

BEFORE THE BOARD OF INQUIRY

IN THE MATTER of the Resource
Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of applications for resource
consent and notices of
requirement by
Transpower New Zealand
Limited for the North Island
Grid Upgrade Project

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF PETER RASUL IN REBUTTAL
ON BEHALF OF TRANSPOWER NEW ZEALAND LIMITED
(Overview of construction processes: lines)**

SIMPSON GRIERSON
D J S LAING / J G A WINCHESTER
TELEPHONE: +64-4-499 4599
FACSIMILE: +64-4-472 6986
DX SX11174: PO BOX 2402
SOLICITORS

J S KÓS QC
STOUT STREET CHAMBERS
TELEPHONE: +64-4-472 9026
FACSIMILE: +64-4-472 9027
PO BOX 117
WELLINGTON

WELLINGTON

Introduction

1. **MY** name is Peter Rasul. I wish to present rebuttal evidence to the statement of evidence of Mr Alasdair Gray, on behalf of Waikato District Council (**WDC**) (**Submission number 1200**).
2. **AT** paragraph 16 bullet point 3 of his evidence, Mr Gray refers to paragraph 32 of my first statement of evidence. At paragraph 32, I discussed the need to store some materials such as tower steel, insulators and conductors, and some plant before dispatching these to work sites. Mr Gray states that this may mean double handling and therefore increased traffic.
3. **IT** is normal on this type of project to have overseas shipments of materials delivered to a central store, and distributed to individual tower sites as required. In my experience, it is efficient, cost effective and reduces security costs, in addition to addressing the necessary quality assurance requirements. It would be impracticable for the contractor to deliver various materials direct to each site (426 sites) as they arrive from suppliers as raised by Mr Gray, as material control measures would have to be implemented. Further, such an approach would cause further disruption to the landowners, as repeat visits to tower sites would be required. In some instances, some major items may go direct to a site (e.g. conductors), depending on the current status of the project at the time (ie. if works were shortly to proceed at the relevant site and if cost effective). In that respect, delivery of materials to tower sites will depend upon the scheduling of works along the route.
4. **AT** paragraph 16, bullet point 4 of his evidence, Mr Gray comments that there is no information on the timing of the approval of the Construction Management Plans or Road Controlling Authority input to it. The Construction Management Plan (**CMP**) will be developed following the appointment of the alliance partner (currently programmed for winter 2008). The plan will be submitted to the Council for approval prior to construction commencing. A designation condition to this effect has been proposed. There are likely to be a wide range of different inputs into a CMP, and there is no intention for the input of Road Controlling Authorities into the CMP to be provided at the last minute. It will be to the advantage of both the contractors and Road Controlling Authorities to resolve any issues well in advance of construction commencing.

5. **AT** paragraph 16, bullet point 6 of his evidence, Mr Gray comments on the measurements I gave at paragraph 75 of my first statement of evidence relating to foundations, as compared to those measurements given in the NOR documentation. To clarify, the quantities of concrete and concrete vehicle numbers given in my evidence are the very worst case scenarios, and provide a possible range attempting to address every geotechnical scenario along the overhead line route. The figures given in the NOR are typical scenarios. All site foundation designs will be selected following the site specific soil investigations at the start of the construction work to determine the correct foundation for each tower site on a site by site basis. This is normal international practice for a project such as this. Mr Patrick, in his rebuttal evidence, will provide further detail about construction quantities.

6. **AT** paragraph 16, bullet point 7 of his evidence, Mr Gray comments that the removal of surplus materials and access roads could significantly increase traffic volumes. To clarify, surplus materials and access road material removal will be kept to a minimum and is unknown at present until detailed discussions with each landowner are completed. However, it is expected that the volumes of surplus material will not be significant and will not have a significant effect on the estimate of traffic volumes already given in the NOR.

Peter Rasul

4 April 2008