

PUBLIC

THE PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 1, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART ON THURSDAY 12 FEBRUARY 2026.

MACQUARIE POINT NORTHERN ACCESS ROAD

The Committee met at 2.01 p.m.

CHAIR - Welcome, everyone. Before we commence the hearing, I will introduce the members of the Committee: Tania Rattray; Mark Shelton; Jen Butler; Dean Harriss; and Helen Burnet. From Hansard we have Roey; and our Secretaries, Scott and Georgia. Thank you. There are no apologies for the hearing today.

Secretary, would you please read out the message from Her Excellency, the Governor-in-Council referring the project to the Committee for inquiry?

SECRETARY –

Pursuant to section 16(2) of the *Public Works Committee Act 1914*, the Governor refers the under mentioned proposed public work to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works to consider and report thereon:

Macquarie Point Northern Access Road Project.

Pursuant to section 16(3) of Act, the estimated cost of such work being completed is \$75.9 million.

CHAIR - The Committee is in receipt of 21 submissions. Could I ask a member to move that the submissions be received, taken into evidence and published?

Mr SHELTON - Moved.

Motion agreed to.

CHAIR - The witnesses appearing before the Committee today are representing the proponent, the Department of State Growth. Could I ask each of you to state your name, your position and organisation and then make the statutory declaration?

Ms LAURA MIDDLETON, MANAGER STAKEHOLDER COMMUNICATIONS, **Mr KEVIN BOURNE**, DIRECTOR, **Mr BEN MOLONEY**, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AND **Ms MIA POTTER**, MANAGER APPROVALS, MAJOR TRANSPORT PROJECTS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Thank you for appearing before the Committee. The Committee is pleased to hear your evidence today. Before you begin giving your evidence, I would like to inform you of some important aspects of committee proceedings.

PUBLIC

A committee hearing is a proceeding in parliament. This means it receives the protection of parliamentary privilege. This is an important legal protection that allows individuals giving evidence to a parliamentary committee to speak with complete freedom without the fear of being sued or questioned in any court or place out of parliament. It applies to ensure that parliament receives the very best information when conducting its inquiries. It is important to be aware that this protection is not accorded to you if statements that may be defamatory are repeated or referred to by you outside the confines of the parliamentary proceedings.

This is a public hearing; members of the public and journalists may be present and this means your evidence may be reported.

Do you understand?

WITNESSES - Yes.

CHAIR - Mr Bourne, would you, or one of your colleagues, like to make an opening statement?

Mr BOURNE - Today we are seeking consideration of the Macquarie Point Northern Access Road, which is fully funded by the Tasmanian Government, with an approved budget of \$78.9 million.

I'd just like to note there was a reference to Australian Government funding in the introduction section of our submission to the Committee and that was an error. It inadvertently had been overlooked. My apologies. It was correctly stated elsewhere in the document.

Originally conceived several years ago, the primary purpose of the Northern Access Road is to unlock opportunities for further economic development of public land in the Macquarie Point Precinct and to provide an additional point of access to the Port of Hobart as it continues to expand operations and reduce reliance on the current access to the port via Evans Street. This improved port access is important as it will support critical port operations including, for example, Antarctic logistics as part of Tasmania's role as a gateway to the Antarctic and Southern Ocean.

The Northern Access will also be a key piece of enabling infrastructure for future pedestrian, cycling and passenger transport access to the Regatta Grounds foreshore and to the new bus plaza at the proposed multipurpose stadium. The road will also provide access to infrastructure managed by TasNetworks, TasWater and other owners and businesses within the precinct.

If this project was unable to proceed for any reason, the identified needs would not be met and once the new port and Macquarie Point Stadium became operational, traffic congestion issues would be expected to increase on the Tasman Highway, Davey Street and Evans Street.

The primary objectives of the project will be to provide safe and efficient vehicle access from the Tasman Highway to the port access and the adjacent precinct. Also to provide hardstand areas and infrastructure to support efficient operation of public transport during major events at the stadium, and to deliver the project in a manner that considers the needs and interests of other projects and users in the broad area.

PUBLIC

One of the challenges of this project will be interfacing with the other precinct projects at various stages of design and delivery. The project is already working closely with the Macquarie Point Development Corporation, TasPorts, TasWater and TasNetworks on those projects that will be delivered concurrently, including the multipurpose stadium, decommissioning and demolition of the wastewater treatment plant, and the Macquarie Point Wharf No. 6.

In addition, we are working with proponents on what allowances to make for other future projects including the Macquarie Point Urban Developments, historic tram museum, Regatta Point ferry terminal, Northern Suburbs Transit Corridor and the lane use management system.

With several interfaces with other projects to be managed, the project decided the best approach was to undertake the detailed design first, then seek tenders for a construct only contract. The design consultant is already developing the detailed design documentation to inform planning approvals and procurement documentation required later this year.

The design includes new retaining walls along parts of the route, allowing for shared use paths on either side of the new road that connect to the Intercity Cycleway via a new underpass. The road connects with the port access before looping back to the bus plaza, providing an area for passengers to get on or off buses during stadium events. The design also includes an underpass below the new access road to connect with the Domain slipyards.

While the new road provides safe and efficient access to the Macquarie Point Precinct, the increase in the number of trucks and buses going to the port and stadium precinct necessitate improvements to the traffic efficiency and safety at the McVilly Drive interchange on the Tasman Highway by addressing some current issues that can sometimes cause congestion at peak times. The project scope includes an upgrade to both the northbound and southbound Tasman Highway onramps at McVilly Drive to cater for this increased heavy vehicle traffic.

During the planning of the project, we've been speaking to a lot of stakeholders to ensure their needs have been identified and are, wherever possible, addressed by the design of the project. In addition, we have recently launched a public consultation period to allow other stakeholder and community groups to provide feedback on the design developed today. This feedback will inform further detailed design development over coming months.

Following the Public Works Committee hearing and other public consultation, the project will submit a development application to the City of Hobart seeking formal planning approval as well as other permits as required. The development application will provide further opportunities for public feedback and representations before the project is approved to proceed with construction.

Developing a detailed design before inviting the construction tenders will ensure that an appropriate selection is selected and delivered to meet the identified needs in the most cost effective and responsible way. When the project is successfully delivered in this way, the benefits will include enhanced resilience and efficiency in port operations, facilitation of development and urban renewal across the precinct, a bus plaza that is functional, safe and efficient for stadium events, and improved safety and connectivity for road users, pedestrians and cyclists.

PUBLIC

In conclusion, the project is needed and is a good use of taxpayers' money. The proposed solution is an appropriate way to address the identified needs by supporting critical infrastructure development, providing improved access and ensuring public safety in the further development and use of this important public area.

Thank you for the opportunity to present the project to the Public Works Committee.

CHAIR - Thank you. How we like to scrutinise these submissions put in front of the Public Works Committee is to go through the submission page by page. We try to be as methodical as we can.

I will kick off with asking a question on this submission. What we have in front of us as a Committee is a concept design only at this stage. We have looked at various submissions from other projects in the past where we have had designs placed in front of us and those designs have been very different by the time they've been built to what we sign off on. Could you clarify, for our peace of mind, whether this concept design will be accurate? Or do you believe that there will be some significant changes?

Mr BOURNE - While it's still, I guess, at a concept level, we are progressing into detailed design. So we do have some understanding of things as they are developing beyond what's been put into the submission.

This project has been going for several years, so there's been a lot of consultation with stakeholders to identify those needs and put that together. What we feel is that the concept design presented has already been through a lot of review and development with stakeholders. And now it's about turning that concept into a more detailed engineering design that can be put to tender and constructed in accordance with that. We don't expect there'll be very much difference from this at a concept level.

CHAIR - For further clarification to that point, you've been working on this for six, seven years. But it has changed significantly now because this is now about the provider having a bus hub for a stadium, where that wouldn't have been the case seven years ago when this was first started. Is that correct?

Mr BOURNE - That's right. There have been some changes in what the needs are in the earlier years. But yes, certainly it has been a good year of development for the current concept with the current needs to service a stadium, as well as a port.

CHAIR - Another point on the bus hub itself: it's my understanding from our walk-through - and thank you for taking us on that onsite visit this morning - that the rapid buses which are meant to complement the stadium from a public transport perspective will not be used in this actual site. This is not their hub. These will just be normal buses. Is that correct?

Mr BOURNE - Yes, that's the intention. This project is providing the infrastructure for the buses to operate. The operation of those buses is to be determined by others within the Department and, I guess, the operator and developer of the stadium. Exactly how those buses will work is yet to be fully defined. We're providing the infrastructure to allow that flexibility.

PUBLIC

That doesn't include a connection to a possible future northern suburbs transit corridor, which will involve the rapid buses. The exact connection to the rapid bus buses is as yet to be determined by others.

CHAIR - So the interface for the rapid buses is in a different location to where those buses would be departing and exiting from? It's a different location from this site that we're looking at today?

Mr MOLONEY - At this stage, we are still at the stages of undertaking the preparation of a detailed business case for the rapid bus project, so we're not ruling in or out any particular solutions in relation to that project.

In relation to transport into major events and after major events, again, we wouldn't rule out that the particular infrastructure, such as the rapid buses themselves, may or may not be deployed in order to support movement of public to and from major events.

At this stage, what we've designed is a bus mall that can accommodate a range of different public transport means: regular buses, other forms of transport as well, so rapid buses and things like that. I don't think we're ruling anything in or out. What the project has sought to do is adopt an anticipated operating model where we can safely get the quantity of passengers onto public buses via the bus plaza.

Ms RATTRAY - The Chair touched on the fact that this has been about seven years in the development and it was part of the Hobart City Deal. You said there's no Australian Government funding. But the City Deal had Australian Government funding. Is it all just straight-out state government funding?

Mr BOURNE - My understanding is that the Hobart City Deal had funding for some initiatives within that deal, but this particular one wasn't there.

Ms RATTRAY - So this is not included?

Mr BOURNE - Not included.

Ms RATTRAY - Even though it's part of the original development of the Hobart City Deal?

Mr BOURNE - Yes. I guess it was an initiative that came out of the City Deal but not necessarily funded as part of the Hobart City Deal. That's my understanding.

Ms RATTRAY - And there isn't any Australian Government funding? That's an error on page one?

Mr BOURNE - That's right.

Ms RATTRAY - I have another question about the bus shelter, but I'll leave that until we get into the actual work.

Ms BURNET - I looked up the budget. The 2023-24 Budget allocated \$3 million for planning and design, which is probably what you're spending now. The 2025-26 State Budget

PUBLIC

allocates \$75.6 million across three years for the Northern Access Road, which includes cycle and pedestrian infrastructure as part of that. The state contribution to the Urban Congestion Fund is a total of \$124.9 million, and the Australian Government funding is \$62.7 million, according to table 7.5 in the Budget. So, there must be some dual arrangement with funding from the federal government in relation to this project?

Mr BOURNE - You mentioned that congestion fund. My understanding, as you said, that's 120-something million dollars –

Ms BURNET - \$124.9 million.

Mr BOURNE - which, obviously, is a lot more than just this project. That covers other initiatives. I'm not able to tell you exactly what is included in that remaining \$50-odd million, but it's funding of projects outside of this area.

Ms BURNET - That leaves about \$46 million, I think. There is \$78 million going into this project, so it doesn't leave much for any other part of the congestion fund by the sounds of it?

Mr BOURNE - I'm not sure exactly the make-up of the remaining -

Ms BURNET - My point, I suppose, is this project taking away from other projects such as the Southern Outlet?

Mr BOURNE - I probably can't comment on the impact on other projects.

Ms BURNET - Could you perhaps take that on notice? We're talking about the spending of state money, and money specifically set aside in the budget for the Urban Congestion Fund. It would be good to know that.

I also have some questions about the rapid transit buses. I believe the report was going to be released in January. There's a report to the Infrastructure Australia Chair. When are we likely to get that?

Mr MOLONEY - The provision of that report is through a different area of our Department. I'm unable to provide specific data as to when that will be released. It is my understanding that the intention is to release it in the near future.

Ms BURNET - Okay. To the point of Ms Butler in relation to where the rapid transit buses might terminate or whether they'd be coming into the Northern Access Road, if they were coming into the Northern Access Road, or wherever they might land in relation to the stadium, would that not have significant implications on any further design?

Mr MOLONEY - In terms of the route's potential use by rapid buses, our understanding is that the strategic business case analyses a number of routes. One of those routes is potentially using the old rail corridor on the river side of the Domain. In terms of that route, if it were to be utilised for rapid bus transport, we believe that there are fairly efficient ways of connecting it into the design that we have on the table. Effectively, we believe that it would be able to be accommodated without significant wasted cost.

PUBLIC

Ms BURNET - I might save the question in relation to the design because of where they might come off that site.

Mr MOLONEY - I would probably make the distinction that there would be certain routes that the rapid buses would make if they are servicing the community in terms of day-to-day usage of travelling public trying to get to the CBD or other central locations. Then there may, as I mentioned before, on event days be different procedures put in place. That's a body of work that is yet to be undertaken by the various stakeholders. My understanding is that a commitment has been made that a detailed mode of operation for the transport on event days is something that will be worked up in the coming year or two to produce a detailed plan for how that will operate on major event days.

Ms BURNET - Presumably that would need more federal funding to deliver that project?

Mr MOLONEY - I'm not aware of federal funding being sought for that particular project. I guess what is involved in that project are the key stakeholders, such as the Department of State Growth's transport area, working with Stadiums Tasmania, the Macquarie Point Development Corporation and other parties such as Hobart City Council, to ensure that on event days there is appropriate planning to ensure safe and efficient access to the precinct.

Ms BURNET - Chair, can we take that on notice as well? I was of the understanding that there was a project request to Infrastructure Australia. Could we take that on notice, please?

Mr MOLONEY - If you could. Sorry, as I mentioned before, it is an element of - I guess it's a commitment that's being fulfilled by a different area of our Department and other stakeholders, so I'm unfamiliar with the funding. Perhaps I shouldn't have made that comment. Thank you.

Mr SHELTON - Mainly just a point of clarification. Your notes in your submission indicated that the Northern Access Road was talked about six or seven years ago, as Tania has mentioned. That's prior to any stadium debate. The need, as I understand it, was the growing need for the Antarctic Division to have better access through the port. I guess the question to you is, do you agree that now the stadium has passed the parliament that there's a greater need than there was six years ago? If it was a worthy project six years ago, then it's a more worthy project now.

Mr MOLONEY - Yes, I think we would agree with that. It's certainly more than just a stadium access project. It's a port access project and other developments in there. It's an urban renewal project. It's trying to - as I mentioned in my opening statement - it's unlocking opportunities for the whole area, not just providing access to a stadium.

CHAIR - Ms Rattray, did you have a subsequent question to that?

Ms RATTRAY - No.

CHAIR - We might move on to page four. Any questions on page four with need for works? Page five with related works?

PUBLIC

Ms BURNET - I have a question, Chair, if I may. Just in relation to the - this is taken out of the Urban Congestion Fund, I believe. How much traffic is likely to be diverted with the development of this Northern Access Road?

Mr BOURNE - Could you clarify what you mean by 'traffic diverted' - from where? From port? From elsewhere?

Ms BURNET - From Evans Street or - if we're looking at congestion, what is the congestion that you're looking to mitigate?

Mr BOURNE - There is congestion along the Tasman Highway from the access of McVilly Drive joining on there. There's room for improvement of the Tasman Highway flowthrough there by the work we're proposing. The number of trucks leaving the port currently along Evans Street, crossing Davey Street and Macquarie Street, joining that part of the network, which is at times congested, by diverting some of that traffic to an alternative access - it wouldn't all be moved, it would be shared. That's for TasPorts to determine the most optimum way that they manage their internal traffic to move out of the port into the network in the most efficient way. I think that's where we'd see some movement, but I don't have a way to put numbers on that at this stage.

Ms BURNET - And traffic flow; how many traffic movements - heavy vehicles and light vehicles are moving in and out of the port presently?

Mr BOURNE - We've been working with information provided by TasPorts. We believe about five heavy vehicles per hour would be using the Northern Access Road instead of the Evans Street access. It will reduce the impact on the traffic as a result of that.

Ms BURNET - Five per hour?

Mr BOURNE - Not a big impact, but it would.

CHAIR - As a follow on to Ms Burnet's question, can you talk us through, as a committee, so we can get a visualisation of what this would look like. It's my understanding that the entry/exit point for heavy vehicles runs from the bottom of the proposed Northern Access Road and that exit and entry point is very close to where the buses will be coming into that depot area. Can you run through what that would look like with five heavy vehicles an hour on days when the stadium will be active and will be used?

Mr BOURNE - First of all, the five vehicles an hour is not -

CHAIR - But they're heavy vehicles; they're not normal cars.

Mr BOURNE - Heavy vehicles, yes, but it's not a constant flow, five vehicles an hour, every hour. It peaks when certain freight off-loading activities at the port happen. We are expecting that there would be not a common situation where there would be freight trucks leaving the port via that access at the same time as buses operating at event times.

CHAIR - Do you think that the concept design is appropriate in having all the entry and exits so close to where the main congestion points would be on that road? If you have a whole series of buses entering and exiting, and this morning down at the port, we could see a large

PUBLIC

number of logs that were sitting on the port, obviously brought there by heavy vehicles, or, sorry, large trucks. Is there a more improved design where you could separate pedestrians, people on buses and buses from entry and exit points for those heavy vehicles?

Mr BOURNE - Within the site constraints that we've looked at - we've looked at various options and we're not finding any significant opportunity to improve the arrangement that's been proposed.

CHAIR - So, it's the best out of a bad situation style. Is that what we're looking?

Mr BOURNE - I was about to say that the volumes coming out of that port are quite low, so the proposed design is considered appropriate for the volumes of traffic coming out of the port.

CHAIR - Have you consulted with truck drivers? Have you consulted the main users of that site in the design?

Mr BOURNE - Not at this stage, no.

CHAIR - When will you undertake that consulting, do you think? That would really help inform us as a committee whether or not it's an appropriate spend.

Mr MOLONEY - I have a comment that, in terms of the consultation regarding the safety and efficiency of the access to the port, we have undertaken detailed liaison with TasPorts as the owner and operator of the facility to get their feedback and input into this design. As Kevin mentioned, we're trying to come up with an efficient method to provide access to both locations. We do anticipate that, when the stadium is at its peak usage - so when we have the need for thousands of people to exit the stadium and use public transport to get home - during those periods the quantity of traffic out of the port would be minimised. It's something that would be worked through as part of the mode of operation of post-event traffic management to be examined.

CHAIR - Is that lawful for a port to be blocked - a national, a federal - is that lawful?

Mr MOLONEY - I'm not suggesting that it's blocked or completely cut off. What I'm suggesting is that the operation of the port would take into consideration other uses at that time so that we can get the best outcome for Tasmania.

CHAIR - It is the best out of a bad situation.

Mr SHELTON - Just for clarification. It's my understanding the port - and I really don't have much of an understanding of the port - but to me it's an exit port, as in, the logs come in by truck and exit by boat. Anything being loaded on the Antarctic vessels is coming into the port, not being loaded and carted out of the port. So, primarily it's about loads coming into the port and the road that goes into the port off this northern outlet road is an exit from the road which is 30 or 40 metres before the turning circle of the buses. All the loaded trucks are actually in the port drive before buses do a U-turn and all passengers exit the buses on the other side of the road - the Macquarie Point side of the road - and therefore go to the stadium. There shouldn't be any mixing of large volumes of traffic and the pedestrians.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - You sound like you've already made your decision, Mr Shelton.

Mr SHELTON - For a point of clarification: that's what the plan tells me.

Mr MOLONEY - I think everyone would appreciate on major event days, where we would have heavy usage of the bus plaza by buses, there will be appropriate traffic management at that stage. If you've ever been to these major events, clearly the safety of the public is important and, typically, you do have appropriate traffic management active at those sites.

CHAIR - It's not optimum though, is it? To have an exit and entry point for heavy vehicles near where you're putting thousands of people. It's not optimum. I don't think you'd see that at some of the other stadiums across the country in their capital cities. I know we are very limited in geography and there does need to be significant exit and entry points for our ships, especially also with cruise ships, also with the icebreaker and so forth in that region. We completely understand that. But a design where you have a lot of public transport and pedestrians really close to heavy vehicles is not optimum.

Mr MOLONEY - The counter argument, in terms of value for money, could be made that multiple uses of this access road means we get more benefit - more bang for buck, as it were. I think what's important to note is, currently, the port's access is only via Evans Street. Through this project they have an opportunity for a second entrance. It is something that improves the efficiency of the port and they have the benefit of that improved operation for a vast majority of the time. We recognise there will potentially be some constraints during the short periods post-events and that's still to be worked through with them.

But, if this was a road only to serve the stadium, one would argue that it may not be returning value for money. If it's a project that's only to support the port, again, the cost-benefit would be beneficial, but wouldn't be as much as if it was using those dual purposes. It's important to note this project is providing a second access to a port that currently only has one and also providing the improved access to Macquarie Point.

CHAIR - It is my understanding on stadium sitting days, Evans Street will be mainly cut off, would it not, for heavy vehicles to the port. So, this would provide the ability to still access the port even on those stadium days. Is that correct?

Mr MOLONEY - That's correct. I think there's a body of work to be undertaken with all the stakeholders in planning what is safe and efficient and the best for all parties.

CHAIR - Okay. Any other questions on page five?

Ms BURNET - Something Mr Moloney raised. Is there any cost-benefit analysis actually undertaken in this project?

Mr MOLONEY - No, there is not. I guess it is a project that's been contemplated for quite some time. I think, in terms of the development of the precinct, its benefits are very important. I would also say that in terms of the order associated with the stadium, it was quite clear this was a prerequisite project that needed to proceed. In that regard, without this project, the stadium project cannot proceed. As I said, there is a range of benefits this project is providing and, on that basis, we haven't done a detailed cost-benefit analysis.

PUBLIC

Ms BURNET - I suppose my point is again we are making decisions about state and public funds, so having a cost-benefit analysis would be quite useful - even whether it supports a stadium, supports a port, or not.

Mr MOLONEY - It's fair to say regardless of whether the stadium was there or not, this project has been contemplated for some time because the only way Tasmania can benefit from the development of Macquarie Point is if we provide improved access. With or without a stadium for the Macquarie Point to be developed, this was considered to be a core prerequisite and that's why it's been a project on the books for some time now.

CHAIR - Any questions on page seven? What about page six. Sorry, I thought that was the page you were talking about, Ms Rattray.

Ms RATTRAY - On the historic tram museum, this talks about related works, but it's in the submission. We did talk earlier today on site about some DAs for the historic tram museum near Huon Quays and the Regatta Grounds. It says, 'with no planned parking or vehicle access and a future stage allowing occasional tram operations on the existing rail line'. I understand that there's been some discussions with the group that has had this on their radar.

Mr BOURNE - That's right, and unfortunately, I personally wasn't involved in that meeting, but Mr Moloney and Ms Middleton were, so they can maybe talk to that more. There's been a meeting with the society there outlining the proposal, the approved development application and how that might be amended to operate out of a similar function, out of a slightly different location. We are planning to work with the group there to consider options and help them get back to the position where they were in terms of an approved development application.

Ms RATTRAY - Right, because we've received a submission that says the proposed road will effectively destroy the future of rail travel to Hobart. Obviously, this is a tram museum, so does somebody want to share what the differences are here and how that might impact on what we have before us?

Mr BOURNE - My understanding of what's proposed for the museum is a building with a static display of trams and trains, and an older infrastructure. The request has been that's close to the rail corridor so they can examine the opportunity to run occasional visits along around the train line. That's quite different to running rail services right into Hobart. There's already a lot of the rail corridor that has been removed prior to this project at both ends of that section. That's a separate discussion from this project, I would say.

Ms RATTRAY - But there's still opportunity, regardless of this project, for the train and tram enthusiasts to be able to progress some access to some line farther out from what's in this precinct that's been proposed?

Mr BOURNE - Theoretically, yes, but we can only take it so far within the scope of this project. That's our commitment to the stakeholders to work with them.

Ms RATTRAY - It's been put in the submission, so it's there for discussion if you like. Thank you.

Mr MOLONEY - The impact that we have on the disused rail line is limited to the footprint of our project. Once you go beyond that, then that is where those potentials start to

PUBLIC

exist. Previously, there was a discussion of a rapid bus transport and whether or not that would utilise the corridor. As mentioned previously, the detailed business case to determine the route for rapid buses has yet to be undertaken. If that corridor was to be utilised for rapid buses, then that would preclude the use for trams or trains, but that is a completely separate project.

Ms RATTRAY - That is an aside.

Mr MOLONEY - In the overall broad context of the length of rail going from Macquarie Point through Glenorchy and northwards, our project occupies a small footprint.

Ms RATTRAY - Thank you.

CHAIR - As a follow up to that question, I have a similar line of questioning. Why was the concept of having rail right up to that stage of that existing rail corridor excluded? There is a PWC report saying it was expensive to have rail or a light rail going to that point on Macquarie Point. Why was that excluded when it is such a long-term efficient way of moving people?

Mr MOLONEY - I can't comment on the investigation of, basically, the production of the business case around different modes of transport, be it light rail, buses and the likes. That is something which you'd probably be best referring to other parties within government, and within the Department, who have undertaken the strategic business case, which has concluded that rapid buses are a more efficient solution. I understand that the associated strategic business case is intended to be released sometime in the near future.

CHAIR - Okay. Because it would probably help to inform this. Can I ask a question around the Regatta Point ferry terminal? It's in the submission -

Ms RATTRAY - Probably in the same camp as the Lindisfarne, Wilkinson Point and Sandy Bay one, I reckon.

CHAIR - They might have spotted handfish underneath them. But where's that at, at the moment - the status of the Regatta Point ferry terminal? Does the proposed project we're looking at today complement a ferry terminal?

Mr BOURNE - I guess it complements in that when you get off a ferry, you've got to go somewhere. We are not pursuing the ferry terminal. That's a separate part of the Department -

CHAIR - But it is in this project here, so it is in our submission.

Mr BOURNE - Yes, but that's because when people get off that ferry, they need to go somewhere and we have made provision through the network of footpaths to give a route for people getting off the ferry to progress to wherever they're going, be that the stadium, be that elsewhere within the city.

CHAIR - Do you know the status of where the Regatta Point ferry terminal is at?

Mr BOURNE - Not specifically, other than that is a location that's been earmarked for it. Beyond that we've just made provision for offloading.

CHAIR - Okay, thank you. Any further questions on page six?

PUBLIC

Ms BURNET - In relation to the proposed road, what impact will that have on the rail corridor in that area from the Tasman Highway through? Or not from the Tasman Highway through, but from the Intercity Cycleway through?

Mr BOURNE - The project has proposed a footprint for the road that partially occupies the current rail corridor. That rail corridor is a disused part of the rail network. As Mr Moloney said earlier, it's one small proportion of the overall length of rail between the city and Granton, I guess. The proposal to government has been that the rail corridor in this location be taken out of the rail network so that it can be used for other purposes in that area.

Ms BURNET - So, it won't be able to be used. So, it's basically being decommissioned under the Minister's prerogative? Or how does that work?

Mr BOURNE - Ms Potter may be able to add some detail there.

Ms POTTER - It's under the *Rail Infrastructure Act 2007*. There's a process by which the Minister, through an order, can amend the Tasmanian rail network. In relation to this project, that's taking place and has been taking place. The Minister has approved to remove that section of the corridor, and that's going through the *Gazette* next week.

Ms BURNET - Right, so it will be gazetted next week. So, that doesn't have to come to parliament? That's just a minister's discretion?

Ms POTTER - No. It's just a ministerial process.

Ms BURNET - Rail has been a really important component of Tasmania's history. I know that we've only got sort of conceptual ideas in front of us to consider, but has there been any consideration of the impacts on important heritage of this site in your undertaking?

Mr BOURNE - I guess there are lots of aspects to heritage around the site. There is the Huon Quays, for example -

Ms BURNET - Sorry, I was talking about rail. But we'll get onto those as well. That rail corridor has a significant history in the lives of Tasmanians over many years. Is there any consideration of the heritage of this?

Mr BOURNE - I don't think there's any legislated heritage value of the rail corridor or rail infrastructure. I might defer to Ms Potter on that, but that's my understanding.

Ms POTTER - No, it's not a listed heritage site. There are other ones, as noted, in the area. There's the Cenotaph, the Domain shipyards, the Soldiers Memorial Avenue. But the rail isn't a site that has any legislated heritage value under the Historic Heritage Act.

Ms BURNET - Right. On the Cenotaph and the Soldiers Memorial Avenue, what sort of impact will there be with this proposal?

Mr BOURNE - The Soldiers Memorial Avenue, we have identified that it runs a long way along there and just touches on the side of the footprint. Our expectation is that the extent of works will not impact on any of the trees along the Soldiers Memorial Avenue. And we will

PUBLIC

continue to work through with specialists, maybe arborists, as part of the detailed design to ensure that whatever works are required to make sure that that happens continue to be pursued.

Mr HARRISS - What has the planning been around the related work - Macquarie Point Wharf is coming up and TasWater is doing sewerage works down there - in relation to timeframes for construction of the road?

Mr BOURNE - We have regular meetings between those other organisations to discuss exactly that. It's obviously an ongoing discussion that continues to evolve as each of the precinct partners there develop their works. Some are more - for example, TasWater is quite advanced. They've got a lot of things constructed. Others not so much. It's an ongoing coordination between those parties about how the design, the consultation with stakeholders and regulators, and the construction of those will all coordinate together.

Mr HARRISS - Could any of those projects delay construction?

Mr BOURNE - At this stage, it doesn't appear that they will delay construction, no.

CHAIR - In a follow-up to Mr Harriss's question, can you talk us through the replacement of the water and sewerage, the sewage treatment plant on the point - how long that will take, and whether there will be mitigation around the smell that that may emit?

Mr BOURNE - That's probably more of a question for TasWater than us. It's not our responsibility to deliver that project. Removal of the treatment plant requires construction of a wastewater treatment plant at Selfs Point, which is pretty well under construction - the pump station that has been constructed at Macquarie Point is yet to be commissioned, through a rising main that's been partially constructed as well. How all those components fit together in a timeframe is really up to TasWater to determine. But those are all the steps that are needed to be able to intercept sewage coming into the Macquarie Point treatment plant and divert it to the Selfs Point treatment plant once it's commissioned.

Then once that's done, they will be able to decommission and demolish the existing Macquarie Point treatment plant. The odour production at the pump station would need to be deferred to TasWater to answer that question.

CHAIR - One would expect that with the technologies that are being developed in that field over the last - how old is the existing treatment plant?

Mr BOURNE - I'm not sure.

CHAIR - It's quite aged, isn't it?

Mr BOURNE - Sixty-plus years, I think.

CHAIR - You'd like to think that the replacement would have a bit more advancement than what we were doing with sewage 60 years ago, I'm hoping. We might seek some further clarification around that from TasWater.

Mr MOLONEY - To be clear, the wastewater won't be treated on this site after completion of that project.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Okay.

Mr MOLONEY - What TasWater is putting in place is a pumping facility to transport material that arrives to that location down to the new wastewater treatment plant at Selfs Point. That's where the wastewater would be treated, using all the modern approaches to wastewater treatment. In terms of Macquarie Point, it will just be a pumping station. It's basically diverting sewage that is coming downhill to the site across to the new wastewater treatment plant at Selfs Point. There would be a significant reduction, if not complete elimination of the smell.

CHAIR - It's quite unpleasant sometimes at the moment. Also on page six, can I seek some clarification around the fourth dot point where it says, 'installation of four bus stopping zones'. My understanding is it's going to have room for eight buses. Is that correct?

Mr BOURNE - Yes, that's eight bays in four zones, so two per zone, basically.

Ms RATTRAY - Supplementary if I might? Will there be any shelters next to those?

Mr BOURNE - Yes, there are plans for shelters.

Ms RATTRAY - All the way, good, thank you.

CHAIR - Questions on page seven?

Ms RATTRAY - We're still working under Transport Victoria's specifications?

Mr BOURNE - That's right.

Ms RATTRAY - There's no movement off that? Even though we build a road and then six weeks later we're looking to improve it and fix it? Is this going to be looked at some time? Ben, that might be a question for you.

Mr MOLONEY - Unfortunately, I can't comment on that. It is something which the transport division of the Department of State Growth is responsible for and the questions on that would need to be referred to them at this stage.

Ms RATTRAY - But, you'd want to know, if you were building this facility, that the resource that was being used was of the best quality?

Mr MOLONEY - We believe that the - as part of our project, we will be implementing the appropriate standards and specifications. We remain confident that it will perform well. I think it's important to note that geological conditions, although they may vary from location to location, specific types of rock are what they are regardless of where they are physically located. We are a relatively small jurisdiction here in Tasmania. If you think about our population being a small percentage nationally, we do benefit by utilising the learnings that other states with much larger portfolios and much larger works gain experience from. For us to not take advantage of the benefits of their learnings would be remiss. Whether there are some benefits in tailoring ours to complement the Victorian standards, that's probably something that's better to be referred to our transport division.

PUBLIC

Ms RATTRAY - I don't disagree with everything you've said but, unfortunately, I've seen a lot of bad examples of where resources being used to the Victorian standard - but if you're confident - and you have to be the one who says yes at the end of this.

Mr MOLONEY - Making a comment more on a personal basis as opposed to on behalf of the Department. I was involved - I worked in the Department in the project delivery space quite some time ago. At that time we were still using Tasmania's standards and I recall the huge impost and cost of administering our own standards here in Tasmania with the limited resources that we had. It was observable that, quite often, standards weren't kept up to date because of the amount of resources that needed to be invested in that. By utilising the Victorian standards, we benefit from them investing in keeping their standards up to date and reflecting contemporary requirements. I'm not suggesting that there may not be some benefits in some tailoring, but again, that would be more referred back to the transport people. Certainly, the benefits that I observed in running the projects area within the transport was that by moving to the Victorian standards, it meant that at least we were working with a set of standards that would be maintained and kept up to date to reflect contemporary requirements.

Ms RATTRAY - I can show you a couple of roads when you have a long time to come out of Hobart that are 40 years old and there's not a pothole in them, but I can't show you many up the main - middle of ours, but that's probably a conversation for another day.

Ms BURNET - Related to the capital works, on our site visit this morning, you talked about the new bridge and some changes for pedestrians and coming up the Intercity Cycleway. Could you describe that, please?

Mr BOURNE - I think you're referring to the underpass for the Intercity Cycleway. On our submission, we've shown a fairly long underpass on the basis that we had examined some alternative options to an underpass. Underpasses come with a level of difficulty to ensure safety via passive surveillance, so they would typically be avoided, especially longer ones. We looked at the alternative options. One of the ones that we considered was to widen the underpass bridge to the Domain slipyards to provide space for the cycleway to be diverted through there. That was eliminated at that earlier stage on the basis that it was seen to be quite an expensive solution for that. Hence, we went to the underpass with the intent to consider that further during the design development.

That's exactly what we're doing now. We've looked at other options and, number one, have done some more estimating of the alternative to having a wider bridge that will allow the Intercity Cycleway to be diverted under that bridge. It serves the same function as an underpass, but it improves the safety and passive surveillance of that. It will also provide further opportunities for other community facilities like benches, water stations, landscaping areas, artworks potentially, to be included in that area along the cycleway. So, that's the option we're pursuing at the moment - to change from the plans that were shown in the submission to develop that wider bridge.

Ms BURNET - Was that in consultation with interested parties?

Mr BOURNE - Yes. We've had active transport groups within the Department and the cycling representative groups we've spoken to and I think some comments on the current public consultation period that we have open for public comment.

PUBLIC

Ms BURNET - It's open at the moment, the public consultation?

Mr BOURNE - Yes.

Ms BURNET - How long is that open until?

Mr BOURNE - Until 22 February.

CHAIR - Another 10 days right.

Ms BURNET - It would be good to see who's interested in this.

Can you describe for me - you're having an overpass and that's to accommodate the road going down to the quay and the slipyards -

Mr BOURNE - That's right.

Ms BURNET - So, the road going over - what height is that bridge?

Mr BOURNE - There'd be a clearance of - I think, it was 5.4 metres above the existing level of the access road into the slipyard and then there's, obviously, the depth of the structure above that before the road level.

Ms BURNET - So, I have the idea clearly in my mind, does the road come, McVilly Drive, dip down after that bridge, if you're heading towards -

Mr BOURNE - Towards the bus plaza?

Ms BURNET - TasPorts, yes.

Mr BOURNE - Yes, it slopes down from that high point down towards the bus plaza at TasPorts' end. It's a reasonably gentle slope compared to some of the existing slopes within the area.

Ms BURNET - Okay. Does that mean you fill in any of the rail corridor? How much fill would -

Mr BOURNE - Yes, there will be retaining walls built along the side of that road corridor to retain the fill where we need to raise the levels above the existing ground.

Ms BURNET - What sort of level would that fill be?

Mr BOURNE - It varies as it goes, but it would be, I guess, six metres to seven metres at the highest end down to nothing at the other end.

CHAIR - We'll move on to page eight if that works.

Ms BURNET - I'm sorry, I still have some questions about the Tasman Highway modifications because that's quite important.

PUBLIC

In relation to the southbound acceleration lane joining onto the third lane - so there's that addition and then there's a modification to create a short northbound acceleration lane - the third point is the relocated shared use path which is impacted by the southbound acceleration lane. Can you describe how you intend to change that? Is that the footpath currently you're talking about that will be impacted?

Mr BOURNE - In that section there's already a slight widening for the entry ramp coming out of McVilly Drive because we are putting more heavy vehicles along there. There's a proposal to widen that to make it a full lane farther south.

The intention is we move the kerb or reconstruct the kerb farther out to provide that lane and then build the similar footpath farther beyond that kerb. Both of those go underneath the Bridge of Remembrance, so that is probably the main constraint to making that wider, moving away from the road farther.

Ms BURNET - I don't understand why that would be a constraint, but perhaps you can explain that. Also, that is a two-way bike lane; it's usually used for bikes, but sometimes for pedestrians. It's very narrow, right next to a busy road. What sort of improvements are you likely to do as part of this such as widening and the works, because you would be cutting into the embankment along there as well, wouldn't you?

Mr BOURNE -Yes. First of all, to your first comment about the Bridge of Remembrance. The Bridge of Remembrance slopes down once it goes over the highway and it has clearance there, then continues to slope down away from it. The farther away from the current alignment of the road, the clearance under the bridge reduces. At some point you get to the point where it's just too low to fit a clearance envelope for pedestrians and cyclists through that area.

Ms BURNET - Oh I see what you mean, yes.

Mr BOURNE -Secondly, how would we do that?

Ms BURNET - Would you be looking at widening the footpath, because it's not very wide at all and you'd have to cut into the embankment south of the Bridge of Remembrance?

Mr BOURNE - I think the intention is we would make the pathway as wide as we can physically fit within that vertical clearance envelope I was mentioning, under the bridge. It is potentially a narrow section and would require some excavation into the embankment along that section, yes.

Ms BURNET - Quite a lot of people come off the Bridge of Remembrance and double back, so wouldn't need to be necessarily going underneath the bridge. If you're going to make improvements as that area is quite narrow - and bikes go fast down there because there's a bit of a decline - so it would be good if that improvement were made.

Mr BOURNE - One comment that needs to be made is that's the current route for a lot of cyclists. It's because the Intercity Cycleway goes to that point at McVilly Drive and then I understand people climb and go that way - the majority of people go that way.

PUBLIC

With the proposed Northern Access Road, that will provide an alternative route which we believe will become the primary route for people coming from the Intercity Cycleway towards the city and would go along the Northern Access Road around the bus plaza, past the stadium and link back to Davey Street that way. It should mean a lot of cyclists that are currently using that route move away from that route.

There might be exceptions, people going different directions; they can make those decisions themselves, but that's our expectation.

CHAIR - Subsequent to that, from looking at the proposed plans, that cycleway goes straight through where all the people will be exiting and entering the buses, is that correct? There's not a dedicated bike area there, because it's a shared space they have to go through where all the buses are dropping people off don't they? It's not really an optimum design.

Mr BOURNE - That's right. I guess events represent a -

CHAIR - Hopefully, that might be remodelled.

Mr BOURNE - Well, events represent a small proportion of the total time out of 24 hours a day, seven days a week. For the most part, that will be a viable route for cyclists and pedestrians to find a way away from the road, as in Davey Street. During event times, those short periods of a week where there's an event on there would be, potentially, a short period of time where there's a lot of people in that area - may impact the ability of riding a bike through there. That would need to be a decision by the cyclist as to whether they wanted to do that or not.

CHAIR - It's not really an optimum design because my understanding from the Premier that there are going to be events at that site. Actually, we might get that on notice. Do you know how many events are meant to be at that site annually?

Mr MOLONEY - It's important to note that there are large events and then there are other events. There are various numbers mentioned in terms of how often the stadium will be used, but in terms of major events, if you were running a major event that had a sellout crowd, people congregating around the stadium, we're talking about in excess of 10,000 people congregating through there. People won't be riding their bicycles at high speed through a crowd of 10,000 people. It would be unsafe regardless.

CHAIR - But they're being cut off from doing it the other way because of what you're saying with the restriction of the bridge being low.

Mr MOLONEY - There won't be a restriction. I should probably add to complement Kevin's comments. It's important to note the Bridge of Remembrance when it was designed, took into consideration the long-term intention to widen this section. The location of the support pier and also the height through that area specifically took into consideration vehicles going along the alignment of the road that we've designed and the retention of a sufficiently wide shared user path between that road and the pier and the support. The reason why I think that alignment is chosen is a combination of the fact that is probably the alignment that minimises your vertical alignment. When you're riding a cycle going up and down hills, it is less preferable and it is also likely to be the most cost-effective outcome. In terms of cost-benefit -

PUBLIC

Mr SHELTON - It's less preferable if you're not Richie Porte. He'd love the hill.

Mr MOLONEY - That is to say, we're currently going through a process of public consultation and consultation with council. If there was a superior route that had cyclists on the not-road side of the pier there at the bridge, then that's certainly something we could consider. It would be something we would work through to see whether or not the benefits warranted any additional costs and whether or not the extra climbing up and down would dissuade people or otherwise.

CHAIR - Can we move onto page eight, because I'm mindful of time –

Ms BURNET - Just one question. One of the ways for getting bike riders and pedestrians away was the Collins Street bridge proposal. Is that completely out of the question for removing people from the site?

Mr MOLONEY - That'd be a question for Macquarie Point Development Corporation or others within government. It's not part of the remit of our project.

CHAIR - We might move on to page eight and heritage desktop assessment on Aboriginal and historic assessment. It's under progress to date. We learnt today that the actual site may have quite a high Aboriginal heritage concentration and may be a site potentially with some important relics. Can you fill us in of the progress and the status of that consultation? Keeping in mind the Brighton Bypass cost and how that cost became quite significant when middens were found near that and an additional overpass had to be put in. It did cause a really big delay in that project. That was many years ago when things were a lot cheaper. Can you talk us through this as a potential risk and status of this?

Ms POTTER - I can talk to it. We have engaged a professional community consultant who's speaking to community. That began in the last week of January, so it's been going for a couple of weeks now. They'll be continuing for the weeks to come. That is a process of seeking feedback broadly from the Aboriginal community, making sure we get a good sense from a large number of people, and they can have that conversation with someone from community as well.

That process is happening at the same time that we've been speaking to Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania and a consulting archaeologist to look at the impacts that the project is having.

We'll be continuing to work through that with all those parties, and we have a briefing with the Aboriginal Heritage Council scheduled for later this month where we can talk to them about the project as well.

CHAIR - Do you think that maybe having some more concrete communication, not just a few weeks of initial meetings, may have been more prudent when bringing that to the Public Works Committee? Usually, we'd like to have more than, 'Look, we've entered into discussions, it could be an issue, but we're not sure,' because that could be a stop-work. It could mean a project redesign and it is highlighted as a risk. Do you think that maybe this could be a bit pre-emptive in that area, coming to us at this stage without that information?

PUBLIC

Ms POTTER - I think we are doing the steps at the moment that would hopefully prevent a stop-work situation because we'd be seeking a permit in advance of the works from the Minister, and speaking with the community at this stage now so we can see what that feedback is prior to any stage we're getting into tender or construction.

CHAIR - For the previous seven years or so that this project has been assessed and looked at, and developed, this only started two weeks ago? Is that correct?

Mr MOLONEY - I guess similar to the comments made earlier in the hearing about at what point is it appropriate to come to people that have a vested interest in a project and discuss the potential implications of the project, we've done a lot of work to get to the concept designs, so that we have sufficient confidence in this design that we are having meaningful conversations with impacted stakeholders, such as the Aboriginal community, around what our project means. We have a familiarity of some of the challenges and we've sought to design our project to minimise any impacts. But it is important for us to get to this point that we can present where we're at and where it's going.

In terms of presenting this information to the community later, after going through that process, one of the challenges there is that if, for instance, the outcomes of this process meant that the project wasn't to proceed, then we'd be investing a large amount of money and time and effort into consultation that may not be fruitful. It's very challenging as to when to come to each of the key stakeholders. We've tried to achieve what we felt - for instance, coming to this Committee when we reached a point where we have sufficient confidence that what we're presenting, we have a fair degree of confidence that's what we're intending to deliver. For the same reason, we've timed in similar conversations with the Aboriginal community.

CHAIR - It's also quite unusual for our Committee to have a submission put in front of us where the community consultation isn't complete as well. That also gives me reason to believe that this could be quite pre-emptive or maybe a little bit early. We can't be advised from you what the reaction from the community consultation is because it's not finished yet and closed. It's still open at the moment. That's another reason why I am a bit concerned that there seems to be loops that aren't closed yet, and we're at the Public Works Committee stage. I think that needs to be put on the table.

Can you talk to us a little bit around the traffic modelling and the work that's been undertaken in that?

Mr BOURNE - The traffic modelling is - as I mentioned before, the Tasman Highway can be congested at some peak times. We're putting a little bit more traffic into that location where McVilly Drive joins on, particularly in the northbound direction, and we don't want to make it worse. We are trying to assess, by that traffic modelling, whether the impact to either the Tasman Highway or to queuing along the Northern Access Road at peak times is acceptable.

CHAIR - Thank you. Any questions on page eight?

Ms BURNET - There was a significant amount of traffic modelling undertaken when - WT appendix N, if I remember correctly, from the Macquarie Point Development Assessment. But also, there's another organisation starting with 'w' who did traffic analysis. Was that former traffic modelling looked at as part of your considerations?

PUBLIC

Mr BOURNE - I can't confirm that at this stage. Maybe I will take that on notice. But I know that the same sort of overall network-wide traffic models that would probably have been used for that work are being used to examine scenarios that related to what we're designing and modelling here.

Ms BURNET - So, you're saying that having a third lane to exit McVilly Drive might cause a little bit more congestion, possibly?

Mr BOURNE - Our expectation would be that that would improve because that's currently the location where there is a bit of uncertainty in terms of the line marking of the lanes through that area. I think three lanes currently merge into two, just as McVilly Drive joins in and then the Lower Domain Road exits off at the same point. We'd be trying to clarify that and hopefully prevent any delays by, let's say, messy merging behaviour at those points.

Ms BURNET - Okay. Have we got any of that modelling? No.

CHAIR - Would you like us to ask for some modelling on notice?

Ms BURNET - That would be good, thank you.

CHAIR - If we provide a question on notice, would you be happy to provide us with some modelling around the traffic in that area? Is that correct?

Ms BURNET - Coming into the site and off the site.

CHAIR - And how that would have impact on that Tasman Highway area along there?

Mr BOURNE - Yes, I understand the question. I guess the relative volumes coming into McVilly Drive are quite small compared to the through traffic of the Tasman Highway. It's a much, much wider, city-wide problem in terms of accurately modelling the behaviour of the highway along that section. Yes, we can provide some information but I'm not sure -

CHAIR - You will see what you can come up with for us?

Mr BOURNE - I'm not sure it's necessarily going to answer your question and give you that confidence.

Ms BURNET - Does your Department look at, once the stadium is built, the modal shift? Or is that some other area of the Department? So, getting people out of cars?

Mr BOURNE - I guess that's part of a wider modelling in other sections of the Department.

Mr MOLONEY - Would it be correct to say, Kevin, that the focus of our traffic modelling is more determining whether or not the particular alignments and shapes of our proposed intersection alterations could potentially create challenges or more heavy traffic? So, if we're adopting a design that involves the merging of traffic at an earlier point along the Tasman Highway, what implications that may have in peak hour as to whether or not that would increase or decrease congestion?

PUBLIC

The types of modelling that were undertaken for this project are probably not from the concept of the broader, whole-of-Hobart, changes in demographics, changes in mixed-use between public transport and others, because that's a much bigger matter. What we're looking at are changes of behaviour and changes of operation that would be specifically influenced by the design that we're proposing for the merging of traffic at those intersections. I think that is probably the greater emphasis.

We have undertaken sufficient modelling to give us confidence that what we're proceeding with is workable and should have relatively minor impacts.

However, I also understand that that modelling is still being concluded and we have yet to complete it for the developed design stage, so it's something we're constantly monitoring. But we do have enough analysis that we have a high degree of confidence in our design and we're going through the additional analysis as due diligence to make sure that we're satisfied with it before we commence construction.

Ms BURNET - If there were cruise ships, would that traffic - like minibuses and so forth, picking them up - how would that likely - would that use the Northern Access Road or not? Will it just continue to use Evans Street?

Mr BOURNE - It's difficult for us to say because that's going to be reactive to the network, the future network, the performance of that network, where they're coming from, the types of patrons who are using that. That would be something for TasPorts and the cruise ship operators to be working out - whether they operate out of the Northern Access Road or not. My understanding is that the port access off the Northern Access Road may be beyond a secure port zone and may not, therefore, give access to the general public coming off a cruise ship to make their way through to buses that are offloading and unloading at the bus plaza.

Ms BURNET - Yes, it's not a through road, is it? It's a terminating road within the port and then back out.

Sorry, one last question. If there is the housing that's promised - I think, I don't know, was it \$42 million of housing in that area near where the ferry terminal may be, or where the slippery pole is presently? What sort of traffic modelling have you done to think about that?

Mr BOURNE - Part of our analysis of the traffic volumes on that road considers volumes generated from that development. They're fairly low by road design standards, so we don't expect that those volumes in themselves will create any issues. Even the heavy vehicle and bus traffic is relatively low as a traffic volume.

Ms BURNET - It's all very low, isn't it, really? Until you have a match day.

Mr BOURNE - Well, even at match day, the number of buses - there's a lot of them, but they will space that over time. At any one point in time, it's a relatively low volume of traffic.

CHAIR - Okay, moving on to page 10, if that suits the Committee? We had a person from the Regatta Association who spoke to us today when we were doing our onsite visit. Pending on the information that he provided us, can you talk us through the consultation with the Regatta Association, City of Hobart and will that road cut off the normal regatta - you have the fair and then you have the grandstand and that road will be running between the grandstand

PUBLIC

and where families sit to watch fireworks and so forth, and there's a show that they do. Can you talk about the consultation you've had with the Regatta Association and any ways you might be able to work with them to find some form of solution for that regatta - I think it goes on for three or four days, doesn't it - annually?

Ms MIDDLETON - We initially met with - I can't remember his name off the top of my head, but the head of the Regatta Association, late last year. We presented the concepts, which are largely the same as the concepts you're seeing today, and we talked through those. I think the general feeling was there wasn't opposition to our works. The view of the Regatta Association is they prefer to be farther down towards the water, but there would be a number of projects that would facilitate that, that aren't necessarily anything that we're delivering, but we did talk to them about the fact that they would have, potentially, a split event once the road is built. Kevin might be able to talk to that.

Mr BOURNE - Okay, as we discussed on the site visit today, currently my understanding of the way the regatta operates is that there are existing roads - very lightly trafficked roads, but there are existing roads throughout the site and those roads are shut off for normal vehicle use during the time of the regatta event, so the area is available for foot traffic around the event.

With the construction of the Northern Access Road, that could still occur. Just like other events that require permits on state roads, a permit application could be developed outlining the proposed traffic management during those events such that they can run the event as it currently does. I'm not pre-empting an approval of a permit, but there's a permit application process and they would consider those issues. That could include foreclosure of the road, potentially.

CHAIR - People may be using that northern road, though, to catch buses to and from the regatta, so you probably can't close it, if you're thinking about it from that level as well. Anyway, I'm probably jumping ahead in time, which is part of our role.

Mr BOURNE - That's something that the regatta, as an event organiser, would need to work through - the details for the new situation of having a new road through the area.

CHAIR - Can you talk us through your consultation with RSL in relation to the Cenotaph access and amenity in relation to the sightlines from the Cenotaph to the Northern Access Road? And where you're at with that consultation, because I believe that's not resolved either; there's still more consultation that needs to happen there?

Ms MIDDLETON - Again, they were a group that we met with late last year and we presented our designs. They saw us very much as a separate project to the stadium and noted that as long as we don't have sightlines that impact the Cenotaph, which we don't, they were comfortable. They were largely focused on maintaining access to the car park and the toilet facilities, and we reassured them that we will maintain that. In terms of sightlines and general support, they were positive.

CHAIR - The Friends of Soldiers Memorial Avenue, general public, where are you at with that consultation?

Ms MIDDLETON - We met with them onsite late last year and we did a site walk up the avenue. We then briefed them in our offices after that. Again, the same briefings that we

PUBLIC

gave others. I think Kevin had spoken earlier to our commitment not to impact the trees, where possible. The consultation with the Friends of the Soldiers Memorial is ongoing.

CHAIR - Okay, thank you.

Ms MIDDLETON - They work quite closely with the Hobart City Council, too, and that's ongoing but we're including them in the early stages and really working with them, rather than just presenting a briefing and that's it.

CHAIR - We will move on to page 12, any questions?

Page 13, any questions?

Page 14, do you have any questions around that, Mr Harriss?

Mr HARRISS - Yes, funding and costs. I'm interested to understand the contingency. It sits at 55 per cent of base estimate at the moment, which to me seems pretty high, albeit at a concept design stage.

Mr BOURNE - I think there are guidelines in terms of how you go about developing cost estimates of various stages of project development. This cost estimate was based on informing the concept design and gives us some confidence that the cost estimate is going to be within the budget funding commitment.

The base estimate is based on our calculation of the various direct costs for materials to build retaining walls, to build pavements, to build kerbs, et cetera, based on the scope as we could foresee at the point of time of doing that concept design cost estimate. As the detailed design develops, we will get more certainty on some of those provisions - exactly how thick the retaining walls are, for example; what material they are going to be made from, et cetera. Then we can give more confident direct-cost-based estimate values. Correspondingly, the contingency percentage will come down over time as we develop that further detail. There could be a small increase in the base estimate, but the percentage of contingency would come down as we get more information there. Overall, we're confident that it will be delivered within that value, likely less.

CHAIR - Does anyone else have any questions on pages 14, 15, 16 - timing?

Ms RATTRAY - What is the engagement thus far with the likes of TasNetworks. I expect TasWater's probably ongoing given they're already doing quite a bit of work there. Then you have Telstra and the NBN. In particular TasNetworks because I noticed there's some pedestrian lighting that's going to be included in the project and there's also, from a layman's terms, some untidy looking overheads on private poles right beside where the new road pavement is going to be. Where are you with TasNetworks?

Mr BOURNE - I mentioned earlier we have a working group between ourselves, Macquarie Point Development Corporation, TasWater, TasPorts, TasNetworks. They're participating with us on a monthly basis, looking at the scope they have to provide. That is to provide some fairly significant infrastructure for power supply into the stadium and into the new port. We're working closely with them in terms of the route allocation between their services, TasWater's rising main, other services, power conduits for the lighting. That's a lot of

PUBLIC

detailed design work to be done in there, but that's already well advanced, allocating routes. We're coordinating the schedules in terms of when they're doing their work, when we're doing our work and TasWater, et cetera.

In terms of the lighting that will come through as part of the detailed design, you have to have a set road alignment before you get too advanced in terms of lighting design. We're at that point where we're still finalising the road design and then the lighting design will follow that.

Ms RATTRAY - There is a lot of pedestrian access right across what's proposed. Do you have any idea of how many light towers you will need or whether it will be on the ground lighting? What are you thinking in that way?

Mr BOURNE - I couldn't say exact numbers of light poles, et cetera, but they'll be designed to provide a certain suitable adequate level of lighting at ground level for both road traffic and the pedestrian traffic.

Ms RATTRAY - That's been well and truly factored into to your cost estimates?

Mr BOURNE - Yes, I believe so.

CHAIR - Any other questions on page 16?

Mr SHELTON - It is to do with so-called which committee, which approval you get first. You've already mentioned how you go about this process and the approvals as listed here, 'Public Works in February 2026, submit your development application to coun' - I presume that's to council, 'development application in April' and then down to the design concept, the preliminary design in April and detailed design in July. It goes to the question of Ms Rattray. Before you engage an electrical engineer to design the underground of it, you probably need approval to say it's going to go ahead. How do you determine whether it comes to the Public Works Committee, and I presume it would be a bit presumptuous of you to submit the DA before it actually comes to the Public Works Committee.

CHAIR - It has happened before.

Mr SHELTON - Okay. It is that chicken and the egg - which approval do you get first and how you manage that as a Department in order to keep everybody happy. You haven't been to me yet and you haven't been here and you haven't been there. How do you determine that in the initial stages about what approval you seek first?

Mr BOURNE - It's all part of project planning and identifying the levels of risk, the things that can delay, the things that are more set timeframes. It's putting together a whole program. Obviously, the Public Works Committee has other things to do as well and so you have a schedule of other projects we've had to fit within that. All those things combined that we've proposed to hold this hearing now and develop an application providing at that point once we've got more detail -

Mr SHELTON - The only thing - and it was mentioned by Mr Harriss - for me, is that you've stated at the table that you are very confident with the design, that that basically won't change that much, and I take you at your word. However, you've still got a 25 per cent contingency for your design -

PUBLIC

Ms RATTRAY - 55 per cent.

Mr SHELTON - \$25 million contingency. The two just don't quite align. I imagine if you are really happy with concept plan to go to engineering, that your contingency would be somewhat less than what it is at the moment.

CHAIR - It is one of the highest that I've seen from a base estimate with the Public Works Committee.

Mr MOLONEY - In relation to that, I might make a couple of comments. In terms of the cost estimate in its preparation, I understand the cost estimate would have been prepared at the end of last year - Kevin?

Mr BOURNE - Yes, probably October or November.

Mr MOLONEY - We are utilising information that was developed back then on that concept design. We have continued to develop the design since that time to keep the project moving forward. As of today, our design is much more developed in the sense that we are approaching preliminary design by April. At the moment, our developed design looks very similar to the concept design. Kevin mentioned before that we think we have some opportunities to improve the safety of the pedestrian underpass. That's an example where there might be some change in cost and may move.

In terms of the contingency, and the quantity of that contingency, it does relate a little bit more to not necessarily the layout, although that could influence. It's things that Kevin mentioned: high costs in terms of retaining walls - how exactly do we go about undertaking those works? They may be influenced by the footprint we're trying to minimise and how we're moving through that area.

In terms of the timing of coming to this committee: part of what we try to do is take on board, perhaps, feedback from previous hearings with yourselves. I guess we're following a protocol which we've developed in transport as to when do we come to yourselves with concepts. Our practice has been to come to this Committee with about this level of detail and not wait until the end, unless there was a reason thereof. But if there is feedback from this Committee that that approach being adopted by DSG isn't appropriate, or, if there's other guidance that's certainly something I think the Department of State Growth could consider in terms of the timing of it. I guess we saw this on the balance of confidence in information, but coming early enough that the Committee can have a meaningful look at it before it got too far advanced. We thought that this was the sweet spot.

Having said that, it was also one of the scenarios where you have a fairly tight calendar. If I recall correctly, it was a choice between now or about two- or three-months time, so we did have to make a call. If we had to pick a perfect time, it may have been in about a month's time, but I think the calendar might have precluded that. When we were discussing scheduling this, we sort of had a choice of either go early or go late, and we felt that we could still come to yourselves with enough confidence. In a perfect world, we probably would have preferred to come to yourselves in about a month's time when we had concluded the public consultation. But basically, the alternative would have been to delay it much later in the project and we felt that lost the opportunity to get your input in at this stage.

PUBLIC

Ms RATTRAY - I appreciate what's being provided to us. I feel like that now we're going to have more input into these projects, Chair. If we get them early, those light poles are going to be moved and we're going to have more opportunity. The stopping bays going up the on the Tasman Highway on the side link would have actually been slow vehicle turnouts. I mean, I'm excited.

CHAIR - To clarify the anticipated construction completion will be 2028?

Mr SHELTON - No, later.

Mr BOURNE - 2029.

CHAIR - 2029?

Mr SHELTON - Yes, 2027-2029.

CHAIR - I have 2028 on mine.

Ms RATTRAY - I have 2028 on mine. I don't know what you have.

Mr SHELTON - Well, I didn't have my glasses on.

CHAIR - Okay, what's the anticipated completion with everything going to plan?

Mr BOURNE - Early 2029, rather than late 2028.

Ms RATTRAY - You're in the know.

CHAIR - Any more questions on the report?

Mr HARRISS - To go to Mr Moloney's point on timing, that following paragraph on page 16 says:

The project is presented to the PWC at this point as it provides further opportunity for community and stakeholder input into the project before design details are finalised and become more difficult to influence.

Bearing in mind that statement, I think the opening comment was that the detailed design documentation is well underway and due to completion. I suppose my question is, is that a reasonable statement to have in there? What part of community and stakeholder input would change any design process now?

Mr BOURNE - Well, we can only change within the constraints of the site and the functionality. We've referred to this a couple of times, the cyclist underpass. That is something that we were proceeding on the basis of an underpass but, based on various consultation and feedback, we are now pursuing an alternative, and a similar cost.

Ms BURNET - Is that overpass on Crown Land or City of Hobart land?

PUBLIC

Mr BOURNE - I'm not sure. Mia, are you - I just have to double-check the plan.

Ms POTTER - I think it's probably right on the boundary of some different parties.

Ms BURNET - My point is that if you're going to put in a development application, it would have to be a lot more detailed than what we've been provided, that's for sure.

Mr MOLONEY - With our project, that particular overpass is probably predominantly in the rail corridor, which would be part of, sort of a state-owned asset. We recognise that part of our project does touch on the footprint of land which is under the responsibility and management of Hobart City Council. We're in discussions with them about the ability to submit a DA on works which would include works on property managed by Hobart City Council.

Mr BOURNE - Notwithstanding the ownership, though, there's still a requirement for a development application in either case. That's where we've - we're not planning to put in a development application today. It's in a couple of months' time.

CHAIR - Okay. Any more questions? Thank you very much for attending. We'll call you back to the table after we've spoken to our other witnesses.

The witnesses withdrew.

CHAIR - The next witnesses are Toby Rowallan, President, and Stephen Zvillis, Vice-President, of the Hobart Northern Suburbs Rail Action Group. Mr Rowallan and Mr Zvillis, could you please introduce yourself and then make the statutory declaration?

Mr ROWALLAN - Thank you. My name's Toby Rowallan from the Hobart Northern Suburbs Rail Action Group. I'm the President.

Mr ZVILLIS - I'm Steven Zvillis. I'm Vice-President of the Hobart Northern Suburbs Rail Action Group. I'm also a member and a representative of the various heritage rail routes in southern Tasmania.

TOBY ROWALLAN, PRESIDENT, and **STEPHEN ZVILLIS**, VICE-PRESIDENT, HOBART NORTHERN SUBURBS RAIL ACTION GROUP, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Thank you for appearing before the Committee. The Committee is pleased to hear your evidence today. Just before you begin giving your evidence, I would like to inform you of some important aspects of the committee proceedings. A committee hearing is a proceeding in parliament. This means it receives the protection of parliamentary privilege. This is an important legal protection that allows individuals giving evidence to a parliamentary committee to speak with complete freedom without the fear of being sued or questioned in any court or place out of parliament. It applies to ensure that parliament receives the very best information when conducting its inquiries.

It is important to be aware that this protection is not accorded to you if statements that may be defamatory are repeated or referred to by you outside the confines of parliamentary proceedings. This is a public hearing. Members of the public and journalists may be present and this means your evidence may be reported. Do you understand?

PUBLIC

WITNESSES - Yes.

CHAIR - Mr Rowallan, would you like to make an opening statement? Because we are limited for time this afternoon, if you can limit the evidence you provide us to 10 to 12 minutes and then we will conduct any further questioning for about another five to 10 minutes from that. We're certainly not restricting any of the information that you're providing to us, but if you can be as succinct as possible, so we can make sure we get the best evidence that we can out of you in that timeframe. Thank you.

Mr ROWALLAN - Yes, that's not a problem at all. We don't have a huge amount to say. In a way, it's fairly succinct. I would just begin - it will just be very brief. As far as we're concerned, the Northern Access Road, because it destroys the railway line - even though it has been stated earlier that it's a short section of the line, it's the key section of the line because it's the access into Hobart. For us this plan is not a future plan, but a plan to fail. If it was a recipe book it'd be called 'Mr Rockliff's Recipe for Disaster'.

The Tasmanian Planning Commission reported approximately 80 buses would be required to move just 6000 people, so the first sold-out event at the stadium could well be the last. We really feel it's very important that we have rail as an option in the future, even though this government is obviously vehemently anti-rail, despite the evidence. That option must be retained for the future. I note earlier as well, they're quite happy to plan for widening roads and yet they're not interested in planning for future transport needs.

Despite being a community group lobbying for specific public transport improvement, we're not considered a stakeholder by the Department. I've got no confidence that they will take any notice of us now, let alone through the public consultation process that ends in less than two weeks. This Committee, as has already been identified today, is expected to sign off on this project as it is, which then presumes that only minor changes can be made through the public consultation process, if any at all. Thus, the Department has already made its decision, I presume with the blessing of the Minister, that this is going to go ahead regardless of what anyone else says, and that this Committee and the public consultation that follows is a rubber-stamp process.

CHAIR - Would you like to make a statement as well before we go into questioning?

Mr ZVILLIS - Yes, Chair. I'd just like to state that we've had a look at the site prior to appearing today and we do see that the provision of rail does not severely interfere with the provision of the road. I think there is sufficient space, with minor modifications, that the rail throughway could still be included as part.

We feel that the provision of a future application of rail, even though it may not be a current priority for the government at this stage, it should not be barricaded for a future government that may decide that they feel that rail is a better option. The throughway should be kept at least open so a future government can make that decision and not be prevented from making that decision in the future.

We also feel that the provision of rail opens up usage of the site for multiple stakeholders, not just for a potential future metro rail, but also for tourist and heritage access to the site for potentially connecting with cruise ships or conferences held at the site. Our priority is to make

PUBLIC

access to the site as multiuser and as a multifaceted as possible and not lock out certain sectors of the of the Tasmanian economy from the site who should be able to have access as well.

CHAIR - To clarify that we are limited in scope as a committee today of what we can investigate when it comes to the rail corridor. Technically, the rail corridor is not part of our scope, however the point you have raised around cutting off the rail in that key point really cuts off the future of a potential rail corridor along that - is it 17 kilometres for the rest of it?

Mr ROWALLAN - It's roughly that but yes, it is only a short distance, and it wouldn't prohibit it from coming back. Because that site is going to be filled in with the road going over the top it would then have to be dug up again. It just makes it all more expensive. The funny thing is all the reports which claim that rail is too expensive - every action that's been taken by the government has made rail more expensive. They've actually created that situation to justify something that they said earlier.

CHAIR - Can you clarify your understanding of the decision to use the rapid buses as opposed to the light rail, which I believe was a promise? But that's changed because of a report. What's your understanding of the difference in cost between?

Mr ROWALLAN - The cost has been deliberately exaggerated and skewed. The government made a decision - they have made a number of statements why they made that decision. We don't agree with those statements. We have tried to meet with the Minister; we have not been able to do so.

The last cost for rail that was identified in the PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) report, which you may have mentioned earlier as well, said the cost was \$596 million and bus was over \$400 million. That included a 56 per cent increase due to perceived risk. That perceived risk was neither justified nor explained in the report. In other words, the cost was doubled for no readily known reason. That's the first thing; the cost is not nearly as high.

However, the cost of rail was assessed as using a wider gauge in that report. It's not actually a real cost if we were to keep the gauge we have, because we need to if we are going to use rail because then heritage rail can use the track as well and can't if you change the gauge. The report seems to have been a deliberate sabotage of what rail is going to cost. The Northern Access Road appears to be a deliberate sabotage as well because there is room in that area to continue the road to go down into Macquarie Point to go across to the port and keep a corridor for rail. They have chosen not to do that. The reason for that has not been adequately justified.

CHAIR - That might be a question we can ask when we have the Department come back to the table.

Ms RATTRAY - Have you had a conversation with the Hobart City Council?

Mr ROWALLAN - We've talked -

Ms RATTRAY - Is that something - or elected representatives in regard to your aspirations?

Mr ROWALLAN -The reality is this is a state government decision. It's the state government's -

PUBLIC

Ms RATTRAY - It's going to have DA approval.

Mr ROWALLAN - It does, and we will talk to Hobart City Council once a DA is submitted, but until then it's going to be a wait and see. They wouldn't be able to make a decision - the decision to not go with rail and to go with buses was made some time ago. We have yet to see the business case for the busway, which is a little convenient for the government because we can't then offer a critique on it in the context of this. I note the rapid bus is not expected to be using that part of the rail corridor, but that actually means that the rapid bus is not going to be rapid because it's going to be on the road network. Unless there's a lane that's actually completely closed off to the rest of the vehicles, that is not -

Ms RATTRAY - Like a dedicated bus lane?

Mr ROWALLAN - Like a dedicated bus lane.

Ms RATTRAY - Which they do, I think, coming in from down the Huon.

Mr ROWALLAN - There's a short distance on the Southern Outlet, that's correct, but it finishes before you get to the traffic lights. Unless that's going to be happening in the middle of the city or on the Brooker, I don't know, then it's not going to be rapid bus. They can call it that, but it's not going to be rapid bus. No matter what anybody says. The only way you could do it is with a completely separate corridor. If they're not using the whole railway corridor, which will cost over \$400 million. If you've got \$76 million or \$78 million for less than a kilometre of this Northern Access Road, then there is absolutely no way that a busway will be cheaper if you use the whole railway corridor than it would be just to use the railway as it is.

Ms BURNET - Thanks for your submission and your ongoing interest in retaining the rail corridor for rail. Future thinking governments would give their right arm to have an intact rail corridor. What do you say to the potential of delivering people by rail to events or indeed as commuter rail into the future?

Mr ROWALLAN - The Australasian Railway Association has done a study. They identified that rail can move over 20,000 people per hour. Buses cannot do that unless you simply have way more buses, which we are not going to have. As I said, the Planning Commission said that we'd need about 80 extra buses to move 6000 people. Not 20,000 - 6000. We're not going to have 80 extra buses to move 6000 people from the stadium. It's not going to work. The numbers do not add up. I have contacted people who have advised the government and they could not answer because they did not know what the government's plan was. They said, 'Oh, on the basis of what is happening in Brisbane, you might be able to do it', but we don't know that what's going to be happening here is going to be the same. In fact, the evidence suggests it's not, especially given it's not going to have its own dedicated corridor.

Ms RATTRAY - Does Tasmania, in your networks, have the rail infrastructure if the line was still there? Do you have enough of the rolling stock to manage what you've just outlined there?

Mr ROWALLAN - We would need new trains to have a commuter rail service. You would need new ones or at least relatively new ones, so it was a reliable and frequent service.

PUBLIC

Ms RATTRAY - You're not going to put us on ones that cart logs, are you?

Mr ROWALLAN - No, you're not going to convert freight wagons or use heritage vehicles because they're not built to modern standards. That's not the issue. That's simply a choice. The situation is that around the rest of the country we have had cities all switched to new rail lines and new light rail lines. Canberra, Gold Coast, extensions in Adelaide, Perth has built new lines, and in Sydney. They've all done this because they've realised that the existing transport road networks are not coping. Sydney has brought their trams back into the city because the network wasn't coping. All these places had to build a new line, and they've had to pay lots and lots of money to do so. The Gold Coast did not have an existing corridor -

CHAIR - Was that the acquisition of the properties? Sorry for interrupting you.

Mr ROWALLAN - They've had to move lanes, remove parking. They had to build a new bridge. There was no grass verge that they could choose to then just put track on. Even Canberra, where they did have a central grass verge that they could use for the light rail, they still had to dig up every intersection, of course. All that costs money. We don't have to do any of that because we have an existing rail line. All these cities would have loved to have what we have because it's so much easier to just simply put that back into use. It only needs upgrading rather than starting from scratch.

CHAIR - Is it more expensive in the short term to utilise rail or a light rail as opposed to buses? Are buses a cheaper short-term fix than rail? Is that one of the reasons behind this?

Mr ROWALLAN - You'd have to ask the government because - as I said, firstly, we don't have the exact costing of using the existing gauge and doing it that way and doing it the cheapest way. We don't actually know. We only know that it's not actually that much more than it was for their busway. However, according to this PwC report, the rail was going to develop four times more jobs, four times more residential and commercial development. If the busway was going to be equal to rail in terms of cost, it would have to cost a quarter of rail, but it doesn't. Even according to this report, it's only slightly less, about 23 per cent, so it would have to cost one quarter of the amount of rail, but it's not even close, and that's just to equal rail but it doesn't, and it doesn't generate the jobs.

Whilst this government may choose to not go with rail, that's their choice and we have been unable to influence that, they should not limit the options for the future. This is going to be critical. We need to plan for the future. We need to plan for a bigger city. We need to plan for more people coming here and, at the moment, we're planning to fail.

Mr SHELTON - A quick question and given your experience, I'm interested - one of the issues that's been talked about with the single line is that the train can only come into the city or out of the city and it can't do both at the same time. How do you duplicate the line in order to have trains coming in and trains going out?

Mr ROWALLAN - That's very simple. It's just computer-controlled train networking. The freight trains operate this way all the time. They just have passing loops. Wellington: one of the commuter lines there actually goes out to a suburb called Johnsonville, it's the same, it's single track with passing loops. The trains just pass each other at stations. It's not a problem.

PUBLIC

At some point once the line was being well utilised you could then say, 'Okay, it's successful, we can justify putting double track all the way'. We're not advocating for something gold-plated and super expensive because we know that Tassie can't afford it.

Ms RATTRAY - Can you actually fit the loop?

Mr ROWALLAN - There's plenty of room for passing loops all the way along. There's room at Moonah, there's room at Derwent Park, there's room at Glenorchy, there's room at Claremont. There's room.

Mr SHELTON - But there is no room. I've walked the track a lot between the bridge and wherever you come out of the hockey centre there -

Mr ROWALLAN - There's room near the hockey centre, though, because there used to be three tracks at New Town. There was a siding.

Mr SHELTON - You'd have to take over the walking track if you moved it sideways onto the walking track.

Mr ROWALLAN - No, there's definitely room. That's not an issue and it's never been raised as a reason for the government not doing it. It also means that, if it's not wide enough for two tracks, it's not wide enough for two roads for a busway.

Ms BURNET - One last question. There's a lot riding on delivering a modal shift to buses for match days or big events at the stadium - or the proposed stadium, it hasn't been built yet. What's your understanding of people wanting to get onto buses versus catching trains?

Mr ROWALLAN - That's a great question. Canberra did a survey of people using their new metro light rail, and it's very important to note that 43 per cent of people who responded to the survey were new to public transport. Canberra already had buses, as I said in my submission. Those people weren't using the buses and Canberra has a very good road network as well, it's three lanes each way all the way through the city. It's very easy to drive around, I was there in October. It's not hard. It's not particularly congested and yet the rail has persuaded people to switch.

That doesn't happen with buses. Last night, Metro posted saying that the heavy rains and wind and congestion from lots of other people driving in and out of the city meant that there were going to be 25-minute delays for bus services, which is pretty unfortunate because these are the people who are trying to get home as well and they're stuck in the rain waiting for a bus. We already have really low confidence in our bus services, which is unfortunate and we would like to see that better, but it means that we're in an environment where people aren't wanting to switch and they're not going to be persuaded to switch to buses. They're going to have to do a lot of advertising for this bus rapid proposal just to make people think twice about it and consider it because the perception is already very negative.

When you have a completely different transport system, when you have rail, you don't need to even advertise to say this is something different because it's obvious. Half of that work is done.

PUBLIC

Mr ZVILLIS - I was just advancing on what Toby said in regard to the attraction of buses versus rail. The statistics from Australian capital cities is that the public transport usage in Hobart is at 4 per cent, which is the lowest of the entire country. Yet, when you rate our congestion levels, even though we're the 13th largest city, we're the fourth most congested city in the country, after Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and then Hobart. Even though we're the 13th, we're more congested than Perth and Adelaide, yet our public transit usage is at a miserable 4 per cent. You can dress up buses all your like, if you're not going to raise it, you'd be lucky to get usage of the bus, with rapid schemes and all this sort of thing, maybe you might get to 8 per cent, you might, if you're really, really lucky, might get to 10 per cent, but that's about it, you pretty much floor out at that.

Whereas, with rail - it's not just rail alone, you integrate it as part of a wider network with rapid ferry services because, obviously, rail doesn't go everywhere - ferries service areas that rail can't. You build up an integrated network with on-call minibuses and things to connect stations. You have to have an integrated network, but you shouldn't go cutting off your options because if you want to raise the state's public transport usage from its absolutely abysmal 4 per cent to a substantial increase, especially to service things like the stadium, which have that situation where you not have got have people feeding in and out on a regular basis, it's everyone in at one time; everyone out at one time.

That's where you're going to find your transit networks are going to completely fall over because it's that mass demand in very, very short periods of time. That's going to be a significant aspect of the stadium and that's going to be a significant aspect where metro rail could make a far more effective solution for moving people rapidly in and out of the stadium than a network of buses could. The basics are that a metro rail service would be able to move that mass amount of people very quickly and very efficiently in and out.

You also mentioned in previous discussions about potential concerns about the clashes of the port traffic with events.

CHAIR - With commuters.

Mr ZVILLIS - If you're having the commuters being moved by metro rail and reducing the reliance on buses, you're reducing the competition on the road between port traffic and bus traffic trying to use the same Northern Access Road at the same time. You can tend to segregate them more, and then your port becomes a lot freer to move its traffic in and out of the port via the Northern Access Road without getting tangled up with convoys of buses desperately trying and failing to move people out of the stadium in an extremely short amount of time.

Mr ROWALLAN - One of the other issues we've noticed with the transport, particularly because the stadium is right where the three key arterial roads go, right at the intersection of those three arterial routes, it's extremely vulnerable to any kind of incident. The road network struggles the moment you have a blockage on one of those arterial roads - as we all know.

CHAIR - One flat tyre and it all stops.

Mr ROWALLAN - A couple of years ago we had the truck rollover on the Tasman Bridge. My normal work job is an ambulance dispatcher, and I was acting team leader in the ambulance dispatch room at that time. The night shift crew could not get to work. The day shift ambulance crews had finished duty because the time was up, and they could not get back to the

PUBLIC

stations to actually finish duty. The night shift ambulance crews could not get to the stations to commence duty. The amount of available ambulance crews could not get to the stations to commence duty. The number of available ambulances in Hobart plummeted to almost nothing, maybe two or three of the afternoon crews at best. Even then, of course, imagine them having to try and get on an emergency response through the city.

If we're going to have 23,000 people or, for a standing event, 30,000 people, trying to leave the stadium, we can't rely on the road network alone. At the moment, the plan is to rely on the road network alone. That doesn't make sense.

CHAIR - We might finish there. Thank you very much for the evidence you've provided today. Before you leave the table, I'd like to reiterate the statement I made earlier about committee proceedings. What you have said to us here today is protected by parliamentary privilege. Once you leave the table, you need to be aware that privilege does not attach to comments you may make to anyone, including the media, even if you are just repeating what you have said to us. Do you understand that?

WITNESSES - Yes.

CHAIR - Okay. Thank you very much for attending and giving evidence.

The witnesses withdrew.

MARK DONNELLON, PRESIDENT, STREETS PEOPLE LOVE HOBART, WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Thank you for appearing before the Committee. The Committee is pleased to hear your evidence today. Just before you begin giving your evidence, I would like to inform you of some important aspects of committee proceedings. A committee hearing is a proceeding in parliament. This means it receives the protection of parliamentary privilege. This is an important legal protection that allows individuals giving evidence to a parliamentary committee to speak with complete freedom without the fear of being sued or questioned in any court or place out of parliament. It applies to ensure that parliament receives the very best information when conducting its inquiries.

It is important to be aware that this protection is not accorded to you if statements that may be defamatory are repeated or referred to by you outside the confines of the parliamentary proceedings. This is a public hearing. Members of the public and journalists may be present and this means your evidence may be reported. Do you understand?

Mr DONNELLON - I understand.

CHAIR - Thank you. Would you like to make an opening statement?

Mr DONNELLON - Yes. First of all, Streets People Love Hobart is a community organisation that advocates for streets that prioritise people safety and sustainability. There are a number of benefits to streets that prioritise people safety and sustainability. I'm going to borrow the Department of State Growth's cycling infrastructure design guidelines:

PUBLIC

Some of the benefits for walking, wheeling and riding include: improved physical and mental health for individuals, which saves costs for the health system; supporting tourism and the visitor economy; reduced traffic congestion and road maintenance costs; improved social connections; integration with other modes to reduce car dependence; and avoiding environmental impacts of motor vehicles through noise, air pollution and emissions.

This document also includes some tips for thinking about what things are important when choosing designs for footpaths and cycle paths: they should be designed for a 12-year-old to be able to ride without supervision; don't give up at the intersection - interacting with vehicles at intersections feels the most dangerous; and people riding generally travel faster than others who are walking and wheeling, so separate where possible.

I want to talk about how that relates to the plans that we've had submitted. In our submission we identified that we believe the paths on those plans, according to the scale, the shared paths around the road are three metres wide. We would expect that once the Macquarie Point development gets to a more completed stage that we would see a lot of pedestrian and cyclist movements on these paths at all times of the day; not just at events but especially at events, as you can imagine.

The Austroads and Department of State Growth guidelines for paths and cycle paths recommend that bikes and pedestrians be separated at movement volumes over 110, 150 per hour.

CHAIR - It's 150 people per hour, 150 bikes per hour, or both?

Mr DONNELLON - It depends on what you look at. In these guidelines it will say 150 combined movements per hour, at which you should separate pedestrians and cyclists. It also mentions that a bi-directional cycling path should be four metres wide - two metres for each direction, compared to these shared paths that are going in which are three metres.

We would recommend that the Department of State Growth, if they're interested in promoting cycling and reducing conflict between faster moving cyclists and pedestrians, that the path be wider. Looking at the cross-sections in the plans, there is certainly room available to widen the footpaths.

Another thing we looked at were the intersections. For pedestrian and cyclist safety on roads, and to make the paths better to use for pedestrians and cyclists, we can prioritise pedestrians and cyclists at the crossings. With pedestrian and cyclist priority crossings, if you'd like a diagram -

Ms RATTRAY - Bit hard for Hansard to pick up.

Mr DONNELLON - Yes, sure. I can talk through it.

CHAIR - We will table it, but if you can speak through the diagram for the public record and we will table that for our evidence. Is that okay?

PUBLIC

Mr DONNELLON - Sure thing. Page 47 of the Cycling Infrastructure Design Book for off-road path-crossing segments depicts both a shared cycleway and pedestrian path separated and crossing a T-junction - the terminating road is being crossed by the shared path. In this way, the shared path and the footpath both continue and those users are given priority over motor vehicles turning in and out of the terminating street. This improves safety and amenity for pedestrians and cyclists.

CHAIR - Thank you. We will have our Secretary take a copy of that document for our evidence, if that's okay.

Mr DONNELLON - Sure.

CHAIR - Thank you. We've got about five more minutes. Does that work with your evidence?

Mr DONNELLON - It sure does. I might add that on this road you could possibly fit single direction bike lanes on each side separated from the walking path. It wouldn't have to be two directional on both sides. I'm free to answer any questions you might have.

CHAIR - I can't see on the proposed road plan where pedestrians might be able to just cross the road from one side to the other. Is that just me missing something? Say you're a pedestrian who's got off the bus, but you want to walk over to the ferry terminal down at Regatta Point, is there a crossing or is it here?

Mr DONNELLON - There is not.

CHAIR - There's an island divider in the middle of the road, but there's not really anywhere for pedestrians to cross the road is there? Like a dedicated crossing of sorts?

Mr DONNELLON - I imagine that's being discouraged, but that does look like a refuge below the grandstand there.

CHAIR - Do you know many people who cycle along there and along that site? Have you got any through your own consultation you can share with the Committee?

Mr DONNELLON - The Bicycle Network conducts bike counts every year. I brought with me the data for the 2025 commuter morning cycling counts. They counted 238 movements on the Intercity Cycleway here between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m. on a Tuesday, 160 of which continue round to the Davey Street side. We did, however, hear earlier today that it's expected that many cyclists would continue through Macquarie Point once that's built. That would become the main way to get into the city.

Mr SHELTON - You agree with that? As a flatter ride?

Mr DONNELLON - Thinking it over briefly, I would certainly much prefer to ride through Macquarie Point than next to a busy highway. Also, riding around between the current port entrance is troublesome. It is also the road down the highway has pedestrians on it a lot. Being as narrow as it is, it does create a lot of conflict between cyclists and pedestrians.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Do you think there should be a dedicated bike area that goes through Macquarie Point, the new road where it's not shared with pedestrians? How important is that?

Mr DONNELLON - It would help reduce that conflict I'm talking about. That would be the recommendation. If you're considering the design guidelines and greater than 150 movements, then yes, separation would be important to reduce that conflict.

Ms BURNET - Thanks for your submission. It's very detailed. Who uses the Intercity Cycleway, just commuters or is it other younger kids and so forth?

Mr DONNELLON - I personally don't know the answer to that.

Ms BURNET - I've mentioned it before, but that is a route down to Davey Street along the side of the Tasman Highway. You do pick up quite a lot of speed going down there, don't you? What would you suggest would be a safe treatment for that area?

Mr DONNELLON - We did hear that the width is constrained under the bridge there and so not likely to see a wide bike path. It's also important to separate both bikes and pedestrians with a median. Simply making a path wider with paint, dividing it up that way would not do a great job of keeping pedestrians and cyclists separated, so I would expect that a more optimal solution would be to direct the cycle traffic from the Intercity Cycleway through Macquarie Point where I imagine in the precinct plan we expect to see quite large, wide boulevards - open spaces for people - when it's not busy, there's plenty of room for a cyclist to move through there.

Ms BURNET - So you're saying that through a busy match day, which probably would hinder some of that cyclist movement through Macquarie Point - I would have thought that you don't have any concern about the footpath along the Tasman Highway.

Mr DONNELLON - I would certainly have concern about the footpath and the Tasman Highway. It is already, without a stadium there, the conflict between pedestrians and cyclists is great. As you said, cyclists can move quite quickly down that path down the decline and that does not work well with pedestrians. If you've ever been jumpscared by a cyclist approaching you from behind, it's not great.

Ms BURNET - You can ride around the entrance, the Cenotaph side of the Remembrance Bridge so you could ride through there, so you don't have to go underneath any widened path. You wouldn't have to necessarily widen the path under the bridge; you could divert people around and widen the path down the side of the embankment.

Mr DONNELLON - Yes.

CHAIR - Before you leave the table, I'd like to reiterate the statement I made earlier about committee proceedings. As I advised what you have said to us here today is protected by parliamentary privilege. Once you leave the table, you need to be aware that privilege does not attach to comments you may make to anyone, including the media, even if you are just repeating what you have said to us. Do you understand that?

Mr DONNELLON - I understand.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Thank you very much for your evidence and for coming today, we really appreciate it.

The witness withdrew.

CHAIR - I would like to call the witnesses from the Department back to the table to give further evidence.

Ms BURNET - Mr Donnellon suggested there might be priority for pedestrians at those road junctions. Is that a possibility to consider, like raised walkways, so there is that priority?

Mr BOURNE - I believe there has been some suggestion in some of the consultation we've done with the cycling groups. The designers are considering the ability to do that.

There are challenges with that. For example, having cycling crossing the road if it's a steep road such as the one into the Domain means that you already have a steep road and then if you're going up over a raised platform, it's going to be steeper coming back down again, so there are some challenges, but I'm not saying they're insurmountable.

Mr SHELTON - Going along with that and my interpretation of the plans, the drive coming down from the car park on the southern side of the road, given that I would consider that's the predominant pedestrian one of the two versus the one on the riverside zebra crossing. It's only car parking and access to the bottom area that you're actually controlling the traffic on, so I would consider that a compromise on that one might be possible, whereas you're not crossing the main road for pedestrians.

What I didn't ask Mr Donnellon, and I think it was mentioned this morning, has a direct link off the Intercity Cycleway under the road to the Domain side been discussed as a possibility?

Mr BOURNE - To the Domain side under the existing McVilly Drive underpass, do you mean?

Mr SHELTON - Yes, if you look at Mr Donnellon's -

Mr BOURNE - Oh, yes. That is something that, again, has been raised by the cycling groups we've spoken to. We believe that there's a lot of merit in doing that. Yes, we're looking into that.

Mr SHELTON - I've walked that a number of times out to the bridge and back. It's exactly five kilometres from parliament, so over lunchtime, it is used quite frequently by walkers and cyclists, so it is important to make sure that everybody who's using the road is kept as safe as possible. You don't want to put cyclists and/or pedestrians across a busy road either. That's the other thing.

There also seems to be some islands in the middle of the road. My knowledge of local government and traffic islands to slow traffic down and give pedestrians walking across the road some means of safety in the middle of the road, if that's needed - and that's in the design, as I understand it. If you can just clarify that, that'd be great.

PUBLIC

Mr BOURNE - I guess one of the things we also are looking at is the speed this road is designed for. The need for a pedestrian refuge in the middle of a road may be affected by that decision. Certainly, we're trying to limit the number of crossings, but there is a bit of a balance between following some of these desired lines and fitting in not having crossings of the existing roads. We're weighing up the alternatives for the best overall outcomes.

Ms BURNET - When you met with cycling groups, did you meet with Streets People Love as well as part of that exercise?

Mr BOURNE - We did, yes. We had a site visit with them. We met with Cycling South and Bicycle Network Tasmania a few weeks earlier. We made the offer that we would meet them on-site during this public consultation period. We conducted that yesterday, and Streets People Love were represented there.

Ms BURNET - There are small children who learn to ride on the bike track, and walking along there as well with their parents. What sort of mitigation would you do during construction of any sort of risk associated with pedestrians and vulnerable road users?

Mr BOURNE - The contractor we engage will be required to develop a traffic management plan. That will consider how all types of vehicles would be catered for to continue operating on the road through construction. That includes pedestrians, cyclists and all sorts. Yeah, there would be appropriate protective measures during construction in accordance with the Australian standards.

Ms RATTRAY - You obviously heard the strong evidence presented by the train group prior. Do you want to give us a comment or provide some feedback on the suggestion of not taking that significant piece of the rail network, but still being able to proceed with the northern access? Or does the northern road access rely solely on that piece of rail network?

Mr BOURNE - I think there is obviously a lot of the comments related to the appropriate mode choice along the corridor, which is beyond the scope of what we're here to talk about of this project, so I won't engage with that, unless Mr Moloney wanted to. But in terms of the ability to have the design of the Northern Access Road avoiding any impact on the rail corridor, I'd consider that really difficult.

Ms RATTRAY - Because this is only a concept?

Mr BOURNE - It is. But as I said earlier, any amendments to that would still need to fit within the site constraints. The reality is some of the site constraints, as we've heard today, would probably make that extremely difficult to avoid any impact on.

Ms RATTRAY - But it's not impossible?

Mr BOURNE - I don't like to use the word 'impossible', but I can't see a way that that would work at the moment.

Mr MOLONEY - It's important that we consider that, I guess, what's being presented at the hearing today is really a project about the northern access corridor. It is not about the debate around buses versus trains. Whilst we might be very passionate about that, and there's lots of

PUBLIC

arguments for and against, I think it's very important to focus on what this project means in terms of that.

The reality is that the existing proposals to develop Macquarie Point, as they stand, mean that there is no corridor that goes through that site. There is no existing rail corridor through to the CBD so the reality is, if rail was to be introduced, as best I can tell, it would be terminating effectively at the location of the Cenotaph. I guess what would be considered at this hearing is whether or not being able to get a couple of 100 metres closer to the Cenotaph, rather than terminating before, is such a significant impact that it would warrant not having a northern access corridor to Macquarie Point. Because, as far as Kevin was quite generous in explaining that it's not physically impossible, it would be close to impossible to maintain a northern access road or rail there unless you were talking about a subway.

I guess what we need to be careful is not to conflate all the various issues and challenges around the broader Hobart movement. What I would say is that the rapid bus network, which is being proposed by the state government in lieu of a dedicated rail to the northern corridor, is a rapid bus network that serves us as all of Greater Hobart. So it seeks to address the southern corridor, it seeks to address the northern corridor and also the eastern corridor.

If this location, if basically we were to go down the path of rail - and the suggestion is that that is the best form of transport to get people away from major events, that would be suitable for patrons at major events that live in the City of Glenorchy. It would not be a suitable form of transport for patrons that go to Kingborough; it would not be a suitable form of transport for patrons that need to go to Clarence. The bus plaza proposition that we have as part of this project enables buses to arrive, pick up patrons and take them to all of those north, south and eastern corridors. A dedicated rail line cannot do that.

I think it's very important to consider those broader aspects, as the debate on whether or not rail or buses is the best form of transport to the northern suburbs is something that is separate to this. As I said, I don't think it's material to the considerations that we're talking about on this particular project.

CHAIR - Some of the evidence that was provided to us which came from a planning report - and I'm not sure which planning report - estimated that it's going to be 80 buses to move 6000 people. When you're designing that space for the buses, I don't know what that would look like -

Ms RATTRAY - A lot of buses.

CHAIR - You wouldn't have all 23,000 people catching a bus. There would be people on foot and there'd be people coming from other places, of course. That's an incredible number of buses. Is it accurate? Have you factored that into your designs? That's going to be chaotic, isn't it, that number of buses. Is that accurate?

Mr MOLONEY - I think that that number probably is in the right order of magnitude in terms of the quantity of patrons that we would like to use public transport. I mean, to be honest, it would be a fantastic problem to have, if we had more and more people using buses that we needed more buses.

PUBLIC

In terms of the design scope of this project, we haven't sought to accommodate the queuing of buses for this project. So, as part of that mode of operation for public transport in terms of post-events, what we would expect to happen is marshalling areas to be identified, so that a number of buses could be basically in close proximity to the precinct and come and arrive at the same time the other buses are leaving. If I had to give an example of what I think might be one scenario, you could imagine a number of buses being marshalled in the broader Domain area where there are a number of streets there where they could be marshalled and could be in close proximity and come in and feed into, pick up patrons and move on in an efficient manner. If their destination is close enough, you could anticipate that those vehicles would be used more than once in terms of distributing people to their final destination. Although it might be 80 bus movements, it might be that there's a combination of 60 buses that 20 have time to go out, drop off and come back in.

CHAIR - It's only for 6000 people. We'd be doubling that, wouldn't we, potentially? That'd be 160 buses that could potentially be going through where you only have eight bays in your design. I think that would all be within an hour, wouldn't it? An hour to get there, then an hour when they're leaving. Is the space that you've designed big enough, and where are we going to find 160 buses as well?

Mr MOLONEY - In terms of buses, I think the number was 80. I've seen numbers like 100 buses. I haven't seen a number of 160 buses in terms of -

CHAIR - Well, that'd be doubling for 12,000 people, which would be probably realistic, if you're thinking about attendance at a 23,000 sitting down stadium.

Mr MOLONEY - I think if you assume, say 50 or 60 people per bus. You calculate - I don't have a calculator in front of myself, but that would broadly - if you thought of the number, divide it by 50 or 60 -

CHAIR - You'd have to be filling a bus about every two minutes, or a minute and a half. Is that physically possible to put 50 people on a bus - or take 50 people off a bus, put 50 people on a bus and then move them on within a minute and a half, to cater to that?

Mr MOLONEY - There are a total of eight bus bays, each of them being loaded. There has been preliminary analysis around potential loading times, transfer times. But, really, the detailed analysis of that does form into more of the mode of operation plan that needs to be developed.

CHAIR - Could we have access to that detailed analysis of that movement?

Mr MOLONEY - I wouldn't classify it as a detailed analysis. We do have some analysis of numbers and timeframes.

CHAIR - That'd be really helpful. Just about whether or not the area is going to be big enough to cater for that, if it does end up being with a bus model.

Mr MOLONEY - In determining that, we have obtained a lot of that information from the Macquarie Point Development Corporation, in terms of some of their early planning, and then undertaken some of our own basic analysis.

PUBLIC

Ms BURNET - There was a point raised about the confluence of the three main routes through that area. How do you feel that could be - do you feel that that's going to be, like the peaks that were referred to - When you're delivering those buses and patrons to the stadium and going, it's all at a peak. What sort of strain would there be on the network?

Mr MOLONEY - Are we referring to congestion at peak business times?

Ms BURNET - When the stadium is filling and emptying. Those times.

Mr MOLONEY - Again, it would come back to that broader plan. I think that there will be a number of buses exiting here. Certainly, we're trying to make this bus plaza as efficient as possible to get as many patrons as possible to be using public transport. If they're using public transport, they're not using private vehicles. If they're not using private vehicles, they're not increasing the congestion. I'm not suggesting that there won't be traffic congestion post event, but I would argue that this project is specifically targeted at utilising an existing intention to provide a northern access to the port and the precinct and combining that with a bus plaza, which will encourage people to use public transport and reduce the number of people using private vehicles.

CHAIR - It's not going to be an underground bus plaza, is it, by the way? I had to say it.

Mr MOLONEY - It's not.

CHAIR - Does anyone have any more questions? I have a series of questions that I will be asking all of you and if you can just answer yes or no. Thank you for coming in today and providing us with the site visit and also for being in here this afternoon. We really appreciate that.

Do the proposed works meet an identified need or needs, or solve a recognised problem?

WITNESSES - Yes.

CHAIR - Are the proposed works the best solution to meet identified needs or solve a recognised problem within the allocated budget?

WITNESSES - Yes.

CHAIR - Are the proposed works fit for purpose?

WITNESSES - Yes.

CHAIR - Do the proposed works provide value for money?

WITNESSES - Yes.

CHAIR - Are the proposed works a good use of public funds?

WITNESSES - Yes.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - As I advised you at the commencement of your evidence, what you have said to us here today is protected by parliamentary privilege. Once you leave the table, you need to be aware that privilege does not attach to comments you may make to anyone, including the media, even if you are just repeating what you have said to us. Do you understand that?

WITNESSES - Yes.

CHAIR - Thank you very much for attending and giving evidence.

The witnesses withdrew.

The Committee adjourned at 4.48 p.m.