

## **Submission to Legislative Council Inquiry**

August 2012

### **The challenge: To provide Tasmanians transport choice instead of car dependence and oil price vulnerability**

In the few years since Future Transport Tasmania (FTT) was formed, we have come to the realisation that the words 'Tasmania' and 'Public Transport' are most definitely not synonymous. We acknowledge that work has been done in terms of strategies and studies, and that these are important stepping stones towards infrastructure projects. However FTT has no doubt that in order to manage vital change, a dramatic shift in policy and action must occur.

While reviewing a number of documents produced by various State Government departments and consultants, FTT has found a large number of what we consider to be glaring inconsistencies and contradictions. Combined with a distinct lack of positive action on public transport of all kinds, FTT strongly believes a dramatic shift in Government policy is required for any change to occur.

FTT has provided comments relating to some of those documents in our submission. Many of these documents fail in one key regard –they refer to the desire to change Tasmania's car dependence, but then detail plans and strategies which we believe are either contradictory, or utterly insufficient to actually achieve what is stated as a goal.

Over the last several years Tasmania has had little or zero growth in public transport use (principally Metro) and yet growth in car use has continued to increase. Metro have reorganized bus timetables and a small number of new services have been introduced, however this pales by comparison with the expenditure on highways over the same period of time. For example, Metro Tasmania's annual budget of approximately \$40 million was exceeded by the \$51 million of the final cost of the Kingston Bypass, a highway improvement to a single outer urban region that covered just over 2 kilometres. FTT notes that the cost of the Kingston Bypass exceeded the planned budget by approximately 23%. Along with the Kingston Bypass, there already are very large road projects under construction and planning. Some of these include a new four-lane Bridgewater Bridge, the Bagdad and Brighton bypasses plus planned improvements to the Brooker Highway. It seems very clear to us that the publicly stated goal of increasing public transport use is completely at odds with this level of road construction.

## **Climate Change and Oil Price Vulnerability**

Climate change is now recognised as a serious global issue that requires global action. Tasmania is obviously a very small contributor to global emissions, and is significantly assisted by its hydro-electric energy facilities. Unfortunately Tasmania does have a large component of its emissions generated by the transport sector. Any action that encourages or increases the number of road users, either private vehicles or heavy trucks, is clearly going to increase Tasmania's carbon emissions. Because of its dependency on oil for transport, Tasmania is acutely vulnerable to oil price fluctuations. If Peak Oil becomes a more significant factor in the global economy, Tasmania will obviously then be affected by not only an increase in oil prices, but will eventually suffer from oil shortages until alternatives can be made available.

The most significant issue regarding this is quite simply affordability. Tasmania is expected to spend over \$630 million on petrol in 2012. This figure includes households, industry and government. The higher petrol prices go the greater the impact will be on all sectors. As was highlighted by Peak Oil Tasmania in May this year, if the Australian dollar had been still sitting at 85 US cents, we would be spending over \$750 million dollars in just one year. If this money was not spent on petrol, industry, government and households could be spending it elsewhere. If or perhaps when prices rise dramatically, Tasmania's economy will inevitably struggle. Our transport capacity will be reduced and those who are already vulnerable will be acutely affected. The impacts would be felt across all areas, not just those who are already transport disadvantaged, but in also terms of industries that become marginal due to fuel and supply costs. Our car and road dependency, fostered by decades of government inaction on public and rail transport, is now placing Tasmania in an acutely vulnerable position that could result in a crisis. It is the very nature of our transport system that makes us vulnerable, but fortunately it is the easiest thing that can be changed. All it requires is action.

## **Changing Attitudes or Changing Actions**

A number of the documents that FTT has studied refer to efforts at changing attitudes and perceptions regarding public transport. FTT believes that Tasmania's car dependence is deeply entrenched and attitudes very far ingrained. If no additional or alternative public transport services were introduced, FTT doubts that this attitude would be altered by anything other than drastic changes in the convenience and cost of private car travel. Even this might not result in an overwhelming demand for additional public transport services, unless those problems were at crisis point. FTT believes that in order to generate change, the road network that supports Tasmania's car dependency should therefore not be expanded or improved. FTT recommends only safety and black spot improvements should be made for Tasmania's road network. Altering perceptions and behaviour is unlikely to be achieved by merely providing information to Tasmanians. We believe they will rightly demand action in the form of improved and additional services before altering transport behaviour.

Bus services are traditionally regarded as being an essential service provided for those who cannot drive or otherwise have access to transport. Government must consider bus services an essential service for all potential users, not just those who cannot access private transport for whatever reason. FTT is of the opinion that it is not in fact the public's attitude that must change, but in fact the policy and actions of Government and bureaucracy.

## **Land Use Planning and Zoning**

FTT believes that transit oriented developments (TOD) will only occur once a transit service has commenced construction or has been completed. FTT doubts that changes in land use will occur on their own without significant effort from local authorities, with the results being unlikely to be commensurate with the effort involved. Given Tasmania's population dispersal, the benefits of high density development will not be realised unless high frequency mass transit services are put in place prior to such development. The Tasmanian Urban Passenger Transport Framework refers to the potential development cost savings on page 28. FTT believes that asking developers to have faith in the future implementation of a transit service, by investing in high density housing, will not achieve the results desired. If we are to change the way our city is growing, transport services must be changed first, not last.

## **An Integrated Public Transport System**

Southern Tasmania's dispersed population areas ensure that creating a viable public transport system is expensive. However as we have seen already, without any change, future transport costs could be unsustainable and unaffordable. Highway and road construction is also extremely expensive. FTT recommends a long term plan that encompasses and addresses land use planning, population growth and future transport costs. Any public transport system should be considered holistically, that is one that involves pedestrian, cycling, buses, taxis and rail. All should be connected effectively, to ensure seamless transition from one mode to another wherever possible. This is essential to enable the system to provide the maximum possible convenience for users.

## **Funding**

One of the big questions regarding any public infrastructure will always be funding. FTT would like to make it abundantly clear that it is not the lack of funding availability that prevents public transport services from being introduced or improved. Rather it is political choices that have resulted in prolific road spending and reduced public transport spending. Merely considering the amount of money spent on road projects, reveals that there is more than sufficient money available for spending on infrastructure. The key issue is one of choice. Not only can we not afford to do everything, but neither can we justify constructing everything. FTT has noticed that a significant number of public transport projects are particularly scrutinised regarding viability. Large road projects do not appear to undergo anywhere near the same level of scrutiny. Obviously Governments do not want to spend money on a service or infrastructure that is not used. A road is regarded as viable because it will generate use, despite the fact that it will not provide a return on investment. Alternatively, a public transport service is not regarded as viable unless it generates sufficient return. FTT regards this as a fallacy. Even a poorly patronised public transport service is reducing car dependence and carbon emissions. A poorly patronised public transport service, if properly promoted and marketed, may one day become a well-patronised service. However where there is little or no public transport service then there is nothing for those who are transport disadvantaged. Nor is there any prospect of a reduction in carbon emissions, nor any decrease in oil price vulnerability. Consequently FTT regards any questioning of the viability of public transport infrastructure with scepticism, unless comparable questioning of the viability of road and highway construction projects also occurs.

## **Transport and Social Disadvantage**

Transport planning and infrastructure in Tasmania largely ignores the 'mobility' and 'spatial' issues relating to low socioeconomic communities. A lack of adequate public transport significantly impacts on these communities' opportunities to access to activities, resources and support that are readily available to others living within the metropolitan area of Hobart. The current transport networks operating within and outside of the greater Hobart area are permeating a culture of social exclusion.

Research indicates that social exclusion from public transport has a significant impact on young people, the old, the poor, the physically handicapped and the sick. There are links between transport disadvantage and a wide range of adverse health outcomes, including mental illness, suicide and general poor health. Additionally, such lack of transport access inhibits individuals' access to education, training and work opportunities with consequent adverse implications for such individuals' ability to improve their own economic situation.

Social exclusion, from a transport perspective, continues to be a major social problem worldwide, particularly in urban fringe and rural areas, resulting in isolation, lost work opportunities and health issues, including mental illnesses and medical disorders. These are the barriers facing many individuals living outside or the metropolitan areas of Hobart, where bus services are limited. Introducing reliable and economically affordable transport alternatives to communities living in lower socio economical areas of the greater Hobart area would offer significant opportunities for the access to basic health, employment and educational opportunities which are readily available to individuals in similar circumstances, but are living in suburbs around and within the Hobart area with access to public buses.

FTT notes that a number of suburbs that are regarded as transport disadvantaged are in the northern suburbs of Hobart. If the Northern Suburbs Railway was to be implemented only to Claremont, a number of transport disadvantaged suburbs would be left with no improvement to services. Considering the above points, FTT regards this as a serious deficiency.

### **The Cars are Fine**

FTT does not subscribe to the notion that cars equal people. Whenever a proposal recommends reducing traffic lanes or making it more difficult for those driving there is inevitably a backlash of those crying out; 'But what about the cars?' FTT asserts that the cars are currently the best looked after item in our society, and that it is indeed time to look after people first. For decades road transport and the needs of cars has been virtually the sole determinant of infrastructure construction. The dispersal of our suburbs has occurred because of the perceived flexibility of the car. However we are now learning that the car has limits. Car parks are expensive and take up an enormous amount of space. The cost of fuel, registration, maintenance and insurance makes even operating a car a relatively expensive proposition for the average wage earner. In the hearings for this enquiry on June 20<sup>th</sup> Secretary of DIER, Norm McIlfatrick stated that '..we don't have a congestion problem..'. FTT is of the belief that this is only by comparison to mainland large capital cities. FTT has been unable to determine if there has been any comparison with similar sized cities in Australia. FTT suspects that we do in fact have a congestion problem that is not commensurate with the size of Greater Hobart.

## **Tasmanian Government Submission to Infrastructure Australia**

FTT would like to highlight the massive disparity listed in the Tasmanian Government's preliminary submission to Infrastructure Australia in November of 2011. In that submission both the Hobart Northern Suburbs Light Railway (NSLR) proposal was listed along with plans for upgrades and improvements to parts of the Brooker Highway. The NSLR project could cost as little as \$80 million, yet the improvements to the Brooker Highway are listed as costing over \$213 million. FTT contends that these two projects are mutually exclusive and that either one must be constructed or the other. FTT is of the strong belief that the Brooker Highway funding should not be made forthcoming. It is this submission, more than any other document, that highlights our belief regarding the predominance and overwhelming support that the road 'culture' has in Tasmania. FTT believes that the Brooker Highway (and other arterial roads) should only be improved in locations where significant 'black spots' have been identified, and that any improvement should only be remedial in nature. No large scale re-construction or alterations should be necessary.

### **Summary of Recommendations**

#### **Short Term (1-5 years)**

- Greater Hobart Household Survey – what do the public actually want in terms of transport?
- Bicycle Networks – the creation of a fully connected Hobart Bicycle network. Currently most bicycle lanes are not connected to any other bicycle lane. Whilst this has obviously always been the goal, insufficient action has occurred to date.
- Additional subsidisation of bus services to ensure costs are lower than car use.
- Commuter Rail – implementation of a commuter rail service on the Hobart Northern Suburbs Railway.
- High Frequency Bus Services – introduction of 'Park and Ride' services at specific outlying suburbs.
- Bus Transit lanes introduced at key locations. Only buses and private vehicles carrying 3 or more people would be permitted to use such lanes.
- North Hobart – Salamanca Tram – introduction of a tram service as approved by Hobart City Council. Concurrent permanent removal of cars from Salamanca Place.
- Begin altering land use planning and zoning to encourage higher density housing zones close to key public transport corridors.

#### **Medium Term (5-10 years)**

- Additional bicycle networks around outlying urban centres (such as Rosny, Glenorchy and Kingston). All connected to Hobart bicycle network.
- Duplication of commuter rail track from Hobart to Claremont.
- Extension to Bridgewater and Brighton.
- A new rail bridge constructed alongside the new road bridge at Bridgewater.

- Prohibition on new or greenfield urban areas.
- Grants or other encouragements for increasing housing density.
- Extension of tram and light rail services through New Town to Moonah, and from Hobart to Sandy Bay (University).

### **Long Term (10-30 years)**

- Consideration made regarding extension of light rail or tram network to Eastern Shore.
- Consideration made regarding extension of light rail network to Kingston.

## **Reviewing Current Strategies**

FTT has reviewed a number of current documents outlining Government strategies and policies. Some other documents inform Government policy or provide additional information.

### **Southern Integrated Transport Plan 2010 (SITP)**

In the Executive Summary of the SITP it was stated that: “significant investment had been made in the road and rail networks, reflected in major infrastructure developments and proposals –Brighton and Bagdad bypasses, Brighton Hub, Bridgewater Bridge and rail network upgrades.” FTT would like to highlight that by comparison to road, rail received just a fraction of this component. FTT does not believe that such an imbalance of funding will achieve long term sustainability nor will it assist in achieving many of the key goals of this document nor others mentioned in this submission.

The SITP references a number of other strategies and policies but none of these strategies show evidence of a clear and definitive project that appears at all likely to achieve its goals. In particular the reference to the Southern Tasmania National Transport Investment Program 2007-15 highlights the enormous imbalance of road funding compared to rail. FTT would like to make it very clear that any further funding for any significant road projects will ensure the likely failure of;

1. Any plan to increase public transport patronage, in particular Metro bus services.
2. Any desire to reduce carbon emissions.
3. Any desire to reduce Tasmania’s oil price vulnerability.
4. Any other plan or initiative involving public transport infrastructure.
5. Any desire to reduce heavy vehicle frequency on our main arterial roads and highways.

The SITP notes that private travel by car in the Greater Hobart area accounts for approximately 75% of all trips. Over the past decade, the number of cars has increased by 14% and the number of car kilometres travelled by 17%. This indicates a serious failure on the part of all alternative transport modes. FTT believes this shows that only significant action will have any impact on these statistics.

The SITP also states that the Greater Hobart region “cannot accommodate unrestrained growth in car use”. FTT fully agrees with this statement, and notes again that despite this, further projects to encourage such growth are already under construction and in the planning process.

The SITP goes on to add that; “There is a need to better understand the travel needs and patterns of individuals and households , in order to develop effective alternatives to car-based transport.” FTT believes that the best and first place to start would be to ask the general public what they want. FTT will address this idea more fully, later in this document.

In the area of Key Challenges, the SITP refers to Sustainability. The heading refers to maximising the efficiency of our current infrastructure and ensuring that it is climate change resilient. In relation to this it refers to; “providing networks to support transport modes other than cars.” FTT agrees that this is a key challenge, and highlights the lack of foresight shown by planners who are not including anything other than roads in their planning processes. FTT believes that in terms of sustainability, only public transport related projects or black-spot removal upgrades are justifiable for Tasmania in the current economic climate.

#### 2030: What type of regional transport system do we want? (Page 18 of the SITP)

The SITP amongst other things refers to a transport system that; “Responds to climate change and an oil constrained future by lowering greenhouse gas emissions and reducing car dependency.” FTT wholeheartedly agrees with this sentiment, noting again how at odds this is with the construction of new highways and large road bridges. The SITP also has a strategy of demand management, referring to encouraging a greater efficiency of existing transport systems. FTT doubts the effectiveness of this strategy, and believes that travel behaviour is motivated by convenience and cost, with convenience the greater factor. Only if costs were to rise significantly would more people alter their behaviour, resulting in greater efficiencies such as car-pooling increasing. FTT doubts the effectiveness of any ‘encourage’ strategy and recommends a ‘support’ and ‘provide’ strategy instead.

#### Objectives and Strategies –People (page 28 & 29 of SITP)

FTT does not discount the objectives and strategies listed, however FTT contends that these strategies are insufficient and lack actual initiatives or projects to ensure that the objectives are met. Pricing incentives, investigation of park and ride, mechanisms to enable community input, all of these are unlikely on their own to achieve any significant changes. FTT contends that these strategies must be matched by actual infrastructure improvements to result in any change in transport behaviour.

#### **Greater Hobart Household Travel Survey 2009-10**

Whilst gathering a large amount of interesting and useful data, the survey did not ask any questions regarding what kind of public transport would people like to see. For example, for those who currently use the car for their main mode of transport, we recommend asking them what type of service would persuade them to switch modes. Options could be tailored to various regions; however FTT recommends the same questions for all regions. Although many of Hobart’s outer regions are obviously not in the short or medium term an option for a light rail service, if there was a significant known public desire for such a service, this could inform future planning.

## **HCC Sustainable Transport Strategy 2009-2014**

-Talks about educating individuals regarding our 'car culture' but utterly fails to recognise that providing alternative means of transport is the only possible means of altering this culture.

-The HCC plan fails to adequately address the real problems that afflict Greater Hobart, unsurprisingly as HCC only covers a small part of this area.

## **Tasmanian Urban Passenger Transport Framework (TUPTF)**

FTT broadly supports the initiatives and strategies contained within the TUPTF, however would like to highlight this particular comment on page 23;

"However, our current settlement pattern and transport behaviours do not match such mass transit initiatives"

FTT notes that given there are frequently few or poor alternative transport options available to people in Greater Hobart, such transport behaviours are unsurprising. FTT contends that it is impossible to adequately judge the nature of potential behaviour change in an atmosphere of inaction and with a lack of high frequency transit services. Behaviour cannot change when there is no available means of changing. This statement from the TUPTF is a fallacy and must be recognised as such. It has been used to justify inaction, when clearly in order to provoke change, action is required.

## **Public Transport Alternatives**

Below we list and briefly comment on a number of potential public transport options that have previously been mentioned or proposed for Hobart and Southern Tasmania.

### **Monorails, Trolley Buses and Podcars**

All of the above transport systems have merit in certain circumstances and conditions. All have been introduced successfully although not all (particularly podcars) are commonplace. Most monorails are installed at theme parks and tourist attractions, and are not true commuter services. FTT does not believe that any of these options are viable or suitable for Hobart or Southern Tasmania.

### **Ferries**

FTT remains agnostic regarding the future viability of commuter ferry services on the Derwent Estuary. FTT supports any investigation into the viability of such services; however we agree that the issues already raised by DIER are valid. Until Hobart's population is significantly greater, FTT doubts that ferry services will be viable in the short to medium term.

### **Tidal Busway**

Some time ago a tidal busway was suggested to replace Hobart's railway line, where buses could jump onto an isolated road that would replace the railway line, and enjoy a speedy trip into the city.



On the surface such an idea has its attractions. Buses are a flexible means of providing public transport and routes could be easily altered to enable such a service to work. A busway would ensure that buses are not hampered by the congestion of private cars on the Main Road and Brooker Highway.

The trouble is that such a busway has been costed at nearly \$50 million greater than using the railway line, just to put the platforms and concrete down; -never mind the additional buses and drivers that would be required to ensure it's success. Furthermore a busway which can only travel in one direction is in fact quite inflexible -a breakdown or a crash in the wrong place could result in the entire route being jammed up in minutes.

If the busway operated over the current railway route then every crossing with ordinary roads would generate more congestion than a rail service, due to the greater number of buses that would be required to carry passengers compared to a rail vehicle.

The busway would also destroy any chance of passenger rail or freight into Hobart, including tourist operations. It has been suggested that the busway could operate over the top of the rail tracks, or that the concrete could be poured around the existing tracks. From an engineering point of view this is completely unfeasible and impractical. Use of the railway could not ever be considered in conjunction with a busway. If the tracks were to remain in situ with a concrete base, this would mean ensuring a heavy rail capacity is retained on a tramway style formation that was scarcely used. The cost of this would be far greater than the busway as costed in the Pitt & Sherry report.

FTT also contends that buses are fundamentally unpopular as a potential alternative and whilst there may be some additional users the amount would be insufficient to justify the expenditure. Rail (of all kinds) has a much greater attractant capability than any bus services.

The TUPTF also makes it clear that the higher cost of its construction added to the lower level of attractant that such a service has, ensures it is not nearly as viable as a rail service. FTT agrees with this assessment.

### **High Frequency Bus Services (Park and Ride)**

With its dispersed population Hobart's public transport problem is expensive to solve. The population centres of the Sorell area and the Kingborough area are not sufficiently large to justify the expense of a light rail connection at this time, nor are they likely to be in the foreseeable future.

However the size of these areas is sufficient to generate significant congestion and both of them have a very high percentage of car use. It is these areas which will always be harder to provide attractive transport alternatives.

FTT strongly recommends priority bus lanes and park and ride facilities are constructed to connect these areas to the central CBD. Such a service is not likely to provide a financial return nor is it likely to significantly alter transport choices for the majority of current road users. However, even a fairly small reduction in overall car use along with a steady if small decline in the increase of car use into these areas should be considered a vital improvement.

## **Trams**

In April of this year Hobart City Council (HCC) voted to seek funding for a tramway to North Hobart. FTT strongly supports this plan. Firstly, the HCC has endorsed the PSPL (Gehl) report which amongst other things identifies the removal of cars from the waterfront area, in particular Salamanca Place, as a desirable goal. Clearly a public transport alternative has to be put in place for when this happens. FTT considers a tram from Castray Esplanade to the CBD to be the ideal solution. HCC already has three restored heritage trams which FTT recommends be used on weekends. FTT understands at least two new trams would be purchased to run the service during the week. A number of incentives, such as a free tram ticket with any multi-storey car park ticket, could be a way to help ensure the tram service is fully utilised. FTT believes the connection between Salamanca Place, the CBD and North Hobart is a vital one for the future success of public transport in Hobart. FTT would like to highlight the fact that Salamanca Market is Tasmania's most popular tourism location. This alone strongly suggests the tramway proposal has merit and will be successful.

## **Commuter Rail Service on existing Hobart – Northern Suburbs Railway**

FTT disputes the findings of the Business Case for the Light Rail proposal. The business case did not measure the cost of the proposal against improvements on the Brooker Highway; key alternative measures that have already been demonstrated to have a much greater cost. FTT believes the business case also failed to adequately measure potential travel demand and consider the full cost benefits of the proposal. Many of the benefits were not monetized and therefore did not count in the net-cost benefit analysis. Therefore, FTT contends that the Northern Suburbs Railway line should be given much greater weight as an initiative in Government planning. FTT notes that most of the planned highway projects previously mentioned have not been subject to the same level of scrutiny as the Light Rail proposal. Therefore, the value of those road projects and their net cost-benefits are highly subjective and questionable.

FTT believes that if the Northern Suburbs Railway is not introduced within the short term, the corridor will soon after become unavailable for any such service. The opportunity for altering Hobart's transport options is therefore a short one. FTT supports the efforts of the Hobart Northern Suburbs Rail Action Group and its case for the Northern Suburbs Railway.

## **Too Small?**

One argument that has been made against the introduction of a commuter rail service is that Hobart (and Tasmania) is too small to justify such infrastructure. Metro CEO Heather Haselgrove in her hearing for this enquiry on the 18<sup>th</sup> of June stated an opinion which matches this argument. In fact there are over 90 cities worldwide, all with a population between 100,000 and 300,000, that have operating tram or light rail services. Most of these cities are of course in Europe, but there are significant differences between them. The mere fact that suburban trains and trams used to operate in Hobart when the population was smaller, highlights the fallacy of the 'too small' argument.

## **The True Value of Rail**

Earlier this year the Australasian Railway Association released its True Value of Rail report (TVR). FTT recommends members examine the report for themselves, but will highlight some of the most significant points here. We would like to make it clear that these numbers are clearly averaged figures and there would be differences in Tasmania.

The TVR found that one passenger train (service) can take 525 vehicles off the road. This equals over 3 million vehicle kilometres annually. It found that one passenger train over one year reduces carbon emissions by the same amount as planting 320 hectares of trees. Whilst FTT acknowledges that carbon emissions and other factors were included in the Light Rail Business Case, because the light rail proposal was not weighed against improvements on the Brooker Highway, the true value of these factors was not fully recognised. This is because if the Northern Suburbs Railway remains unused and the improvements to the Brooker Highway are constructed, we can expect growth in emissions and fuel costs, and ultimately in congestion. Whilst FTT acknowledges that Hobart does not have a congestion problem by comparison to the mainland capitals, FTT believes that Hobart does have a much larger congestion problem than it should.

## **Additional Notes on Recommendations**

### **Greater Hobart Household Survey**

FTT recommends a new survey not just to gather data but to ascertain what kind of public transport services might be desired by the potential users. At no stage in recent times have the public actually been asked what they might want. We are aware of polling which suggests that around 70% of Southern Tasmanians believe that the Northern Suburbs Railway is the most important pending infrastructure project. However polling is often inaccurate and does not provide us with a level of information that a survey can.

### **Bicycle Networks**

FTT supports the planning and implementation of a Greater Hobart Cycle Network. FTT will not cover this in great detail due to the work conducted by other groups such as Bicycle Tasmania.

### **Subsidisation of Public Transport**

FTT notes that Metro services are already subsidised to a significant degree. However FTT believes that in order to assist in gaining as much patronage as possible, FTT recommends a freeze in Metro fares for at least the next 7 years. FTT believes the cost of this subsidy will be far less than any increase in costs for private transport.

### **Commuter Rail Northern Suburbs**

FTT fully supports the implementation of a commuter rail service on the Northern Suburbs Railway, as mentioned above. FTT believes that only with this significant alteration of the transport dynamic will there be any chance of altering the balance of transport behaviour in Southern Tasmania.

## **High Frequency Bus Services**

FTT supports the introduction of 'Park and Ride' facilities and matching high frequency bus services to outlying suburban areas as per the TUPTF. FTT does have some reservations regarding their potential for growth and viability, however FTT believes this highlights how important it is to get such services implemented properly from the outset. As highlighted in the first part of the Main Road Corridor Study, FTT also supports bus travel time amelioration actions. One of those is the return of two-way streets in the Hobart CBD as recommended in the HCC Public Spaces and Public Life (Gehl) Report (PSPL).

## **Bus Transit lanes**

FTT supports implementing Bus or T3 lanes at key locations, such as the Tasman Bridge and the Macquarie – Davey Street couplet. Only buses and private vehicles carrying 3 or more people would be permitted to use such lanes. FTT recommends investigation into other key locations for such lanes.

## **North Hobart – Salamanca Tram**

FTT supports the introduction of a tram service as approved by Hobart City Council. FTT also supports the concurrent permanent removal of cars from Salamanca Place as per the PSPL report.

## **Land Use Planning**

Begin altering land use planning and zoning to encourage higher density housing zones close to key public transport corridors. FTT does not normally consider land use planning except in relation to public transport usage. As stated in the introduction FTT does not believe changes to land use will occur prior to the construction of new transport infrastructure. Therefore all levels of Government must work closely together to ensure that new transport projects are matched by commensurate changes to land use planning and zoning. FTT does not recommend further urban 'sprawl' in outer areas.

## **Medium Term (5-10 years)**

### **Expanding the Bicycle Network**

FTT expects that in the medium term demand for expansion of the bicycle network will result in additional cycle ways constructed to and within the outer suburban areas.

### **Extension of tram and light rail services**

The Parsons Brinkerhoff study examined costs of a light rail and tram network from Moonah to North Hobart and the CBD, and from Hobart to Sandy Bay (University). FTT expects that once successful, a commuter rail service to the Northern Suburbs and a tram service to North Hobart, would generate demand for expansion. FTT supports the routes named as they cover a large area of travel demand.

### **Further Expansion of Commuter Rail Network**

FTT does not subscribe to a particular starting terminus for the Northern Suburbs Railway service. FTT is dubious regarding the projected lack of success for the Brighton – Bridgewater – Granton section, however is prepared to await results for any service that was initially implemented. However FTT would prefer that such a service commenced to Bridgewater from the beginning, noting in particular the issues

relating to transport disadvantage noted above. FTT believes that the demand for extensions would occur very soon after a successful service was commenced for only part of the line. Assuming the service was only introduced to Claremont initially, FTT would recommend an extension to Brighton in the medium term, although preferably within 5 years. FTT recommends a new rail bridge to be constructed alongside the new road bridge at Bridgewater.

Successful growth in patronage on the Northern Suburbs railway would eventually require the track to be duplicated, as it was previously when suburban services were in place (noting the TGR line was duplicated only to Claremont). Whilst expensive in parts, FTT believes that it is a myth that the northern railway corridor could not retain both the cycle way and two railway tracks for the entire distance from Hobart to Claremont. This would require additional infrastructure spending, but there are no infrastructure issues that could not be solved with various engineering solutions. These solutions would be far easier than it would be to construct a completely new railway through the suburbs.

### **Long Term (10-30 years)**

Dependent on population growth and the popularity of outlying bus services, consideration would be made in the long term for extensions to the existing light rail and tram network to the outer suburban regions.

By 2030 we believe that there should be in place a central light rail/tram network going from Brighton along the alignment of the current railway line, crossing over the Derwent River on a new rail bridge and then continuing into Hobart. Another line would divert off the railway alignment near Moonah and continue along Main Road and New Town Main Road to Elizabeth Street and then into Hobart before terminating at Salamanca Place. It would connect with the Northern Suburbs Line at Mawson Place. Another line would proceed from Elizabeth Street on to Davey Street before turning off at Sandy Bay Road, continuing on to terminate near Marieville Esplanade. This light rail and tram network would form the centrepiece of a public transport network involving feeder buses to the rail services, high frequency park and ride services to outlying suburbs, cycle ways and enlarged pedestrian zones.

The cost of all of this in today's money would be less than that of the Brighton, Bagdad bypass and the new Bridgewater Bridge.

### **DEFINITIONS**

**Definition of Light Rail:** FTT defines light rail as a tram (not necessarily electric) passenger rail vehicle that runs on its own dedicated exclusive corridor. Light rail is often used as a term to describe new tram services, but many of these do not have a dedicated rail corridor on which to travel. Some have both street running and their own exclusive corridor in certain sections. This definition matches industry standards around the world. Certain light rail vehicles are referred as Tram-Trains. These are usually not light rail or tram type vehicles but slightly larger. These vehicles are usually equipped with a different wheel profile to that of a light rail vehicle or tram, to enable them to run freely on 'heavy' rail lines.

**Definition of Tram:** FTT defines a tram as an electric or battery powered vehicle that runs on streets, sharing its right of way with other road vehicles.