

# PUBLIC

**THE PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS MET AT PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART, ON WEDNESDAY 13 NOVEMBER 2024**

## **KINGSTON BYPASS DUPLICATION AND ALGONA ROAD ROUNDABOUT UPGRADE**

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

**CHAIR** (Ms Rattray) - Welcome everyone. Before we commence the hearing, I'll introduce the members of the committee. We have Dean Harriss, the member for Huon; Jen Butler, the member for Lyons; Tania Rattray, the member for McIntyre; Helen Burnet, the member for Clark; and Simon Wood, the member for Bass. We have our secretariat support in Scott Hennessy. We have no apologies for today. Mr Secretary, would you please read the message from Her Excellency the Governor-in-Council referring the project to the committee for inquiry.

**The SECRETARY -**

Pursuant to section 16(2) of the *Public Works Committee Act 1914*, the Governor refers the undermentioned proposed public work to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works to consider and report thereon. Pursuant to section 16(3) of the act, the estimated cost of such work when completed is \$76.42 million.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much. We're in receipt of submissions: the Kingston bypass duplication and Algona Road roundabout upgrade, Public Works Committee submission 28 October 2024 from the Department of State Growth. We also have a submission from Cycling South, from the Bicycle Network, and Mark Donnellon.

The committee is in receipt of the four submissions, as I've said. I ask for a member to move a motion that the submissions be received and taken into evidence and published.

**Ms BUTLER** - I move.

**CHAIR** - Thank you Ms Butler.

**Motion agreed to.**

**CHAIR** - The first witnesses appearing before the committee today are representing the proponent, the Department of State Growth. Could I ask you to please state your name, your position and the organisation and then make the statutory declaration that is before you? Thank you.

**Mr MIDDLETON** - My name is Luke Middleton. I'm currently the acting manager, network planning, at the Department of State Growth.

**Mr JORDAAN** - I'm Johan Jordaan. I'm the project manager for the Department of State Growth for this project.

## PUBLIC

**Ms HICKS** - My name is Cary Hicks, I'm the project director for this project with the Department of State Growth.

**Mr LUKE MIDDLETON**, ACTING MANAGER, NETWORK PLANNING, **Mr JOHAN JORDAAN**, PROJECT MANAGER, and **Ms CARY HICKS**, PROJECT DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much. I have a statement that needs to be provided. I'm sure that you've probably heard this before, but in the interests of the committee process, thank you for appearing before the committee. The committee is pleased to hear your evidence today. Before we begin your evidence, I'd like to inform you of some of the important aspects of the committee proceedings. Our committee hearing is a proceeding in 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 also important to be aware that this protection is not afforded 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 and this means that your evidence may be reported. We have from time to time people watching. This is being broadcast. Do you understand?

**WITNESSES** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Would you like to make an opening statement? We don't mind who it is. That's just the usual process.

**Mr MIDDLETON** - Good afternoon. Today we are seeking consideration for the Kingston Bypass duplication and Algona Road roundabout upgrade project. Here is a bit of background for you. Following the Kingston and Environs transport study in the mid-2000s, we started planning for the Kingston Bypass in the late 2000s, with the construction of the first stage of the bypass completed in 2011. This was a two-lane, two-way highway, one lane in each direction, extending from the Southern Outlet highway at the Kingston Interchange to a large-diameter five-legged roundabout at Algona Road, which is the current roundabout.

The planning work for the first stage of the bypass included consideration of the need for a second stage, with traffic modelling at the time indicating that duplication would be required sometime prior to 2027. The Channel Highway Algona Road to Sandfly Road corridor study report, completed in September 2020, confirmed the need for upgrades to the existing highway. The project will provide two lanes in each direction between the Channel Highway and the Southern Outlet, improve consistency of travel times through the Algona Road intersection by the provision of a grade separated interchange, and improve pedestrian and cycle connectivity between residential areas and park-and-ride sites.

The project is located in southern Tasmania in the Kingborough local government area and includes the suburbs of Huntingfield and Kingston. The Kingston Bypass is a component of the Southern Outlet, and is bounded by the Huon Highway at the Kingston Interchange to the Algona Road roundabout, where it becomes the Channel Highway south of the project area. The northern extent of the project area joins to the southern end of the Southern Outlet near the

Groningen Road on-ramp, where we were today at the second site visit. The southern end of the project site joins the Channel Highway north of the Maddocks Road intersection, near where we were at the first stop.

The Southern Outlet is classified as a Category 1 trunk road under the current Tasmanian state road hierarchy, while the Channel Highway and Kingston Bypass are classified as Category 3 regional access roads.

In 2021, the Tasmanian government committed \$12 million to a \$60 million project to deliver a grade separated interchange at the Algonia roundabout and to duplicate the Kingston Bypass. The Australian Government subsequently confirmed the commitment of \$48 million to these two important projects in its May 2021 Budget, with further funding in the May 2024 Australian Government Budget, bringing the total to \$76.42 million, which is \$61.12 million Australian Government and \$15.3 million state government.

Public consultation on the project took place over two consultation phases: April 2022 and June 2023. Feedback received during the public consultation and from engagement with residents, landowners and other key stakeholders was taken into consideration when finalising design. Summaries of the consultation and feedback were published on the Transport Tasmania website after public consultation was completed.

Three primary objectives of the project are to improve road safety for all road users, improve travel time reliability for road users, and provide greater modal choice for people travelling between south of Kingston and Hobart. The project is expected to deliver positive outcomes and benefits, including: improved road safety for all road users; increased capacity of the Kingston Bypass, Southern Outlet, allowing more consistent travel times for through traffic and accommodating for future population and traffic growth south of Kingston; improved consistency of travel times for local Kingston residents through improved intersection performance; and improved active travel connectivity to Huntingfield park-and-ride for all transport users.

I'll now hand over to my colleague Johan to talk more on this project.

**Mr JORDAAN** - Thank you, Luke. The proposed works for the Kingston Bypass duplication and Algonia Road roundabout project comprise the following:

- A grade separated interchange at Algonia Road.
- An additional roundabout at the western side of the existing Algonia Road roundabout that will facilitate access between the northbound carriageway of the Channel Highway and Algonia Road.
- The duplication of the Kingston Bypass between Algonia Road and Groningen Road.
- A shared-use path connecting the Huntingfield park-and-ride to Maddocks Road and Hollyhock Drive with the provision of a future pedestrian overpass over the Channel Highway.
- And safety improvements to the Maddocks Road and Channel Highway intersection.

## PUBLIC

During the scoping phase, a multi-criteria option analysis was completed. The different options were ranked against addressing the project objectives, the safety benefits and the estimated cost. The project is currently at the detailed design stage, which is planned to be completed by the end of this year. Construction is planned to start in mid-2025, subject to environmental approvals, and to be completed in mid-2027.

The estimated cost of the project is \$73.4 million, based on the P50 estimate, and \$76.3 million based on the P90 estimate. The cost estimate is considered to be reasonable for the scale and scope of the works proposed.

Once delivered, the Kingston Bypass duplication and Algona Road roundabout project will address the existing community need to reduce congestion and improve active transport links across the Channel Highway corridor.

Overall, we submit that the project is an important project that aligns with the department's response to best meet the needs of Kingston's and surrounding areas' growth in population. We recognise the significance of stakeholder contribution and engagement in the success of the project. We will continue to engage with cyclists to ensure key objectives of the project are met. We are seeking other legislative approvals, as required. The costs are appropriate.

In conclusion, we contend that this project is a good use of taxpayers' money.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much. There will be some questions that I'll ask at the end of the hearing process so we'll get an opportunity to talk to that.

In regard to the need for works, Luke outlined what's been proposed quite clearly in his contribution. But can we have some history around the options that were put forward? I don't need a detailed account of them, but just so we've got some understanding of why this option was deemed to be the most suitable to address the needs outlined in this proposal before us today.

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes, thank you for the question. As I said, we went through an option analysis in one of the previous stages of the project. That was actually during the scoping phase. We conducted a multi-criteria option analysis. We completed that by ranking all the options in terms of feasibility, cost benefit and what the community wanted at that stage. There were basically eight options. I can quickly summarise the options that we identified.

It was at-grade dual roundabout to maximise the use of existing infrastructure and for ease of future construction of grade-separated options.

The second one was at-grade dual signalised intersection for better control, and balance flows on existing road networks. That one is the one that included the traffic signals.

Then there was a grade-separated interchange with elevated dual-lane at Kingston Bypass and roundabout control terminals with a southern terminal to Algona Road roundabout.

Then there was a grade-separated interchange with elevated Kingston Bypass and signalised controlled terminals.

## PUBLIC

Then a grade-separated interchange with elevated Kingston bypass, northbound Kingston Bypass carriageway and signalised control terminals.

A grade-separated interchange with signalised controlled terminals on the left to right on-ramp merges and off-ramp diverges to Kingston Bypass.

The seventh option was a grade-separated interchange with an elevated southbound and at-grade northbound Kingston Bypass carriageway.

And then the last option, a grade-separated interchange with elevated southbound and northbound Kingston bypass carriageways.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, I appreciate that. In one of our submissions we received from the Bicycle Network Tasmania, it talked about this particular proposal being rectified to address some matters that were raised for those who went through this stakeholder process. These matters that were raised and have been addressed, were they after those first eight options were put forward or did you have the proposal in place and then you made the changes to address, for instance, Bicycle Network Tasmania's concerns? Is that clear?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes, it's about the timing of the eight options.

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Mr JORDAAN** - We'll have to confirm that against the two dates the public consultations were conducted and the time we did the option analysis.

**CHAIR** - Okay.

**Ms BURNET** - Could I ask a follow-up question?

**CHAIR** - Absolutely. That might not have been as clear as I would have liked, but I'll work on that.

**Ms BURNET** - Could you tell the committee when there was input from stakeholders, as far as you know, as part of the process?

**Mr JORDAAN** - As Luke mentioned, the input from the stakeholders was at the two opportunities we had for public consultation.

**Ms BURNET** - When is that in relation to having significant input into the process?

**Ms HICKS** - I can probably add to that. We're talking about the concept phase, which was undertaken a couple of years ago now. The initial consultation was when we developed a number of options for consideration by the public and went out and invited feedback from the public: 'What are your issues? What do you need this interchange for?' We were just gathering data initially. That was the first round. From that we were able to finalise the top eight. There were probably more options than that initially. We isolated the top eight and then undertook our multi-criteria analysis and those criteria were discussed briefly by Johan before. Then there was a second round of public consultation where we went back out to the public with a restricted number of options. Correct me whether that was one or three options at the time. It

## PUBLIC

might have been the preferred option. That's typically the process we go through for those early optioneering type exercises.

**Ms BURNET** - Input from stakeholders - TasNetworks and Cycling South have a lot of experience in providing advice on bike infrastructure and active transport. When is that information listened to or put into the design? Is it currently the best way of doing it? Is it optimal?

**Mr JORDAAN** - To get back to the previous part of the question, the two rounds were conducted between 1 December to 21 December 2021 and the second round was 27 June to 17 July 2022. Those were through public consultation. The public had the opportunity to comment on Social Pinpoint. That information was collected and then the two summary reports we added to the submission were then compiled. Our designer worked with that information into the next phase of the of the design. It was not that the public consultation was done after the design was completed, it was part of the process.

**CHAIR** - There was some criticism in one of the submissions that you would expect the department, given they have an obligation or their policies, that all major projects include safe access for people walking and riding. Their input delivered the outcomes that have been presented here today, but it appears it wasn't the initial part of the project put forward. Is that a fair criticism or not exactly the way it unfolded?

**Ms HICKS** - I'm not sure I agree with that summary of it.

**CHAIR** - That's my summary, their words are possibly a little bit different.

**Ms HICKS** - The approach is open; it's an equal playing field. We go out to the public and also have some targeted consultation with individual stakeholders, which could be the cycling community groups, could be council or TasNetworks. We invite feedback from anybody, but we do have to consider all of the different aspects for the project and traffic modelling is certainly a part of it.

Cost effectiveness, long-term planning, all of those are criteria we have to assess and weigh up. And, yes, we're just trying to get the best fit.

**CHAIR** - Would it be fair to say - a girl from the north where we don't have nearly the traffic you have in the south and it's a busy area - that there's a focus on vehicle traffic. In that particular area, walking and riding is not something - you'd have to be brave from what I could see today to be cycling around that particular area. Is that somewhat part of why there's a more particular focus on vehicles?

**Ms HICKS** - No, I don't think there's more of a focus on vehicles, but it is a grade separated interchange and that is the nature of the project. There's a massive amount of traffic volume running through that intersection every day.

**CHAIR** - We heard it and saw it.

**Ms HICKS** - Exactly and so, we are aware of the active transport users and have made provision to improve safety where we can for that and provide additional access where we can also.

**Mr MIDDLETON** - The department does operate under the positive provision policy for cycling infrastructure, which means we have to take it into account when we do major transport projects like this and that is what we've done. We may not be able to deliver everything that particular stakeholders want, but we take it into account and that's what the design is certainly doing.

**Ms BURNET** - What's that called again?

**Mr MIDDLETON** - Positive provision policy for cycling infrastructure.

**CHAIR** - I will add that there's an acknowledgement particularly in the Bicycle Network submission that most of the problems have now been rectified in the final concept map. I want to place that on the record. But you can understand it's our job to try to dissect all of the aspects of what we receive for this proposal.

Are there any other questions around the need for the works as we work our way through the submission?

**Ms BURNET** - This highway is in a growth corridor as Kingston and many of the suburbs there are growing and quite a number of subdivisions with an expected increase in car traffic and vehicle movements. What's the modelling suggesting over the next 10 or 20 years in this area from the Huon Highway as well as more local traffic in the Kingston area?

Tying that in with developments such as the recent shopping centre that's been approved on the other side of the large roundabout now - long question - what sort of input has the transport area of State Growth with some of this traffic or some of this modelling and thinking?

**CHAIR** - Have you got a crystal ball is what the member's asking.

**Ms HICKS** - Certainly, the traffic modelling does account for future growth in the corridor. We do have standard documents and data sources available to State Growth which provide this information that's outside of the scope of the project, but to get an actual reference for that document and data we use, we would need to take that on notice.

**Ms BURNET** - That would be useful.

**CHAIR** - Is the member happy to?

**Ms BURNET** - I'm curious, and I really want to see how that informs the project as well, which hopefully is a fair question. Thank you.

**CHAIR** - We'll move on now down to proposed works, and I think Ms Butler has a question about the capital works aspect.

**Ms BUTLER** - I wanted to have a quick discussion of two main questions. The first is the Huon Highway section of this proposal. There doesn't seem to be as much information about that part of the project as there is around, I suppose, the Algona Road section. For the record, could you run through why the new bridgeworks are going in for that part of the project, and the current state of the bridge and the need for that upgrade to that area in this project?

**Mr JORDAAN** - I will start with an answer. For all the intersections on the bypass, except for the Huon Highway and the new Algonia Road, will be underpasses, and provisions were made for double lanes in both directions with previous phases and previous projects. That is an existing overpass, and we need to fit two lanes in both directions, which the existing bridge couldn't accommodate. For that reason, we had to look at duplication of the bridge. It will be a separate structure next to the existing structure.

**Ms BUTLER** - It's widening the bridge for the overpass - and anything to the underpass area?

**Mr JORDAAN** - It's not widening the bridge, it's additional bridge widening capacity, for traffic. The underpass, in that section, will just be bridge protection structure that will be added, but nothing additional to the existing underpass.

**Ms BUTLER** - So, the current state of that bridge is up to standard. This is just simply creating more space? That's the reason that this is being prioritised?

**CHAIR** - Does it need any strengthening?

**Mr JORDAAN** - No, not for the scope of the project. The bridge assets are maintained by Bridge Assets, which is a separate division, but it's not being upgraded as part of this project and it was not identified as being needed for upgrading now.

**Ms BUTLER** - Okay, thank you. I also wanted to talk about the pedestrian bridge and how that is discussed in this submission. However, this submission is not providing for that bridge; it's touted as a future possibility. Why was it included at all in this submission if it's not part of these costs at all, and why is it on the maps?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Part of the objectives of the project was to cater for pedestrian access; to make sure we cater for that need, so during the initial -

**Ms BUTLER** - Sorry to cut you off, but it doesn't cater to that need in this project, so I'm just curious why it's actually in this proposal because it's not being built under this proposal.

**Mr JORDAAN** - When we received the submission for the concept design, there was some allowance for footpaths as part of the Algonia Road dual carriageway. It made provision for pedestrians passing at the underpass. After a few reviews, we've realised that is not a proper solution. Going through a detailed design, we looked at better options, and that overpass was identified as an option that is more suitable for the public need. Therefore we progressed to that as part of the design. The other thing is we just need to, because at that stage the funding would not allow within the budget, for an overpass. It was just part of pedestrian walkways at the underpass. It is additional cost, which is outside the cost estimate for this project or the budget. Therefore, we still have to look for additional funding for that.

**Ms BUTLER** - I thought it's important on the record that there was an announcement by the federal government of \$100 million, the Active Transport Fund, that will come into term, I suppose, as of 1 July 2025. Has there been any engagement made on that level from the department to potentially tap into that \$100 million fund to complement this? That is about active transport. Could you provide any information about whether that has been considered?



## PUBLIC

It seems like it could be a reasonable way to ensure this project can actually not be three-quarters.

**CHAIR** - The member might provide you with a support letter.

**Ms BUTLER** - Has that been considered at all?

**Mr MIDDLETON** - I might have to take that on notice and check back with our urban mobility planner.

**Ms BURNET** - Just on those pertinent points that Ms Butler raises, is it just seen as a 'nice to have', or is this pedestrian active transport bridge an important component of this application before us?

**Mr MIDDLETON** - From my perspective, it's an important component. What Johan was trying to say before about the design was that the initial concept was for a separate pedestrian underpass at the Algona end. The problem was that as the design progressed that proved to be impractical. Basically, it couldn't be drained. It wouldn't be safe, from the antisocial perspective.

**CHAIR** - It would be a real dingy tunnel.

**Mr MIDDLETON** - It would, and it would be very long and very deep, and you'd basically have to have a pump going 24/7 to keep the water out of it. By the time we'd got to that point, the design had moved on some time, and I'm sure you'd appreciate these are very complex designs that you have to go through to come up with a final.

**CHAIR** - I have to admit, I do not have an engineering degree.

**Mr MIDDLETON** - Myself neither. So, yes, by the time we got to the point in the concept development and realised that the underpass was just not practical, we started to look for an alternative, but we'd moved a long way down the track. Essentially the design for the overpass was just a bit late to get a start, which is probably the primary reason why it's a bit delayed.

**CHAIR** - The entire project's a bit delayed, or the overpass?

**Mr MIDDLETON** - Finishing off the design of the overpass was a bit delayed, because it started later in the design process as well.

**Ms BURNET** - Is there any way of addressing that for next time? To me, this is a really important component, and whilst you have to do those investigations for what you have before you, I mean, how do you get around that for next time so that you have that front and centre as part of any linkage of two parts of a suburb which are on either side of a major highway?

**Mr MIDDLETON** - I'm not sure what the answer is to that.

**Ms BURNET** - Well, I mean, it's processes.

## PUBLIC

**Mr MIDDLETON** - Yes, it's all about processes, and how we engage with people and what they tell us, and knowledge of the site. I think all those things come into play. They influence the design.

**Mr HARRISS** - Just on that, at the early stages, when the underpass was getting considered, that would have obviously been at a cost. Was there any cost savings with deleting that which could have gone into the overpass? Or was that chewed up somewhere?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes. We have information about the total cost, or total estimate, for the new overpass versus the allowance made for the underpass, and then the net effect of the deduction of the previous scope compared to the new scope.

**Mr HARRISS** - The overpass is more expensive?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Our advice is it's more expensive.

**CHAIR** - Significantly more? We heard this morning on site, I hope I'm portraying the right information, approximately \$4 million.

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - The underpass was significantly less than that?

**Mr JORDAAN** - That's correct. Taking into account that the underpass was not for the total width of the bypass, it was just one of the arms of the new roundabout to get access to the other side.

**CHAIR** - Right. Good question.

**Ms BUTLER** - As a subsequent question, the underpass that was put under the Midland Highway in Campbell Town between the school and the swimming pool was very expensive. Was there a concern that you could run into the same geotechnical problems as they did or was it just the drainage? That was very expensive.

**Mr MIDDLETON** - I might answer that question because I was the client on that project for the department as well.

**Ms BUTLER** - It's a beautiful underpass.

**Mr MIDDLETON** - It's a wonderful underpass.

**CHAIR** - It's a fantastic service to that community.

**Ms BUTLER** - It's one of the best underpasses in the country.

**Mr MIDDLETON** - I have walked it. It is very nice.

There was an issue with that one with water drainage, too. There is also a pump available to drain that but it needs to be maintained and looked after in perpetuity. There are also issues with services. Yes, you're right, geotech was an issue. There is very hard rock at that location.

## PUBLIC

I'm not sure what geotech has been undertaken for the Kingston Bypass project at the Algona Road end, but I'm sure there would have been a lot more required to justify and to prove that an underpass was a viable option. To be honest, we didn't get beyond the concept really. There was some design work done, but it wasn't much more than the concept because it was realised by the project team that it wasn't the optimum option to serve the community.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Are there any more questions around the capital works?

I have one. In regard to the capital works, again I'm taking myself back to the submission by Bicycle Network Tasmania where it talks about how the current crossing and proposed crossings are at a grade and very difficult for people to use safely during peak periods because of the volume and speed of the cars, having to cross two lots of two lanes of traffic. Is that something that you could comment on?

**Mr MIDDLETON** - It sounds like it's talking about Algona Road.

**CHAIR** - Yes, it is.

**Mr MIDDLETON** - One of the things being looked at which perhaps Johan can talk to is some changes at the Algona Road crossing coming from the AAD side.

**CHAIR** - That issue may well have been addressed in some refining of the scope of the project.

**Mr JORDAAN** - The one at Algona Road at that roundabout - that crossing coming from the Antarctic Division; currently you're not crossing the road perpendicular; it's at an angle. We've improved that crossing to be more perpendicular to the existing road. Also, the radius of the path the vehicles need to follow going outside of the roundabout was also adjusted to slow the traffic down slightly. The benefit is the better crossing; it is moved slightly away from the roundabout, so there's better visibility, and then the advantage of traffic being slowed.

**CHAIR** - Does that address the grade to some extent?

**Mr JORDAAN** - That is a level crossing. It is not at an angle at all.

**Ms BURNET** - Is that a zebra crossing?

**Mr JORDAAN** - No, it's not a zebra crossing.

**Ms BURNET** - Which road is this? Is it Algona?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes.

**Ms BURNET** - Does it have a refuge?

**Mr MIDDLETON** - Yes.

**Ms BURNET** - Is that proposed or is there one there?

**Mr MIDDLETON** - There is one there.

## PUBLIC

**Mr JORDAAN** - Correct.

**CHAIR** - The materials. This is one of my favourite areas.

**Mr HARRISS** - Sorry, Chair, could I ask one more?

**CHAIR** - Absolutely. I don't want to move too quickly.

**Mr HARRISS** - No, I'm probably going a bit slow. Point 4 on the capital works, the shared-use path connecting the Huntingfield park-and-ride and Maddocks Road and Hollyhock Drive: will all that work be done or is it costed in this one, and at the moment the only works not included is the pedestrian overpass? Am I making sense there? The work on each side of the highway - will that work be done, and just not the orange highlighted part at the moment is costed, is that right?

**Mr JORDAAN** - That is correct, yes. It is allowed for in the budget.

**Mr HARRISS** - So you've got all the footpaths, the shared -

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes, that's correct.

**CHAIR** - It's just that small component that's really important that we need the \$4 million for.

**Mr JORDAAN** - That's correct, yes.

**Mr HARRISS** - Sorry, Chair.

**CHAIR** - No, it's good to have that information on the public record, because the people that are going to read this, they don't necessarily have the drawings that we have in front of them. We appreciate the opportunity to really flesh out that information.

**Ms BUTLER** - I think it's really important as well, Chair, as a committee that we're looking to see if there's value for money in a project which provides shared pathways. There's a park-and-ride on one side, which is all about having people not use cars. We've got the Antarctic Division, we've got a new potential shopping precinct going into the area, we've got Clennett's Mitre 10, then we've also got another hardware store, but there's no safe avenue for people to gain access across that highway. There are no traffic lights or a crossing or a bridge or an underpass. I think that's really the deficient part of the project for us. I think it's important that that's noted on the record, that we're investing in, but there's nothing to get over the road for people on bikes or walking. It just seems like a large component of the project is missing.

**Ms BURNET** - Given there are so many functions there, shopping functions, school, park and ride.

**CHAIR** - I'm sure the people before us possibly agree, but it's about the money allocation. Anyway, the committee has some work to do and you never know, we might be able to make a recommendation. We'll see.

## PUBLIC

The materials. I did talk onsite and I'm really keen to get on the public record the response that you gave me about the Austroad guidelines. This has to do with the road pavement, particularly, because my experience over the past 10 or 20 years of travelling various parts of our road pavement that have been upgraded, is that some of them have failed significantly and they have met the design of the Austroad guidelines, but it's around some of the resource that's being used as well.

I'm aware that Victoria, which we've often modelled our specifications off, are also moving away from some of their existing specifications. If you'd like to give the committee your understanding of that, and I know Luke chimed in this morning when I talked about that. I don't mind who takes my question, just to get that clarity.

**Ms HICKS** - I might respond to that one. Yes, the department has adopted the VicRoads specifications. I know that there is some reassessment by VicRoads themselves and also the department on whether or not we'll proceed with those in the future.

In terms of the Austroad design guidelines, in the project we're not in a position to have bespoke design and construction specifications for the project. We can only use those guidelines that are available to us and they are the highest standard.

**CHAIR** - Is that because the Australian Government is funding a large proportion of this project, should it seek favour, as well as Tasmania is a small state?

**Ms HICKS** - Not that much. Even if it was a state government funded project only, we would still adopt the industry standard of the Austroads pavement design guidelines. I'm not aware that those are actually under question. We have proceeded with that design. We also have -

**CHAIR** - It's more just the Victorian standards -

**Ms HICKS** - There are questions about how they've been applied and their effectiveness in some projects. That is true. We've also had really good experiences with recent projects on Perth Link roads and the airport interchange here in Hobart. It's all been quite successful and there haven't been any issues with the pavement materials. We've adopted the standards available to us and they are the highest standards. We're not in a position to actually change that for the project unless the Department of State Growth takes a high-level decision to use a different design standard we can include in our contracts.

**CHAIR** - That's really important to have on the record. One of the biggest criticisms that I receive from the people I represent: 'how did you let such a poor-quality product be put on our roads and then two or three months down the track - large hole'. I know that's often to do with drainage and the like. But it's an important aspect to have on the record. Any other questions on the materials going to be used?

**Mr WOOD** - You're doubling the capacity of the highway, therefore, would it be fair to assume noise will increase a little bit too? There are different types of asphalt or whatever the product's called that can reduce the sound ramifications. Is that factored into this at all or is there any need for soundproofing walls along this area due to the extra noise possibly generated?

## PUBLIC

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes, we did. We went through a process of conducting noise assessments. Taking into account the model of additional traffic in the next few years as well as the fact we are not going to increase the speed limit on the bypass. It will still be 80 kilometres per hour. From the noise assessment, it has been determined it is not needed to do additional noise mitigation over and above what we have already done there.

**Mr WOOD** - Right.

**Ms BURNET** - But I don't know if that goes to the heart of your question in relation to the noise with the surface of the road, is that what you're doing?

**Mr JORDAAN** - We will use the same type of surface we currently have. We did investigate other options. As you mentioned, there are options available to reduce noise even further. However, that comes at additional cost. During the assessment, it was determined that the specific additional measurement will not be required.

**Mr WOOD** - Wasn't warranted.

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Would that in any way elevate the road from a P50 to a P90 by having that extra sound proofing in the resource that's used for the bitumen. Does that elevate that?

**Ms HICKS** - We don't have that level of detail for the specific additional cost and how that will relate to the P90. But typically, we have a design guideline for noise mitigation and that gives us our constraints as to how far we have to model in the future and what the thresholds are before we have to spend money on mitigation. We went through that process - including the location of the new lanes, which are closer to some traffic - and we found that everything was within those thresholds. We don't have justification to spend more money on asphalt types. However, the asphalt surfacing and all of the spray seal surfacing on the project have a design life of about 15 years. Then we resurface just the same as any other road on our network. At that time in the future, that assessment can be done again if there are issues and we can then resurface with the different asphalt at that time.

**Ms BUTLER** - On that, the new roundabout is a lot closer to residential than what was there previously. Was there consultation done on that and additional noise mitigation because that is a lot closer to residential dwellings than has been previously. Could you provide the committee with a bit of information about the consultation or that potential noise monitoring undertaken, because that is significantly closer to residential properties than previously.

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes. A part of the noise assessment was actually to temporarily install noise measuring equipment over the project area, which includes private properties. As per those assessments and the results we received from that, it was not required to do additional noise mitigation and therefore no additional public consultations.

If we found there were properties affected and where you have added or higher thresholds, then you go to the next step and actually do that.

**CHAIR** - You put up a barrier, rather than change the product you use in your seal.

## PUBLIC

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes, correct.

**Ms HICKS** - We would consider all of those options for mitigation.

**CHAIR** - It would be too late after the seal's done. You'd have to put up a barrier. A sound barrier like a wall, because you've already sealed the roads, so it's too late for that.

**Mr JORDAAN** - It all goes into part of the design. We know what type of seal will produce specific noise levels. It's not needed to measure afterwards. You can predict that within your design model.

**Ms BUTLER** - Could you provide an idea about what you anticipate the speed limit would be on that new roundabout? I imagine it would be a slower speed than the highway going straight through to Margate. Would that be a slower speed? Would that reduce the noise?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes, definitely. I'm not sure if there will be a speed limit, but you have to drive according to conditions and certainly that will not be as high as 80 km/h.

**Ms BURNET** - I was going to ask a similar question. Coming off the highways onto the roundabouts, is it likely that there will be a drop in speed like a 60 kilometres zone through there? Or not your department?

**Ms BUTLER** - On the new roundabout section.

**CHAIR** - Different department?

**Mr JORDAAN** - No, it is. It's part of the design.

**Ms HICKS** - We'd probably need to take that on notice.

**Mr JORDAAN** - I don't have that answer with me.

**Mr MIDDLETON** - Perhaps the simplest way to answer that is to say the existing Algonia is in a 60-kilometre speed zone. That's unlikely to change around that roundabout. If you extrapolate that speed zoning to the other roundabout, it's conceivable it could have a 60 kilometre speed zone on it.

Typically, the advisory speed on roundabouts is around 35 kilometres an hour. That answers your question in terms of what would the speed be around the other roundabout. Probably somewhere between 60 and 35.

**CHAIR** - Because if you're shooting straight through it's probably nearly 60, but if you're going around it, you've got to slow down.

**Ms HICKS** - Certainly the noise modelling does account for the posted speed limit; the expected speeds of vehicles. They'll be braking as vehicles are coming on the ramp and approaching the roundabout; accelerating as they leave. All of that is taken into consideration in the model.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - I have a question about the steel being commonly fabricated outside of Tasmania - sadly I might add. Is that going to be the case in this instance? We don't have any capacity for steel manufacturing in Tasmania when it comes to this type of project? It said you even get it from overseas. I think perhaps that might even be New Zealand. It's happened with rail in the past. Is that the case?

**Ms HICKS** - I'm not aware of any change to the industry. Certainly if our construction contractors who will do that tendering find an opportunity in Tasmania, they will take it if it's a more cost effective -

**CHAIR** - But it's likely to be the big island or New Zealand?

**Ms HICKS** - That's right.

**CHAIR** - Sad state, Mr Wood.

**Mr WOOD** - This might be a silly question but forgive me for this -

**CHAIR** - No question is a silly question.

**Mr WOOD** - I didn't notice this morning if the existing roundabout was, but will it be lit? There'll be lighting on the roundabout? Is that par for the course all these sorts of things are lit.

**Ms HICKS** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Is there is there lighting on the current roundabout?

**Ms HICKS** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - It's got a lot of vegetation on it. I did notice that. Looks like it needed a good tidy-up, actually.

**Ms HICKS** - Are you talking about lighting in the middle?

**CHAIR** - No, the actual centre part of the roundabout looked like it had a lot of vegetation on it today. Anyway, that's not your department, I'm sure.

**Ms HICKS** - Typically, we don't have lighting in the middle of the roundabout. The lighting is designed for the outside for the conflict areas.

**CHAIR** - Any more questions about the materials? If not, let's move to the benefits. I think some of that's possibly already been covered in members' questions and the information, but I'm happy to go over anything that members see as being important.

**Ms BUTLER** - Could you run through some of the drainage condition assessments for the area, and additional drainage infrastructure that will be required for this project?

**CHAIR** - Is that stormwater or?



## PUBLIC

**Ms BUTLER** - Well, stormwater and overall. Is the area prone to flooding? What kind of civil works will be put in?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes, the design does cater for the drainage and stormwater around the project area, but it is just designed fit for purpose. There is no additional design work for flooding outside the design parameters of the project.

**CHAIR** - I have a question about the engagement with services authorities. Obviously, there's quite a lead time when you have a look at the table that talks about the timing of the project - heading out to 2027. Regarding some of the entities that will need to be engaged with, has there been initial discussions with the likes of TasNetworks, TasWater, Telstra and NBN?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes, that's correct. During the design phase we engaged with those service authorities, making sure that we have adequate designs. By the time of construction, all the designs will be completed. We will liaise with those entities during the construction phase to make sure we work together in delivering the project.

**CHAIR** - They haven't indicated that there'll be any issue with moving any services that might need to be moved to facilitate a project of this nature at this stage?

**Mr JORDAAN** - No, we haven't identified areas that would be a problem. Everything was part of the design and incorporated into the design works.

**CHAIR** - Are the actual entities comfortable that they can meet their obligations in the time frame? I know there have been times when some of the poles have been jutting out into no man's land when it comes to TasNetworks.

**Ms BUTLER** - Oh, gosh, that was terrible.

**CHAIR** - Yes, I kept on sending photos to the department, saying when are these poles going to be taken off the road verge? They were virtually sitting there.

**Mr MIDDLETON** - Fortunately, we have a site with a corridor that's been planned for this future upgrade and we don't have overhead poles in this situation.

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes, it's always a project risk because we have more deliverables on the project. But it's not that we didn't cater for it. It is just the timing of engaging with those entities and making sure the delivery of the project and their component will be catered for within the construction program.

**Ms BURNET** - In relation to one of the benefits you're talking about, the increase in the use of park-and-ride and access to the public transport - all transport users. It probably goes back to the question about modelling, Cary, in relation to - we were talking about vehicular movement. I'm wondering about bus uptake. Is the modelling looking at an increase in bus patronage as well in what you're considering?

**Ms HICKS** - The specifics around the projected further modelling is outside of our skill set. We would need to go and approach a different branch of our department to provide that, so we'll take that on notice if you require some more information.

## PUBLIC

**Ms BURNET** - Thank you. You talk about how you'd like to reduce the accident rates, as we all would. I think it says here it will be reduced by 50 per cent in the study area. How do you measure successes or otherwise in relation to that? How would that be reported? Does that come back as part of your reporting?

**Ms HICKS** - No, typically not. We don't undertake reporting after the project, not within our team anyway. There are other branches within State Roads who look after road safety.

**Ms BURNET** - How was that line arrived at, then? If there's an expectation that it'll be reduced by 50 per cent, how is it arrived at initially? Is it a 'this just has to happen' type of thing?

**Ms HICKS** - I don't think anyone here - Luke might be able to correct me - we probably can't comment on the specifics of how our consultant has come up with the benefit-cost ratio. That would be a statement from there, so we would have to take that on notice.

**Ms BUTLER** - It's a pretty big call.

**CHAIR** - We would be chuffed if that was the case. We want no accidents. Anyway, we'll leave that to others.

**Ms BURNET** - We talked about the significant natural landscape and maintaining that. Can you talk us through the EPBC referral process and how that might work?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes, certainly. During the design we had to do everything related to the environmental compliance, and guidance and acts around that. We've submitted the referral to the Australian Government under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act*, the EPBC act. Based on that, the feedback that we've got as part of the inquiry was that we had to look at a referral area for a specific site, meaning that we are currently in a process of investigating alternative sites that can be used as an offset. More specifically, as mentioned during the site visit this morning, that area at the Algona Road roundabout, we've got Eucalyptus ovata forest. There is about 0.7 hectares that fall within the project footprint. That is the specific environmental triggers that we need to cater for.

**Ms BURNET** - Okay, so That's 0.7 hectares. By offset, do you mean planting new trees? How do you offset removal of that?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Offsetting is we investigate other sites, other possibilities where you have current vegetation of that specific species. And then, depending on the quality of that site, there's specific calculations that are done to calculate what will be there at the new site for offset. It's normally much bigger than the current footprint, but it will all depend on the quality of vegetation in that offset area. So it could be; the areas that we've looked at are typically 10 times that size.

**Ms BURNET** - Where do you find that?

**Mr JORDAAN** - With difficulty. We've looked at a few options around Kingston, so there was a site alongside the Southern Outlet. We've looked at a site close to Hobart College. At this stage, the feedback that we've received is that they were not adequately vegetated,

## PUBLIC

specifically with *Eucalyptus ovata*. So, there is an ongoing process for identifying other locations.

**Ms BURNET** - Right. That's an interesting process. That will all be considered through the federal - you will have to get permission through that referral process?

**Mr JORDAAN** - That is correct.

**Ms BURNET** - When do you expect that?

**Mr JORDAAN** - They've asked us to submit a strategy for the offset. They call it the offset strategy, and there are guidelines on what needs to be included through that process.

**CHAIR** - I hope you don't have to wait as long as they're waiting for the Macquarie Harbour Maugean skate report. My comment, not yours.

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes, we are working closely with the Australian Government. It is unfortunately difficult to predict a specific date, because this process is outside of our control. At the moment, we've got the offset and we've got the offset strategy documented. We will submit again and then we will then be in contact with them and hopefully, as soon as possible, get a response.

**Ms BURNET** - Are there any mitigating things you can do as part of this project rather than take that part of that wooded area?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes. We did look at that. The first option was not to affect that specific area, but we did a lot of work around the design to see how we can avoid having to go through that area. The consultant had to look at various options in the location of the roundabout. The proposed option we've got at the stage is basically the best option we've got.

**CHAIR** - Ticked as many boxes as you could.

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes, that's correct, and then the other avoidance could be to revegetate an existing site in State Growth property, but once again, that could be 10 or 15 hectares of new vegetation to be planted. There needs to be a proper program to manage that and it's not just the specific species, it's also the species that grows below that. It's quite a complex process. The easiest way or the recommended way is to find an adequate piece of land and then work around that. If not, then we have to revert back to revegetation.

**Ms BUTLER** - That's for the EPBCA (*Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*)?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes.

**Ms BUTLER** - Just making sure.

**Ms BURNET** - And will that information be made public?

**Mr JORDAAN** - The whole process of the EPBC is published by the Australian government, so that is already public.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - It will be on their website.

**Mr JORDAAN** -It will be on their website. Yes.

**Ms BURNET** - Thank you. I'm new to this kind of process and where it might be published or available.

**Mr JORDAAN** - No. It's all good.

**CHAIR** - Moving on to the potential impacts and opportunities. I did ask on site before, as an overarching question, about the interruption by the works, should this proposal see favour, to the travelling community, the community in general, to anyone who uses this road. Can we have some indication of what discussions will be had with any chosen contractor should the proposal proceed around general impact on the community? Like, whether you're going to have night works or whether it'll be purely day work or how that might be undertaken? If you could just give the committee some of your thoughts around that?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes. The first thing after we place an order on a contractor, the contractor needs to submit a stakeholder engagement and communication plan. Within that plan, the way we communicate with the community will be defined and it's also reviewed by the department. If it's going to be night works or day works and noise and those type of things, lighting to be used, traffic management, everything will go into that, what we call a SCEP. There's also additional traffic management that also needs to be approved by the department.

**CHAIR** - Luke also said that there is a process where the department might identify that there needs to be at least this much of the highway available and must be able to travel at x amount of speed through the works as well. That's something that is also put into the mix on behalf of the department, representing the community. Is that correct?

**Ms HICKS** - That's typical of all of our construction projects, where we do provide a specification that's specific to the project and the specific traffic needs of that project. Yes, that will be developed, and then the contractor will need to comply with those requirements in their traffic management.

**CHAIR** - For instance, we won't have traffic banked up for more than 10 minutes on a red light for any time during the construction stage.

**Ms HICKS** - Yes, that is correct.

**CHAIR** - Is that the going time, 10 minutes?

**Ms HICKS** - No, we are typically have less than that, particularly on these high traffic volume roads.

**CHAIR** - Right. I really like those new lights where it actually tells you how many more minutes it's got to go -

**Mr MIDDLETON** - The countdown.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - The countdown, like four, three, two - I was on the Tasman Highway by Pyengana and they were working there on Monday, and I didn't have to get frustrated at all. I knew in three minutes I'd be on my way. Whoever made those or designed those, well done to them.

**Ms BUTLER** - Sounds like the good mayor up there took care of that.

**CHAIR** - Yes, possibly, but it is the Tasman Highway, so it'd be Fulton Hogan.

**Ms BUTLER** - A different one.

**CHAIR** - Wouldn't it? Or Stornoway, one or the other.

Potential impacts and opportunities, if somebody would address their minds, Ms Butler.

**Ms BUTLER** - I've probably jumped ahead a bit. I just wondered if you could talk to us - and I know that Ms Burnet also raised that this morning during our hearing around the installation of roadkill mitigations as part of the project. Could you run through what those mitigations would be?

**CHAIR** - The ShuRoos on your car don't work every time. I can vouch for that.

**Mr JORDAAN** - Thanks for the question. We did address that during the design. We've identified the roadkill hotspots and we did look at the consideration of installing signage to alert the public of hotspots in specific areas.

**Ms BUTLER** - It's just signage? There's no other kind of pathways created for which certain wildlife might be more likely to travel down, or anything else? It's just signage, that's it?

**Mr JORDAAN** - That's correct, yes. For this project, that was identified as the mitigation strategy.

**Ms BUTLER** - I might suggest that it seems a bit over the top, that statement in the submission, if it's just signage. Makes it seem like it's a lot more than it might be.

**CHAIR** - You think the jumping kangaroo just doesn't do it?

**Ms BUTLER** - Yes, because I know there are other mitigations which can be used to cut down roadkill. Is it a high roadkill area though, along there? Is there a large native animal footprint? I didn't really envision that it would be, compared to some other projects we've looked at.

**CHAIR** - It's a fairly built-up area.

**Mr JORDAAN** - That's the thing, yeah, it's Kingston. The footprint of the bypass is mainly surrounded by suburban buildings and that's why, basically, the recommendation was just to look at signage.

**Ms BUTLER** - Yes, okay. Thank you.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - And more to come with the proposed development across from the original roundabout?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes, that's correct.

**Ms BURNET** - That bushland would be an area where there is the greatest need, I suppose. Is that correct?

**Ms HICKS** - Typically, that section of bushland is a swift parrot habitat area, which is the main treatment we're looking at. That's not so much for roadkill.

**Ms BURNET** - Okay, so no roadkill there?

**Ms HICKS** - I don't know if there's no roadkill there, wallabies tend to get everywhere around the place.

**CHAIR** - No wild fallow deer down here?

**Ms HICKS** - I haven't seen one, and I do live down there, not on that side.

**CHAIR** - Right, okay, just checking, because they're getting everywhere now. They are really getting about.

**Ms BUTLER** - Below roadkill, Madam Chair, we have Aboriginal Heritage. Could you, for the record, provide us with some information around the potential to disturb several sites of varying significance of Aboriginal heritage, and what work is underway to try to lessen that impact at the moment?

**Mr JORDAAN** - We have done assessments on Aboriginal heritage sites. We've identified certain areas where we found some specific sites that will be affected within the project footprint. We've been in contact with Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania and Aboriginal Heritage Council to basically communicate the strategy on how to deal with those sites. Subsequently to obtain permits for removal of those to relocate to identified approved alternative sites. We are currently busy with that process.

**Ms BUTLER** - How significant is that removal work and is there any other alternative than removing Aboriginal heritage from those sites?

**Mr JORDAAN** - As I said, it was all negotiated with the council and that was their preference.

**Ms BUTLER** - The Aboriginal Council or the Kingborough Council?

**Mr JORDAAN** - The Aboriginal Heritage Council. Their requirement is that we do relocate those artefacts and we went through a process of identifying a relocation site which we presented to them. They then indicated what would be their preference and we are currently going through that process of getting everything relocated.

## PUBLIC

We also had to contact the Australian government because of the EPBC referral that could have affected the site, but we've got permission from them to continue this process independently.

**Ms BURNET** - How best do you see that improvement, particularly around the Mitre 10 site, with traffic movements versus cars, active transport, people walking on footpaths and riding bicycles in that area? It was suggested, possibly by Cycling South, about just having one exit point rather than two exit points at that Mitre 10 store. Can you condition that or have any input into that?

**Ms HICKS** - I don't believe we can condition that because those two exit points out of Mitre 10 are onto Huntingfield Avenue which is a Kingborough Council asset.

**Ms BURNET** - Okay, so it might be something to take up with Kingborough.

**CHAIR** - Hospitable council, they're proactive.

**Ms BURNET** - You're working closely with Kingborough on this?

**Ms HICKS** - Yes, that's correct.

**CHAIR** - If there were no more questions on that, we'll move onto the really important part, not that they're all not important, but that's funding and cost. Obviously, we've been presented with the estimates and it's clear that these are only estimates.

When you go over, particularly around the escalation allowance, is a provisioning costs for changes in economic and market conditions over time. Estimates of escalation are not intended to be precise forecasts for future prices.

Does the department feel confident that the P50 estimate, the P90 estimate and those escalations that are not set in stone are going to be achieved? Because I can see \$3 million that we could possibly start on that overpass if we went P50, which we go P50 - take P50 road - can I have some assurance around that?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes, just to get back to your statement about the estimates, these estimates were derived just before we went into the detailed design. We did that with the preliminary design, which is, at that stage, you have fairly accurate quantities and those estimates were derived from that bill of quantities. We have the base estimate and then above that we had to work on a contingency allowance for both P50 and P90. We also allowed for the escalation over the two years of construction, but also the additional year heading up to its approval of the project. Yes, we are confident that we've looked in detail into these numbers and they are similar to what we do with other projects.

**CHAIR** - The reference to a contingency of between 10 to 30 per cent, that's a big gap. My learned colleague to my right who has a background in building would say that's a huge gap - I expect. Is that usual? That big a variance.

**Mr JORDAAN** - That is just under the typical guidelines notes. If we look at the contingency that we've published in the tables of the report, the P50 was at 12 per cent and the P90 was at 17 per cent.

**CHAIR** - But then it's up to 30 per cent.

**Mr JORDAAN** - I said, yes, the 10 to 30 is like a typical guideline. That will also depend on the accuracy of your design at that stage. If you are still only at concept design, then it can easily go up to 30.

**CHAIR** - If something happens with a geotechnical risk it could blow the budget out of the water.

**Ms HICKS** - There are contingency items for things like geotechnical and other delays, but yes, we might use some of that contingency, but there's another contingency that might not get realised.

**Ms BUTLER** - It is quite significant though. If you add together the contingency and the escalation on P50, that's 14 per cent of the total cost. If you add together the P90, the contingency and the escalation, it's almost 13.5 per cent of the total cost. It's a lot. Why is that? It's unusual for us to see contingency and escalation actually divided as such. Usually, when we get these submissions they're not. Why is there a different approach, because that's a lot?

**Mr JORDAAN** - The contingency is based on confidence about the base case items identified. It's not just a one liner at the bottom of the of the cost estimate, it's a column on the side. Those contingencies the percentages differ from for all the line items so that the average combined contingency for the P50 was 12 and for the P90 was 17. Escalation is about the future price that you will pay for something you buy.

**CHAIR** - Like steel or concrete or whatever that might be?

**Mr JORDAAN** - That's not about the uncertainty...it's not uncertainty about the numbers.

**Ms HICKS** - The base estimate is on today's rates. The contingency is on the base estimate, which is also today's rates.

**Ms BUTLER** - We usually don't see them separated as such. We usually see them-

**Ms HICKS** - In all estimates, they will always be separated and sometimes the way they're presented might not show that separation, but escalation is always applied to both the base estimate and the contingency because it is a separate item and it can apply to both.

**Ms BURNET** - The funding from the feds totalling \$76.4 million, is that current levels?

**CHAIR** - That's combined.

**Ms BURNET** - I'm sorry, the \$61.12 million. That's presumably a fixed amount. Is there any sort of contingency on when that needs to be spent?

**Mr JORDAAN** - How it works with the federal government to get to that number is part of a budget. That is now allocated into a budget. To actually get that funds paid over to state government, we've got another set of milestones. We also submit that to government to state when we require that funding.



**CHAIR** - You get part payments.

**Mr JORDAAN** - It's not coming all at once, it's in portions.

**Ms BURNET** - Is that Infrastructure Australia? One of their major projects?

**Ms HICKS** - No, this one doesn't come under Infrastructure Australia because the project is within the threshold, which I think might be \$250 million or something like that.

**Mr HARRISS** - You touched on it just before. The base estimate's done on current market. Is it taken into account when the project's going to start, or is it purely done on 2024?

**Ms HICKS** - It's on today's rates. That's all we can do - is start off with a base case. Then we work out what contingent risk there is, or risks, applied to all of those items, and some mathematical wizardry and probabilistic analysis gets applied to all of those items, which generates the contingency amounts. That's where the P50 and P90 comes in. Those have different weightings in that probabilistic analysis. That's all on today's rates. Both of those sides of the estimate can then increase based on whether or not we construct in one year's time, two years, three years.

**CHAIR** - Moving on to the timing. I know we've talked a little bit and touched on some of these milestones as we've been walking through the submission. Are there any questions, members, around what's been presented? Complete construction mid-2027, if all goes well?

**Ms BUTLER** - Is that realistic, do you think? Do you think that's realistic that the commence construction is mid-2025 when you've got the EPBC approval estimated date April 2025, the advertising for the construction tender - there are quite a few hurdles there. Do you think that's a realistic commence construction, mid-2025?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Just to give a bit more perspective, in terms of the design, we aim to finish that off by the end of this year, which will include the tender pack. Then it will be placed on the side until we get approval from EPBC. If that happens in April next year, we can immediately go to market with the tender. Then it is just to allow for the tenders to come back and then to place the order. We believe it is feasible, based on the fact that we get the EPBC approval in April.

**Ms BUTLER** - On a protocol or procedural level - and I'm thinking out loud here - if there was an opportunity for additional funding -

**CHAIR** - Of \$4 million?

**Ms BUTLER** - Yes, if there was, where would that fit in that timeframe? When would you know whether or not you do need such a large contingency or amount for escalated costs as well? Do you have an idea around timing around that, and whether or not there would be an opportunity? Or where opportunities might fit for either additional funding or to understand whether or not you may have more money in the kitty than what you realise?

**Mr JORDAAN** - I think the easiest answer is to say closest to the end of the project. However, we will have to look at - as we realise the actual cost, to then compare that to what

## PUBLIC

we had in the estimate in terms of the specific contingency against those deliverables. If there are certain items that were identified as high contingency, a high value item, early in the project, then we would know that you may not need that. Yes, most often, you only know what will be available closer to the end of the project.

**Ms HICKS** - I'll add to that. The first time we will actually have information about what contingency won't be required is the estimate contingency. As soon as we have got tenders in, and particularly have selected a preferred tender and awarded a contract, within that part of the contingency is immediately resolved. If there are savings at tender time, then that's the first time we're aware that we have some money up our sleeve to reinvest or provide back.

**Ms BUTLER** - That's around mid-2025? Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Any other questions?

**Mr HARRISS** - I have one. The EPBC - your estimated April date, where does that come from? Do you get guidance on that or is that just a guess to go, 'We hope the federal government's going to come back with something?'

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes, to be honest, that was just based on previous experiences and what we could gather from these types of inquiries, the duration that took. We already came a long way with them with this initial submission, the response, then now we are at the last stage, where we have to present the offset proposal and the strategy. We've allowed about four months, five months, in the new year. It's not based on core evidence and correspondence with them to have an accurate date - unfortunately we don't have that at this stage.

**CHAIR** - The last page we have is conclusion and recommendation. Is there anything there, members, that you would like to ask before I ask our current attendees at the table to step back and we have another witness? This is just really a summing up of what we've already discussed. At this point in time, we do have another witness to hear from, so I would ask that you leave the table and please take a seat, because we will invite you back before the conclusion of this today.

Do we need to suspend or we keep going? Just so we can invite our member of the public, an interested party, to come forward.

**The witnesses withdrew.**

Welcome, Mr Donnellon. Could you please introduce yourself and take this statutory declaration? Even though you would have heard me previously when I gave an outline of the statement before evidence, I will do it again, for completeness, so thank you.

**Mr MARK DONNELLON** WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much, and as I said, you're appearing before the committee. The committee is certainly pleased to hear your evidence today. Just be advised that before giving evidence, I need to inform you of some important aspects of committee proceedings.

## PUBLIC

Our committee hearing is a proceeding in parliament, which means that it receives a protection of parliamentary privilege. It is an important legal protection that allows individuals to give evidence to a parliamentary committee to speak with complete freedom and without fear of being sued or questioned in any court or place out of parliament, and it implies to ensure that parliament receives the very best of information when conducting its inquiries. It is also important to be aware that the protection is not afforded to you if statements may be defamatory, are repeated or referred to by you outside the confines of the parliamentary proceedings. It is a public hearing and we may well have somebody watching and there may be somebody listening as well. Do you understand?

**Mr DONNELLON** - I do.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much. Please, we do have your submission, but if you'd like to just provide us with an overview, then we'll ask some questions. Thank you.

**Mr DONNELLON** - Sure. I'm a member of Kingborough Council's Bicycle Advisory Committee, and have lived in the area for five years now. A keen bike rider, obviously, and use the park and ride often and get around the local area by bike, so I'm quite acquainted with the Algona Road roundabout.

**CHAIR** - You've made some suggestions?

**Mr DONNELLON** - Sure. The crossing at Algona Road, as has been mentioned. It's two lanes in each direction for people to cross. It's a high-traffic road at particular times of the day, like school mornings and, yes, easily considered a frightening road to cross.

**CHAIR** - Busy. I hear you've got to be brave.

**Mr DONNELLON** - That's it. However, the alternative to crossing there is if you're going from the Channel Highway to the park and ride, it's a 250-metre detour to go through the industrial estate, of which is not really high-grade footpaths.

**CHAIR** - It's not ideal.

**Mr DONNELLON** - No.

**Ms BUTLER** - Is it well marked? If you were local, would you know it was there?

**Mr DONNELLON** - No. If you're local and you've tried a few times, you'll eventually figure it out.

**Ms BUTLER** - But if you're someone not local who is going to, say, Clennett's to do some shopping, you wouldn't know it was there, would you?

**Mr DONNELLON** - That's right. Especially if you're approaching from the Huntingfield side, you have to go through some side streets to actually find it.

**Ms BUTLER** - So it's local knowledge.

## PUBLIC

**Mr DONNELLON** - That's right. And if your goal is to get people to take up active transport, then what's currently there is a barrier to using that, a discoverability barrier and practicality barriers as well. This project doesn't include any changes to that underpass, or changes to access to that underpass. One of my recommendations is to link up the other side of Algona Road where the underpass is.

**Ms BURNET** - That's the northern side?

**Mr DONNELLON** - So, a link on the south side of that tunnel up to the Algona Road roundabout, in the road reserve between Algona Road and what is currently Mitre 10.

**CHAIR** - How do you mean link up? What do you envision there, as a person who is using that area?

**Mr DONNELLON** - It would mirror what's alongside the Antarctic Division going down from the roundabout to the tunnel.

**CHAIR** - Is this where you've suggested that a keep-clear zone or zebra crossing would be a cost-effective way to make this part of the Algona Road crossing significantly easier for users of the park and ride?

**Mr DONNELLON** - It's a different suggestion. If you want to make the level crossing perceived safer and easier to use, you could do so by designating some space for cyclists, pedestrians to cross there. Currently, cars will back up at the intersection when entering the roundabout.

**CHAIR** - Right. So, you'd need a keep-clear type, which is pretty simple.

**Mr DONNELLON** - Simple bit of paint.

**CHAIR** - Very simple. That's only some paint on the road.

**Mr DONNELLON** - Yes. It may also involve some realignment of the path because it's quite close to the entrance to the roundabout, but that's specifics.

**CHAIR** - Right. And your suggestion around the northern side of Algona Road has a shared path and gravel path leading down to the underpass.

**Mr DONNELLON** - Yes, the gravel path leads to Redwood Road. That is a residential area that's not pictured on the plans you have. But it's a very walkable distance for the residents there to access the park and ride.

**CHAIR** - So, again, a fairly cost-effective solution to achieve a reasonable outcome, in your view?

**Mr DONNELLON** - A cheap solution to make a small improvement, yes.

**CHAIR** - Keep going. We're reading as we're going.

## PUBLIC

**Mr DONNELLON** - Things that I think are important to focus on is improving the access to the park and ride without a car.

**CHAIR** - Which seems like a really logical approach.

**Mr DONNELLON** - Yes, so, right. One of the ways I believe we can improve uptake of the bus services from the park and ride is to create options that make it viable for people not to own one of their cars. The area -

**CHAIR** - We are talking about Tasmania here, Mark.

**Mr DONNELLON** - Yes. One of the cars. Yes, it's not really a practical area to entirely give up cars.

**Ms BUTLER** - But if you were a person that was living nearby or riding a bike, there are a lot of residential dwellings around there. So, instead of those people having to drive from their residential dwelling, cut across, go park up near a bus stop, for them to have an access way to be able to just walk across to catch a bus would be a lot easier, I imagine.

**Mr DONNELLON** - That's right. I might point out that there are houses 200 metres away on the western side of this project and for people to walk currently without the unfunded overpass, they have to walk 1.7 kilometres, or 24 minutes.

**CHAIR** - Saves them going for a run in the morning.

**Mr DONNELLON** - Yes. The overpass would cut that reasonably significantly, although it isn't entirely the most direct route yet.

**Ms BUTLER** - Are there any other locations in that area - excuse my ignorance, where you can catch the buses from? Or is it all funnelled through the park-and-ride areas and main bus depot?

**Mr DONNELLON** - Almost entirely at the park and ride there. There are stops down the Channel Highway around Bunnings and, well, farther north of Bunnings that are infrequently serviced by some buses. But I would say the vast majority of people living in the area will use the Huntingfield park and ride because it has express services to Hobart.

**CHAIR** - And you know the times? Are they regular?

**Mr DONNELLON** - Being a regular user, yes, I know the times. For a lot of services it's about, to Hobart, every half an hour.

**Ms BUTLER** - And the shelters, you don't get wet being underneath them any more, do you? Helpful.

**Ms BURNET** - Can you just describe, as a bike user, the difficulties or ease of getting around if you're crossing the Channel Highway or you just try to get from point A to point B effectively? And also your experience using that roundabout as a bike user?

## PUBLIC

**Mr DONNELLON** - Sure. From deep into Huntingfield, towards where the schools are, down Huntingfield Avenue, is where I normally come from. And down that way there is a great, I think it's about 2 metre, footpath that's hardly intersected by roads and driveways, which makes travelling out of Huntingfield pretty great up until we get to the industrial estate. It might be Patriarch Drive; and the very narrow road sections and footpaths immediately on the approach to the park and ride. So, we have some great separated paths on Huntingfield Avenue already, but they end a few hundred metres from the park and ride. So that will put myself, being a keen bike rider, onto the road with the traffic on the left-hand side going up to the park and ride. If I'm catching the bus, I'll pull in there. Otherwise, continue on until I can turn into the Mitre 10 intersection.

**CHAIR** - Is that where you risk your life.

**Mr DONNELLON** - Not quite. It is pretty busy there. Anyway, you can turn off there and then go on to the newish path that leads to the Algona Road crossing. At that point, depending on the time of day, there'll be two lines of cars banked up across the crossing waiting to enter the roundabout, which I will navigate with my kid in my child seat on the back of my bike, and often try to acknowledge the drivers.

**CHAIR** - You put a child on the back of your bike as well?

**Mr DONNELLON** - Yes. How else do you get around with only one car?

**CHAIR** - Well done you.

**Mr DONNELLON** - Yes, it's tricky to navigate. Definitely need to pay attention to whether the drivers are paying attention and get across there. And then the second crossing is much more difficult to do in high traffic, as you have a lot of cars coming round the roundabout at speed. If they've come from the Kingston Bypass, it's pretty much a straight shot across the roundabout and they will -

**CHAIR** - They're the ones doing 50 and 60.

**Mr DONNELLON** - Exactly. Then you also have traffic that may or may not be turning around the roundabout and you have to, essentially, give way to them whether or not they're going to take the exit or not, because drivers can't reliably indicate.

**Ms BURNET** - It makes me shudder.

**Mr DONNELLON** - There's a lot of traffic to give way to crossing that second side of Algona Road.

**CHAIR** - Your recommendation for paths, and you've made what I consider is a fairly reasonable recommendation here, where you talk about:

The re-alignment of the north side will increase the distance where path users and road users can see each other, a welcome change. This could be further improved with the removal of vegetation that blocks the sightline between path users and road users turning left from Channel Hwy to Algona Road.

## PUBLIC

Is that something that could just be done as a matter of course? It doesn't need this reference to do that.

**Mr DONNELLON** - Absolutely not. No.

**CHAIR** - Right. I thought that sounded so practical that surely that's not part of this. Is that something that you've progressed with anyone: the council or Department of State Growth or anyone?

**Mr DONNELLON** - I don't know who to contact in Department of State Growth.

**CHAIR** - Well, guess what? We do. We will find somebody and I'll probably throw it up to the other end of the table. I think that's a really practical solution for providing some better sight distance, so thank you for that. Anything else that you'd like to add, Mark? This is your chance to shine.

**Mr DONNELLON** - I'd like to add that this project area is smack bang in the middle of some large residential areas, large places of employment, schools, a new shopping centre, hopefully.

**CHAIR** - Yes, across the road. We saw that.

**Mr DONNELLON** - A huge one. And it's in an area that should have lots of trips taken without cars. We're not talking about large distances here. We're talking about walkable, bikeable distances. This project area is right in the middle, and I believe non-car transport should be highly considered as part of the project.

**Ms BURNET** - In relation to how projects might be considered in the future, what sort of suggestions would you have? I mean, is this a perfect process? You probably have been involved in writing a submission and probably earlier as well, with adding your bit as part of KBUG (Kingston Bicycle User Group). What would you suggest?

**Mr DONNELLON** - I think the consultation process has been great, actually, as far as requesting -

**CHAIR** - Consideration?

**Mr DONNELLON** - Consideration. We saw a lot of feedback similar to what I've been giving today over the years on this project. I don't think it's the consultation process that is lacking.

**Ms BURNET** - You obviously heard that the active transport bridge may or may not get built because it may not be funded. I mean, is that a good outcome from your perspective?

**Mr DONNELLON** - No.

**CHAIR** - You can answer without fear or favour, I think I mentioned.

**Mr DONNELLON** - Yes, no -

## PUBLIC

**Ms BURNET** - How would you envisage that in an ideal world as to the priorities?

**Mr DONNELLON** - Well, I believe the state government already has policies that say these things will be considered as part of their infrastructure projects. I have with me the 2024 Tasmanian Walk, Wheel and Ride policy, previously the Positive Provision Policy, which states that these sorts of things, these active transport links, will be considered as part of infrastructure projects. So the policy is already there. It's just not happening. I don't know how to change that.

**CHAIR** - Would you ascertain there's some attempt to meet that policy, but there could be enhanced opportunities.

**Mr DONNELLON** - Yes, from watching the - four years has it been for this project - it seems that the active transport infrastructure has come very second to the primary road infrastructure, and I'd like to see it on the same level.

**CHAIR** - Would you agree that's always going to be a challenge when vehicles would obviously have a higher usage than a bike and a walking person in that particular area, or is that still not satisfying you?

**Mr DONNELLON** - Yes, and I might point out the active transport infrastructure costs are a fraction of the road infrastructure costs.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Ms BURNET** - It's probably why it's easier to not build, unfortunately. But yes, we certainly hear what you're saying.

**CHAIR** - Any other questions for Mark? No.

Mark, on behalf of the committee, we would very much like to thank you for taking the time - and the significant time that you've sat and waited. The committee certainly takes their role seriously, so we thank you.

I need to advise you - and at the commencement of your evidence I did let you know - that your evidence here today is protected by parliamentary privilege. But once you leave the table, that privilege does not attach to the comments that you may make to anyone, including the media - they could be waiting outside - even if you're just repeating what you've said to us. Do you understand that?

**Mr DONNELLON** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much. We're happy for you to move away from the table. Thank you.

**Mr MIDDLETON** - Would you like us to come back?

**CHAIR** - Please rejoin us at the table. So you've heard the number of comments that have been made by Mr Donnellon. We very much appreciate the public taking time to not only



## PUBLIC

come today, but provide submissions, which has happened for this. Is there any comment that anyone would like to make and then I'll open it up to questions from members.

**Mr MIDDLETON** - If I may, Chair, I'd like to correct something that I said earlier. I mentioned the positive provision policy for cycling infrastructure. As Mark has quite rightly pointed out, that's been superseded by the new Tasmanian Walk, Wheel, Ride Policy 2024. That was an error on my part.

**CHAIR** - It's fine.

**Mr MIDDLETON** - living in the past.

**CHAIR** - It's alright. It's hard to keep up with some of these changes, I can assure you. Any comments about what what's been presented?

**Ms BUTLER** - Which department looks after that particular strategy or that particular area. Where does that fit within the department?

**CHAIR** - The Tasmanian Walk, Wheel and Ride Policy?

**Ms BUTLER** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Is that Active Tasmania?

**Mr MIDDLETON** - No, it sits in State Growth.

**CHAIR** - It's gone out of Communities, I suppose, when Communities was made defunct.

**Mr MIDDLETON** - I don't think it was ever in Communities. It's always been a State Growth policy since I've been there.

**Ms BUTLER** - How do they tie in? I'm trying to think of the practicalities on this project. Your team's been managing this and you're given a remit of 'This is what we need'. Where does that team that looks after the walk-ride strategy fit into projects like this?

**Mr MIDDLETON** - If I may just give clarification about where the three of us sit.

**Ms BUTLER** - It's purely procedural.

**Mr MIDDLETON** - These two people are in the planning and delivery, or programming and delivery, area of the department within State Roads. I sit in the network planning area within State Roads. Previously, that was in ITAS; they were in State Roads. We've recently moved back into State Roads. The person who's responsible for that policy sits next to me when I'm in the office. He's in the office at the same time within network planning.

**CHAIR** - Can I have some thoughts around the suggestion of having the keep-clear zone or the zebra crossing, which I indicated at the time seemed like a very easy solution to be able to gain some sort of access without fear of being knocked off your bike, particularly with a

little person on the back. Is that something that's not an expensive item that could be progressed?

**Ms HICKS** - I'm happy to talk about that one. I'm not sure if we acknowledged it in the report; part of our final detailed design activities are making some adjustments to -

**CHAIR** - So it's in now, for sure?

**Ms HICKS** - We are looking at that crossing of Algona Road. Johan mentioned previously we were realigning and moving the crossing a little bit farther away from the roundabout.

**CHAIR** - Didn't mention the zigzag or the keep-clear zone, but it's in?

**Ms HICKS** - No.

**CHAIR** - It's in? It's a definite in?

**Ms HICKS** - We're doing improvements to that crossing. I don't know specifically whether we have line marking to preclude vehicles parking over that on the approach to the Algona roundabout from Blackmans Bay. I actually do agree that that is a good suggestion. Because we're still finalising that design, if we haven't considered that, I'm happy to add that to the list of things we're looking at. I agree with that approach.

In terms of a pedestrian crossing, it's not practical to have a pedestrian crossing that close to the proximity of approaches to a roundabout because of the impact of backing up traffic through the roundabout. That causes other substantial safety issues for motorists and everybody.

I do agree the line marking is a good opportunity.

**CHAIR** - Like a keep-clear zone.

**Ms HICKS** - Yes, a keep-clear zone type line marking. We will look into that if we are not already.

Another point on that matter, with pedestrians and cyclists crossing Algona Road, we acknowledge the issues with crossing it at the moment with the current level of traffic that uses the roundabout. The new design will have a greatly reduced amount of traffic using the roundabout.

**CHAIR** - Spread the traffic across two roundabouts.

**Ms HICKS** - That's right. That will also have a positive impact on the safety of that crossing.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Any other issues members would like to raise?

## PUBLIC

**Mr HARRISS** - On that, when we say reduce traffic at Algona Road, how does that reduce traffic there? How will the new bit reduce traffic coming from Algona Road and Blackman's Bay? That won't reduce traffic through there, will it?

**Ms HICKS** - That's a fair point. It'll still be the same amount of traffic travelling to Blackmans Bay. That won't change.

**Mr HARRISS** - And travelling from Blackmans Bay through the Algona Road roundabout, is that right?

**Ms HICKS** - The amount of traffic using the roundabout will change. That gives some more gaps in traffic opportunities for people trying to cross that road. It's hard to tell if they're going to be -

**Mr HARRISS** - Which way.

**Ms HICKS** - Going down Algona Road when you're trying to make a decision to cross.

**Ms BURNET** - Are the Huntingfield road improvements that Mark raised in your remit?

**Ms HICKS** - No, I'm sorry.

**Ms BURNET** - The park and ride is something this committee could possibly refer to Kingborough Council, possibly, with concerns maybe from this committee, should we think of that.

Obviously, some cyclists will continue to use the existing roundabout. Is there any provision to improve cyclist safety in regard to the other roundabout or is it like that connection? I don't know we've talked about that at all.

**Ms HICKS** - I can't comment on that one.

**Ms BURNET** - The linkage between -

**Mr JORDAAN** - The only reason why a cyclist would want to use the new roundabout is to get access to the bypass. I don't think that would be a high priority.

**Mr MIDDLETON** - As someone who rides on the road there now, although not in the peak times that Mark is doing it, I think there would be limited on-road cycle use of coming down the offramp to go to the roundabout to get on the bypass or coming from the Algona Road side to go around the second roundabout to get on the bypass.

Some hardy souls will and they will do that. I think the majority of cyclists who are doing it for the commute will probably come off the Channel Highway south of this area and travel down the old Channel Highway through Kingston and head up over Bonnet Hill. That would be my assumption.

In terms of road space on the road between those two roundabouts, I'm not sure what the cross section would be, but I suspect it will have a fairly reasonable sealed shoulder width.

## PUBLIC

**Ms BURNET** - I'd be interested to know if there's any improvements.

**CHAIR** - Is that available?

**Mr MIDDLETON** - Yes, we'll have to take that on notice and provide that to you.

**CHAIR** - The question is -

**Ms BURNET** - In relation to whether there is any shoulder or improved cycling between the roundabouts?

**CHAIR** - Any further questions, members? There was some indication earlier from Johan this project does meet these needs, but I still need to ask the questions.

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

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Are the proposed works the best solution to meet identified needs or solve a recognised problem within the allocated budget with a couple of amendments that we've already heard and we look forward to?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes.

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

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Do the proposed works provide value for money and are the proposed works a good use of public funds?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much.

For completeness, as I indicated earlier at the commencement of your evidence, what you have said here today is protected by parliamentary privilege, but once you leave the table, please be aware that privilege does not attach to your comments that you may make to anyone, including the media, even if you're just repeating what you said to us. Do you understand?

**Mr JORDAAN** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much. On behalf of the committee, we very much appreciate the opportunity to meet onsite, albeit it was somewhat wet, and I think our secretary almost ruined his suit, but it does allow members, particularly who are not familiar with the area, to get a better understanding of what's being presented. So, we appreciate that opportunity.

**Ms BUTLER** - And laminated maps.

## **PUBLIC**

**CHAIR** - And one laminated map just in case. But again, thank you very much. The committee looks forward to receiving responses to questions, which you'll receive by email from the secretary, in those areas that we'd like to close the loop on. Again, we appreciate the work, effort and time that goes into providing these submissions.

I particularly would like to thank those groups that provided submissions and for Mark as well for coming along today. It's a really important process that we hear from the community who have a significant vested interest in these proposed projects. So, thank you and we shall stop the broadcast.

**THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.**

**The committee adjourned at 4.06 p.m.**