

03 JUL 2006

SL06/216
CSL 15

File No. CMPL/00.12.02-00091

JSC CROSS CITY TUNNEL

03 JUL 2006

RECEIVED

3 July 2006

Mr Simon Johnston
A/Director
Joint Select Committee on the Cross City Tunnel
Parliament House
Macquarie Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Dear Mr Johnston

RE INQUIRY INTO LANE COVE TUNNEL

Thank you for your letter of 21 June enclosing a transcript of my evidence and the questions taken on notice.

I have amended the transcript as requested, and enclose the marked-up copy.

Also attached are my answers to the questions taken on notice. Most of the specific questions provided by Ms Rhiannon MLC will be answered by Thiess John Holland. I have provided answers to her questions 25, 26, 27 and 35.

If you require any further information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me on 9034 8401.

Yours sincerely



Ian Hunt
Chief Executive Officer

Encl.

Joint Select Committee on the Cross City Tunnel

Inquiry into Lane Cove Tunnel

Questions taken on notice 15 June 2006

1) Could you supply us with the solution [to the dispute between the M2 Hills Motorway and the operators of the Lane Cove Tunnel over traffic and lane configurations connecting the two motorways]? [page 92]

Answer: This matter relates to the potential for eastbound motorists on the M2 Motorway to make an illegal manoeuvre in order to turn left into Mowbray Road, by traversing through a gap in the barrier between the M2 and Epping Road that has been provided to enable emergency vehicle to cross through the barrier. During the design process, The Hills Motorway Limited (THML) engineering consultant, Sinclair Knight Merz (SKM) provided comments on the proposed design. There was no 'dispute' but a difference of opinion that was discussed by THML, Connector Motorways and RTA.

The solution adopted has the following features:

- The gap is restricted to 53 m in length.
- There will be a "vibraline" between Epping Road and the Epping Road merge lane.
- There will be in-pavement sockets provided to enable future deployment of narrow post/bollard lane markers (Supaflex bollards from Saferoads), colloquially known as 'candy sticks'.

The design fully complies with the requirements of the Project Deed's Scope of Work and Technical Criteria for lane widths and land boundaries. A design road safety audit was undertaken.

There may still be a potential of the illegal movement, so Connector Motorways in consultation with RTA has developed a contingency plan. The plan will involve THML, RTA and Connector Motorways in a joint effort, as the three owners at this interface.

The contingency plan is:

1. Deploy portable variable message signs during the initial tunnel opening to inform drivers of the changed traffic conditions, in particular regarding access to Mowbray Road West. This will be assessed as part of the construction staging and the opening Traffic Management Plan and implemented as appropriate.
2. Monitor the interface using the CCTV cameras positioned at the tunnel entry portal. A procedure will be developed to allow this to be done without compromising the monitoring requirements of the tunnel.
3. Maintain or deploy portable variable message signs on the M2 for a longer period of time, with the permission of THML.
4. Continually monitor the interface as part of the traffic management procedures at the LCT's western portal. If the illegal traffic movement still occurs then the 'candy sticks' will be deployed.
5. If the above does not resolve the issue during the first few months of operations, an appropriate solution would need to be developed in conjunction with the RTA

2) With regard to over-height vehicle management, the document [Technical Memorandum No. 42, from Sinclair Knight Merz] speaks about the situation where the vehicle [an over-height vehicle] may have to be cut out and there began a dispute about how to resolve that. I would be interested to hear how you resolved that...The dispute was also about the management of the traffic while the truck is stuck in the tunnel. People were saying that the traffic could flow freely, whereas the other consultants were saying it is all going to be backing up. I am interested in that traffic management and how you resolved it. [p. 92–93]

Answer: This situation is covered by an Incident Response Plan (IRP) specifically prepared for over-dimension vehicles. The plan has been developed in consultation with stakeholders including NSW Police, RTA's Transport Management Centre, NSW Fire Brigade, NSW Ambulance Service and THML. The IRP utilises traffic management devices such as in-pavement lights, variable message signs and moveable medians.

The concept of the IRP is:

- There are over-height vehicle detectors on all approach roads to the western tunnel portal (M2 and Epping Road), which trigger warning messages to the driver of the over-height vehicle.
- This detection is in two stages. The first stage is prior to the last diversion e.g. prior to the Delhi Road exit on the M2 and prior to Lane Cove River Bridge on Epping Road, aimed at diverting the vehicle up Epping Road. The second stage is on the M2 after Delhi Road to confirm to the LCT Motorway Control Centre that an over-height vehicle has missed the Delhi Road exit.
- The alerts initiate a traffic management plan that uses moveable medians and associated traffic devices (stop lights, in-pavement lights, advance warning signs, changeable message signs) to stop then divert all traffic away from the tunnel and on to Epping Road, for the short period required to divert the offending vehicle.
- If the over-height vehicle is not diverted, traffic management devices will continue to warn the driver to stop before the portal. If the driver stops just before the portal, or fails to stop and hits the physical barrier, there will be significant traffic disruption while the vehicle is removed.
- RTA's Transport Management Centre will be notified and RTA will implement a pre-agreed traffic management plan for dealing with the diversion of traffic away from the tunnel on to Epping Road and Mowbray Road. (The RTA can provide details of this traffic management plan.)

The physical barrier is located just inside the portal, making it more difficult for the vehicle to be removed, therefore requiring a longer period of traffic disruption. Connector Motorways could not locate the barrier outside the portal due to land restrictions.

25) Do you acknowledge that the value of some properties will have dropped due to the Lane Cove Tunnel project?

Answer: This is not a matter for Connector Motorways or our contractors.

26) For those residences where the property value has dropped will compensation be provided and if so how much?

Answer: No compensation is provided by Connector Motorways or our contractors.

27) If no compensation will be provided why was such decision made?

Answer: This is not a matter for Connector Motorways or our contractors.

35) Could you supply the details of the solution recommended by the RTA in relation to the gap in the barrier between Epping Road and the M2?

Answer: Please refer to the answer to question no. 1 above.