Technical Note 30 (Document 98) concerns the option to extend the North East Link twin tunnels further north to a location just south of Grimshaw Street (being the option described in the BabEng report as ‘Option B’).

The technical note explained that:

- NELP had previously considered a range of design alternatives in the preparation of the reference project, including an alternative to extend the tunnels further to the north of Lower Plenty Road in a configuration that closely aligns with Option B as described by BabEng;

- NELP rejected that option for a number of reasons, including its implications in respect of Project cost, the duration of construction, and land acquisition;

- NELP had received advice from an external quantity surveying firm that the extension of the tunnels in the manner proposed would increase the cost of the Project to the State by approximately $1.49 billion relative to the cost of the reference project.

REQUEST:

Following the evidence of Mr Babenderede the IAC requested information about the elements of the reference project and the longer tunnel option that were taken into account for the purposes of the cost comparison, subject to NELP not breaching matters of commercial confidence. This technical note has been prepared in response to that request.

RESPONSE:

1) NELP has prepared a diagram that shows the elements of the reference project and the longer tunnel option that were taken into account for the purposes of the cost comparison.

2) The diagram demonstrates that the cost comparison was prepared having regard to:

   a) All physical components of the reference project, including the surface road mainline, the trench mainline, the cut and cover mainline, the ramp structures, the land bridges, the ventilation structure, the rail tunnel extension, the Watsonia Station car park upgrade, and associated noise wall and other structures;

   b) All physical components of the northern tunnel extension option, including the TBM tunnel mainline, the trench mainline, the cut and cover mainline, the ramp structures, and the ventilation and smoke extraction structures.

3) The cost comparison also took additional factors into account that influence the cost of the
Project to the State, including an allowance for overheads, contingencies, design costs, and profit margin on the part of the private sector partner.

4) The cost estimate did not include any difference in the ongoing operation and management costs or land acquisition and associated costs.

CORRESPONDENCE: N/A

ATTACHMENTS: A – Reference Design and Option B (as described by Babeng)
Cost Comparison Diagram.