

MEETING NOTES



Name of meeting: Foxground & Berry Bypass Route Comparison Study: Technical Investigation Group
Weekly Progress/Coordination Meeting 10

Location of meeting: AECOM, 420 George Street, Sydney

Meeting facilitator: Steve Zhivanovich

Date: 18/04/2012 **Time:** 10am

Attendees:

Name	Initials	Organisation
Henk Buys	HB	AECOM
Derrick Hitchins	DH	SMEC (External reviewer)
Phil Jorgensen	PJ	Evans & Peck
David Kennewell	DK	AECOM
Annabel Killen	AK	Evans & Peck
Chris Masters	CM	SMEC (External reviewer)
Michael Moore	MM	Evans & Peck
Ken O'Neill	KO'N	Aurecon
Basil Pazpinis	BP	RMS PMO (Internal reviewer)
John Poposki	JP	RMS
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
Ben Noble	BN	AECOM

Attachments: Outstanding actions from past minutes

	Item		
1.	Review and update of outstanding actions from previous minutes	Outstanding actions reviewed	Noted
2.	Critical Issues Register	Updated issues register reviewed	All
		<p>Northern route drainage structures</p> <p>Discussion regarding investigations to date on extending the embankment to reduce the length of the bridge. A consequence of lowering the viaduct height at Woodhill Mountain Road is the western approach is close to ground level over its length up to Connollys Creek (post meeting note – approx 50m to 75m). The height clearance from ground level to the underside of the bridge is approximately 1.5m in this area. The design of the embankment / road / bridge must be reviewed in this location to provide adequate height clearance and flood flow capacity at the same taking account of the environmental impact on the Connollys Creek riparian zone. The road geometry and drainage engineers to review possible solutions and advise.</p>	JW / GS / BN
		<p>Constraints on vertical alignment of southern route from flood levels</p> <p>Further flood modelling to be undertaken on southern route.</p> <p>Drainage and flood modelling independent reviewer Brian Lyall advised he has discussed expanding the flood model with Aecom’s drainage engineer Ben Noble. Adaptation of SMEC’s flood model to tie into the boundary conditions of the Cardno flood model used in the Berry area is possible. The flood model is based on a finite element analysis with a grid sample size of 3 x 3 metres equating to several million data points over the study area. High powered computers are required to process the data for many hours and Aecom will organise computer run time over-night and weekends to undertake the modelling.</p> <p>Results and constraints will be</p>	BN

		documented in detail.	
		<p>Climate change assumptions</p> <p>Further documentation of application of climate change allowances to be prepared incorporation results of further flood modelling being undertaken</p>	BN
		<p>Island embankment</p> <p>Further flood modelling to investigate flood behaviour with and without island embankment</p> <p>Cost impact of island embankment to be assessed as a provisional item in the estimate</p> <p>Documentation to be prepared for report on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Risks - Impact of discontinuous construction - Precedents of inclusion or exclusion of equivalent embankments in other projects 	BN PJ
		<p>Earthworks optimisation</p> <p>Further documentation to be prepared to communicate the sources and use of excess earthworks material.</p> <p>Further optimisation of earthworks on southern suggestion to be developed through revisiting options for gaining fill in other sections of the job.</p> <p>Potential areas of adjustment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduction of embankment fill material by steepening batter slopes 2. Increase of material production by making cutting slopes shallower 3. Examining localised adjustments to the vertical alignment to generate fill <p>Noted that such changes need to be considered along with urban design and property impacts.</p>	

		<p>Format of critical issues register</p> <p>Column to be added indicating whether item is complete or ongoing. Format to be updated by RMS project team.</p>	
3.	Comparative Report	Comparative report deliverables	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design <p>Content received from KO'N Initial content received from GS, some further content required</p>	GS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood investigations <p>Flood investigation section due 19/04 from BN</p>	BN
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geotechnical investigations <p>HB to provide AK with material prepared in previous investigations for northern preferred option</p>	HB
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RailCorp <p>RdR awaiting documentation from RailCorp</p>	RdR
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property <p>RMS has completed property acquisition assessment and all content has been received.</p>	Noted
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction methods <p>All content received, report being prepared.</p>	Noted
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction programme <p>Construction programme generally complete and required presentation documentation for report is being prepared</p>	Noted
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost estimation <p>Cost estimate is approaching completion with final review to be held 23/4.</p>	Noted
4.	Geotechnical investigations (fieldwork)	<p>Results from fieldwork have been sent to various laboratories for analysis to expedite analysis.</p> <p>HB notes that urgency has been placed on results regarding presence of ASS.</p>	Noted

		<p>RMS is engaging consultants to prepare second interpretive report.</p> <p>HB to prepare memo for the second interpretive report outlining the geotechnical factors that impact on design for this project.</p>	HB
		PJ has provided HB with register of cost estimate items awaiting input from geotechnical results.	Noted
5.	Visualisations	Visualisations prepared for upcoming community meeting. Visualisations to be included in report where appropriate.	Noted
6.	Flood investigations: External Reviewers	<p>BL is working with AECOM on an ongoing basis to review flood investigations to date.</p> <p>BL supports the further flood modelling being undertaken as important for providing results to an appropriate level of certainty</p>	Noted
7.	AOB	<p>Upcoming community meeting on 30/4</p> <p>Presenters to include representatives of the group as well as the external reviewers.</p> <p>Format to be consistent with format of previous meeting.</p> <p>Preparation for presentations to occur at next meeting.</p>	Noted
		<p>Kangaroo Valley Road interchange</p> <p>RdR and SZ provide update on progress of design development through community working groups. Significant changes to the interchange and its location have been proposed by some members of the community. The current approach for the group is to continue using the present interchange layout unless otherwise advised.</p> <p>Noted that if the investigation was directed to include major changes to the interchange the investigation would take significantly longer than currently planned.</p>	Noted
		<p>Next meeting</p> <p>The ANZAC Day public holiday precludes the next meeting to take place on Wednesday 25 April and due to group</p>	Noted

		member availability the next meeting has been moved to Thursday 26 th April.	
--	--	---	--