off Old Hunt Road at the Midland Highway. I just pass around a plan, if I may, that shows the work that we discussed today but didn't get a chance to fully evaluate. The plan that I have provided you with is in effect the concept plan that we have and there's not too much work that has been done in addition to that apart from a broad costing.

Mr GREEN - Which is?

Mr KACZMARSKI - About \$900 000.

Mr HALL - To do just that intersection?

Mr KACZMARSKI - Yes. So at the moment that's a strategic estimate and one of the issues that we've identified is that there is a potential for contamination from the two service stations on the other side of the road so we expect that there'd be a reasonable amount of investigation required so it's got a fairly high contingency on that basis.

Site 4, then, is the Illawarra Main Road left-turn slip lane onto the Bass Highway. The open proposal there is to improve visibility of the departure lane as you are approaching the Bass Highway intersection.

The Illawarra Main Road is an effective bypass of Launceston for freight and traffic travelling from the north-west coast to Hobart. So, on that basis, the road is a category 1 trunk road classification under DIER's State road hierarchy, which is the highest of our five categories. On that basis the State Government, through an election commitment in 2006, have provided \$3.1 million worth of funding, and similarly the Federal Government has pledged in the 2007 election \$3.1 million to fund this project dollar-for-dollar. The site 1 estimated cost is \$2.7 million in round terms, so that is the roundabout. The Bishopsbourne section is estimated at \$3.5 million. Site 3, the Midland Highway end, is \$0.9 million, and site 4 on the Bass Highway end is a similar \$0.9 million estimate.

At this point I would like to hand over to Shane Gregory, who might give us a bit of a background to how we got to these particular projects.

Mr GREGORY - The development of the project to get us to the point where we have the projects that we do is underpinned by two key documents, the Illawarra Main Road Planning Study from 2000, which was conducted up to 2000 and published in 2000, and another document, the Perth Roads Priorities for Improvement, which was produced in

2008. The first document, the Illawarra Main Road Study, was a strategic level approach to the Illawarra Main Road, and it looked at Illawarra Main Road in terms of transport efficiency, safety for motorists, environmental constraints, heritage constraints, and that process included some consultation with the community and identified 10 key projects to be undertaken. Since that time a number of those projects are no longer relevant. For example, project 2, the dairy stock underpass, is no longer a project of relevance, and some of the priorities have changed slightly.

The highest priority project identified was work at the Longford junction, and at that time it was simply to be an improvement of the delineation of traffic west bound to eliminate a series of crashes involving right-turn vehicles, so that was a fairly low-cost project and there was some work undertaken. Subsequently in 2008 a broader view was taken that incorporated the Illawarra Main Road, Midland Highway, Youl Main Road, Drummond Street and the intersection at project site 3. That work focused specifically on safety as distinct from the Illawarra Main Road which was a bit higher level and looked at transport efficiency as well. So the key outcomes from the Perth Road study were that the Longford junction issue still remained, and a greater level of work needed to be undertaken to eliminate the right-turn crash problem, and that led to the development of a roundabout proposal. A roundabout was considered under the original Illawarra Main Road study but priority was given to a lower-cost option and also because the community generally did not support an option that they saw as imposing on those members of the community who were driving safely. So a lower-impact option was initially undertaken, but subsequent analysis showed that that had not been effective, so that led us to the roundabout option.

They are the key elements. The priorities that were put forward in the strategic study were done on the basis that there would be some more work undertaken to refine those priorities, so some of the priorities have been moved around and, in looking at the work, the strict order of priority as identified through the study would not be adhered to because you would look to link specific sites together to make actual projects. So in that case one of the key things to be undertaken was to make some improvements around Esk Farm, the sight distance, and the underpass was included in that. That section of road has effectively been the missing link, if you like, in the cross-section, so that was the section of road that was inconsistent with regard to the rest of the road in terms of cross-section, so that had been slightly elevated in priority. The Mountford stock underpass which had been given a high priority initially, a priority 4, after some consultation with the community and the identification of an alternative option was relegated to a priority 7 in the final document.

Mr HALL - The community or the council?

Mr GREGORY - Well, when you say community, we talked about it with the community, and we also had some consultation with council.

Mrs NAPIER - Was that an alternative for the Mountford property?

Mr GREGORY - Yes.

Mrs NAPIER - Right, and what was that alternative?

Mr GREGORY - There is an existing alternative for stock to be taken down to an existing bridge and underpass the road and existing bridge. So for a small amount of work, a viable alternative could be found that would be lower costing.

Mrs NAPIER - Is it still on the Mountford property?

Mr GREGORY - I think we'd need to look at some easements and some options there.

Mr BEST - I am not sure whether this is in relation to the roundabout but it says increasing stopping sight distance to 100 kph to match the speed limit of the preferred operating speed. What will be the speed limit at the roundabout?

Mr GREGORY - The reference you are making is actually the Bishopsbourne to Wickford section and that's about developing the consistent speed environment. The speed environment through a roundabout is much lower and that's effectively what roundabouts do; they bring the speed environment down and give people a greater amount of time to have their decision-making process.

Mr BEST - Yes, because it's 80 kph now, isn't it? What will it become with the roundabout?

Mr GREGORY - The speed limit would be kept at about 80 kph or something of that order but, of course, roundabouts are designed that they are slow in and accelerating out.

Mr BEST - Yes.

Mr GREGORY - So we would be hoping to bring the speed environment down considerably. The speed environment is not the speed limit; it is the perception, the driver's perception, of what is an appropriate speed to drive on a particular section of road.

Mr BEST - It will function as a normal roundabout. With a roundabout you give way to the vehicle that's on the roundabout -

Mr GREGORY - Yes.

Mr BEST - so that means someone coming out of Longford would have right of way to the highway traffic.

Mr GREGORY - Potentially, but the distinction is that you give way to someone in the roundabout.

Mr BEST - That's right. So if they're onto it, you'd have to stop, basically - well, you are supposed to, aren't you, really, before you work out where it's -

Mr GREGORY - On smaller roundabouts you tend to have the stopping effect. With larger roundabouts you have a greater circulating diameter so you tend to have the flow. When people get used to using them you tend to have a lot less stopping.

Mr BEST - That is the law but not everyone bothers with it, but that is supposed to be the law, isn't it?

Mr GREGORY - With larger roundabouts you have less stopping because you have a larger road to work in. So when people get used to using roundabouts they start to do gap perception and choosing gaps so you find the actual stopping is much less.

Mr HALL - While you are talking about those priorities, Mrs Napier raised the issue of the underpass at Mountford. There was also the question of slope improvement. Is that a projected project? Going up past the water reservoir, up the hill there, I understood that under the priorities you were going to cut some of that slope out at some stage.

Mr GREGORY - It's not on the capital works program at this stage. In terms of looking at the priorities, reviewing these priorities, it was thought that the need to get some consistency in the cross-section would raise the section that we're doing ahead of the Mountford section. This particular area through Mountford does have quite a good cross-section at the moment so, yes, there is a slight deficiency in sight distance that we would like to improve, however we do have more manoeuvring space so if you are faced with a situation you actually have more pavement to manoeuvre on to avoid that. The other issue with Bishopsbourne to Wickford is that since the 2000 report, there's been a significant ageing of the asset so we have moved eight years down the track when we were typically designing pavements for 20 years with a view that they'll last to maybe 30. So the residual life in that pavement is dramatically lower whereas the rest of the road is still in reasonable condition. So the urgency to upgrade Bishopsbourne to Wickford has elevated. If we went back and did this again, I think that would have a greater priority than the Mountford section.

CHAIR - I will pursue that a little further, if I might, Shane. How were the preliminary priorities for Illawarra Main Road developed - through what sort of consultation? I'm reading from your document of June 1999 and I haven't been back to it for a couple of weeks. Was that done in consultation with community meetings?

Mr GREGORY - There were two phases, from my understanding. I was not involved in this process. There were two phases. One was that there was an engineering assessment, a normal planning assessment that took into account engineering issues, environmental issues, heritage issues, potential benefit-cost ratio, and that developed a list of priorities. Then there was consultation with the community and other stakeholders, and there was an extensive list of stakeholders involved: the Northern Midlands Council, the Meander Valley Council, RACT, the TFGA, Primary Industries, Water and Environment, Longford Main Street Committee, and officers of the department. So there was initial assessment that said these are the things we think are the priorities, and when you are doing that you do factor in social benefits. Then that was taken to the community and they expressed their views about those and their perception was that some of the social benefits that were identified they did not see as being benefits to them, so there was the shift in the Mountford stock underpass as a priority, on the basis that the community did not believe that that was where money was best spent. They preferred to see other options pursued.

CHAIR - Okay. But at that stage during that consultation process the Mountford stock underpass was priority 4. The crest and slope to which Greg referred, the improvements there were priority 5, so if they were being done at the same time, they would have been

higher on the list than the crest and dip improvements at Esk Farm, the one we considered today.

Mr GREGORY - Yes.

CHAIR - But, as you have explained, the deterioration in the road pavement at the crest and dip at Esk Farm and so on has necessitated a reassessment.

Mr GREGORY - Yes.

Mr KACZMARSKI - Just on that, approximately two or three years ago we were planning to do a major pavement repair to that section of Bishopsbourne to Wickford, and that was delayed on the basis that we would do a holistic project in that area, and so we just did a reseal and wrapped it all up into the one project that we are now putting forward to the committee.

CHAIR - Thanks, Steven.

Mr KACZMARSKI - Mike, if you will explain the main constraints we have had on this project which were environmental and heritage issues.

Mr EDRICH - Both sites are heavily constrained for the design, so I will start with site 1, the roundabout. You may have noticed on site that there are lines of trees down that way and there are many heritage issues around there. The design of the roundabout has managed to avoid impacts to the heritage values of Longford there. To the north of the roundabout you have the South Esk Wildlife Conservation Area, and that area goes within some of the road reserves there, so that has required a reserves activity assessment which we have submitted, and that is being assessed by -

Mrs NAPIER - So that is that flooded area that you are talking about?

Mr EDRICH - That's right.

Mrs NAPIER - It looked as if a lot of the trees had been cut down there, though.

Mr EDRICH - That's right.

Mrs NAPIER - Was that a willow removal program or something?

Mr HALL - Then the fences all got washed away.

Mr EDRICH - That is mainly for the constraints of site 1. There are many constraints around there, but the design of the roundabout managed to avoid them. Then to site 2, the Bishopsbourne to Wickford section, there were not natural value constraints there. It was all heritage and cultural landscape issues, mainly to do with historic tree plantings alongside the road, and you would have noticed that with the elms. And of course Esk Farm is listed on the Tasmanian Heritage Register, protected by the Historic Cultural Heritage Act. We have applied for an exclusion to heritage approval for Esk Farm and have just received exclusion from heritage works approval because Heritage Tasmania's

interest is completely with the Esk Farm as opposed to the Esk Cottage on the southern side of the road.

Mr HALL - So that precinct comes right out to the road, does it? It obviously includes the house; that would be heritage listed.

Mr EDRICH - It comes close to the road.

Mr HALL - Close, but right out as far as the road? Normally they only take the curtilage of the outbuildings and everything else around them, don't they?

Mr EDRICH - The information that Heritage Tasmania supplied, the map of the area was a sketch map so it was difficult to define the boundaries, and that resulted in our applying for heritage exclusion so that Heritage Tasmania could assess the works and determine whether or not we were impacting. It did not look like we were going to, and that has been confirmed.

Mr HALL - Okay, yes.

Mr EDRICH - The main heritage impacts are more cultural, landscape impacts, the trees that are being removed. You will have noticed the eucalypt trees in the paddock and the one pine tree that are being removed; they have been deemed to be not that significant due to the remaining paddock staying intact, and the same with the line of trees. There have been four elms to be removed out of a line of 18.

Mr BEST - Is there some sort of standard about the distance of trees from the road?

Mr LEE - It is mainly a clear zone distance. For a road there is what is known as a clear zone, which is the area for recovery of a vehicle, so if you lose control you can get back onto the road. So the trees are supposed to be outside that area, or protected by some sort of protection barrier.

Mr BEST - It is a little bit off the subject, but there is one at Elizabeth Town which I think has been hit a couple of times, or there are at least one or two there. So is there an actual set distance?

Mr LEE - Yes. Depending on the speed, so this is 100 kilometres per hour, I think it is about 6.7 metres. I would have to look it up.

Mr GREGORY - We might need to just clarify an issue. When we start talking about road design and construction, people talk about standards. In fact Austroads produces guidelines and there is quite a bit of discretion that needs to be applied using the guidelines, so the Austroads guidelines come out of the Austroads body which is represented by all State road authorities. So when you are going to do a greenfields road you have open slather. You can choose a standard that you wish to apply, and you go and apply it. When we are dealing with brownfields projects we start to be influenced by historic elm trees, buildings, and it is really about what you can achieve and how you apply the guidelines. So it is not always about building the best as building what is appropriate, and what delivers the functional outcome that you are after.

Mr BEST - I don't know if you have had this constituent, and I won't mention his name, but he is very obsessed with these sorts of standards. Are there standards as regards the Armco railing? Where do you get your standards for your fencing, the materials and all that sort of stuff?

Mr GREGORY - There are manufacturers' specifications and manufacturers' guidelines for implementation. There are standards for certain elements of your design. There are standard tests for crash barriers and there is an Australian standard for crash barriers, and from that they have to comply with certain testing.

Mr BEST - The materials would have to have the ASA to say it is the right sort of material, it is the right thickness?

Mr GREGORY - Yes.

Mr BEST - And then again, where you put that fencing, is that similar to your situation with trees?

Mr GREGORY - When you go from the fence as a material thing that meets a standard in terms of being tested in a certain way, yes, that is quite defined, although manufacturers have some scope in what they design if you put in the standard. When you start to think about how you apply those, then you move into the guidelines, the Austroads guidelines and you undertake risk assessment. You look at whether you are in fact creating a greater risk by putting in a crash barrier than if there wasn't one there. There is a whole range of engineering judgments that are made in applying the guidelines.

Mr BEST - And have any of these things been subject to coroners' investigations as to how things have been designed in the case of accidents?

Mr GREGORY - Not that I am aware of.

Mr KACZMARSKI - In this particular case where the elm trees are beside the stock underpass, we are removing the three trees on the end of the one that the underpass goes through, but the other row of trees will be protected by a barrier because otherwise they will need to be removed. So the compromise is, put in a barrier to save the trees, but bearing in mind that putting in barriers as well means that you've got to ensure that they don't become a hazard in themselves. So you've got to look at your end stocks and everything else.

Mr BEST - Thank you.

Mr EDRICH - I think that sums up most of the issues there. This section of road is heavily constrained on both sides with heritage issues almost entirely to do with trees. It took a lot of design effort to work out the precise alignment that we have now.

Mr LEE - Alignment and width.

Mr KACZMARSKI - I can follow on from that then because I want to talk about stakeholders and public consultation. The main engagement with the stakeholders has been with the owner of Esk Farm, because the majority of work on the Bishopsbourne

section goes through his particular property, so I've had lots of discussions, I should say, at least three discussions with him specifically about what might need to be removed, what can be retained and we had a discussion about the elm trees and we identified that they have significance to him as well. At the moment I've said that we have to take two out and we might have to take a third one out and that's a further point I just need to clarify with that particular owner. He's comfortable about the big eucalypt and the old pine tree that we looked at on the other side of the road and then there are the ongoing issues with the hawthorn hedging that we've said that we'll come to an arrangement and see when we get through to the construction phase how that might transpire.

That's been the main engagement that I've had and then DIER develops a stakeholder arrangement plan for all our projects which identifies who the key people are that we need to talk to.

The other landowner that's involved with the stock crossing, that's the owner of Killam Farm; we have also had discussions with and probably need some more consultation shortly. We've not met with him for some time, a couple of months at this stage. We've discussed the issues with the Northern Midlands Council, and particularly the landscaping of the roundabout, for example. They're keen to make that an entry feature into Longford so we've said that we'll assist them wherever we can but if they're wanting something that's too out of the ordinary, then they might need to take over some responsibility for maintenance for that entry into their town. So they're coming back to me with those sorts of issues.

Mrs NAPIER - What about a statue?

Mr KACZMARSKI - No statues.

Mrs NAPIER - Bestie could fix a statue.

Mr BEST - Yes, I'm pretty good on statues; if you need a hand just sing out.

Laughter.

Mr KACZMARSKI - Regarding the two owners that have the stock underpass, the transport association and the transport council, I have met with both of those organisations, talked to their CEOs about the project, particularly the roundabout. We've had a response from both of those organisations and DIER has advised them that we have to go and talk to them in their committee meetings or in their council meetings so we can put forward the DIER situation and issues on why we are doing what we're doing. At this stage, we're waiting on their response to come back to us so we can go and have that further conversation with them.

Mrs NAPIER - What has the response been from truck owners?

Mr KACZMARSKI - The truck owners' responses will be targeting to come back through the transport council and the transport association. Obviously, I'd have to say that the truck drivers don't like roundabouts because they do have to slow down. In this particular case the issue is safety; the junction particularly at the roundabout obviously is a high-accident location and, therefore, we need to do something about that.

Mrs NAPIER - It's currently 80 km/h through there, isn't it?

Mr KACZMARSKI - Yes, it's currently 80 km/h. The roundabout that we've designed will require them to slow down much further than that.

Mr GREEN - You're not going to be able to take down that heritage-listed camera stand there, are you?

Mr LEE - Yes, we are.

Laughter.

Mr KACZMARSKI - It might be relocated to another location.

Mr HALL - Will roll-over kerbs on the roundabout itself be there for the trucks?

Mr KACZMARSKI - The roundabout is designed so that the trucks and B-doubles will be able to go around without mounting either the inside or the outside parts of the roundabout. Nevertheless, they are designed so that you can still go over them but obviously a lot smoother.

Mrs NAPIER - What will the speed limit be through there? I think you said it before but I missed it.

Mr KACZMARSKI - The speed limit at the moment is 80 km/h but vehicles and trucks, particularly, need to slow down more than that. The design speed of the roundabout is something like 45 km/h but it depends on the vehicle, of course.

Mrs NAPIER - So what would the sign say that you have to slow down to?

Mr KACZMARSKI - At this stage my understanding is that we retain the 80 on it.

Mr GREEN - It would be the same as the Moriarty intersection, for example, at the Mersey hospital. It is 80 both sides, but there is a roundabout in the middle and you just have to slow down. The one at Heybridge is a bit different. That is 60.

Mr KACZMARSKI - That roundabout is a bit tighter and a bit smaller, so that is why they have made it slower.

Mr GREEN - And it has a bad angle on it.

Mr KACZMARSKI - So we have learnt from all of those lessons, and we are proposing a roundabout that will not have those issues. The only other aspect with the Transport Association who represent, in our view, the truck owners, is the issue of fog which they have raised. What we are doing there is we are providing the ducting to put the wiring through at some later stage, so our view is that we ought to assess how the roundabout operates, and if there is an issue during foggy situations then that fog warning system can be retrofitted at some later stage. But once again, fog affects a lot of roads and a lot of

junctions and a lot of intersections in Tasmania, and we just have to be mindful about the implications of putting them up wherever for that particular reason.

Mr HALL - With regard to signage approaching, following on from Mrs Napier's question, you obviously have 'Roundabout ahead', I would presume -

Mr KACZMARSKI - Yes.

Mr HALL - and if you are travelling from the west towards the east, will you try to make it as clear to people as possible, 'Longford right lane', or -

Mr LEE - We have advanced directional signages, which are those big signs with the roundabout symbol on them where you are going to and from. That is part of the reason we don't think these electronic signboards are required, because those advanced directional signs are quite prominent.

Mr KACZMARSKI - We have also conducted a public display of sites 1 and 2 at the Northern Midlands Council in September, finishing in early October. We received no public comments or submissions on that public display. As I said, we have met with Northern Midlands Council to look at particularly the roundabout project itself, but the discussion mainly revolved around the landscaping rather than the actual roundabout itself. The development application to the Northern Midlands Council has been approved for the roundabout, and so we are now working on the basis of getting tenders out in November and in hopefully awarding the project as soon as we get your approval.

Just to summarise then, with site 1 which is the roundabout, the main intention of that project is to improve safety, and as a result of that there will be better accessibility to Illawarra Main Road from the Longford side, which I think you mentioned before about Burnie traffic having to slow down, so that will be an outcome there. At site 2 we are looking at reinstating the structural integrity of the road, which will improve the right quality and also improve the road geometry for the 100 km/h speed environment which that road is. That road standard that we construct to will be consistent with the adjacent section of the Illawarra Main Road, so the feeling when you get onto that road at the Perth end and leave at the Bass Highway end will be similar all the way through, and obviously we will be providing the one stock underpass to eliminate the two existing stock crossings.

Mr HALL - And just for the record you can assure us that both of those property owners are happy with that stock underpass, that shared facility?

Mr KACZMARSKI - We still have to finalise the details. We have had what you would call preliminary discussions and preliminary agreements and verbal agreements. We need to finalise those arrangements with those landowners, but bearing in mind the construction program we have at the moment is to build the roundabout this summer, and then tender out and construct the Bishopsbourne section in the following construction period, which probably would start in about August, so it could be started earlier, and that is based on the funding as well, that we have approximately half the funding this year and half next year.

Mr HALL - And further to the underpass, I think we did, just to confirm that on site we talked about that they are for stock only, but they will probably take a ute.

Mr KACZMARSKI - They will take a light vehicle.

Mr HALL - A light vehicle underneath as well, yes. Is drainage a problem there?

Mr KACZMARSKI - We will be digging a hole effectively to put that underpass in, and there will need to be a drainage line taken out to the river from that, which will be a piped drain. And the management of all that is yet to be finalised as well.

Mr HALL - With the roundabout, obviously it is a pretty major piece of infrastructure in terms of traffic disruption. How are you going to manage that? A lane is closed at a time, I presume.

Mr KACZMARSKI - Yes. Basically what we require from the successful contractor will be a detailed traffic management plan. It obviously is a busy road, as all of our roads are, and that traffic management plan will need to identify how the traffic will be managed around the construction phase. In fact the construction phasing is basically around managing traffic and we basically build the roundabout to make sure that traffic can get through. There will be delays, of course, and traffic will need to be slowed whilst it is in that work area. There is a reasonable amount of room in some cases to divert traffic slightly around, but nevertheless there will be delays.

Mr HALL - And on the northern side, that is obviously where the ground falls away there and you will have to put a lot of fill in there. Where are you going to get all that fill from? That is probably the biggest earthworks; 374 is probably the biggest item just on that bit.

Mr KACZMARSKI - We have looked at the volume of earth embankments. We have also looked at other options of retaining walls, the amount of embankment fill that you need, but certainly the fill material will need to be sourced and it would be responsibility of the contractor to source that.

Mrs NAPIER - You need to be digging out the underpass at the same time as you are doing the roundabout, don't you?

Mr KACZMARSKI - Yes, that was one of the things that we looked at, but we just couldn't bring the two projects together.

Mr LEE - We will need some fill to correct that vertical curve as well.

Mr KACZMARSKI - On that section, so the underpass fill will be used immediately into the north of that underpass area.

Mr HALL - If I look at the design on page 11, the cost estimates, design, contract administration, project management, public consultation et cetera, are getting up towards 30 per cent, and then we have another contingency around about 20 per cent, so we are heading towards maybe 45 per cent, I suppose, of total cost for both projects. Do you think that is an acceptable sort of parameter to be working within?

Mr KACZMARSKI - What we are finding is that the environmental and the heritage and all the other assessments that we need to do before we do the technical design is occupying a lot of time and effort, and so it is becoming an increasing cost in our projects to even get to the stage of doing a technical design, but that certainly is in our current planning of costs. That is our current estimate.

Mr HALL - The Chair mentioned before the actual length of that part 2. I could not see it in the documents. I just had another look through as well.

Mr LEE - I will have to get back to you on that one.

CHAIR - You could probably do it with the chainage calculation, couldn't you? That is about all.

Mr LEE - That is right.

Mr GREEN - I have a question with respect to the project overall. Obviously the consultation went out as to what the Government is doing. It is all fine. I understand that. It is a good thing. But it just seems to me that there has been an enormous amount of work going on here and we have really two distinct projects, and the committee has a cut-off of \$5 million. Had you arranged those as two distinct projects, you would not have had to worry about this process.

Mr KACZMARSKI - At the time this project was developed I think the committee limits were \$2 million, and my understanding is the fact that the two projects are jointly funded by Federal and State governments there was a requirement to have it as one project effectively, which meant that we needed to come through this committee.

Mr GREEN - Right. Personally I do not think that ought to be the case really because they are two distinct projects in their own right.

CHAIR - The issue here being, as Steven said, at the time of putting it in it was a \$2 million threshold.

Mr KACZMARSKI - I think the main factor identified to me was the fact that it was joint State and Federal Government and it was the one pool of money for effectively Illawarra road -

Mrs NAPIER - Two projects.

Mr KACZMARSKI - Two projects, yes.

Mrs NAPIER - If it is a combined project, I think it is appropriate that it should -

Mr GREEN - Just trying to save a few bob, that was all. The preparation for this committee is extensive, obviously. It seems to me that stand alone you have \$2.5 million and \$3.5 million effectively.

CHAIR - But if they were 10 kilometres apart, is that any different to a kilometre apart?

Mr GREEN - I am just trying to save you some work, that is all.

Mr KACZMARSKI - I am happy to concede to that.

Mr GREEN - We are happy to do the work here, don't get me wrong.

Mrs NAPIER - And I do not necessarily agree with my colleague.

Laughter.

Mr GREEN - Just trying to save a few bob.

CHAIR - Steven, back to the Mountford underpass, I read in the report that heavy vehicles are reluctant to slow down and there is increasing evidence of that so regarding the stock underpass you are providing on the Bishopsbourne stretch of road there, one of the justifications was that danger component. Is not that danger component likewise in play at the Mountford stock crossing and, if that is the case, where does that now sit on the priority listing?

Mr KACZMARSKI - At the moment the reason that we are doing the Esk Farm underpass is that it achieves two objectives - that aggregates two existing onroad crossings into one location. The fact that we are doing that section of road means the opportunity arose to do all of that in one project. So there is a benefit in doing those two combined projects. If we were to just do individual underpasses then the priorities may have been different. So, as it stands at the moment, the one that might be perceived to be not as high priority is because of that opportunity. The Mountford underpass is still a priority and, as Mr Gregory identified, it depends on the capital works program we have on where that might fit in. Nevertheless up to this point, I do not think there has been an active program of building stock underpasses on State roads. We have certainly built them on the Federal Government highway on the AusLink roads but there is not that same funding source for State roads.

CHAIR - The reason I raise it is that the report refers specifically to the danger component of heavy vehicles. The drivers fail to slow when stock seem to be crossing notwithstanding there would be all sorts of warnings about stock crossing. What weight is given to that component, the fact of the danger with heavy vehicles travelling at 100 kilometres?

Mr KACZMARSKI - I am not sure whether Mr Gregory can answer that one. It is certainly a high criteria.

Mrs NAPIER - We put quite a few of them on that Deloraine road, didn't we, the Lake Highway?

Mr GREEN - I was looking at the map. You pointed out earlier that there is a bridge; they can get under the bridge there anyway.

Mr KACZMARSKI - There is an alternative at Mountford which could be accomplished with some adjustments or some fence movements. I am not exactly up to speed with what the property titles there entail but there would seem to be an opportunity to move

stock albeit to an end of a property and then back again under that first existing bridge that is there.

Mr HALL - Have you discussed that with Mr McKinnon at all?

Mr KACZMARSKI - I haven't personally. I have met Mr McKinnon but I have not talked to him about that. My role has been to implement these two projects and that was before - there were other officers dealing with that at the time. So I am not sure what discussions there have been in recent times about that or in fact up until now.

Mr GREGORY - Something we really need to keep in context is that the livestock underpass at Mountford would be a project in itself, simply providing a stock underpass. We are doing an underpass on Bishopsbourne to Wickford because we have a need to rehabilitate the pavement. We have a need to bring that cross-section up to a level that is consistent with the remainder of the road, so effectively the underpass, in a way, is ancillary to the works we are doing. So it is an opportunistic time to put the underpass in. There is a viable alternative at Mountford.

The other issue is, when the Illawarra Main Road study was done and produced, and there was quite an emphasis put on stock underpasses, it was in the context that the State would push to have Illawarra Main Road included in the AusLink network. The Federal Government has made it very clear that that is not going to happen. So it was in the context that it was not appropriate on the AusLink network to have back-road stock crossings, so there was a certain amount of the priority attached to that view of what is an appropriate standard for part of the AusLink network. That will not happen in the foreseeable future. The Federal Government has been very clear that we have an AusLink network which is the Midland Highway through to the Bass Highway, and that is what they are going to accept.

Mr HALL - It seems a bit bizarre. As you well know, it is a link to the north-west coast. It is the way we all go, isn't it?

Mrs NAPIER - It is, for north-west coasters.

Mr HALL - With regard to the underpass, I am just trying to find that in the cost estimate there. Where is it contained? Is it contained in 'Earthworks'? No, it wouldn't be under 'Earthworks'. On page 11, the cost estimates.

Mr GREGORY - It would come in under 'Accesses and utility relocations'.

Mr HALL - So we haven't got a specific figure for that?

Mr LEE - It is actually in the more detailed project estimate, which is at the back under 'Accesses and relocations'. So the stock underpass is valued at about \$360 000.

Mr HALL - Okay. I am trying to relate that back to the Lake secondary road when we did it. I think they were almost retro. They are the ones they do in Victoria, as they do many of those box-type ones and they bring them in and put them in place. I thought they were considerably less than that, actually.

Mr KACZMARSKI - I am the project manager for that project as well, and so what happened there was that we obviously had a design, as we do now, for an adequately constructed and designed stock underpass. When it came to the construction phase there was an opportunity of looking at other options, in which case we did. We need to be very careful about certification of those structures, because in a lot of cases they might comply with guidelines or standards that perhaps are not as rigorous as ours. Nevertheless, the ones on the Lake Highway were put in and they are much lower. You cannot get a vehicle through those except for a quad-bike, so it is realistically just a stock underpass, but they were put in and contributed to by the owners there. There was a contribution to the retro.

Mr HALL - . Yes, there were.

Mr KACZMARSKI - And we are having the same discussion with the owners here about contribution as well.

Mr HALL - With regard to this one, site 2?

Mr KACZMARSKI - Yes.

Mr HALL - Okay. So it is still a little bit up in the air at this stage then.

Mr KACZMARSKI - Our understanding is that there is a cost-sharing arrangement and there is an agreement to that. The difficulty of course is in difficult times how that might be accomplished, but nevertheless the department has a view that there ought to be a contribution, and others have contributed in the past.

Mrs NAPIER - What would happen if they didn't agree to a contribution? Out there you were saying this would be suitable for a ute to go through, but not necessarily full-sized tractors.

Mr HALL - Following on from Mrs Napier's question then, I think that it would have been better from the committee's point of view if that had actually been nailed down by now so we can be in our own minds -

Mr KACZMARSKI - There is a verbal agreement and a notation about that but we haven't signed off the finer details, and in most cases the value is then counterbalanced by any property acquisition that we make as well. We might need to pay for any property acquisition and that is taken into consideration.

Mrs NAPIER - Quid pro quo.

Mr KACZMARSKI - Yes.

Mrs NAPIER - Are they the same property owners?

Mr KACZMARSKI - In one case there obviously is one property owner, but the other property owner would not be effected in that same way.

Mrs NAPIER - I have been asked a question too, are there any Aboriginal heritage issues in this?

Mr KACZMARSKI - No.

Mrs NAPIER - We will not find them out afterwards, will we, when someone goes digging around in the dirt?

Mr KACZMARSKI - Once you disturb the soil you do not know. The likelihood is there will be nothing there based on the assessments we have had done, but you never say never.

Mrs NAPIER - That was asking about Brighton, it seemed to me we had two Aboriginal heritage reports, and then it seemed they had only scratched the surface.

Mr HALL - That was on the Meander Valley pipelines too, recently.

CHAIR - Are there any more questions regarding this part of the submission to the committee?

Mr BEST - I think it is a very good report, Mr Chairman.

Mrs NAPIER - And I think - through you, Mr Chairman - we accept that given the nature of the constrictions of the road and the heritage items, the normal cycle allowance just can't be done and there is only half a metre on either side. I am not sure cyclists would want to use that road anyhow.

CHAIR - Very heavy.

Mrs NAPIER - They do?

CHAIR - Yes, heavy use.

Mr LEE - To get back to that other question, the Bishopsbourne to Wickford section is about 1.5 kilometres long.

CHAIR - I made a quick guess at about 1.7 kilometres; I have looked at a change of 1 300 -

Mr LEE - There are a couple of high ends on each end but the major works are about 1.5, so there is a little bit of transition back to the natural profile.

Mr HALL - Any roods and perches, Mr Chair?

CHAIR - Different measure.

Mrs NAPIER - So are we saying when you referred to site 3 being \$0.9 million and site 4 \$0.9 million, as I understand it, that if any moneys should be remaining from this they would go towards those projects in that order?

Mr KACZMARSKI - Yes.

Mrs NAPIER - And that is where the Drummond Street intersection comes in? It is a busy intersection, it is always busy.

CHAIR - I can echo Brenton's comment about the quality of the report. When we go to the detailed information, it leaves nothing for the committee to guess at and I appreciate that. This committee has been critical in the past of submissions from whoever, whether it be Education or DIER or whatever, but that is very expansive and we appreciate that. Thank you very much.

Mr HUGH MACKINNON, RESIDENT, WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR (Mr Harriss) - We have your submission, Hugh. We would invite you to make your contribution to that. We might just let you know at the outset that we have already asked the department about the hierarchy of the priorities because we have had your submission and extracts from the department's report from some time ago. We would like to hear from you and then we will have some questions for you. It may be necessary that we get Shane and Steven back before the committee to test some of the things that you might share with us.

Mr MACKINNON - Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Very briefly, I farm between Perth and the South Esk River on both sides of the road so I suffer from Federal, State and local roads, railway line, fibre-optic line, a couple of mobile phone towers, a reservoir et cetera, so public infrastructure is really something of importance to the management and the future of the property.

You will note in the submission I made there were extracts from a plan that I have had done by R J Graham from Hobart to look at the future of the property and the key part of that in a couple of bits that I included there is that public infrastructure has a great deal to do with how we manage the property and the effectiveness and the cost of managing the property and maintaining it as a farming operation.

We have had three major incursions via the B52, flying mile, the first being the realignment, the second being the bridge over the South Esk River and the works along with that, and then the B-double passing lanes which led to the reduction in a number of our crossing points et cetera, changed the management substantially and there was compensation for that et cetera. That being said, further changes and increases in traffic volume and expectations of the travelling public are of key concern to me. So too is my ability to put stock across the road and back across the road and for the daily movement of my staff, vehicles et cetera which are going backwards and forwards across that with the ever-increasing volume of everyday traffic, tourist traffic and certainly heavy vehicles and particularly B-doubles and the like.

It is, in my view, a safety issue to my staff, myself and family but also to the travelling public and I think that is a key point to take into account when we are looking at the costing of these things; that it is not to the benefit of the landowner on adjacent sides, it is to the benefit of the travelling public and to some extent a reparation to the landowner from what has been lost over the period of the years.

It is a de facto national highway, as I see it, and I am not quite sure what the situation with it is as far as the department is concerned and AusLink et cetera and where the funding comes from.

CHAIR - It has a high-category allocation to it because of the freight.

Mr MACKINNON - Yes, which is getting more and more a problem to us and relative to the situation over the railway line.

I appreciate that good works are about to start on the B52. I have identified in my submission concerns that I had are relative to the public consultation and the original discussions with the department some nine or 10 years ago so I will not go into those again but I wanted to highlight the importance of underpasses to both the farming fraternity and the travelling public, in particular the one that you would have driven past today that is further down the priority list at Mountford and the sight distances involved there and the difficulty with moving stock off the highway into one's farm so run-off lanes or whatever they are called, slip lanes, are of particular importance.

I did question where the priorities had changed with the Bishopsbourne intersection. I do not know what the funding allocation is within the works there but, again, I am very much in favour of the Esk Farm underpass but appreciate that I am not trying to push my case ahead of that but I am talking about the road in general. I do question the interchange there.

Mr GREEN - What are you questioning, sorry?

Mr MACKINNON - The amount of funding relative to the priorities and whether the Bishopsbourne mill dam intersection is a key component of the funding. If it is, I believe if we look back it was not seen as important.

Mr HALL - I understand from a question before out on site that there is not a lot to be spent on that issue, the intersection itself. So that is virtually as it is.

Mr MACKINNON - As far as limited access is concerned, regarding the main highway certainly there are parts of that that proceed adjacent to my property that are limited access. My understanding, and I may be incorrect, is that there is a move for parts of the B52 Illawarra to be made limited access, in which case I would highlight the point that on the mainland - and whether it would occur here I don't know - agricultural machinery is barred from limited-access roads. We have the supposed food bowl of the Northern Midlands or the Midlands area. Agricultural machinery must pass along that arterial route but particularly farms that are landlocked, if you like, and the only umbilical cord is the B52. So that is a small one that is of importance to us.

I suppose the other one that is of key concern to me is the funding of underpasses. There have been a number of discussions about this over the years with myself and members of the department. My concern is very much that as a principle, private individuals should not be funding public infrastructure. I go back to my point earlier on that underpasses in particular or slip roads into farms et cetera are there for the good of the travelling public as well as for the individual farmer that is adjacent on both sides of the road. The costs for the management of a farm that has a major highway through it get more and more expensive as you go on. You have to go further with stock, with implements, the difficulty of getting stock off the road if anything happened with high volumes and the safety of one's personnel and staff et cetera is critical. So I would be very keen for the committee to take on board, particularly on high-value infrastructure routes such as this, that it is very much the public in the main to fund underpasses et cetera.

Mr BEST - Do you move much stock? I travel from Devonport and frequently, although I cannot say it happens all the time, there is stock moving on there and you wait. Do you move a fair bit?

Mr MACKINNON - Yes, we do, and it is particularly hard if you are moving ewes and lambs because it takes more time, there is more difficulty at the moment. We do not have any cattle but they can be exceptionally difficult because they shy at the wet road et cetera, and that is a danger to all concerned. Dogs, people and those using the road.

Mr GREEN - What proportion north and south of the highway are we talking about, on your farm?

Mr MACKINNON - Between Longford and Perth. You have Perth there and the South Esk River there; we are all of the yellow area. So on that whole road from there to there we have only one place now where we can take stock across the road really, and that is at the reservoir.

Mr GREEN - We have had a look at it from an aerial point of view and were wondering why it isn't possible to take stock under the existing bridge.

Mr MACKINNON - It is impossible when there is a flood and this year it was -

Mr GREEN - It is not possible when there is a flood?

Mr MACKINNON - No.

Mr GREEN - But at all other times it is possible?

Mr MACKINNON - Yes, it is possible but that is a significantly longer distance that we have to take stock. If you bear in mind, we used to be able to take stock across the road here, but if we are taking stock from there to there and we have to go almost to Longford and back. My key point also is that the location here where vehicles, motorbikes, quad-bikes, people, long lengths of probably five big rolls of hay are going across the road and there is very short sight distance, again it is extremely difficult and a safety problem.

I think that is the key to what I wanted to reinforce, Mr Chairman, thank you.

Mrs NAPIER - What is the distance along the highway that your property runs?

Mr MACKINNON - Probably 2.5 to 3 kilometres, approximately.

Mrs NAPIER - How many crossing points do you have currently?

Mr MACKINNON - We have one that we use, which is at the reservoir; there is one more that is licensed but is not practical. If you go east from the reservoir approximately 800 metres exactly where the old motor races control tower used to be and there is a single poplar in the jigger, there are two gates there, but from a management viewpoint that is very difficult for us and the traffic is faster there, I suppose.

The only other one I would highlight very quickly, Mr Chairman - and this is just a general comment for all high-speed roads where there is agricultural activity - is that if stock gets on to a road it is then an extremely difficult task to get stock off the road and that can happen. There are three instances where it happens: it jumps out of the back of a truck, which can often happen on the way to the meatworks or does happen; a car can go through a fence and stock can get on the road; or if there is a hole in the fence and the stock get on the road or they rub the gate open. So then the difficulty to get stock back in when there is a hell of a lot of traffic around, it is at night or whatever, means that we need to give consideration, I believe, to access gates for the removal of stock off the road in case of emergency.

Mrs NAPIER - You would leave them there?

Mr MACKINNON - Yes, they would be locked and not for access other than the removal of stock off the road.

CHAIR - By way of information, Hugh, if I can reiterate that we have questioned the departmental representatives about the change in project priority and rather than go all over that with you now, we will provide to you a copy of the *Hansard* of that relevant section so you can see what the departmental people have answered to us -

Mr MACKINNON - I will appreciate that because, in actual fact, with the public consultation period, albeit it was some while ago it seems reasonable that if there were major changes that perhaps the system would have gone back again for another bite at the cherry.

CHAIR - Just by way of information to you, the committee's jurisdiction has only two outcomes. We can either approve a project submitted to us or reject it. We cannot demand any variations or adjustments to the project so either we reject what is in front of us or we approve it.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

Mr GREEN - My query is on the question of access restrictions with respect to this particular property.

Mr GREGORY - What has been mentioned is the prospect of the Illawarra Main Road being proclaimed a 'limited access road'.

Mr GREEN - As part of the National Highway, is it?

Mr GREGORY - We have limited access roads that are not part of the National Highway. In Tasmania under Tasmanian legislation 'limited access' has a very specific meaning and it is about limiting access directly from adjacent properties onto the road - that is what we are talking about.

Hugh mentioned roads on the mainland where agricultural machinery is prohibited from being on the road - that is an entirely different scenario. That is typically freeways; I think it is referred to more as 'restricted access' or 'prohibited access', but in Tasmania 'limited access' is very specifically about direct access from a property onto the road. It has nothing to do with what is allowed to drive on the road.

Mr GREEN - So with respect to Hugh's property, is there any likelihood there would be restricted access to his property?

Mr GREGORY - Limited access?

Mr GREEN - Limited access, I should say.

Mr GREGORY - I do not know the full history but I understand a portion of the road through his property is proclaimed as limited access -

Mr GREEN - With the double lane?

Mr GREGORY - Yes, and you mentioned compensation to various things, too. When the State declares limited access, it is effectively taking away the property owner's right to access and it compensates the property owner.

CHAIR - Any further on that issue?

Mr HALL - Just one, Mr Chairman, and I did ask the question before, I think, in regard to the draft priority order on that one that Mr Mackinnon supplied to the committee which was dated -

CHAIR - 28 June 1999.

Mr HALL - Yes, and the crest and slope improvement at Mountford you talked about near the reservoir taking - so that is not on the radar, could you just reiterate that again? That is not on the radar at this stage?

Mr GREGORY - It is not on the Forward Work Program.

Mr HALL - Okay.

CHAIR - And the Forward Work Program covers what period of time, please, Shane?

Mr GREGORY - The Forward Work Program typically runs out four or five years and as the program gets further out it is, if you like, more rubbery and it is not as solid in its context. So we know exactly what we are doing this year, we are 99 per cent sure of what we are doing next year but by the time we get five years out we might be 50 per cent sure. By the time we get five years out not everything has committed funding, whereas the things we are doing this year have committed funding and next year will have committed funding.

Mr HALL - You also mentioned before the Federal Government does not consider it to be part of the National Highway system AusLink. Is there any likelihood that may change in future? You have been told it is not at the moment, but has there been any pressure put on or has the question been asked?

Mr GREGORY - The question has been asked previously. I do not think it will change. The Federal Government has been very firm that it does not think it should be funding what it calls 'parallel works', so it would consider the Illawarra Main Road to be - although it does not meet the strict definition of parallel - a parallel route to the Midland Highway and Bass Highway and their view is they fund improvements on the Midland Highway and the Bass Highway, so why would they fund another connection?

The AusLink funding which is now known as the National Land Transport Network is targeted at what the Federal Government believes to be projects of national significance. That very much constrains what they think money should be available for.

CHAIR - Gentlemen, that concludes the questions from the committee subsequent to Mr Mckinnon's presentation to us so, again, we thank you for your earlier presentation and your subsequent contributions and answers to our questions.

Mr BEST - In closing off, I am just remembering the stock underpass at the road we inspected between Wynyard and Smithton. I am trying to think how that was resolved. Maybe we should talk in committee about that.

CHAIR - Yes.

Mrs NAPIER - Was that Federally funded?

Mr BEST - No, I do not think so. No, it was a State funding.

CHAIR - Okay, thank you very much.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.