

PUBLIC

THE PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS MET AT THE
SCOTTSDALE LIBRARY MEETING ROOM, SCOTTSDALE, ON WEDNESDAY
15 DECEMBER 2021

TASMAN HIGHWAY-SIDELING UPGRADE

Mr GREG HOWARD, MAYOR, DORSET COUNCIL, WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

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

Mr HOWARD - I do.

CHAIR - Thank you very much.

Mr HOWARD - I just wish I had that at council.

CHAIR - Well, yes. It is an important thing, though, for people to understand. Over to you to make your submission.

Mr HOWARD - Thank you, Chair, for the opportunity to address the committee. It's much appreciated. The project that you are addressing is probably my pet project, I suppose. Ever since I've been on council, I've pushed very hard for the upgrade.

The north-east is probably the only substantial area of prime agricultural land in the state that doesn't have a reasonable B-double access. There is B-double access in and out of the municipality via Bridport Road, the Flinders Highway and either up through Lebrina, or all the way to George Town and up the East Tamar, but that adds considerable distance to the trip and time and it still lands you on the northern side of the City of Launceston. If you look at both the inbound and the outbound freight from the north-east, probably less than 10 per cent of that inbound and outbound freight either emanates from, or ends up in, Launceston as a destination and the vast majority, the other 90 per cent, either goes to the central north, the north-west coast or to the southern region.

It is for that reason that we need a road that does not necessarily go through the City of Launceston and goes around the back of it. It is not only a cost saving to local producers and to trucking companies, but it allows a considerable saving in time which is time and money. Speaking to local truckies, they save 60 litres less of diesel if you use the current route to go to Launceston than it takes to go via either the Lilydale way or -

CHAIR - Sixty litres?

Mr HOWARD - Sixty litres of diesel per trip. It is not an insignificant amount and it is also probably 30 to 40 minutes because it can sometimes take you 30 minutes to get through the City of Launceston in peak hour traffic and it is no picnic travelling up Wellington Street or down Bathurst Street in a B-double in peak hour traffic.

We have been pushing for this really hard. We did a considerable amount of research as a council before I went to the federal Liberal Party and asked for an election commitment. That was a considerable amount of work, speaking with most of the large companies and the local trucking companies as to the amount of freight that they cart in and out of the north-east, and which route they would take in the event that we upgraded the Sideling. We appreciate there is a large amount of timber that goes to Bell Bay and will still continue to go to Bell Bay; and there would be some agricultural produce that comes from the Bridport-Waterhouse area which would probably still go to George Town, across the Batman and down to the north-west coast. So, of the available freight that is probably going to use the Sideling, if the Sideling was upgraded, we are still looking at close to a million tonnes worth of freight to go over the Sideling on an upgraded basis.

On a cost basis, we think that somewhere in the order of \$8 to \$10 a tonne would be the cost savings on a million tonnes of freight. That is a considerable amount of savings for the north-east, and if you compare that against the \$120 million that is now budgeted for the entire project, it is still a pretty good return on your investment. At the time we first decided we wanted to chase the money, we had on our staff an engineer/project manager who we got to cost the project. He did do the second part of the project around the current route, around the back of the Sideling, and it came in at \$43 million.

We decided that we would add at least 20 per cent contingencies on that, which took it to \$51 million and a bit. Before we went any further, we fact checked that with Shaw Contracting. We submitted the plans and the numbers to Shaw and said, have a look at this for us and see where you think we are; are we on the money or are we too short or too light? Their response was, 'No, we think you are pretty close to the mark, \$50 million should build the whole project'. We were pretty confident in that number, in that we just finished the western access road into Bridport which is 2.8 kilometres long, it is a greenfield site, we had an \$800 000 bridge to build and we built it for less than \$5 million.

CHAIR - This was the council?

Mr HOWARD - This was the council, yes. When we went to the federal government I had a discussion with Michael McCormack and he said, because it is obviously not our road, 'If you are going to give this project to the state or federal government department you can double that cost and add some', and that is where we are planned. That \$50 million has grown to \$120 million - somewhat to our shock to be honest. We have an existing road and I know it is not easy building up through there; I have a considerable amount of experience in road design and road construction from a forestry point of view, and I know that's not building a highway but the principles are the same. I was rather shocked by the \$120 million. I understand there are a lot of processes in how the Department would go about it that we probably would not have to do in a forestry situation.

PUBLIC

I am very much in support of the project and I think it is absolutely necessary for the survival and for the sustainability of the north-east. We had a situation where there were a couple of large farms for sale in the Winnaleah area. As it turned out, potential buyers from the mainland flew into Launceston, got half-way over the Sideling and turned around and went back and said, 'No, we are not interested'. The road was that scary to them. To us who drive it all the time it's not that scary except if you meet a semi-trailer or something on one of those corners.

CHAIR - Two B-doubles meeting on a corner.

Mr HOWARD - Yes. It's pretty tight. We have a lot of shock-horror stories from tourists who have never accessed roads like that where they've come from. To meet one of those trucks on the corners is particularly scary for them.

The business case, we worked with Adrian Mythen in the lead-up to consult with the Department and Adrian was really good. Out of that, we worked out that while following the existing route, which is that part you are looking at at the moment, the second part of the route would be preferable down through Corkerys Road.

Originally, they said it was too steep but I had already plotted a route which I proved to them, in the end, wasn't too steep. It's certainly less than the 12 per cent that they said they need for B-double access. So, that's the second part of the project, not to be considered today. But Shaw's view was that you could shave \$10 million off the cost if you went that way, that's how good the route is. And it is more direct, and it will be less corners.

But, of course, we have to get this part done first and that's important. I think we will struggle as a municipality and as an area. We've spent a considerable amount in money - it must be close to \$100 million now in terms of federal government commitment, state government commitment and local farmers on irrigation schemes and extending the Winnaleah scheme, the Ringarooma scheme and the Headquarters Road scheme, and the new Scottsdale Irrigation Scheme. So, we have a very large amount of water available which should mean a huge increase in the amount of produce produced in the district. We obviously need a suitable route to get that produce to market at a reasonable cost.

About five or six years ago, we had some salad retailers from Victoria who were very keen on growing salad vegetables in the north-east because when it gets to 35 degrees in Victoria, even under shade, they just wilt. So, they came over here and looked at our average temperatures and we've got the ideal ground, the ideal temperature, the water, everything that is needed. The only thing that stopped us was ready access from here to the airport to get that produce on the plane.

I commend this project, obviously, to the committee. I think it is very important for the north-east that it goes ahead. I had some reservations when I spoke briefly with the Department about how the project might actually occur. One of those things is that I would have thought that the road needs to be closed to do the first part. The reason for that is that, I know from our own experience, that you could probably add 35 per cent to the cost if you use road traffic management. That is not just the cost of traffic management but it's the lost production by having to use smaller equipment.

PUBLIC

If you are going to have traffic management, you're probably going to be up there with at 25-tonne excavator and a few 10-yarders. Whereas, if you can close the road, you can probably bring in a 50- to 100-tonne excavator, dump trucks and a D11, and smash it out very quickly, the major construction part. Then you can reopen the road while they are doing -

CHAIR - Do you think the community would be broadly supportive of that?

Mr HOWARD - Yes, we've had considerable discussions, especially with the people who live in the Springfield area, which will be the most affected. We have alternative routes. Lilydale Road is an alternative route. For those people in the Springfield area, they can either go up over the Camden and come out at Myrtle Park or they can take Koomeela Road which is a shortcut through to Lilydale Road. I think they would be more tolerant of the shorter full road closure than they would be of an 18-month interruption, where you sit up there. We know for a fact that some of the rocks are going to need to be blown, so you could be sitting there for a considerable time after a blast before they actually clear the road and let the traffic through.

CHAIR - So, extra distance going those ways.

Mr HOWARD - They're not worried. We have consulted extensively on that and everyone is so keen to get the new road that they're prepared to put up with a bit of pain to get a result at the end.

CHAIR - Okay, thank you.

Ms RATTRAY - Thanks, Greg. Really appreciate you coming along today and certainly your passion for this project, and I share that.

In regard to any excess resource, the dirt that comes out, the materials, we talked about earlier today and I know it is important to be able to reuse some of that. Do you have a view around that?

Mr HOWARD - The product we're talking about, it's essentially sedimentary rock through there, which is ideal road-building product. There will be a considerable amount of fill required in the next section, between Whish Wilson Road and Scottsdale, and it would be remiss of us not to use that product. It's 70 000 cubic metres, from memory.

CHAIR - That figure is largely sandstone?

Mr HOWARD - That's sandstone, sedimentary rock, yes. That would be ideal fill for places like across the Brid River flat and for a lot of the other, for that section at Scottsdale. I would like to see some of that crushed, stored and used in the next section.

Where you store it is probably up to the contractors. If you store it up the top, that's a mixture of Crown land and state forest. If you're going to store it down the bottom, you would have to do some sort of deal with private land owners.

The contractors who have tendered for the project have already approached some land owners down the bottom about just dumping the product in gullies and swamps, and stuff like that, and not reclaiming it. I think that would be a massive waste, especially if you are then

PUBLIC

short of resource on that next section and you have to go and buy fill and road base to complete the second part of the project.

Ms BUTLER - As a supplementary to that, with your experience in this area, what kind of cost savings do you think that could provide by using that fill on the next stage? Are we talking a few hundred thousand dollars?

Mr HOWARD - We're talking a couple of million I reckon, at a guess. It will be a significant amount. I don't know the exact price -

CHAIR - Through avoided cost, you mean?

Mr HOWARD - If you dump all the existing soil from up there and you have to buy it, and you need 70 000 cubic metres that you're going to buy for fill down the bottom, at whatever the price is per cubic metre, it's going to be massive.

CHAIR - You're also transporting it if you're dumping it somewhere else.

Mr HOWARD - That's right. Unfortunately, the design for that second piece between Whish Wilson Road and Scottsdale is not finished. If it was, you could literally dump it in its end zone basically, where it's needed.

Mr TUCKER - Following on from that, you make a very good point about that fill, because I think at the Perth Link Road, they actually dug a dam to build that road, which I thought was, because it takes all the truck movements and that sort of thing off the -

CHAIR - They dug what?

Mr TUCKER - They dug a dam there on Ian McKinnon's land and it was actually a hill of rock. They took the hill away and dug a dam at the same time and built the whole of that Perth Link Road from that hill and the dam site. It just takes all those truck movements off the road.

But, also, the interesting point that you're saying there about the road closure, with the building of that road, that was all closed and people went through Perth. It was quite well engineered and designed. It worked quite well, which is quite an interesting point that you're making with this one. The other thing that I see with what you're saying, we need to get more things done through the year and if we can quicken the process of getting those roads built, yes, you're right, we have a little bit of pain, but if the community is supportive of it, and that's what you're saying - the community *is* supportive of it, it opens a lot of options to get more roadworks and more of these projects built quicker throughout the year. I see a lot of merit in what you're saying.

Mr HOWARD - Totally agree with that.

Ms RATTRAY - We had some discussions this morning about the informal pull-over bays, lay-bys, that are already existing as you're coming up from Scottsdale to the top of the Sideling and we've been told that two of those will stay -

CHAIR - Will be formalised.

PUBLIC

Ms RATTRAY - Will be formalised, which is pleasing. But also, I suggested that at the top of the Sideling Lookout that there be an actual passing lane because that's the only place you can safely pass till once you get off that, past the St Patricks River bridge. Would you support that?

Mr HOWARD - Certainly, those little mini-passing lanes work very well on the mainland. I was in Victoria just before COVID-19 took over and I went to speak at a cycling conference at Omeo -

Ms RATTRAY - You don't ride a bike, though?

Mr HOWARD - No, I know. I went to talk to them about how we built Derby.

The road from Lakes Entrance to Omeo has those. There were half a dozen of them. They work really well. You can slip half a dozen cars through the inside of a slow-moving truck. I agree with that. I certainly agree that straight up past the lookout is the only possible opportunity that cars have to pass slow-moving vehicles on the upward side of the siding.

Depending on the design on the other side, they might be an opportunity as well. I would support a passing lane on that straight.

CHAIR - Something we can explore. Any further questions?

Mr HOWARD - I think we've covered everything.

Ms RATTRAY - I would like to extend my thanks on behalf of those members who came a bit early this morning and met with both yourself and GM Tim Watson. It was very useful. Thank you.

CHAIR - Before you go, I have to remind you that once you leave the table you need to be aware that parliamentary 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?

Mr HOWARD - Yes.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Mr SVEN MEYER, PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM LEADER AND **Mr KILLIAN PEDDELL**, PROJECT MANAGER, DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION, AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR - I think you know this, but I have to inform you of it. This hearing is a proceeding in parliament. That means it receives the protection of parliamentary privilege. It is an important legal protection that allows individuals giving evidence to a parliamentary committee to speak with complete freedom without the fear of being sued or questioned in any court or place out of parliament. It applies to ensure that parliament receives the very best information when conducting its inquiries. It is important to be aware that this protection is not accorded to you if statements that may be defamatory are repeated or referred to by you outside the confines of the parliamentary proceedings.

This is a public hearing. Members of the public and journalists may be present, which means your evidence may be reported. Do you understand?

Mr PEDDELL - Yes.

Mr MEYER - Yes.

Mr PEDDELL - Thank you Chair, and thank you for the opportunity to address the committee.

Good afternoon. My name is Killian Peddell. I am a project manager with State Roads, responsible for the delivery of the Sideling Upgrade projects. With me today is Sven Meyer, project manager team leader.

Today we are seeking your approval for the Sideling Upgrade project stage 1. The Sideling Upgrade project is aimed to increase freight productivity and road safety for all road users.

The project will upgrade 15 kilometres of the Tasman Highway to B-double standard, between Corkerys Road and Minstone Road intersections, including road widening, shoulder sealing and the construction of stopping bays. The project follows extensive option analysis, community consultation and thorough engagement with directly impacted landowners.

The selected design widens the existing alignment, improves corner curvature and installs stopping bays for slow vehicles.

The Project will achieve the following benefits:

- Improved travel time reliability for commercial operators and travelling transport between Bridport, Scottsdale, and Launceston;
- There is a calculated six-minute time saving for heavy vehicles through this package
- Improved safety for heavy vehicles and road users by providing wider lanes, improved corner curvature to allow B-doubles to stay in their current lane, sealing shoulders and passing opportunities

PUBLIC

- Increased economic prosperity for the north east and providing safe and compliant access routes;
- Upgrading of existing intersections and access for property owners;
- Increase heavy vehicle accessibility by 40 per cent. Current estimates are that 260 heavy vehicles use the route per day; it is expected to be 440;
- The creation of 30 jobs throughout the duration of construction;
- Reducing accident rates;
- Safety improvements will be delivered by road widening, inclusion of stopping bays, hairpin bend realignments, improved traffic management at intersections and property access;
- Vehicle-operating cost savings.

In 2019, the Commonwealth and state governments committed \$50 million to upgrade the Sideling as part of the Roads of Strategic Importance initiative. The total project forecast is \$46.9 million as a P50 estimate for the highway upgrades. Project costs are estimated on engineering modelling and estimates that exist for similar projects.

The project has a benefit-cost ratio of three, which means the project benefits will exceed the costs three-fold. Construction is planned to commence in January next year and be completed in late 2024.

Overall, I submit that this project will enhance access to north-east Tasmania and upgrade a key logistical link between the north-east and the rest of the state, improve safety for heavy vehicles and general road users, and will reduce accident frequency and increase travel time reliability.

We have worked with the community and impacted stakeholders, and will continue to do so during the process and post-construction. The project has a strong benefit-cost ratio. In conclusion, this project is good use of taxpayers' money.

CHAIR - Thank you. Do you have anything add at this point, Sven?

Mr MEYER - No, nothing further.

CHAIR - Okay. Over to members to ask any questions. Mr Tucker?

Mr TUCKER - Thank you, Chair. We have to look at whether we are going to get maximum benefit for the taxpayer dollar with what we are proposing here. The witness before was talking about a 35 per cent decrease in the cost if we close the road. Could you expand a little bit on whether that is correct, in your understanding? If we close the road, will we decrease the cost by about 35 per cent - or, how much would it decrease the cost by?

PUBLIC

Mr PEDDELL - At this point we are not aware of the exact percentage. I can take that on notice and get back to you, if that is suitable.

CHAIR - That will be handy, if we can just make a note of that, Mr Secretary.

Mr TUCKER - Are we going to close the road when we're building this? Is that what is being proposed, or are we looking at that?

Mr PEDDELL - Currently the project will keep one lane open during the construction period, when the construction crews are working, and both lanes will be open outside of those construction times.

Mr TUCKER - Closing the road has not been looked at, within the scope of this?

Mr PEDDELL - It has been discussed in early consultation with key stakeholders, and that is something the Department will discuss and explore with the successful tenderer.

Mr TUCKER - Right. The other thing, as I discussed there with the previous witness, is that by closing the road, there is a decrease in the time that it will take to build the road. Is that correct? If we close the road, we would get it done quicker?

Mr PEDDELL - In consultation with contractors in the development of this project, they have echoed the previous witness's comments that closing the road would likely accelerate the program.

Mr TUCKER - By how much?

Mr PEDDELL - At this point an exact time frame would not be known, but the Department would discuss that with the successful tenderer. I could take that on notice if you would like me to look at that further?

Mr TUCKER - If you could look at that, to give us a time line of how long it would take to build the road if we closed it, and how long it would take if we had one lane closed - which is what is put forward at the moment. If we close the road it means we can get through the work quicker and get another project out the door as well, which I see as a major benefit for the state. It's something that we should look more at with road building as we're going along where we can in closing roads, if this is the case. It would be interesting to look at that.

CHAIR - Where you've got alternative accesses?

Mr TUCKER - Yes. Now the other thing that the previous witness brought up was about the 70 000 cubic metres of fill. Is that figure correct, about 70 000 cubic metres of fill?

Mr PEDDELL - I don't have on hand the exact figure with me today, my apologies. I can take that on notice if you'd like me to indicate that?

Ms RATTRAY - It's obviously been spoken about.

Mr PEDDELL - Through section 1, I believe is what you're referring to, the first section?

PUBLIC

CHAIR - He might have been plucking the figure out of the air, but I don't think so.

Mr TUCKER - We just need confirmation that that's what the figure is and the cost. Number one, can we store it at the top there on Crown land, or on STT land, and what would the cost saving be to the community through doing that with this road?

Mr MEYER - We can say that there is still a significant amount of cut - material taken out - in the first stage and then a significant amount of material - fill - needed in the second.

Mr TUCKER - If what you're saying is correct, there are obviously significant savings there. I'm not sure whether it's better to store it at the top, or whether you're better to take it to the bottom while we've got that section of road closed, if we do go down that path, and store it somewhere down lower so we don't have to come down the road and keep those trucks off the road. It's a bit like I mentioned with the Perth link. What they did with that road was a tremendous piece of engineering. Everyone won out of that. We've taken that hill of rock away, dug a dam and took all those trucks off the road. It saves our roads and it saves transport. Saves everywhere, and everyone is happy. I see some really good points, as I think the rest of the committee here sees some really good points that were brought up that we need to look at and get answers to before making the decision on this proposal that you're putting forward to us.

CHAIR - Just in terms of the dollars spent. We're not engineers, but given the suggestion it would be good to have some information on that, so that we can decide the value of it.

Mr PEDDELL - Just for a point on that, the Department will work with the successful contractor to look at costs and time savings with the repurposing of the sprawl. If not, alternate solutions to store that, to be used in section 2, which is currently being designed as we speak.

Ms BUTLER - A supplementary to Mr Tucker's previous question around the closure, or potential road closure. Would community consent for a short period of road closure assist the Department with making that decision, or a contractor making that decision? Would that be helpful?

Mr PEDDELL - Community consultation -

Ms BUTLER - A consent from the community, an agreeance?

Mr PEDDELL - A consent from the community would be definitely something that we would look for, but we would engage the community to get a formal understanding of their position and that would help us shape our decision.

Ms RATTRAY - Given that you've already let the tender and there's a commencement date - you said January, I was of the understanding it was February -

Mr PEDDELL - Sorry, subject to parliamentary -

Ms RATTRAY - Yes; but how are you going to get community consent before you indicate to the successful tenderer that this is the way that the Department would like to see the works unfold? I just don't see a realistic time frame to do that.

Mr PEDDELL - The Department will continue to engage with the community to determine their favour, or disfavour for shutting the road and that will help inform our decision. The time frames around that - if the contractor was to commence in January there would be time allocated for their site mobilisation before they can physically start the works, and the Department would work with the stakeholders and the council to determine whether or not that closing the road, if one is possible, and two, is favourable.

Ms RATTRAY - How much more community consultation/support do you need, other than the mayor sitting at this table telling you there has been a significant amount of consultation with the community over a long period? This funding has been available since 2019, and it is nearly 2022, so it is not new to the community. Would you need to be able to say that we are comfortable, that the community generally supports this, the majority support it?

Mr PEDDELL - I guess when we talk about the community, we are not just talking about the community of people who live in the Scottsdale area. It would also include people who travel through the area, and the transport association that uses it for freight, any emergency access, local landholders and those sorts of things.

We've consulted with the majority of those people and they generally came back in favour of it. I guess when we put the tender out, we generally don't advocate for full closure of roads, because the tender period for this particular section is 18 months. So we said that you can close one lane, but then we work with the successful tenderer to work out the time frames of when you would close it. You may close it for a certain amount of time to clear the vegetation and for significant removal of material, but we probably don't think it is suitable to close it for an extended duration.

Ms RATTRAY - What's your version of extended duration?

Mr PEDDELL - Months at a time, probably.

Ms RATTRAY - Again, that's the community discussion.

Mr PEDDELL - Sometimes we start off where we close the road for a couple of weeks for vegetation removal, and everything works really well, and the community is generally positive, then the contractor works extended hours. It is a bit of trial and error sometimes.

CHAIR - It might be something that would involve council decision. With due respect to the mayor, obviously he has his finger on the pulse, but it might be something that the council might vote on, and then other stakeholders.

The other point, in terms of community benefit in only having a single lane open as opposed to full closure, is frustration and productivity delay and things like that. If you have extra information to add, it would be good. There seems to be a benefit in full closure of the road, but it is something you have to work out.

Ms RATTRAY - It is very pleasing to see that two or three of those stopping bays that are already in place will be formalised through this upgrade. I did notice the project summary says, 'addition of passing lanes'. They are different. A passing lane is different to a stop.

PUBLIC

Mr PEDDELL - That is correct. Stage 1, section 2, which is from Minstone Road to Whish-Wilson Road, is still being developed, and the Department is working with our designers to evaluate any options through that section to provide passing opportunities for the traffic. So, to improve travel time reliability.

Ms RATTRAY - This morning while we were at the Sideling Lookout, we took the opportunity to take notice of the significant stretch of road as we climb up to the Sideling Lookout from Scottsdale and then before we get to Corkerys Road, where the new works are going to finish at this point. We discussed a passing lane opportunity there. That is not in the design?

Mr PEDDELL - That is currently not in the design, but I can take that on notice to discuss with our design consultants the possibility of an inclusion, if we can do that.

Ms RATTRAY - We have already identified a significant saving with reuse of materials. That's a pine tree plantation going up on the right-hand side, so they're certainly not trees that can't be removed. There's a significant amount of road verge into the Sideling lookout as well. That would be a useful use I believe. I am no engineer but as a road user I am prolific. I know and understand where people's frustrations lay because that's where mine lay.

Mr PEDDELL - Yes, I appreciate that, thank you. I will get a response for you.

Mr MEYER - We will have a talk to the designers about that. That section of road will be widened as per all other sections. The existing overtaking opportunity will be better and easier after vegetation removal.

Ms RATTRAY - A designated passing lane is so much safer than just taking the chance that you are going to be able to get around. As one of my colleagues said earlier today, for some reason when you start overtaking someone they decide to speed up, often. I don't know if that is human nature but it happens, particularly signed vehicles. That's worth looking at. My last question is about the cost-benefit ratio. What would the likes of the Marrawah upgrade be? This one you said is three, would a road like that have a ratio assessment or is that something you wouldn't know?

Mr PEDDELL - I don't have those statistics with me today. I can take that on notice.

Ms RATTRAY - But three is significant; am I correct in saying that?

Mr PEDDELL - Three is an impressive number to reach, which strengthens the Department's position on this as a good use of taxpayers' money.

CHAIR - So most things might be around the two or something?

Mr MEYER - Quite often they are just 1:1.

Ms RATTRAY - Or less than one.

Mr MEYER - It really depends on the number of vehicles and the time savings and those sorts of things.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Or safety issues.

Ms RATTRAY - I was very pleased to see that it had been identified at such a high level of cost-ratio. I support that.

CHAIR - Can we move through the pages? Do we have any specific questions on the introduction page?

Mr TUCKER - I am not sure when to bring this one up, Chair. You would have a hydrology report for this road and I know this is fairly straightforward. Could we be provided with that?

Mr PEDDELL - I can provide that one.

Ms RATTRAY - We're giving you a lot of homework.

Mr PEDDELL - That is no problem at all.

Mr MEYER - Is there something specific you are interested in, in terms of hydrology?

Mr TUCKER - It is what I spoke to you earlier this morning about.

CHAIR - Put on the record what it is so that we get a clear understanding.

Mr TUCKER - It was a section of road on the Midland Highway with a drainage issue where the water wasn't draining away under the highway. The water was sitting under the highway and it needs to be fixed. That is why when the Public Works Committee looks at roadworks, we need to look at the hydrology report to make sure that that water is being drained away and not left sitting there.

Mr MEYER - Sure. I understand that.

CHAIR - Okay. Anything on page one? Move across to the maps. A good understanding of where the location is. We have the scope here. The scope is well understood and covered in your introductory remarks. The options. For the record, if we look at the top map - *Hansard* can't see the map - there are a couple of yellow lines on the map which indicate possible routes that were considered. Can you tell us why they weren't considered achievable?

Ms RATTRAY - The straightening of those aspects of the road.

CHAIR - To get rid of some of the corners.

Mr PEDDELL - The map that you are referring to, figure three of the document, shows the lines highlighted in yellow. They were discounted because of the gradient. The gradient was too steep to be compliant with B-double standards.

The other proposed, which is the purple lines, are possible ones that we can explore. It is worth noting that this section here, in Figure Three, is in a later stage.

PUBLIC

The one below, in Figure Four, is above that first hair-pin bend that we looked at this morning, along the Tasman Highway, which had that shortcut, almost, through there. We looked at that option there as a realignment. That opportunity is to improve that 700 metre length of road. Unfortunately, the gradient across that duration there was also too steep, and doesn't meet the current B-double standards, which is the scope of the project.

Mr TUCKER - Quick clarification. Purple lines?

Mr PEDDELL - Apologies. On Figure Three there. Pinky, purple lines.

CHAIR - With Figure Three, that red main red line. What is this?

Mr PEDDELL - This is Corkerys Road. At the top, where that meets the Tasman Highway, which is the blue line, that is the start of this current stage that we are discussing, which then works north up off that map towards Scottsdale.

CHAIR - But just for the record - Corkerys Road: you are using that or you're not using it?

Mr PEDDELL - Corkerys Road is part of a later stage.

CHAIR - Stage 2.

Mr PEDDELL - The first witness was referring to this as Corkerys Road as an alternate route.

Mr MEYER - It's Stage 2; subject to separate funding and separate standing committee approval.

Ms RATTRAY - In Figure 4, where it says this particular option was discounted due to the vertical grade of over 15 percent, which doesn't comply with the B-double requirements. Was that around 200 metres of that 700 metres that was non-compliant?

Mr PEDDELL - I am not sure exactly but the options analysis, when the design engineers reviewed this as an option, it was deemed that it was not suitable for B-doubles.

It is an approximately 700 metre stretch, but what you are probably referring to is, only some of it is compliant.

Ms RATTRAY - Was that that 15 percent?

Mr PEDDELL - I don't have the statistics on me today, about how much of that 700 metres doesn't meet the gradient required; although I would suggest that, even if it is a very short period of that section there, that route wouldn't be compliant. It wouldn't be possible.

Ms RATTRAY - It's still not possible, even if it is only 50 metres of the 700 metres; it still doesn't comply with the B-double requirements.

Mr PEDDELL - That is my understanding, as a non-engineer.

PUBLIC

Ms RATTRAY - These are the questions that the community will ask us. Why did you approve that? Why didn't we do this?

Mr PEDDELL - Unfortunately, it's not compliant.

CHAIR - It's always good to know those sorts of things.

Mr TUCKER - It is interesting, where the old route went with the Sideling. What you are saying there and the possible realignment of that; the old blokes got it pretty right in a lot of ways.

Mr PEDDELL - Follow the existing route.

Mr TUCKER - They worked things out pretty well.

Mr MEYER - Absolutely.

Ms RATTRAY - I talked to a guy this morning whose grandfather surveyed the Sideling.

A Mr Scott had designed that, had surveyed that road.

CHAIR - Okay, moving on - project costs; unless someone has something on 2.3 there, in terms of the scope of the project?

Ms BUTLER - I'd better ask the question around threatened flora and fauna, and attacks on prime agricultural land. If you could just run through that with us and also make sure that there are no orchids?

CHAIR - Something that's going to jump up and rear its head.

Mr PEDDELL - We completed a natural values assessment of the area, and the area associated with the works, and it was concluded that there was no threatened flora or fauna in that area. There is a section that we'll get to further in the report that speaks to that. There was identified some wedge-tailed eagle nests further into the bushlands. We found that one was active. We did some line-of-sight modelling and concluded that the nest did not have line of sight with the Tasman Highway, so these works would not impact that active eagle's nest.

Mr TUCKER - Currently on Compliance in section 8, there are no restrictions at all on this road, correct?

Mr PEDDELL - That's correct.

Ms RATTRAY - Any timber that needs to be removed for the works to be undertaken, there's an arrangement with STT to be able to use that resource?

Mr PEDDELL - A lot of the areas where large vegetation is required to be removed is on Sustainable Timber Tasmania or DPIWE land and that would be a negotiation that we'd have with them, for them to harvest that vegetation and to -

Ms RATTRAY - And chip it if we have to, or use it.

Mr PEDDELL - Use it, definitely.

CHAIR - Project cost. It's interesting on 3.1, with regard to the contingency, that contingency, P50, is a contingency of 18.9 per cent. P90 has a contingency of 26 per cent. Can you explain why that would be?

Mr PEDDELL - The P90 figure is to assume that variations - I might just hand this to you, Sven. You probably have a more rounded understanding of the P50 and P90 calculations.

Mr MEYER - The P50 is the funding that we have got approval to spend and the P90 is the available funding that you could spend if you had lots of unfavourable conditions or unknown issues that you weren't aware of. Why it's quite high is that for this particular project, when it went out for tender, we haven't done a full, detailed design. We've done what is called a design with a schedule of rates. It's not a detailed design in a lump sum contract because we were keen to get this project to market. It's a limited design and a schedule of rates. The contractors put in rates for quantities of material and, as we're working through with the contractors, that rate will increase or decrease, depending on the changing quantities and rates.

Mr TUCKER - Just quickly following on from the question there, Chair, coming back to that 70 000 cubic metres of fill. It looks like there is potential for aggregate out of that. Will that reduce some of these figures if we can crush the material on site for use in the road? It's probably more in section 2, than in section 1 because that's where that fill is going to go. Have we done any figures on - I suppose we haven't because we've got to look at that.

Mr MEYER - We're still working through the design on the second section, but yes, definitely that's part of the contingency, how much material you re-use, or have to import.

Mr TUCKER - So there's potential there to reduce the cost; 70 000 cubic metres is a lot of material.

Mr MEYER - That's right.

Mr TUCKER - When you look at a 10-yard truck and it's 10 cubic metres in a 10-yard truck and you've got 70 000, that's a lot of 10-yard trucks.

Mr MEYER - That's correct.

CHAIR - I suppose at the end of the day though, too, the friability of what gets taken out and all of those sorts of things needs to be taken into account as to whether it's suitable.

Ms RATTRAY - You won't get all of it but you'll certainly get a significant amount.

Mr TUCKER - Even the stuff that isn't good for aggregate could be used for fill. Different sections of that road can be used for different parts, so there is a potential for a huge amount of savings if that figure is correct.

Mr MEYER - If you're looking at savings, yes, you can look at the contingency of where it expects there could be increases or decreases, whereas the base cost is what we expect it to

PUBLIC

be costing. If we can get some significant savings through good construction methodology, then this figure in the contingency is money we could spend for further parts on the road.

CHAIR - The escalation, I know this is almost the same for both - one is 4.1 per cent and the other 4.15 per cent. I am assuming that the P90 which is 90 per cent of the estimates are in the ballpark. That is not going to make much difference on the escalation. The escalation is either there or it's not, and it's going to be the same for both?

Mr MEYER - Yes, pretty much, that is correct. It is worth noting that escalation is a real and current factor in today's market. The price of material is significantly changing, often at a monthly rate. It's not just steel and diesel; there are quite a number of materials that are changing and a lot of the tenders we are currently receiving, there's been some advice around that.

CHAIR - It is the nature of the beast at the moment.

Mr MEYER - It is.

Mr TUCKER - Short carting is a huge saving. When you look at the price of diesel and the price of AdBlue.

Ms RATTRAY - If you can even get AdBlue. It's even hard to get at the moment.

Mr TUCKER - That's the problem, because of the price of it.

CHAIR - Any other questions on that side of it? Let's move across. Project benefits.

Ms RATTRAY - It's very clear what the benefits are, Chair.

CHAIR - What is the travel time/distance difference between the Sideling and alternative routes? Probably, at the moment, the member on my left might be able to tell me, if you are going to Launceston from Scottsdale on the other route, how much longer it takes to do that as opposed to the Sideling?

Ms RATTRAY - It all depends how long it takes you to get through on that East Tamar Highway and up Wellington Street and on the Southern Outlet. Some days that can take you half an hour. You are avoiding that if you go the Sideling way and you're heading to Hobart or to Powranna or to Smithton, you would take out that. Even having to go as a large heavy vehicle, having to go through Waverly because you can't come down Abels Hill Road, of course.

CHAIR - I guess the reason I asked the question is that this is giving a six-minute saving?

Mr PEDDELL - A six minute saving for heavy vehicles.

CHAIR - Is that going to make a person toss up as to which way they go?

Ms RATTRAY - It's that ease of access. It might be six minutes less to get to St Leonards or to get to where you go down Abels Hill Road. But, actually, getting through the city of Launceston, that's the challenging part.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - If you were a truck going from Scottsdale to the Batman Bridge, you are going to take the top road anyway, aren't you?

Ms BUTLER - You might need to take this on notice. I was wondering how many light vehicles utilise Sidelings Road and Powranna and how many heavy vehicles utilise that part of the road.

Mr PEDDELL - I can tell you per day. I believe from memory it was 1648 and 16 per cent of those were heavy vehicles. That's statistics from 2008.

CHAIR - One thousand, six hundred and forty-eight?

Mr PEDDELL - I believe so. I can take it on notice and give you the exact number.

CHAIR - And that's per what?

Mr PEDDELL - Per day. Vehicles, per day.

Ms BUTLER - And 16 per cent are heavy.

Ms RATTRAY - Interesting from just the time that we were at the top of the Sideling today, there was a lot of more medium-size and larger vehicles, almost equal percentage.

CHAIR - Time of day, though.

Ms RATTRAY - I would have thought 16 per cent was quite low.

Mr PEDDELL - Sixteen per cent is still quite high.

CHAIR - Sixteen per cent heavy vehicles.

Mr PEDDELL - Yes.

Ms BUTLER - Thank you.

Ms RATTRAY - Good question, Ms Butler.

CHAIR - Finance procurement; any questions on the time lines?

Ms RATTRAY - Are they on track, given that this committee needs to do a final assessment?

Mr PEDDELL - Yes, at the time of publication it says the commencement of work is January. Obviously that is subject to approval by this committee.

Ms RATTRAY - It is always good to hear those words. Sometimes Departments forget.

CHAIR - The sooner we get that information.

PUBLIC

Mr PEDDELL - Absolutely.

CHAIR - You understand that. And stage 1, section 2, that is as it is.

Mr PEDDELL - That is a continuing design.

Ms RATTRAY - Survey is ongoing.

Mr MEYER - Just to highlight that; stage 1, section 1, the construction period is up to 18 months which would be into May 2023. The plan is to go out to tender for section 2 in June 2022 which means they will then start work and be working concurrently with the other section. Then there is of course that potential to move fill from one to the other. It might be a bit of an advantage for the successful contractor in the first stage to go for second stage, but sometimes that does not work out and sometimes the contractor for the second stage has purchased the material from the first section and the material still gets used.

Ms RATTRAY - Is that material owned by the contractor?

Mr MEYER - Yes.

Ms RATTRAY - That whatever will be moved will be owned by the contractor?

Mr MEYER - That's right.

Ms RATTRAY - That's interesting.

Mr TUCKER - That would make it difficult for the second tender, wouldn't it? Am I correct in that?

Mr MEYER - If it is good material then it is still the cheapest source of material and especially then because you are still just putting it on one truck and moving it straight to the other. You are not unloading it and reloading it if the time frame all works out.

Ms RATTRAY - I find it interesting that it is owned by the contractor and not still owned by the Crown.

Mr MEYER - Normally, you just want to dispose of the material.

Mr PEDDELL - I refer to your question earlier, Mr Tucker. During this section if we are starting early next calendar year, there is a few months of work through there, which probably means - and this would be worked through with your contractor - a lot of vegetation removal before exploding spoil. Stage 2 is to commence works in September. Roughly, May to September is that winter shut down period. So, you have only got a few months of work this year, then a shutdown period, and then section 2 will start. In that September next year when the excavations could potentially commence, we would be able to move that soil straight down to there and repurpose it.

The contractors, as I believe yourself and potentially the first witness were talking about being in contact with other landowners about repurposing that soil, is because at this stage, stage 1 is the only section that is out to tender. Stage 2, section 2 is being designed. They need

PUBLIC

to look at alternates to relocate that, with the intent once section 2 design is complete and out to tender and someone has been awarded that contract, that is where we would go down the repurpose towards section 2.

Mr TUCKER - What you were saying to me is that we probably should have done stage 1 and stage 2 together and near enough to make this work more smoothly.

Mr PEDDELL - I think the time lines will still work where they want it - where that large quantity of soil will be repurposed in section 2.

Mr TUCKER - So you think there is enough time with the way it is set out at the moment with the time constraints?

Mr PEDDELL - I believe so, and we will work with those contractors to get them to make that work.

Mr MEYER - There is a significant amount of vegetation clearing. We have got clearing and grubbing, so the first stage of the project will probably take - while we don't need them we have got the tenders, when we review the tenders - but it could take up to two months just to clear the vegetation and do the initial clearing.

Ms RATTRAY - Not if you close the road.

Mr MEYER - Even then, there is a large number of trees.

CHAIR - Before we get off that topic of fill - you are saying it belongs to the contractor. Does that mean that the contractor is likely to charge for that fill then being repurposed on site?

Mr MEYER - Yes, generally if it is good material they would charge. Normally if you go to a private landholder, it depends what arrangement they have, sometimes they have to pay to dump the material.

CHAIR - Maybe that is something to be considered for later. If we do more work on this particular site where possibly the Crown retains its ownership of that material. You are really buying land back that you previously owned only in a different form, in the form of fill. It seems odd.

Mr TUCKER - It should probably be part of the contract that that material is put there and then that material is used in section 2 as part of the tender.

CHAIR - Or is that something you can negotiate now with a contractor?

Mr MEYER - Yes, we can negotiate things at any time. You are talking about stockpiling material for future use.

Ms RATTRAY - Yes, when you are going to be future using. It is not like it's an unknown. It's not even that far away.

CHAIR - You would not want to see the costs escalate because they are purchasing landfill back.

PUBLIC

Mr PEDDELL -As Sven mentioned before, that provides an advantage for people to provide a lower tender price per section. The economies of scale are massive for them to drop it in a truck once, drive it a couple of kilometres down the road and unload it as opposed to even stockpiling where you load up the truck and trailer, drop it off, unload it.

Ms RATTRAY - As long as they don't try to make excess money out of it.

Mr TUCKER - If the road gets closed, it is a lot easier to bring it down in those big dump trucks at that time.

CHAIR - Cheaper, because you can carry heavier loads.

Mr TUCKER - Coming back to the vegetation. What happens to the vegetation that is going to come out of that? You take the logs out of that with STT, but what happens to the rest of it?

Mr MEYER - We are still working through an agreement with Sustainable Timber Tasmania to get access to the land. It is something we will discuss with them in more detail.

Ms RATTRAY - But they can't object to that.

CHAIR - Sorry?

Ms RATTRAY - STT couldn't object. The Crown has an ability to acquire when it's for roads.

Mr MEYER - That's right, correct. We are trying to get early access to the land -

CHAIR - Is there any land acquisition associated with this development?

Mr PEDDELL - There is. As Ms Ratray mentioned before there's Crown to Crown, SST and DPIPWE.

CHAIR - There are no private acquisitions?

Mr PEDDELL - At the bottom of section one and then throughout section two. In section one there are four sections of property and about 80 in section two, which is a bit further in the report. That is just taking slivers off the front to expand the road corridor to allow us to build the road.

Ms RATTRAY - They're not going to have the road in a bedroom like there was once before.

CHAIR - So we are talking about putting fill over the corners. Mr Tucker was talking about this morning on our visit. Where it was considered that might happen, would there be land acquisition associated with that?

PUBLIC

Mr PEDDELL - We would first have a discussion with our engineers if that's a possibility. If that is a possibility then we would look at where the road boundary sits in those specific sections and whether or not acquisition would be required.

CHAIR - You wouldn't be able to say categorically one way or the other?

Mr PEDDELL - Unfortunately not.

Mr MEYER - I guess that is one of the reasons why section two is coming later because there is quite a large number of very small acquisitions that take time to discuss with the landowners.

CHAIR - Okay. Moving to risk and sustainability. Anything major there that you want to highlight in terms of risks? Are there any showstoppers that we need to be aware of?

Mr PEDDELL - No showstoppers to be aware of. The major risk, as with any sort of civil project, would be latent conditions. The P50 and P90 estimates we discussed earlier come into that.

CHAIR - Okay.

Mr PEDDELL - I believe the first witness mentioned they feel there would probably potentially be rock-blasting and those kinds of things that just can't be evaluated until they're exposed.

CHAIR - I worked with the Public Works Department and the Department of Main Roads back in the 1970s and 1980s. They had a lot of people with expertise in engineering and all the rest of it, and it used to work for them, quite clearly, because they used to design and build their own roads. That is not the case at the moment. When you have a problem or an issue with engineering, do you have to go out and consult to get that advice, or is that something you only deal with a contractor about? Can you give us an understanding of that?

Mr PEDDELL - We deal with a contractor, a superintendent who is the contract administrator -

CHAIR - In the Department?

Mr PEDDELL - They're independent. They are the formal line of communication between the Department and the contractor. On the Department's side, we have our engineering consultant who - we would all work together to solve -

CHAIR - Are they employed by State Growth?

Mr PEDDELL - Our engineer design consultant is engaged by the Department, and then the contractor would have their own engineering team that they work with. So, once we come up with a solution, we would all work together.

CHAIR - Are the costs of those consultants or advisers factored into all of this?

Mr PEDDELL - They're factored into these costs here.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - I just wanted to clarify that. Anything else on 6.1, 6.2 major disbenefits? Well I suppose a single lane being open is a disbenefit. It doesn't say it there, but you say -

Large vehicles such as semitrailers will not be able to travel through the site during the construction works due to the need to maintain safe separation between vehicles and workers.

In effect, isn't that saying that the road is going to be blocked off?

Mr PEDDELL - As you experienced today on that road, because of how narrow it is and how narrow the corners are, for us to keep a safe working distance between contractors and the traffic - and how wider a truck needs to swing to get around a corner safely - I believe it was vehicles of 12 metres and above wouldn't be able to use the road during the construction period. For example -

CHAIR - There will be some vehicles that won't be able to use it anyway.

Mr PEDDELL - That's right, and we would communicate that to those stakeholder groups who would be impacted. For example, if the contractors were working between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m., for example, they would have one lane operational during that time, with traffic management. Outside of those times, in the morning and evening, they would have both lanes open - so, just in that daytime period when the physical works are underway is when that would be in effect.

Ms RATTRAY - Again, this is another reason to just shut the road. Bang, get on with it.

CHAIR - Some of them are going to be disadvantaged anyway, so you may as well disadvantage the lot.

Mr PEDDELL - We definitely agree with you that there's a large amount of merit in closing the road.

CHAIR - You've given us the undertaking that you'll look at that. Anything else under 6.2, 6.3? Just to clarify, is the tender stage completed?

Mr PEDDELL - The tender is closed. Those tenders are being reviewed.

CHAIR - They're being reviewed at the moment, okay.

Mr PEDDELL - At the moment, yes.

Ms BUTLER - In relation to the actual design of the project itself, what road standards do we use? Is it the Victorian road standard, or the Australian standard?

Mr MEYER - It's Austroads standards, and Tasmania has adopted the VicRoads specifications.

PUBLIC

Ms BUTLER - Is there any flexibility in the adoption of that standard? How does that work?

CHAIR - How do you mean?

Ms BUTLER - Say, for instance, there's something in the design process that may not meet the VicRoads standard, but it will be suitable for here. Can a design, or can the Department adapt, if it is safe? Is it really structured, and they have to meet that particular standard?

Mr MEYER - All our contracts are set up as Australian Standard and the VicRoads specifications. That is the general framework; but, yes. Occasionally there are circumstances where the VicRoads specifications might not be suitable. Then if there are other specifications, whether it is Queensland or another jurisdiction, they can be looked at. The normal process is we'd use the standard arrangement.

Ms RATTRAY - Because they would have quite different terrain in Victoria and they have a lot deeper pockets.

Ms MEYER - Yep. Also, the material. We use a different geological material.

Ms BUTLER - And they are a lot flatter than us.

CHAIR - They are generally; but then, there are the Alps.

It is interesting. You are in the negotiation phase with the tender. It is possible to negotiate with regard to the fill and the like?

Mr MEYER - It's only just closed.

CHAIR - It gives an opportunity.

Mr MEYER - It certainly does.

CHAIR - To be able to work with in deciding who should or shouldn't get the gig.

Ms RATTRAY - We reissue the tender, who has a D11, let's get going.

Mr PEDDELL - And a 170 tonne excavator.

Ms BUTLER - Got one of those, John?

CHAIR - Seven - stakeholder engagement. Given us a bit of an understanding there.

It has been 'prepared and approved for this project in accordance with the State Roads Stakeholder and Community Engagement Framework and adopts the practices developed by the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2)'.

Do you want to make any comments on that at the moment? How that has gone or how you are planning to progress that?

PUBLIC

Mr PEDDELL - Thank you. Stakeholder engagement went well. We had a display at the Council Chambers which remained active for 2 weeks. The number of representations, I think -

CHAIR - Where was that displayed?

Mr PEDDELL - The Council Chambers here in Scottsdale. We got 66 I think - there is an Appendix in the back of the report.

CHAIR - Yes, you provided that. Just putting it on the record.

Mr PEDDELL - I believe having that number of people attending and following it up afterwards, it is great to see such support from the community for the project.

CHAIR - I think most people see it as a benefit.

Ms RATTRAY - Even in your feedback. Support for closing the road during construction.

Mr PEDDELL - Yes. The support has definitely been there from the public.

CHAIR - As far as noise is concerned? Any major issues.

Mr PEDDELL - No. As far as noise is concerned, the slight increase in traffic and the associated noise with that, it has been decided it's quite a small and insignificant increase.

CHAIR - Insignificant increase over what traffic is currently there.

Mr PEDDELL - Correct.

CHAIR - I suppose, arguably, if they are going slightly faster, it is likely that it is not going to last as long.

Mr PEDDELL - A lot of areas through there too, especially through that first section one, up through the steep part of the Sideling range, there is not a lot of development in that area.

CHAIR - 8.3, 8.4. We have talked about environment, flora and fauna, landscaping and visual amenity.

Heritage. Aboriginal and historic.

Mr PEDDELL - No impact to any Aboriginal heritage as part of this project.

CHAIR - And planning approvals?

Mr PEDDELL - Since the publication of this report the Dorset Council has advised us that these works are exempt, under some of the clauses that are listed there - 5.24, 5.25 and 5.28. A planning permit is not required.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - That's because it's really just a slight upgrade.

Mr PEDDELL - It is under minor works, I believe.

Ms RATTRAY - A question about the proposed speed limit. Will that stay at the maximum of 100 kilometres an hour?

Mr PEDDELL - I believe so. I will double check. I'm pretty sure it's unlikely to change.

Ms RATTRAY - I would like to have that confirmed otherwise.

CHAIR - Just for the record - no central barriers?

Mr PEDDELL - At this stage of the design, there are no central barriers.

Ms RATTRAY - Will there be an opportunity to have double lines? As you might have noticed, there are mostly only single lines.

CHAIR - Well-maintained double lines.

Mr PEDDELL - That will all be developed through our design.

Ms RATTRAY - You would have noticed as you drove, particularly once you come up past St Patricks River, that windy section there, you can't have double lines because the pavement is not wide enough for double lines. So we have a single line.

Mr MEYER - You mean an edge line?

Ms RATTRAY - Middle line. We don't have edge lines. We only have a middle line. We're lucky if we get a middle line.

Mr PEDDELL - That section that you are referring to from St Patricks River up to probably just before the lookout, that would be under section two which is a separate funding, a separate project and a separate committee of parliamentary standing committee approval.

Ms RATTRAY - I hope I am still around.

Mr PEDDELL - I hope so too. The line situation is taken on notice.

CHAIR - Thank you. Do we have any other questions from members of the committee? Thank you very much for appearing before us. I'll ask the standard questions which we always like to have answered. Your answer yes or no to these is not an indication as to how we might vote on it. We do have to ask these under the act.

Does the proposed works meet an identified need or needs or solve a recognised problem?

Mr PEDDELL - Yes.

Mr MEYER - Yes.

PUBLIC

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

Mr PEDDELL - Yes.

Mr MEYER - Yes.

CHAIR - Are the proposed works fit for purpose?

Mr PEDDELL - Yes.

Mr MEYER - Yes.

CHAIR - Do the proposed works provide value for money?

Mr PEDDELL - Yes.

Mr MEYER - Yes.

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

Mr PEDDELL - Yes.

Mr MEYER - Yes.

CHAIR - Before you go today I want to reiterate that once you leave the table you need to be aware that parliamentary 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 today. Do you understand that?

Mr PEDDELL - Yes.

Mr MEYER - Yes.

CHAIR - Thank you very much. Thank you for your attendance.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.

The Committee adjourned at 2.53 p.m.