

Action Items

Meeting:	Berry Bypass Cost Estimates Meeting
Date:	Tuesday 3 July, 2012
Location:	RMS Southern Region Office
Time:	11am – 1pm
Attendees:	Kathy Jones (KJA) Joey Clayton (KJA) Brad Turner (RMS) John Poposki (RMS) Michael Moore (E&P) Phil Jorgenson (E&P) Dan Reeve (SMEC) Jon Williamson (AECOM) Bruce Ramsey Stuart Coughlan

Item	Subject	Action
1.	KJ started the meeting, established the rules for the meeting.	Note
2.	KJ had each attendee introduce themselves, then state their expectations for the meeting.	Note
3.	KJ asked if BR and SC would like the meeting taped, they agreed.	Note
4.	KJ tabled an issues analysis table.	Note
5.	SC stated further information he had requested was not available on the website, wanted that acknowledged. KJ acknowledged this information was not available on the website, but had been provided on request.	Information provided to SC will all be published online
6.	SC noted BR had not received any direct, personal response to his most recent submission. BT acknowledged this; but said a response had been given albeit indirectly and answered through the Issues, Actions & Outcomes Register which was updated and published on the web weekly.	Specific answers now included in the Issues Analysis Table
7.	SC stated BR's rebuttal of the 9 points had not been responded to at all. KJ acknowledged this.	9 points rebuttal to be responded to and published online in the Issues Analysis Table
8.	Bridge discussion: BR stated revised design was not developed, BT stated JP had taken it as far as possible; to make it compliant removed any cost benefit. BR further noted he was not consulted following its rejection.	Note
9.	BR stated he had offered his services to RMS and AECOM though they weren't accepted. BT stated this was the role of the independent reviewer, who SC had been keen on bringing in.	Note



10.	DR stated he believed the north and south comparison was properly done.	Note
11.	Geotech discussion around 28 v 35 m width (4 v 6 m)	Note
12.	<p>BR stated he believed he had been “kicked out” of the discussion of the southern option, that Steve Zhivanovich had ignored him, including when BR turned up to RMS Pyrmont offices asking for a meeting.</p> <p>BT noted that BR had tried to meet SZ and had succeeded.</p> <p>SC noted this meeting only happened by BR “accosting” SZ.</p> <p>KJ acknowledged BR felt he had not been consulted.</p> <p>BR stated he felt should have been able to go through his last submission with SZ.</p> <p>MM stated BR had gone through this submission with SZ and that they had had a detailed and recorded 2-hour conversation.</p>	Note
13.	BR stated he is able to charge \$3,000/day and had spent 1,000 hours on his efforts.	Note
14.	<p>SC and BR were concerned about the 300-400,000m³ of excess that was no longer available and that this had only been revealed by accident. BT described the impact of the RMS change to the excess fill assumption as 'Massive'.</p> <p>BT acknowledged this as a major error by RMS in not informing the community, that if he “could change one thing that would be it”.</p> <p>SC agreed and said the imported fill added \$42million of direct costs, or over \$100million including mark-up and contingency, to the cost of the Southern route.</p>	Note
15.	<p>BR noted he had done his design and estimates not based on Toolijooa to Croziers Road, instead from chainages 14,500 to 20,600.</p> <p>MM noted BR was working from the desktop analysis, not the TIG brief.</p> <p>SC noted BR had not been informed he was working to incorrect distances and that this affected his calculations.</p> <p>BT said the TIG and the IR were the appropriate forums for these calculations.</p>	Note
16.	<p>SC stated he believed RMS was trying to use project accounts to explain how RMS compares “the evaluation between north and south in terms of properties purchased” and that this would be unclear to most people.</p> <p>MM stated SC wanted to get further into identification of property-by-property valuations. SC agreed with this but acknowledged that RMS doesn't have to show the name of the person against the property - just show the properties 1,2,3,5,6. The key is to find a way of understanding these numbers and he believes that nothing that has been shown so far does this.</p> <p>SC noted that the property information, including lot numbers and addresses was previously provided by RMS to a number of people (not specifically at SC request). MM stated that the data should not have been made public and had possibly breached privacy laws. SC requested that this be noted.</p> <p>BR stated he believed the dairy farmers would “go for the southern</p>	Note

	option” because their land had been overvalued by RMS and that the southern option would only affect “5 or 6 percent of the paddocks”. MM noted these evaluations were done by professional estimators.	
17.	MM noted that BR’s estimates for the embankment were not feasible. BR challenged this, saying the cost was blown out by an unnecessary design amendment, that he understood bridge design and had done it before. DR noted RTA/RMS had changed design guidelines many years ago and BR’s design suggestion would not be compliant. BR stated RMS should change its design guidelines. MM explained BR had not accounted for all features of constructing the embankment.	Note
18.	BR requested a costing exclusively between chainages 14,500 to 20,600. MM stated this would be going backwards and there was no purpose to doing that. BR stated “the purpose would be to satisfy me”.	Note
19.	KJ noted there was a disagreement around the surplus fill and this related to the scope and length of the option.	Note
20.	KJ suggested a process would be to provide answers in the issues tables and for BR and SC to provide further questions which would be answered.	KJ to distribute issues table BR and SC to provide further questions
21.	BR stated the community would not be onside until he said was satisfied and that he wanted another meeting to discuss road estimating and design.	Note
22.	BT stated the process had to be finite as the Minister had made a decision. BR stated it was “a horrible decision”.	Note
23.	SC requested a further meeting between BR and Glen Smith & the CAD Draughtsman to discuss the TIG reasons for rejecting the BR revised design and to understand how RMS had amended the horizontal & vertical alignment plus resulting quantities.	BT to pass this request on to RMS
24.	SC stated there are two questions unanswered: one over “big ticket items”, one over the vertical alignment issues in terms of cut and fill.	KJ agreed these two questions be minuted