

MEETING NOTES



Name of meeting: Foxground & Berry Bypass Route Comparison Study: Technical Investigation Group
Weekly Progress/Coordination Meeting 9

Location of meeting: RMS Project Office, Pyrmont

Meeting facilitator: Steve Zhivanovich

Date: 04/04/2012 **Time:** 10am

Attendees:	Name	Initials	Organisation
	Henk Buys	HB	AECOM
	Derrick Hitchins	DH	SMEC (External reviewer)
	David Kennewell	DK	AECOM
	Annabel Killen	AK	Evans & Peck
	Chris Masters	CM	SMEC (External reviewer)
	Michael Moore	MM	Evans & Peck
	Ben Noble	BN	AECOM
	Ken O'Neill	KO'N	Aurecon
	Basil Pazpinis	BP	RMS PMO (Internal reviewer)
	John Poposki	JP	RMS
	Raj Rajeswaran	RR	Evans & Peck
	Dan Reeve	DR	SMEC (External reviewer)
	Ron de Rooy	RdR	RMS
	Glen Smith	GS	AECOM
	Peter Stewart	PS	Peter Stewart Consulting
	Alan Thomas	AT	RMS PMO (Internal reviewer)
	Jon Williamson	JW	AECOM
	Steven Zhivanovich	SZ	RMS

Additional distribution:	Name	Initials	Organisation
	Adam Berry	AB	RMS
	Stuart Dalziel	SD	AECOM
	Phil Jorgensen	PJ	Evans & Peck

Attachments: Outstanding actions from past minutes
Critical Issues Register

	Item		
1.	Review and update of outstanding actions from previous minutes	Outstanding actions reviewed	Noted
2.	External Reviewers	<p>Flood investigations: Lyall + Associates</p> <p>Briefing meeting to be held 10/4. BN and CM to attend</p> <p><i>Post meeting note: Meeting to be held in the following week due to availability of attendees.</i></p>	Noted
3.	Issues Register	Issues register updates discussed and responsibility for comments allocated. Group to return responses to AK ASAP.	All
4.	<p>Design development:</p> <p>Southern suggestion</p> <p>Northern preferred option developments</p>	<p>Inclusion of ongoing design development in estimates</p> <p>Discussion regarding appropriate approach for incorporating ongoing design development in this exercise.</p> <p>Group acknowledged that this design development will be ongoing for some time. Incorporation of design development into cost estimate will be achieved to the extent possible. However some design development issues will not be able to be incorporated directly in the estimate where</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The design development involves issues that are not to be addressed in detail at this stage in the estimating process (for example some visual/urban design features that may have significant impact on the community but do not significantly impact the cost estimate) - The design development is ongoing or is a design option that would be considered at a later stage in project development (for example the issues currently being addressed in the community working groups) <p>Approach to be adopted:</p> <p>The estimate is to include design development that has been finalised prior to preparation of the estimate.</p>	Noted

		Design development aspects that are ongoing or are options that would be considered in later stages of the project will be documented separately in the report with an assessment of their likely impact on the cost estimate.	
		Southern suggestion: Southern interchange Potential swap of under/overpass. GS progressing design to enable assessment of cost implications.	GS
5.	Flood investigations and assessment	Island embankment investigations Indicative design details distributed for assessment of impact on cost estimate.	Noted
		Flood immune Access GS and BN provide update on design development to assess works required to provide 100yr flood immune access to town with a southern route. Noted that precedent in Belinda St for the Gerringong upgrade involved localised works on only the sections of the road that were subject to flooding. Agreed that this approach will be adopted here.	Noted
		Flood immune Access GS and BN progressing design for flood immune access to provide information for estimate.	GS/BN
6.	Geotech investigations (desk top)	No issues raised	Noted
7.	Geotech investigations (fieldwork)	Fieldwork continuing and approaching completion. HB is developing preliminary notes on results. Noted that lab information not yet available. Preliminary notes to be distributed to PS/AK.	HB
8.	Property severance and adjustments	Valuation complete for both routes. Report section to be progressed. Discussion on information for report. RdR advises that RMS cannot publish details of valuation of individual properties. Agreed that external reviewers will be have access to this detail and review it and raise any issues. Report to explain the method used for valuation and the total assessed values for	Noted

		the two options.	
9.	Structures	<p>Bridge span</p> <p>DR queried use of 33m span when there is precedent for up to 38m span.</p> <p>KO'N stated that this related to flood impacts and notes that it is consistent for both.</p>	Noted
10.	Earthworks	No issues raised.	Noted
11.	Construction methods	<p>Temporary Works</p> <p>PS to provide RR with information on temporary works requirements for estimate.</p>	PS
		<p>Constructability and procurement strategy</p> <p>Status of procurement strategy to be determined and confirmed that current constructability investigations are alignment with this.</p>	AK
		<p>Zoning diagrams</p> <p>Zoning diagrams required by PS.</p>	AK
12.	Mass Haul Analysis	No issues raised.	Noted
13.	Estimating	<p>Island embankment</p> <p>Cost impact of island embankment assessment being progressed by RR.</p> <p>Issues raised</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inclusion of wire rope in median required - Allowance for non-continuous operation in bridge construction - Allowance for restricted access and low volume pavement works <p>Discussion to be held between HB, RR and PS to discuss assumptions and design parameters.</p>	HB, RR,PS
		<p>Road handover costs</p> <p>Indicative costs for handover of existing highway to local council to be obtained from RMS Asset Management</p>	RdR
14.	Construction Programming	No issues raised	Noted

15.	Comparative report	Report preparation progressing. Deliverable content for each section being discussed with relevant members of group.	Noted
16.	AOB	No issues raised	Noted