

Aug 2013

Advertisement in Monthly Chronicle re Transurban's offer. No replies were received. However there were many comments from readers.

Christmas
2013

Monthly Chronicle A3 advertisement '**Problems with TRANSURBAN'S offer to build the F3-M2 tunnel**'. My add request Transurban to justify its study. No replies were received to the copy sent to Transurban or given to the Hornsby consultative meeting in December 2013.

7 May 2014

SMH article about the packed NorthWest rail meeting on 5 May 2014 meeting where Beecroft Cheltenham residents complained to Epping MP Greg Smith, ex Attorney General, had let them down. Whilst I was not there I can understand their anger.

When the proposed Epping to Thornleigh Freight line was proposed the EIS indicated that there would be minimal removal of trees and impact on the community.

In my submission I complained that the EIS had many flaws that were ignored. One concern was that the new track and platform at Pennant Hills would not fit and the design should be altered.

During the exhibition period I and others met the ETTT team at Pennant Hills Station and were advised the track and station plans had been completed and could not be altered. Despite the Department of Planning being advised the ETTT's EIS was approved as submitted with minor amendments.

CONCLUSION

Apart from my concerns about the proposed tunnel, some of the issues raised have local, state and national implications for planning and construction of infrastructure.

I suggest Minister Gay and the government should ensure beyond reasonable doubt that there has been nothing untoward and that all of Transurban's submissions and assessments and financial arrangements should be made public as part of the EIS, or as an adjunct to the EIS as many issues are interrelated and should not be considered in isolation.

If any further information or clarification of my concerns is required, I will do so as quickly as possible, or bring the relevant papers to our meeting set down for 6 June 2014 meeting at 10am at your Rouse Hill office.

Peter Waite 9 May 2014

224

Subject: RE: COST CALCULATIONS SUBMITTED BY TRANSURBAN
From: Enquiries NorthConnex <enquiries@northconnex.com.au>
Date: Wed, 4 Jun 2014 09:46:38 +1000
To: Peter Waite <waitepeter@bigpond.com>

Dear Mr Waite

Firstly I do not recall advising that the SKM report "had errors in it and was unreliable".

2013 Hornsby RSL or 2014 N.S. Meeting

But to assist you to understand the financial process behind the bid I advise as follows:

As you are aware, in 2012 Transurban submitted an unsolicited proposal to the NSW Government to design, construct, operate, maintain and finance the NorthConnex project. A significant component of the unsolicited proposal process was to request and evaluate tenders that were competitively bid by industry for the design and construction of the project. Lend Lease Bouygues Joint Venture was selected as the preferred tenderer.

Three tender offers were received in 2013 and each were reviewed and evaluated in detail. All three were within the budget limit set at \$2.65b. The evaluation process included a thorough review of the tender prices including quantities and rates. The review was managed and peer reviewed by an appropriately experienced and highly regarded firm of cost estimators. The findings were reviewed by representatives of NSW Government. The competitively bid D&C component makes up the vast majority of the final price submitted by the Transurban and the Westlink M7 shareholders.

Subject to planning approval, the selected tender price for the design and construction will form part of the final binding contract between NSW Government, Transurban and the Westlink M7 shareholders.

Unlike the SKM price which was an estimate on a high level feasibility design the current price obtained through a competitive tender process means it is a far more robust and realistic figure based on more detailed design and costing information including a full understanding of the construction methodology.

Yours sincerely

Tim Parker

NorthConnex Project Team

www.northconnex.com.au

Project information line: 1800 997 057 (free call)

Email: enquiries@northconnex.com.au

Collection Statement

Transurban and the Westlink M7 shareholders respect people's privacy. Where you have provided your personal information to us in relation to the NorthConnex project, your personal information will be used solely for the purpose of providing you with information regarding the NorthConnex project, including to send you project and community updates. We may disclose your personal information to other Transurban Group entities and third parties working with us on the NorthConnex project for this purpose. Otherwise Transurban and the Westlink M7 shareholders will not disclose your personal information without your consent unless authorised or required by law. We will always take steps to ensure your personal information is kept secure and is handled in a way that is consistent with the Australian Privacy Principles. Our privacy policy explains how we collect, use and disclose personal information, including how to contact us with access or correction requests or if you wish to make a complaint about how your personal information has been handled. Our privacy policy is available on our website at www.transurban.com/privacy or you can ask one of the project information representatives to send you a copy by mail.

From: Peter Waite [waitepeter@bigpond.com]

Sent: Thursday, 8 May 2014 10:12 AM

To: Enquiries NorthConnex

Subject: COST CALCULATIONS SUBMITTED BY TRANSURBAN

Hi Tim, please advise how NorthConnex will resolve this issue.

Regards

Peter Waite

6 JUNE 9 May 2014 225

PETER WAITE submission to Mr Ray Williams MP Parliamentary Secretary for Roads

Post WW1 State Governments committed to a plan for the Harbor Bridge and rail system. Since then successive governments failed to expand that plan as further development became necessary. Reports indicate an F3 – M7 link will be needed by 2020-25.

28 June 2007: Barry O'Farrell and other MPs called for the F3 – M7 Link.

2014 paper about serious problems with French, English and American projects.

Why cannot the State and Federal Governments build and operate an F3 – M7 link?

[REDACTED]

*2.2 Answers at public meetings were often avoided, evasive, or not addressed. Refer June 4, 2014 email reply to my concerns. Do tenders include provision to exceed budget limit?

In view of the issues I and others have raised, I believe the State has an obligation allow public access to all of Transurban's offer, the assessment process, decision making process and subsequent negotiations that has led to the acceptance of Transurban's unsolicited offer.

CONCLUSION. NorthConnex admits it still has a lot of work to do before it can submit an EIS that will satisfactorily address many other issues and prove that its 'unsolicited offer' will be more cost effective than the 2001 Terms of Reference for the M7-F3 link.

Apart from my concerns about the proposed tunnel, some of the issues raised have local, state and national implications for planning and construction of infrastructure.

If there are problems, will tunnels be closed until emission problems are overcome?

REQUEST Minister Gay ensure that there has been nothing untoward, **AND** Transurban's submissions, assessments and financial arrangements are made public as part of the EIS, or as an adjunct to the EIS as many issues are interrelated and cannot be considered in isolation. And the planning assessment should allow one month for corrections to be made to minimise any errors [REDACTED] as occurred with the ETTT project.



F3 TO SYDNEY ORBITAL LINK STUDY

options development report

draft

october 2002

SINCLAIR KNIGHT MERZ
SKM