

**THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION B COMMITTEE
MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 2, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART ON WEDNESDAY
19 SEPTEMBER 2012**

INTEGRATED TRANSPORT OPTIONS

Mr BENJAMIN STUART JOHNSTON, PRESIDENT AND **Mrs KRISTIE JOHNSTON**, SECRETARY OF HOBART NORTHERN SUBURBS RAIL ACTION GROUP, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR (Mrs Taylor) - Thank you for coming. We are glad to have your verbal submission to us as well as the written one, thank you for that, it is very comprehensive and the committee appreciates that. Evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege. I have to remind you, however, any comments you make outside of this hearing may not be afforded that privilege. You will have received and I hope read the information for witnesses that was sent to you.

Mr JOHNSTON - Yes.

Mrs JOHNSTON - Yes.

CHAIR - Thank you. The evidence you present today is being recorded and the *Hansard* version will be published on the committee website as soon as it becomes available. First of all, would you like to talk to the committee about why you want to talk to us, your field of expertise and your particular interest?

Mr JOHNSTON - I am Ben Johnston and we founded and now preside over the Hobart Northern Suburbs Rail Action Group. I was born in Hobart, lived in Hobart all my life and studied here at the University of Tasmania. In 2000, my final year first class honours project in engineering was actually looking at battery rail vehicles operating on the Hobart to Bridgewater rail line and the outcomes of that study showed that batteries may be a more cost-effective solution than overhead wiring.

Since then I have gone to work in the UK with rail, come back and found Hobart's transport problems aren't any better, they are worse, and yet this underutilised rail asset was still there begging to be used for passenger transport. I am most definitely a rail enthusiast but also an informed one. I am a fully paid up member of the Railway Technical Society of Australasia and have attended the last three conferences on railway engineering and presented at the last two. Only last week in Brisbane I presented the case for Hobart Rail and received a good reception there at that conference.

Mrs JOHNSTON - I am an alderman at Glenorchy City Council and the secretary of the Hobart Northern Suburbs Rail Action Group. We have over 100 members, over 1 400 Facebook

followers, if that means something, but most importantly the vast majority of residents in the northern suburbs are keen supporters of us. We estimate we have spoken to in excess of 15 000 people over our time in the campaign, with only a handful of non-supporters and we can probably count them on two hands, most of them being from DIER.

The number of people we talk to will increase shortly when we attend the Hobart Show. We have been very kindly offered a free stand at the Hobart Show through kind support of the Royal Agricultural Society to promote the Hobart Northern Suburbs Rail Action Group because they are very keen supporters. The project is driven at a grass roots community level by those who face the realities of living in the northern suburbs and everyday issues of public transport. Fundamentally we are about improved public transport, and we think the centrepiece of that would be the northern suburbs railway.

We have provided you with a submission, which we hope was quite detailed in what the proposal actually is, critiquing some of the major studies that the Department of Infrastructure have done on the area. We have a postscript to that. Following our submission the minister had announced that there was going to be a review of the business case. That was at our suggestion. Finally after four years of attempting to meet with the minister we had an opportunity to meet with him and put our concerns about issues with the ACIL Tasman report and suggested to him that it might be appropriate to do a review, but that review should be at arm's length and independent of DIER. We were delighted to hear from the minister's adviser that that was going to occur and the minister had taken on board our recommendations.

Subsequent to that on 17 August we found out from the minister's adviser that the arm's length, transparent and robust review of the business case was going to be conducted by DIER and not only that but was going to be run by the same project manager as ran the original business case. I coincidentally met that project manager on 18 August, Mr Kruup, at the Model Train Show and he indicated to me that the only reason they were conducting the review was to placate the Northern Suburbs Rail Action Group. He was confident that they would find the ACIL Tasman report conclusions were correct and that he does not have much time to invest in this review as he was more concerned about the Launceston bus network review.

We are quite dismayed at the lack of transparency and rigorousness of the review and are very concerned. We met with the minister's adviser about three weeks ago now and asked for some details about that particular review. We are still waiting on confirmation of that. At that time we were informed that six companies were invited to put in a quote and of those six companies none were Tasmanian. He would not divulge who those six companies were. It was not advertised but he did say that the universities were specifically excluded from that. This obviously is very concerning to us. I articulated those concerns to a number of community members. Their frustration was immense that this again has been railroaded, for the want of a better term, by the department.

So that is the postscript. I know we concluded our submission in a hopeful manner because there was a review being conducted, but since then we have found out the details of that are

not what we hoped for and there was a very different definition of 'transparent' and 'rigorous' to what the minister has. That is where we are at.

Dr GOODWIN - Kristie, you mentioned that universities were specifically excluded. Was there any explanation as to why that was the case?

Mrs JOHNSTON - It was based on the fact that they felt the universities could not do it. They felt that transport economists from companies would be better at it than universities would be. We had initially suggested that places like Curtin University, Monash University, and Professor Currie and Professor Newman, have a wealth of expertise and are actually well known internationally for their experience in this area. Particularly Professor Newman is very well versed on the Hobart situation; they would be ideally suited. Unfortunately the minister felt they had a run-in previously with Professor Newman, and was not willing to consider Curtin University as a suitable candidate to do the review. We are still waiting on confirmation of that from the minister's adviser.

Dr GOODWIN - That was nevertheless a blanket exclusion of all universities.

Mrs JOHNSTON - Yes, not only Curtin University but also Monash University. A number of universities would be suitably qualified to do it, and at quite a reasonable price compared to companies. We also expressed to the minister's adviser that we had concerns that companies have a somewhat vested interest in ensuring that DIER are happy with the outcome because they are obviously likely to be doing more work for DIER, whereas universities have a seemingly independent outcome.

Mr MULDER - I guess we have got to try to avoid the distractions of politics. I think we note that independent, transparent and rigorous reviews are best conducted by those who conducted the first review because it saves a lot of time in research, let alone writing conclusions.

I would like to know the cost per passenger per kilometre for running a reasonably well patronised northern suburbs railway. Do we have that sort of data at our fingertips or is that what we are hoping DIER would have done.

Mr JOHNSTON - I do not have that data at my fingertips. Speaking at a higher level, it is well known that unless you have already got the track the capital cost of rail is more expensive than bus.

Mr MULDER - I am particularly interested in operating costs because capital is something different.

Mr JOHNSTON - The reason people build railways for moving passengers is that the operating costs are less. You have the energy efficiency and labour efficiency. Only last week we were in Brisbane and they had their six-railcar sets carrying up to 1 000 people with just the one operator. Given that Metro's operating costs are half labour there are obviously

substantial operating efficiencies if you have the right patronage and the way you get the patronage is to offer an attractive alternative.

Mr MULDER - You do not have a case study where we could go in and say this is the cost of moving people by train versus bus versus ferry?

Mr JOHNSTON - The only thing I have at hand is the energy consumption - kilowatt hours per person per kilometre. They show that rail is half a bus, one seventh of a car and one eighth of an aircraft. It was pointed out by a colleague in Brisbane that TransLink in Brisbane manage the ticketing system for Brisbane ferries, trains and buses. You may be able to extract dollars per passenger kilometre from that.

Mr MULDER - It seems like a powerful argument if we can produce some facts and economic figures that say if the infrastructure is put in place then you are halfway there because you have your main asset, your corridor and stuff like that, so that the subsidy would relate to the operating cost. This committee has been grappling with it with a number of people now, trying to get a handle on how we do those operating cost comparisons because that is where the subsidy ends up going towards.

CHAIR - There is a big difference. We have heard from other people, the opposite point of view to yours, who say you are going to have level crossings and systems managing the level crossings that you do not have with buses, for instance.

Mr MULDER - That is the point; it is capital expenditure.

CHAIR - No, it is operational as well because you have those people monitoring it.

Mr JOHNSTON - Both transport modes do have signalling. Some are called traffic lights; the others called railway signalling. There is similar infrastructure with each mode and the level crossing is already there. Granted they do need barriers to install, but once they are installed you do not have someone waving a flag; they are automatic.

Mr MULDER - I think you would find there would be a more active central control centre than there would be for buses or ferries or traffic light of things like that.

Mr JOHNSTON - You do have a control centre and you would integrate it with Metro Tasmania's existing bus control centre.

CHAIR - You would have to have people manning the stations, would you not?

Mr JOHNSTON - No, not effectively with light rail. The infrastructure for light rail is very minimalist. It is a glamorous bus shelter. You have ticketing systems that are either on the trains or on the stations. They do not have to be attended.

Mrs JOHNSTON - The other thing to consider with operational costs, if you are looking at maintenance in terms of railway, there is also an ongoing maintenance cost in terms of

associated roads. If you look at the council spend on resealing of roads, a lot of those works are done on heavy bus routes and there are considerable amounts of money spent on that.

The ACIL Tasman stage 1 report, does look at a cost per ride. It is based on what they calculate as passenger demand, so it is not, we say, highly reliable but it does give an indication. Looking at their worst case scenario for Glenorchy, they are looking at a \$3.20 ride from Glenorchy to Hobart, the cost of that particular infrastructure.

CHAIR - Subsidised?

Mrs JOHNSTON - That is the real cost, \$3.20.

Mr MULDER - Capital plus operating expenditure?

Mr JOHNSTON - Yes, the capital is apportioned over the life of the project.

Mr MULDER - Normally we right that off as depreciation.

Mr VALENTINE - Is that without the rail infrastructure, above the rail?

Mr JOHNSTON - Yes. The overall cost of the project, infrastructure, operating costs, was around \$3.00-something based on a large number of passengers using the service at Glenorchy.

Mr VALENTINE - Could we get those figures?

Mrs JOHNSTON - It is available on the DIER website.

Mr VALENTINE - You mentioned another set of figures early about cost for bus, train -

Mr JOHNSTON - Energy?

Mr VALENTINE - Yes, can we get those figures?

Mr JOHNSTON - Yes, that is already in there on page 13. As much as we ridicule the ACIL Tasman report, the fact that it comes out with the conclusion that we could have a benefit-cost ratio up to 1.1, suggests that if you did throw in all those benefits that were not quantified and included, you would have a very favourable case.

CHAIR - It has not yet been announced who the successful company is that is going to conduct the review?

Mr JOHNSTON - We have seen the request for quotation and that closed early last month. That is as far as it has progressed as far as I am aware.

Mrs JOHNSTON - But of concern, no Tasmanian companies were approached. One of our criticisms of the ACIL Tasman business case was a lack of local knowledge in quite a few of their drafts. They had mistakes misplacing suburbs, misplacing stations, suggesting a transit orientated development would be appropriate near an oil refinery and cemetery.

Mr JOHNSTON - Hobart Cemetery was quite a good catchment for the rail system.

Mr FARRELL - One transport economist has stated that the rail line is in the wrong position because it was primarily built to service industry. The way the city is laid out, it is there to service industrial traffic and not passenger traffic. Do you have any thoughts on that?

Mrs JOHNSTON - I can challenge that. I think the history of the railway is that the town grew around the railway because that was the main mode of transport. If you look at schools, for instance, they are closely located to railway lines because that was the easiest way of getting children to school. We have spoken extensively to the Moonah-Glenorchy Business Association and its members and a lot of other businesses in the CBD of Moonah, Claremont and Glenorchy. They are very keen because it connects very well with their businesses without limiting the parking on the main road. It traverses residential areas but also, importantly, our three main CBDs in the northern suburbs, and also schools.

Mr JOHNSTON - We readily acknowledge it bypasses North Hobart, but North Hobart is a small fraction of the transport requirement. North Hobart already has readily available and frequent bus services. The residents can walk to the city. What we are really targeting is the north northern suburbs, places such as Brighton that has an hour-and-a-half option on a bus every couple of hours. Brighton is one of the fastest growing municipalities. The fact that a bypass is on the table in some respects is a good thing because it gets you straight to the CBD. If you want to go to North Hobart, you join the feeder bus at New Town station and head off that way.

Mr FARRELL - Other transport economists have based some of their arguments on the fact that Hobart had a suburban rail service up to the 1970s but it was closed due to lack of patronage. You cover a bit in your submission about that, but I would like to hear your expanded thoughts on that.

Mr JOHNSTON - I firmly believe the decline in patronage was a direct result of government policy and priority. In the late 1960s the Brooker Highway was constructed, cars became more affordable and parking was very easy. The Hobart Rail station, which was once too far out of town, suddenly became a very popular car park. It was prioritisation on the car so now we have this car dependence. There was also a number of dispatches between the Transport Commission, the railways and the Metropolitan Transport Trust trying to integrate their services, but the MTT said, 'No, we don't want a bar of it. We're very happy to see the railway slide into oblivion.'. This policy was nationwide, where cars became more popular. Remember, oil was abundant and going to last forever once upon a time, but now that's changing.

Mr FARRELL - This has come up time and time again from submissions we've had - the lack of integration in Hobart. How do you feel the rail system would best integrate other services?

Mr JOHNSTON - We're certainly not advocating a restoration of the Hobart suburban rail service as it stood. It was very romantic and the stations were attended and the signalling was manual. We're advocating a modern, minimalist light rail.

We have a diagram showing the Hobart station, which is a good example. It is a short 400-metre tramway-style extension to Mawson Place. There you can integrate with river transport to eastern or southern suburbs, but also bus services. Mawson Place could be Hobart's small-scale equivalent of Sydney's Circular Quay where rail, bus and road all meet very nicely. Also, at all the other stations there is park-and-ride, a big factor that works in every other capital city in Australia. A lot of the stations are at the side of major shopping centres, so you already have activity centres there by the railway - MONA and a whole host of other things; park-and-ride, cycling - it's very accessible by cycle because of the cycleway - and feeder bus services. It works so well in Brisbane, Perth and Adelaide, which has successfully gained Infrastructure Australia funding to electrify its rail network.

Mrs JOHNSTON - A good public transport system acknowledges the inherent efficiencies of different modes. We don't say, by any stretch of the imagination, that rail can take you from door to door; that is not what rail does. Rail is very good at doing a high-speed route that is permanent and we could do a very good corridor there. Buses are very good for taking you door to door. Ferries are very good for going directly across a river and things like that. We need to acknowledge the inherent efficiencies of each different mode and that together and integrated properly, they could actually provide a very good transport system.

Mr MULDER - We have identified two things that keep getting wrapped into a thing called public transport. One is mass transit along a defined corridor at reasonably high speed, and then there is public transport, which is the public service obligation which means getting into the townships and picking people up within 400 metres of their doorstep. In this case Metro keeps trying to be both but is only servicing the transit corridor, whereas I can see the potential for a project like this to reshape Metro into being public transport that feeds the transit network for those wanting to get into town, and those who just want to go to Glenorchy catch the bus.

Mrs JOHNSTON - Certainly I think it is fair to describe the current public transport system as more of a welfare transport system. They suffer from -

Mr MULDER - It's a community service obligation.

Mrs JOHNSTON - That's right, and you would either have to be incredibly desperate to catch a bus or hold strong to your sustainability beliefs at the moment.

Mr MULDER - Or live close to a convenient bus stop.

Dr GOODWIN - If you're on one of the high-frequency corridors it is a pretty stress-free way to travel, as long it fits in with your lifestyle.

Mrs JOHNSTON - Even on the Main Road corridor between Glenorchy and Hobart it has a high-frequency service but the journey times are incredibly unreliable because it depends on the traffic conditions at any given time. Even then, planning a journey it can be anywhere between 10, 20 or 30 minutes difference in your journey time depending on the traffic conditions on any given day. In terms of the question of public versus mass transport, it is all about that integration and recognising the inherent efficiencies of the different modes and making sure that fits in well together.

Mr FARRELL - Turning to a question I would like to put to you, Ben, from your engineering background, at our first hearing Mr Annells, the chairman of TasRail, indicated that there were some issues possible with a 3'6" system serving a passenger transport network. I would like to know from your experience and background what your thoughts are on this fixation with gauge that some people have.

Mr JOHNSTON - Ironically, I got a message whilst I was sitting on a 3'6" gauge passenger train doing 130 km/h last week from a member who heard Bob Annells on the news say that you can't run passenger trains on a 3'6" gauge, or something to that effect.

Mr MULDER - Was this on a rollercoaster?

Laughter.

Mr JOHNSTON - No, it was on a Queensland Rail electric rail car. It was a commuter train with lots of normal people using it. Basically in Australia the 3'6" gauge is prevalent in Western Australia, Queensland and Tasmania and it is also prevalent in South East Asia and New Zealand, so there is nothing foreign or unusual about it. As a credit to Queensland Rail, Australia's fastest passenger rail service which does 160 km/h maximum and did 220 km/h during testing is on our same 3'6" gauge. They are running heavy freight, fast passenger trains and suburban trains on that gauge.

Mr MULDER - It's one thing to say that the rails are the same distance apart but it's a different thing to say that the railway with its ballast and sleepers and everything else is geared to faster-speed passenger trains.

Mr JOHNSTON - You're right. As well as the gauge of the rail, the integrity of the track - the heaviness of the rails - is also a factor.

Mr MULDER - Let me put the question another way. Given the existing rail, the condition of the line, the ballast and everything that lives below the rails, could we just plonk one of these reasonably fast trains onto it or would we need to rejuvenate the track?

Mr JOHNSTON - The previous suburban rail system had speeds of up to 45 mph, which I believe is 72 km/h. The alignment has not changed in over 100 years. There would still be

similar constraints on speed but if you upgraded that track you could go at faster speeds. Adelaide's broad gauge - almost double the width between rails and track - which they are upgrading is only going to do 110 km/h, so it is still not quite as good as Queensland and Brisbane and Perth's 130 km/h. But as well as the gauge, the actual integrity and quality of the track also affects the speed. The curvature has a major impact on the speed and in Queensland they have overcome that with tilting trains. We are really not advocating a bullet train, it is just moderate speed rail which doesn't have the congestion issues that the parallel roads have and therefore you get much more attractive travel times.

Mr VALENTINE - What about all the crossings that they have to negotiate?

Mr JOHNSTON - They also have level crossings in Brisbane. We definitely advocate barriers being installed at crossings, which is an improvement on simply the active flashing lights we have now.

Mr VALENTINE - I'm thinking that might limit its speed.

Mr JOHNSTON - No, not the rail vehicles. As long as the crossing lights work there is no issue with trains travelling at normal speed. We're only advocating 65 km/h, it's not a 300 km/h bullet train.

Mr VALENTINE - In your model obviously this rail is to the east of where a lot of people live. They have to travel east to get to the rails as opposed to other opportunities that will get them to town.

Mr JOHNSTON - In some cases.

Mr VALENTINE - How do you perceive things changing to facilitate this rail? Would you see Metro offering more localised feeder services to a node or do you perceive other infrastructure that might need to exist to encourage people out of their cars and those sorts of things?

Mrs JOHNSTON - Metro has recently modelled work on their northern suburbs network plan and what they have envisaged, their aspiration, is to have a priority route, which would be the corridor, whether it be Main Road or rail corridor, and then have feeder services into that which are linkage services. They openly acknowledge that you could easily replace the priority route with a rail system, so there you would have feeder services into a priority route. A bit like a feather, I suppose is probably the easiest way to describe it: you would have a spine and those bus or ferry services would feather out from that key spine. You would have smaller buses possibly running between stations or up into the east, as you say. You could have cycling facilities. Certainly cycling integrates very nicely with trains and you could have cycling facilities on the train, walkways and things like that.

Also with rail infrastructure there is the phenomenon that you can have transit-oriented development occurring and we certainly have a lot of sites in the northern suburbs where that can really flourish, particularly if you're looking at the Derwent Park situation. If it is

the case that a lot of those warehouses move out to Brighton when the transport hub opens up, there is a possibility there for some ground-fill sites that could be in-filled.

Mr VALENTINE - Like Perth?

Mrs JOHNSTON - That's right.

Mr VALENTINE - In my mind to encourage people out of their cars you'd need to have childcare facilities. You won't get them out of their cars otherwise because -

CHAIR - Their trip has to be multipurpose.

Mr VALENTINE - Unless it's convenient and flexible.

Mrs JOHNSTON - Certainly on the mainland the experience is that you have park-and-ride stations, so you would park at your local station. For us it would be Claremont. We would park at Claremont, catch a train to the city, for instance, come back, take my car to do the shopping, pick the kids up and then go home. I wouldn't have to do that entire journey all the way by rail, but I wouldn't do the entire journey all the way by car either. It is about multiple uses. If you wanted to park at Glenorchy, for instance, and save yourself the cost of parking in the city, you'd park at Glenorchy, catch a train to the city, come back and you could take your car from Glenorchy and visit Northgate or go to Centro or Claremont Village. Things other than time-saving are factors, including parking costs and things like that.

Mr JOHNSTON - I think you're dead right, Rob, about those types of services like childcare facilities. In Glenorchy, for example, there is the KGV precinct redevelopment. If the rail were going ahead there would be definitely an incentive for someone to build or relocate a childcare facility there because of that requirement.

Mr VALENTINE - Or at various points along the route.

Mr JOHNSTON - Yes.

CHAIR - The first thing people mention when we talk about rail is the population density. Are there enough people to warrant it? The ACIL Tasman report looked at how many people would catch a train. The other thing is that Hobart is a city of 200 000 people and not all the people who live here could possibly catch a train because we're only talking about the northern suburbs.

Mr MULDER - New Town to Brighton, I think, is what we're talking about.

CHAIR - That's right, so we're talking about maybe 70 000 people or thereabouts in the entire catchment area.

Mr JOHNSTON - But if you look at the Brooker Highway and the 50 000 vehicles that move through the Risdon intersection there, the railway can't carry all those people. If we were looking at Hobart without any legacy infrastructure you would probably look at your transport economics textbook and say that 220 000 people is probably not big enough for rail, but our major differentiation is that the railway track is already there and it was there before all those people were there. In 1875 they put them on to Launceston and Hobart grew out along that corridor.

What you've also got to look at are the alternatives to restoring rail on that railway line. Something I tried to get through to DIER as part of my role with the community advisory panel with last year's study was that they were looking at Brooker Highway upgrades simply to mitigate the morning and afternoon peaks when you have that congestion and an 80 km/h highway gets down to 27 km/h. They said they weren't looking at that and then subsequently last year's Infrastructure Australia's submission comes out with \$1 billion worth of highway upgrade between Hobart and Bridgewater.

Mr MULDER - Well, they hadn't thought of it until you put the idea in their head. It's your own fault.

Laughter.

Mr JOHNSTON - Yes, I probably shouldn't say too much.

You're really looking at those sorts of options. Perth has done wonderful things with retaining and expanding a metro rail system. Perth has a smaller, lower population density than Hobart. It is certainly bigger and it has a lot more kilometres of rail track than we're advocating, but it has a lower population density and it is very dispersed, but they have done it with these defined corridors and major nodes where feeder buses and parking is available. The same critics who said it would never work in Perth are now complaining that the trains aren't long enough.

Mrs JOHNSTON - The other thing to consider is that whilst we're talking about the northern suburbs it's probably a bit misleading because we're also talking about the Derwent Valley and southern midlands people who commute. They have a very poor bus service which I'm sure you've heard evidence of already.

Mr MULDER - No, thousands of people catch it. In all fairness, that was retracted shortly after.

Laughter.

Mrs JOHNSTON - The STCA polling, for instance, shows that some of our biggest support comes from places like the Southern Midlands Council and Derwent Valley where they see the possibility.

The other thing that has been quite interesting in our campaign is that we've been talking to a number of different audiences, including statewide audiences, and even people who wouldn't

use the service because they live either down south further or on the eastern shore or even up north in Ulverstone and Burnie, are excited by the possibility that if we can get this project up and going it demonstrates that DIER has the capability to think outside the square and think innovatively about public transport system. They might not need a railway in their local community but it does given them the opportunity that they can actually think about different ways of presenting or providing public transport.

Mr MULDER - We are talking here about let's say 100 000 given the broader area of park-and-ride in the catchment. It seems to me we have to stop thinking about the northern suburbs railway servicing a city of 200 000 people because it's not, it's servicing a population catchment of up to 100 000 people. From that, and your experience of light rail and other rail transport in other cities, we don't need to find a comparable city, we need to find a comparable line with a comparable catchment area so that we can compare apples with apples. If you could steer us in that direction - a similar line over a similar length servicing a similar population that is commuting to a city centre - that's what we're really looking for, I think; a population area serviced by a reasonably viable catchment area, recognising that apparently all public transport needs to be subsidised or it doesn't run.

Mr JOHNSTON - This viability is always in the eye of the beholder. The only metro or public transport system in the world I am aware of that makes money is the Hong Kong Metro and it's not because of bottoms on seats -

Mr MULDER - Slightly higher densities.

Mr JOHNSTON - No, it's not that, it's the fact that they develop the sites around the stations and then have that real estate value capture from there on in, and it's through leasing properties.

Mr MULDER - But that aside, which is quite clear the exception, are there lines in Brisbane or Perth that are of similar length that service a similar population base?

Mr JOHNSTON - There may well be, Tony. Unfortunately I don't have a case here but I am aware, certainly from an engineering perspective, of the rail line that runs out of Wellington in New Zealand which runs passenger trains on the same gauge as ours. It is a similar length from Hobart to Granton. It's also a single-track railway that has those intermediate passing loops at three places - exactly what we're advocating between Hobart and Granton. They have recently bought new trains and done major track upgrade work. I suspect the population is lower than Hobart, but I will try to find that out for you.

Mr FARRELL - Ben, areas such as Brighton that are growing rapidly and Bridgewater have traditionally made representations to me that they don't have adequate public transport. It has improved over the years but the frequency doesn't always suit. How difficult would it be to service, say, Bridgewater? Would that involve a track extension to get it into the area?

CHAIR - And you need to address the new bridge issue.

Mrs JOHNSTON - That is critical, presuming we still have access across the river with the bridge there at the moment. We have spoken with the mayor of Brighton and he sees there is a need for it to go across to Bridgewater. He feels that either Bridgewater or Brighton at the transport hub would be an appropriate place to terminate the service at the early stages. You could either have it very close to the river or further out at the Brighton transport hub. It's an issue that could be negotiated with the local community as to where they would like their feeder services to go to.

Mr JOHNSTON - For Bridgewater specifically, Craig, unless something changes and there is suddenly a lot of money to do a rail extension, I think it's going to be a rail hub with a feeder bus and park-and-ride, and cycling would be a way to get to that rail hub.

On the ACIL Tasman look at patronage, we were dismayed - this particular instance of the Granton potential terminus. We saw that as a wonderful park-and-ride opportunity for a catchment, I think, of 7 000 people - New Norfolk, Brighton, Bridgewater - and yet the first stage, which eventually curtailed the scope back to Claremont, suggested there would only be 15 return journeys each day from Granton. Out of a catchment of 7 000 people, that is a very low fraction.

On the aggregate population, there are figures for other cities such as Perth with low urban density where they have 5 per cent of ridership of public transport. Without doing too much analysis, if we have 7 000 people there it is highly likely that 5 to 10 per cent will use the rail that is provided and we could get some much better estimates than using prevailing bus patronage.

Mr FARRELL - With the Bridgewater bridge, if Brighton and Bridgewater are growing at the rate they are and would benefit from this system, surely the existing causeway could be kept with a more modern rail-only bridge? It wouldn't have to follow the new bridge, would it? You wouldn't have to have a rail link going up over that new bridge; you could keep the existing one and just have a modern lift span where the current Bridgewater bridge is.

Mr JOHNSTON - The rail crossing could stay as it is, if it could be maintained, but I believe there is a requirement to allow river traffic through, small as it may be. The retention of this rail link from Bridgewater to Hobart isn't just for commuters, to my mind, it is for future freight tasks. Also the heritage rail groups would love to get their stock back on track as a tourist venture.

Mr FARRELL - I have seen elsewhere in the world where they've had river crossings - and this is just getting free engineering advice from you - where they have rivers that are open but they have a single span rail bridge that lowers down through a radio system when a train approaches. The river is open all the time but it can be closed to let a train across when it needs to.

Mr JOHNSTON - There's a bascule bridge in Constitution Dock which already has train tracks on it. There are a number of options -

Mr FARRELL - Recycle that, then - there's a saving for the government.

Laughter.

Mr JOHNSTON - On the new bridge, I think it's much larger than the crossing warrants - \$700 million, \$800 million-plus - if you look at all the previous crossings, they've utilised that causeway and then done cost-effective things at the other end. I think that bridge is just extravagant and the fact that it doesn't cater for future rail needs is also a deficiency.

Mrs JOHNSTON - We have had some quite frank discussions with DIER representatives about the new Bridgewater Bridge and made strong representations to them at the time about the need for rail access to remain across the bridge. They were quite clear, in their discussions with us, that they had no intention that rail would ever go across the river again and they were not considering it. They indicated that to include it in the new bridge would be \$150 million extra capital cost. They see no need to maintain the existing bridge in the future and that once the new bridge was opened, their maintenance obligations for the existing bridge would wane. That they were dismissive of any future passenger rail services and the need for future freight rail services is concerning.

Mr FARRELL - Why do you feel that the department has an anti-rail feeling and is certainly not pro-rail?

Mrs JOHNSTON - I think anti-rail would be quite accurate.

CHAIR - It probably more pro-road rather than anti-rail isn't it?

Mr JOHNSTON - As far as our dealings with the infrastructure group in the department go, I think it is still effectively the Department of Main Roads. They very readily got rid of their rail infrastructure management group to TasRail when that became government owned again. There is no mention of this project amongst 170 initiatives in Infrastructure Australia's submissions and the draft Hobart Capital City plan. They want to build more and wider roads.

Mr FARRELL - You were talking about school traffic. How many schools have frontage to the existing rail corridor?

Mrs JOHNSTON - Within walking distance, ten schools.

Mr FARRELL - A lot of the kids are transported by buses.

CHAIR - Or family cars.

Mr FARRELL - You are looking at New Town High and Ogilvie, St Virgils as well.

Mr JOHNSTON - Cosgrove, Rosetta High School.

Mr FARRELL - I imagine St Virgils would have traffic coming from the north and from the south. The proponents of putting in a busway are saying that it could be one-way express into Hobart of a morning and then out again in the afternoon, but your system would allow flexibility to have opposing traffic.

Mr JOHNSTON - Yes, with the three intermediate passing loops we believe you can get a service every 12 minutes in both directions in the peak and you could drop that back to 24 minutes in the off-peak period.

Mrs JOHNSTON - Gilford Young is a good example. It has a campus in Hobart and Glenorchy and its students sometimes move between campuses, so they need to be able to go in both directions at alternate times.

Mr FARRELL - You also mentioned the cost of fossil fuels going up generally. Have you done a model of putting Hydro electricity overhead via catenary, and how much would that add to project?

Mr JOHNSTON - As part of the ACIL Tasman study last year, the consultant quantified that as \$12 million from Hobart to Claremont. The vehicles, whether they are diesel or electric, are roughly similar in capital cost, but the diesel has higher maintenance and operating costs.

Craig, you raised the busway, and I want to make sure that you are aware that DIER has costed that in a study. It is \$115 million to remove the railway tracks and replace them with a concrete busway between Hobart and Claremont.

Mr VALENTINE - Not keeping the tracks there?

Mr JOHNSTON - No, removing the tracks.

Mr FARRELL - We have heard in one hearing - and I cannot remember who it was from - that it would simply be a matter of putting a slab of concrete over the top of the railway lines and keeping the line place.

Mr JOHNSTON - In my engineering experience, that is not practical. The rail does not even form reinforcing as such. It is a substantial slab. The bridges and alignment are just not made for buses at the moment.

Mr FARRELL - The argument that you put is that it is a better idea to look at using the existing infrastructure and developing a vehicle that will run on that, rather than using an existing vehicle and developing the infrastructure underneath it?

Mr JOHNSTON - I believe so. From a capital cost perspective, ACIL Tasman quantified complete replacement of the track at \$35 million. Compare that with \$115 million for a roadway with no new buses.

CHAIR - That is with the base and everything redone?

Mrs JOHNSTON - Yes.

Mr VALENTINE - With respect to the rail, are you factoring in the bypasses you would have to put in? Obviously trains are going both ways on one track, you need passing loops?

Mrs JOHNSTON - Yes, that was factored into ACIL Tasman's costings.

Mr VALENTINE - That is part of the \$35 million?

Mr JOHNSTON - Yes.

Mrs JOHNSTON - Whilst we were very critical of the ACIL Tasman report, a positive to come out of that was a confirmation of our cost estimates. They were quite correct even though we had been quite conservative in our cost estimates.

Mr JOHNSTON - A major difference was that we had not included that track upgrade because we felt that the network was already carrying 2000-ton freight trains at 45 kilometres an hour.

Mr VALENTINE - In your estimates of fares you were talking \$3.50 or so, are you factoring in depreciation over time and replacement of assets?

Mrs JOHNSTON - The \$3.20 fare from Glenorchy is ACIL Tasman's estimate.

Mr JOHNSTON - That is the cost-recovery fare from Glenorchy. It also included \$1.50 fares in the overall economic analysis.

Mr MULDER - I think Rob's question was, does it include depreciation of capital assets?

Mr VALENTINE - Does it include depreciation over time, so you have a replacement arrangement?

Mr JOHNSTON - Yes. Depreciation of the capital was included.

Mr MULDER - The depreciation is to repair and maintain as you go along. When you do not spend that much in a year, you put it aside until you are going to replace. That \$3.50 which includes

Mrs JOHNSTON - That is based on what we consider would be limited passenger demand.

Mr VALENTINE - All the employment costs and things?

Mr JOHNSTON - Yes. Those numbers were based on the entire project, cost both capital and operating, over the life of the project.

CHAIR - But only as far as Claremont.

Mr JOHNSTON - As far as Claremont, but then all the people - deficient as they were - that were using the service, the fare from Claremont was more. They are all there, but Glenorchy, having the highest number of passengers, was the cheapest one.

CHAIR - You would be advocating that you look further than Claremont?

Mr VALENTINE - You would have to have Derwent Valley and Brighton.

Mr JOHNSTON - For stations like New Town it is \$40-odd because of the small number of people they assume would use the service.

Mr VALENTINE - I used to catch it from Montrose to New Town.

Mrs JOHNSTON - The train?

Mr VALENTINE - Yes, to go to work.

Mr FARRELL - You are talking about the Johnsonville line in New Zealand as being a comparable system. Is that a Government-operated transport system?
e

Mrs JOHNSTON - The infrastructure is owned by NZ Rail and the trains are run by Tranz Metro which is affiliated with local government.

Mr FARRELL - That is the model our ferry operator was talking about, where government has the infrastructure and the vehicles and has an operator in to run it.

CHAIR - That is what happens in Perth and Brisbane as well.

Mr JOHNSTON - It is still a public operator.

Mr FARRELL - It has a similar number of trips per day to the Hobart system you would propose?

Mr JOHNSTON - Yes, they get the four units on the four track sections in their peaks. Off the top of my head, it is slightly shorter than Hobart to Granton, but the concept is very similar with the single track and the three intermediate passing loops. They have park and ride facilities at most of the stations.

Mr FARRELL - Apart from park and ride, are there other buses or ferries that they integrate with?

Mr JOHNSTON - Yes, there are bus services integrated with it. It all heads into Wellington train station where they integrate with ferries and trolley buses.

CHAIR - Remind us of the distance between stations, because that has been one of the issues. Would people actually walk to the train or do you need to have Metro service to go between stations?

Mr JOHNSTON - It is slightly variable. The stations are pointed out in our submission. The passing loops between Hobart to Granton divide it into four sections very conveniently at activity centres. These are at New Town, Glenorchy, Claremont and Granton. There are other centres, including Moonah and Berriedale, where you would also want to stop. There are also off-peak station opportunities at the Showgrounds and Botanical Gardens and other attractors.

Dr GOODWIN - There are tourism benefits and you mention those in your submission.

Mr JOHNSTON - Yes. It is always a compromise; the more stations you have, the longer it takes to get from one end to the other. The fewer stations, the better the transit time, but the more challenging it can be for some people to get to one of those stations. Really, as Kristie has already mentioned, rail will never meet everyone at their front door, so unless you are lucky enough to live on a rail station or several minutes away, you really have to have other integrated methods of getting there.

CHAIR - Which is basically the same as the bus system.

Mr MULDER - Buses on the main routes stop more frequently than four times.

CHAIR - I was thinking in terms of distance from -.

Mr JOHNSTON - The so-called 'express bus' has limited stops. It goes directly from Springfield to Hobart. We have compared the journey times with early 1950s Hobart rail, with modern day express buses and modern day electric rail with faster acceleration/deceleration. We get 18 minutes from Claremont to Hobart via modern rail as opposed to 40-odd minutes on a so-called 'express bus' or an hour on a main road all-stops bus. One of the big incentives for people getting out of the cars is offering something comfortable and time effective compared to their car.

CHAIR - That is certainly an issue that has been brought up by many people who have made submissions to us. It is very hard to get people in southern Tasmania out of their cars because it is so convenient and it is cheap or free to park in the city and the distances are not great in time.

Mr JOHNSTON - One of the greatest furbies of the ACIL Tasman report is that it suggests it costs \$3 to park in the city. I challenge them to find me a park for \$3 a day.

Mr VALENTINE - They are in cloud cuckoo land.

Mr MULDER - That is because two-thirds of the parking is free on the Domain.

Mrs JOHNSTON - That's exactly right, but there is a time cost involved in the length of the walk from there.

Mr VALENTINE - It is at least \$8.50.

Mr FARRELL - Brighton and Bridgewater has had a lot of growth since 1978 when the service used to be there. There was nothing in the Gould's Lagoon and Granton area at all, was there?

Mr JOHNSTON - You look at aerial photos of Claremont when the rail was there and there was hardly anything there, only orchards and the odd homestead. That population growth has occurred since the rail disappeared.

Mr MULDER - Does growth always equal an increase in commuting to the city? Things like the Brighton Transport Hub and industrial areas are creating the jobs out there, not in the city. Just because that area is growing, if the majority of those jobs are out there, it doesn't do anything for your case because people will not to come into the city.

Mrs JOHNSTON - It is not just commutes into the city, it is also commutes into Glenorchy, so you would find a lot of residents in the Brighton area commuting to Glenorchy for work. The major services, particularly government services, are located in Glenorchy and not necessarily in Brighton, Bridgewater or Derwent Valley, so it is those commutes as well.

Mr MULDER - We have heard horror stories of government services that are located at Bridgewater, but the people who aren't at Bridgewater cannot get to them.

CHAIR - The New Norfolk people.

Mrs JOHNSTON - Yes.

Mr MULDER - There is a high need.

Mr FARRELL - We certainly have an improved bus service. For a long time the Derwent Valley had no services. O'Driscoll's are providing a much better service, but there is a railway line on the other side of the river.

Mrs JOHNSTON - It is completely fragmented and not integrated and it would very nicely integrate with rail at Granton, which ACIL Tasman didn't consider.

Mr VALENTINE - I recall, during the Brighton Bypass debate where all the councils got together to promote these sorts of things, that they did make statements that the rail across the river would not go. I specifically asked that question and I remember that.

Mrs JOHNSTON - It will not go, but it won't be maintained and so it will eventually fall down.

Mr FARRELL - Back in the 1970s the railway branch was in the Transport Commission and it all had an input into government. Since the railways have gone, so has that group of people within the department and I think that is probably where it makes things very difficult now. I think you have probably found that a lot of people do not understand rail and what is involved and there is a little bit of fear.

Mr JOHNSTON - There is a perception that it is too expensive for Hobart, with no real understanding of what it involves in Hobart.

CHAIR - Also it was made really clear to us by TasRail that their remit is for freight, not for passengers, so they have no expertise and no requirement to think in terms of passengers.

Dr GOODWIN - Also they feel they have enough to do sorting out the freight issues and the rolling stock and the lines and all of those things.

CHAIR - From the Brighton hub out.

Mr VALENTINE - The subsidies they are receiving will be from Brighton outwards, not into Hobart.

Mr JOHNSTON - Strategically I am sure that they would be keen to have a rail link to Hobart port and the Risdon industrial precinct.

Mr VALENTINE - You would think so, if fossil fuels run out and we go back out to sail.

CHAIR - Can I ask you about Mawson Place and your proposed finish there - the extension to Mawson Place, particularly in light of what we have been told about the railyards redevelopment. Got any opinion on that how that will work?

Mrs JOHNSTON - We would hope that the rail would stay there.

Mr JOHNSTON - It is disappointing, Adriana. There has been no mention of rail at the future railyard site, despite it still being a working port. I am not quite sure why they are so diametrically opposed.

Rail is already there, but it is also very flexible. It can go around the railyard site. I can go through the middle or be built over the top of it. It is highly flexible so it really should be on their agenda to retain rail. I believe Mawson Place is a cost-effective, convenient place to bring the future Hobart terminus. I do not think we would get the old station back from the ABC. Really, we should be maintaining that rail corridor because it is very flexible and it should be on the agenda.

CHAIR - In answer to questions the government has said that there is no intention to do away with the rail within the old railyards.

Mr VALENTINE - Have you talked to the Hobart City Council about that Mawson Place aspect?

Mr JOHNSTON - Certainly Damon Thomas thinks it is a good project and he would like to see the station -

Mr VALENTINE - Have you talked to the engineers from a technical perspective about that and what might be involved in terms of the infrastructure.

Mr JOHNSTON - Leon Parker was involved as a representative on the Community Advisory Panel and he took no issue with this Mawson Place proposal. This was my idea back in 2008 and ACIL Tasman ran with it. They seemed to think it was also a good way of accessing the city.

Mr VALENTINE - The biggest issue was taking out the trees that are on the water side of Davey Street. That was the biggest issue with the idea of the tram going across the waterfront.

Mr JOHNSTON - Those Sydney-Hobart bricks there would be very nicely incorporated into the new platform.

Mr VALENTINE - The line has been catered for a tram at least, if not something bigger.

Mr MULDER - Can I pursue perceived competition with the bus services because I think that is possibly the driver, from what we have heard at least. We get all this from Metro about their opposition and their suggestion they run a bus down the corridor instead of a train if they were to take advantage of the corridor. In your discussions with government has anyone suggested that anything that competes with Metro is not on their horizon?

Mr JOHNSTON - We are not advocating rail alone. It is not rail or bus; it is rail and bus.

Mr MULDER - I can be a little more specific. There has been some suggestion that the government has a policy position that says they will not subsidise anything that could possibly take one passenger off Metro. Have you come across that sentiment?

Mrs JOHNSTON - Certainly in our initial discussions with Metro they were fiercely protective of their passengers. We have spent a lot of time and effort trying to work with them to say we are not about taking away your passengers. It is about increasing your passenger numbers. If we can fully integrate with a rail system then we can have public transport patronage increase overall, which would, we expect, increase Metro's patronage as well. We have had some concessions from them of late, within the last few months, to say that they would envisage running a rail service as well. If the act allowed them to do that it is something they would investigate. I think perhaps very slowly those misconceptions or ideas that you would be competing are being turned around.

Mr JOHNSTON - I think they have fears their substantial annual subsidy could be affected by an alternative option but the sustainable transport minister's pre-election policy envisaged Metro Tasmania running the rail and bus service. It should be an opportunity for Metro, not a threat.

Dr GOODWIN - I want to congratulate you on your submission. It is very easy to read and has lots of good diagrams so I think we should acknowledge that. I have heard of park-and-ride but I am but stumped by 'kiss-and-ride'. Could you elaborate on that for me?

Mrs JOHNSTON - An example is that I would take Ben to the nearest Claremont station, kiss him goodbye, drop him off and then I may go to the childcare centre. It is a drop-off.

Dr GOODWIN - And you are saying the ACIL Tasman report failed to take that into consideration? How would you measure that?

Mrs JOHNSTON - They could have looked at mainland examples of park-and-kiss and also their facilities for drop-off. For example, at the airport there is a drop-off zone. There would be similar comparisons on the mainland - to give an estimate at least.

Mr JOHNSTON - Estimate it rather than just ignore it.

Dr GOODWIN - You mentioned schools and that they didn't take them into consideration.

Mrs JOHNSTON - They excluded student patronage because they thought it would increase demand too much.

Dr GOODWIN - I don't quite follow that.

Mrs JOHNSTON - No, neither do we. It was disappointing. When the first draft of the report came out they said they weren't including student patronage because there were no schools along the rail route. We corrected them and said that historically schools are there. Then they decided they would exclude the student patronage because it would increase demand, particularly in peak times.

Mr JOHNSTON - The department had this mind-set that they have gone to all this effort to rejig their school bus contracts, which is substantial dollars, and they couldn't possibly mess with that because they had just done it all, so we'll exclude school students because it might cause overcrowding on the trains.

Mr FARRELL - Back in the 1970s there was a dedicated St Virgil's train, I think.

CHAIR - Previous Premier Paul Lennon talks very fondly about his train trips to St Virgil's.

Mr FARRELL - There are modern OH&S standards now. Back then kids could hang out windows and do all sorts of things.

Mr JOHNSTON - Fortunately in modern trains the windows don't even open. If you are talking safety, rail has a very good track record compared to other modes of transport.

Mrs JOHNSTON - Good public transport is not just about DIER - it shouldn't just be DIER's remit. It should also be economic development, land use planning, health, community services, housing. Very early on we got good support from economic development because they saw the need for maintaining rail services in Tasmania to attract some major industries. Although passenger trains weren't going to meet the needs of the industries, it was meeting the needs of trying to make Tasmania attractive to invest in. It is very important that we don't just consider it DIER's responsibility. It is a cross-government responsibility.

Mr FARRELL - Do you think that rather than having a minister for sustainable transport, you have a minister for public transport?

Mrs JOHNSTON - That's an option. We encourage any reviews to be conducted by another department, perhaps for a fresh look at the approach. It could be economic development or planning to actually look from a different perspective at what good public transport can mean. It is not purely moving people from point A to point B; it is much more about economic development and health and planning.

In terms of funding, you spoke about operational costs, but the capital cost is obviously one thing that scares the state government off. We are looking at perhaps \$100 million. That could rather be funded through Infrastructure Australia or through Nation Building. We have had long discussions with members of state government, local government and federal parliament, and certainly from the federal perspective it is loose change. Some \$100 million for railway is nothing compared to what they are investing nationally in railway. We have had discussions with Mr Wilkie and Minister Crean about it and they are saying why can't the state government prioritise this. If it is a matter of prioritisation and the state government says we want it, then it is loose change for the federal government; it is not a problem in that sense. I suppose for the community that is the frustrating thing. They can see it is a commonsense, simple, easy solution to a community-based problem, a no-brainer. The federal government is there dangling a cheque almost in front of the state government's face and we just need the state government to prioritise it - ahead of the Brooker Highway upgrades.

Dr GOODWIN - So the \$100 million, what would that cover?

Mrs JOHNSTON - ACIL Tasman says \$92 million for electrified; we could go further than that to Granton and Bridgewater for \$100 million.

CHAIR - That is total replacement of the below line?

Mrs JOHNSTON - Yes. That is quite a small sum; \$100 million is the threshold that Infrastructure Australia has, so \$92 million is probably sitting below that threshold for them to consider our project.

CHAIR - It isn't only a matter of setting it up. For TasRail, for instance, the federal government is picking up the bill for everything below-line, but the state government is picking everything up above-line, so we are probably are looking at the state government having to contribute.

Mrs JOHNSTON - We certainly haven't had that discussion from federal representatives. They would see them funding the entire project because it is such a small amount. Certainly on a national scale, the Gold Coast contributed only a third of the total cost, but that is a significant \$1 billion project, so it was a bit of a stretch to ask them to cough up a \$1 billion.

Mr JOHNSTON - It was \$450 million from federal government towards Gold Coast light rail and \$200 million from the state.

Mr FARRELL - I think the present deal with TasRail was just the agreement for the main line.

Mrs JOHNSTON - For freight, that's right.

Mr FARRELL - This would be a stand-alone funding project.

Mrs JOHNSTON - Completely stand-alone.

CHAIR - Then operation and maintenance would still have to be covered by state government, but you are talking about the whole capital cost to set it up.

Mr FARRELL - Ideally Metro would be willing to look at that.

Mrs JOHNSTON - The interesting thing is when they first engaged ACIL Tasman we had conversations with one of their representatives and they did back-of-the-envelope calculations. At that time with what they thought the patronage should be, they thought it would actually break even. The patronage is quite a significantly lower than we think it ought to be, so we are quite hopeful that it wouldn't be a huge loss for their operation.

Dr GOODWIN - What are the maintenance costs likely to be? Are they particularly high once you have spent your \$100 million?

Mr MULDER - Ten per cent capex is a normal sort of depreciation.

Mr JOHNSTON - ACIL Tasman did quantify that, but they inflated it somewhat, in my opinion. They had rail grinding every year. The Taiwan high speed rail do it every three years and it has actually never been done in Tasmania. They certainly beefed it up, but there are costs for electric rail vehicles in particular. In Perth they are doing 500 000 kilometres between any services, which is extraordinary. I really do not think that the rail should be seen as a cost just for this commuter rail service. I think there is definitely a future freight task and there are also tourism aspects. Even with that it still should be able to cover it. There is the track maintenance, the level crossing maintenance, vehicle cleaning - all the

costs that Metro has now for running its vehicles are similar but on a different scale. Per passenger it is much cheaper for rail.

Dr GOODWIN - I think one of the reasons TasRail has had to seek so much funding is that maintenance of rail has been neglected over the years, so it is very important that part of the consideration includes those ongoing maintenance costs.

Mr JOHNSTON - It also got to a tipping point where it became a near-death experience for TasRail. It was extraordinarily expensive just to recover things.

Mrs JOHNSTON - We would hate to see that particular part of the line occur again - they had invested quite a lot of money.

Mr JOHNSTON - Even between Hobart and Bridgewater in the last few years they have invested many millions on new sleepers and new rail level-crossing upgrades, so it would be a shame to throw that away in the middle of next year.

CHAIR - But isn't that all being renewed under the scheme you have?

Mr JOHNSTON - ACIL Tasman has proposed replacing all the rail.

CHAIR - Totally replacing the rail and the sleepers?

Mr JOHNSTON - Yes. I still don't feel that is necessary in the first year. You could progressively do it over a number of years, but if you get federal funding to do it in the first year, why not do it.

Mrs JOHNSTON - The consultancy that made those recommendations - Hyder - based their report on old evidence from DIER about the condition of the track pre-upgrades that TasRail had done and they had very limited site inspections. They hadn't done a detail study into the condition of the track for the kinds of times or speeds we wanted them to operate at. You would expect that if we were to go ahead, you would do a proper investigation of the track conditions and the speeds we would want now to run at; it may not be necessary.

CHAIR - Thank you very much.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.

Mr WILLIAM GLENN COSTIN, GENERAL MANAGER, SORELL COUNCIL, WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR (Mrs Taylor) - Welcome, Bill. Evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege but what you say outside of this hearing may not be afforded such privilege. Have you received and read the information for witnesses?

Mr COSTIN - Yes.

CHAIR - The evidence you present is being record and the *Hansard* version will be published on the committee website as soon as it becomes available.

Mr COSTIN - Currently I am the general manager of the Sorell Council, so I am working in and around the community. I have participated in an integrated transport steering committee that has been running for several years in and around state government departments such as DIER and so forth. I have a background in transport, including 20 years as an army officer in logistics and transport. In the early days there was a fair bit of rail, so I was keen on what you were talking about with rail because from what I have dealt with, rail is only for large tonnages and long distances certainly from a freight perspective.

Heavy road transport was predominantly my background within army logistics but that was a long time ago. Currently I am trying to address commuter peak transport issues that the Sorell constituents express on number of occasions, fully recognising that there will be no major funding to fix the roundabouts and causeway choke points on the way to Hobart that cause the commuter problems. I am interested in the public transport solution which seems to be the logical way to go and the most efficient and expedient one in the short term.

CHAIR - I am sorry Carmel is not here because I have heard her express an opinion about the disconnect for people in Sorell and the fact that people in Sorell as a growing area are not able to access good public transport.

Mr VALENTINE - Or further south even - southern beaches.

CHAIR - Bill, what do you see as a solution?

Mr COSTIN - Carmel and I thought that it was appropriate to respond to the inquiry to keep the profile of the issues with commuter problems on the agenda and hope that in a more holistic review of transport that it is not confined to Metro. The definition of 'metro' is interesting given that we are only 20 minutes from the centre of Hobart but in some respects we are still considered an outer rural region. It was important to keep this on the agenda to make sure that in any review we look at not just the provision of Metro services but how they interact with the private providers. We know full well and have had numerous dialogues with DIER and Norm McIlfratrick in the early days about the trigger points and at what level we suddenly get recognised for extra funding, if funding is the issue.

I mentioned in the submission from our discussions with the providers that if you ask a profit-making provider he or she will say that margins are narrow, there is not a big enough market, and if you look at the corridors that DIER manage there might be far too many smaller players eating the pool and not giving enough flexibility or economies of scale to the one provider to provide more services. I don't know if that is right or wrong. We would hope that the inquiry could look at how it is put together from a state government management point of view to see if it is the most efficient or otherwise. I don't know the answer to that. All I know is that what we need to solve the problems that won't be fixed by huge injections of capital on the roads and road network is a decent public transport system.

There have been a number of small surveys that have been conducted, one more recently by Rebecca White of 100 residents, and the two key issues in terms of public transport - and I think this is representative of the views we hear anecdotally - were services and scheduling and the cost. They are the two factors that always seem to be highest among all the others and probably are the most relevant issues.

CHAIR - So you have a number of providers?

Mr COSTIN - We have Redline predominantly. Tassielink goes down to the Tasman and comes through Sorell but Redline is the major provider of private transport. I would suggest that the school services are running pretty well but I don't know that that's the whole problem. It is the workers in Hobart. If you look at where most people go, it is Hobart. To a lesser extent it is Rosny, Eastlands or the eastern shore, but they're all heading into town and that then flows on to problems that Clarence and the city have with access to and from the bridge. I don't have the vision to see what other interrelated nodes connect with our commuter services but I know that we're delivering a lot of people to Hobart.

If we look out a few years - and this is what is alarming - we know that Sorell is growing rapidly, by a couple of hundred people each year - 2.5 to 3 per cent - and that is consistent; we foresee that that will be the case. We also know that irrigation from 2014 will see some productivity lift, some more workers and more people move there for that reason, so that might increase the rate of growth. We have started work with Southern Water for water and sewerage at the southern beaches, which is one of the reasons Sorell was an advocate of the larger water corporation, simply to provide the capacity to address those issues, and we have \$60 million to \$80 million dollars to fix those health issues. If that comes to fruition, and we think there is a very good chance that it will, my estimate is that by 2017 we will seriously see a water and sewerage solution there. That will mean an explosion in relative terms of population in our area. There are still several hundred lots available, even with the new regional planning urban growth boundary to be put in place. What is still contained within the acceptable limits of that could see another 1 500 people easily fill those and possibly more. That presents us with our own issues in terms of infrastructure which we will deal with, but obviously DIER will have a problem because we only have one road in and out of there which is going to be servicing all those extra people.

Mr VALENTINE - How many thousand people are there in your municipality?

Mr COSTIN - There are 13 500, and we have about 8 500 ratepayers.

Dr GOODWIN - That growth you are talking about, is that in the southern beaches area?

Mr COSTIN - That is across Sorell but realistically it means Sorell, Midway Point and the southern beaches, which comprise Dodges, Lewisham and Primrose Sands. You can look at Sorell and say that there is about 5 000-odd in Sorell-Midway, another 5 000-odd in the southern beaches and the balance between Nugent, Dunalley, Orielson and Penna, spread out in the rural fringes. That is the balance. It is the southern beaches that will present the greatest problem because that area has the greatest capacity for extra growth when those things impact.

Dr GOODWIN - For people who might be thinking of moving there, do you think a factor for them is going to be the accessibility of public transport?

Mr COSTIN - I think the first consideration is that it's still fairly cheap. You can get good flat land or you can get good land with a view close to water and it's still relatively good value. There is not a huge amount of work locally, which suggests that they're still going to have to travel, which is a problem. The fundamental thing is, 'If I can buy somewhere cheap and get in, if I have to travel, the costs of that aren't a problem because I'm getting a cheap house to live in.'

CHAIR - How long is the commute from, say, Dodges Ferry to Hobart?

Mr COSTIN - Thirty-five to 40 minutes.

Mr VALENTINE - It's 40 minutes from Copping.

CHAIR - And from Primrose?

Mr VALENTINE - Forty-five.

Mr COSTIN - Primrose is problematic; there is one road in and one road out. Carmel's initiative to put a community bus on was in response to the fact that an 80-year-old gentleman wanted to get to town and walked out to the main road to catch a private bus that went past the Carlton road but didn't go into Primrose. We put on a community bus on a volunteer basis. It serves for other purposes but we were looking at putting a part-time run into Primrose to try to provide that extra bit of capacity. Some people suggested we should subsidise a private operator but they arced up a little bit. We're not doing it for nothing, there will be a small fare, but I think it was a good initiative and we will see how that develops. That is just one problem.

I think, fundamentally, if you come back to the commuter options, the last Redline bus out of the city is at 5.30 p.m. A year ago there were hardly any buses on the weekend, but I note now that Redline have three on a Saturday and now have a Sunday service of one or two.

CHAIR - Just to Sorell or all the way out?

Mr COSTIN - It goes to Dodges.

Mr VALENTINE - You could put a ferry on for Primrose.

Mr COSTIN - In looking at scheduling services and what will attract people to the, I think it is important. I don't necessarily have the answer to that but are some pointers to considerations that might be a factor. For example, there are a lot of children going to Rosny College. Rosny College is the only college for that tertiary education type of set-up. People on the land rely on buses to get them to school. If they are working the land, they do not have the time. We know that in the school holidays you can go anywhere around Hobart and it is easy - take 10 minutes off your trip. It suggests a lot of parents are going to work and dropping their kids off and taking leave when they're not there.

If you look at the Rosny College example, we know that kids from Sorell are less likely to get part-time employment at Eastlands, for example, if their last bus leaves at six or 5.30 or whatever it might be. They can't get home after that so they're not going to get three hours work at Big W after school. Little issues that inter-relate with the scheduling in that sort of fashion probably need to be looked at.

CHAIR - Uni students are in that position too. They have lectures going until 6 p.m. and they can't get home afterwards.

Dr GOODWIN - Did you get any clarity from DIER around the trigger points issue?

Mr COSTIN - With due respect, Norm was serious and was following through. I have no criticism of that. This is going back two and half or three years, but I think there was a change in staff on the bus front within DIER and we never really found out what the trigger points were for action.

Dr GOODWIN - You just assume you haven't met them yet.

Mr COSTIN - No, we have spoken on a number of occasions and I was involved with the integrated transport committee which raised Sorell in a small amount. There were some key lines through the document that was produced which was heartening for Sorell. This is about momentum and making sure we get to that final solution. They were going to institute a program where they would send us a kit that we could critique and provide feedback to our operator, like a KPI performance kit, which I thought was a great idea. We talk to them anyway, but with this we could get feedback from commuters independently of that. We never got those kits, they never eventuated, so nothing really has come to fruition. We have met with Michael Larissey and Heather Haselgrove and that has been interesting in talking about what role Cambridge might play. The mutual ticketing-type scenario had some interest in terms of encouraging people.

CHAIR - Doesn't Metro go to Cambridge?

Mr COSTIN - Yes.

CHAIR - But it stops at Cambridge.

Mr COSTIN - It does, but Redline also goes to the city, so is that necessarily the most efficient? If they had single ticketing, Redline may not need to. There might be more services coming to Cambridge. If the driver has a shorter run he might be able to do more in that area, but he can't do more in the Seven Mile Beach/Acton area if that is where he wanted to terminate and run a bus, because there is another provider there. Larissey has said - and once again this is second-hand so I don't know if it's true or not - that those buses aren't running to full capacity. There are one or two people on them so they are under-utilised as well. As I said in my report, it's anecdotal but that might be something worth looking at.

Mr MULDER - You've also got to have a look at the operators. They all say they go to Cambridge but I know that the one that goes into Seven Mile Beach goes to the Cambridge township but not to the Cambridge Park commercial and industrial area. Of course it then goes off into Seven Mile Beach, so although everyone says it goes to Cambridge it doesn't actually go to where the major interchange would be, namely Cambridge Park.

Mr COSTIN - Redline can go via Cambridge proper but only if it is booked. If you want to be dropped off there you have to notify them in advance, so it's not a regular scheduled stop, although it is for the school trips, I think, for the school buses.

Mr MULDER - I think the main Metro service is to the Aurora facility at Cambridge Park so it is designed really for the commuter transport there.

Bill, you mentioned earlier on that you've got choke points running through Sorell, Midway Point and that somehow or other -

Mr COSTIN - The airport roundabout is a biggie too.

Mr MULDER - I have walked most of that road at different times, usually during peak hour with my name on my back, but I can vouch for it. I was once tempted to carry a sign saying 'This should not be the fastest way of getting to the city', as I walked past all these cars.

Regarding the idea of the choke point across a couple of causeways, I am looking at a map here and if anyone just looked at the map you can see the difficulty there would be there. It was suggested to Norm McIlfatrick, who did take it on board, that perhaps now is the time to build an alternative route by relinking Penna to Cambridge.

Mr COSTIN - I have favoured that Shark Point crossing old railway solution for a long time.

Mr MULDER - It is ideal for a floating bridge and you connect to a four-lane highway. You would just have to build a three-lane road across it and dedicate one of them to be a transit lane and I think three-quarters of your problems would be solved.

Mr COSTIN - Yes, I like that solution too, and I've often thought that I might put a paper together but have never got round to doing it.

Mr MULDER - You've got to have a transit lane or else it doesn't fall within the remit of this committee.

Mr COSTIN - There are some other issues. There is the major link - Richmond is not that far. We have had several accidents on the causeway which have resulted in kilometres of traffic piled up.

Mr MULDER - That was the other point, that a second route serves for emergency purposes. Even if the one is [inaudible] there are times it gets blocked. It is like the Tasman Bridge; if we didn't have the Bowen Bridge it would be an utter disaster with a two-hour blockage on the Tasman Bridge. The same occurs, no doubt, out at Sorell and Midway Point on the causeways.

Mr VALENTINE - There is very little river traffic or bay traffic that would go up past that point in terms of boats? Are you talking about the Penna link?

Mr MULDER - There's next to nothing over there, apart from the odd dinghy or kayak.

Mr VALENTINE - But you're talking about connecting that link, aren't you?

Mr MULDER - Yes, I'm talking about putting a floating bridge across there.

Mr VALENTINE - I'm saying there would be no water traffic.

Mr MULDER - One of the main reasons for the closure of the Sorell-Bellerive railway was that that bridge kept sinking into the silt due to the weight of the train. We subsequently built a floating bridge across the Derwent and I couldn't see why that wouldn't work perfectly there. It would sit on the mud during low tide and ride nicely at high tide.

Mr COSTIN - The other advantage that I saw strategically is that you have the main link at the back of the airport, so if there is ever an incident at the airport you've lost that link. To come in behind Cambridge makes a lot of sense.

Mr VALENTINE - It does.

Mr MULDER - So it's basically extending the four-lane highway out to Sorell, but splitting it.

Mr VALENTINE - Mind you, the people who live along that road might have a bit of an issue.

Mr COSTIN - There would be issues on both sides.

Mr MULDER - There always are. The other one that springs to mind when you talk about that - and I'm sure Eric Woehler would have a lot to say about it - is the blatantly obvious link across Dodges Ferry to Seven Mile Beach, right through the bird sanctuary.

Mr COSTIN - It's interesting that that's where any pipe for water and sewerage would probably end up going because it is sensible - it's not very far.

Mr MULDER - We did explore that with Norm and he said he would seriously take it on board and factor it into his considerations. I saw that as a potential solution - and you could then start to create what you're talking about at Cambridge as another bus transit station where Richmond, Seven Mile Beach, Acton and Cambridge could be serviced from.

The other thing I want to run past you, Bill, is something this committee is gradually getting to the idea of, and that is that Metro's conundrum is that they're trying to both fulfil a community service obligation and run a mass transit line at the same time. Therefore they flip between door-to-door services, which is public transport, and trying to service the main corridors, which is their direction at the moment. I think the committee is starting to explore the idea that perhaps we need to understand the mass transit routes, which are the main corridors coming into the city, and that there are feeder services. In your case the main transit corridor would terminate at Sorell and there would be frequency of services running backwards and forwards on that, and then feeder buses coming in from the southern beaches and Orielton et cetera.

Mr COSTIN - Agreed. That's one of the concepts we had in mind. There are different schools of thought on this but we were very strongly advocating for a park-and-ride in Sorell and committed quite a bit of funding over three years in our budgeting to get it going. DIER initially said they had \$150 000 to throw at it but then that disappeared and they came back with a promise of \$100 000. We will take whatever contribution we can and we will do it gradually over time. Redline is happy with it because it is going to be a better bus facility than the one we currently have outside Holt's Hardware. We saw that the southern beaches people could drive their vehicle a short distance, 10 minutes, park, and jump on that feeder service you're talking about. Parking is free; we have plenty of space out there so it's not an issue. We are developing a new precinct there which eventually might have a private operator with a café. People can grab a coffee before they get on the bus and go to work. When they come back they might get in their car and go to Woolies and get all they need for tea and then go home, so we think it will work quite well. Some of the bus guys don't, but we think it will work well.

Mr MULDER - I think you only have to look at the way railway stations have grown up. They put a railway station in and shortly an entire commercial district builds up around it because of high customer traffic.

Mr COSTIN - We will pursue that in any case.

CHAIR - The thing that attracts people onto public transport is if it's faster and cheaper than driving their car.

Mr MULDER - Frequency and cost are the big things.

CHAIR - If you have the same hold-up on the single road you have now with a bus as opposed to the car, what is the advantage of catching the bus?

Mr COSTIN - Price comes into it and flexibility. Flexibility and price are the two key elements. I can remember in Melbourne many years ago I used to drive from Keilor Downs into St Kilda Road. People said you are crazy, so I then decided I would go by train. I had to go onto zone 2 at St Albans and it took me longer and cost me more. I said, stuff it. I can get a park 10 minutes out of where I worked and so I took my car. I think they are the issues that are ever present wherever you look.

CHAIR - It is only if you have something like a fast transit lane where buses can beat ordinary commuter cars.

Mr COSTIN - It is interesting; there is sufficient road reserve up to the golf course before you hit McGee's Bridge and go to Midway Point; you could build another transit lane in there. I do not what you would do with the problem of choking on the causeway, but you could do something between the last causeway and the airport roundabout, but then again it is only a part solution.

CHAIR - Which is why the other solution, a separate road would be -

Mr MULDER - I think long-term we have a separate corridor and in 100 years you might want to expand that into four or six lanes. That is where you have the capacity to create something [inaudible]. I also understood with the idea of the three lanes that Midway Point provided the particular choke point, particularly around near the service station.

Mr COSTIN - Adding to the problem, but we have on the books now subdivisions for at least another 300 lots, so we did the traffic count, which I put in the report. That was something I initiated because I think DIER have a cyclic program. The last one was 2007 or something; it was a far while away.

Mr MULDER - Bob Lynch and Lynmore are doing something out the back of Midway Point, out past the golf course?

Mr COSTIN - Yes, that is part of that number. He developed that, he has the permit and it is all ready to go, but because things have slowed down I guess he is not going to borrow a couple of million bucks to develop it. He has it on the market, but he has a valid permit. He has all the approvals in place. On the other side, the back of the Pitt Water Golf Club, there is another 20, 30, 40 going in. There is another one right in the centre of Sorell, which probably has another 20. Midway Point is going to be full shortly and that is going to add several hundred movements a day to the Midway Point roundabout and added to the rest

coming from Sorell, because On Horizons is still ticking over. We have Willis Park at the back of that, which is another 30 lots. They all look to be slowly coming on line, so just trying to get on the front foot with a solution before it really hits us.

CHAIR - One of the things said to us has been about integrating services, like private operators as opposed to Metro, and linking them, as you have said, at Cambridge Park, so why not maybe a changeover.

Mr MULDER - Single ticketing scheduling we talking about.

CHAIR - Yes, but it still doesn't help if you cannot get your buses to travel.

Mr COSTIN - And we still have the Tasman Bridge problem. I remember in part of the integrated transport work that has been going for about 18 months-two years, one of the notions was that we had to change the culture. We had to get people to think that it was better to be on public transport. One way was to put your parking fees up and I know Hobart was complying with that for a while.

CHAIR - Not to the extent that it will make a difference.

Mr COSTIN - Possibly not, no.

CHAIR - As a city they also want to keep it affordable for people to travel into the city.

Mr COSTIN - It is a conundrum because you want people in the city. The other notion that I always had in the back of my mind is why don't some of the state government departments decentralise. If you put the Department of Economic Development at Sorell, you would have free parking, almost no cost in rent and you have the traffic going in the opposite direction, but that is going to be a hard task. It doesn't matter what department or part of a department or section you are talking about, it is a possibility.

CHAIR - Particularly with modern technology, it is really not an issue.

Mr MULDER - To their credit they have tried that. They sent mines over to Rosny Park.

Mr FARRELL - Fisheries are in New Norfolk.

Mr MULDER - And Aurora out at Cambridge Park, but it is not overly well received.

CHAIR - They weren't in the city beforehand.

Mr COSTIN - I would be the last that would want a drain. We know that demographically we are not growing. Because we had six quarters of reduced growth, invariably the unemployed rate drops because most people will leave the state, so you had it at a high rate for a while - cannot find work, so I leave. I think the population is sitting at about 521 000,

which has gone up over the last 15 to 20 years. But it is a very slow growth and it tends to just bubble away. What we are doing is just moving bits around.

CHAIR - If we are spreading further and further out, then infrastructure and transport and all sorts of costs are going to be higher.

Mr COSTIN - Correct. You cannot say one is the right solution in balance. You do not want to deny the city as a centre point of activity, yet we have to address the problem of people wanting to be in there in large numbers. I do not know where the balance point is. I am hoping you can perhaps work that out.

CHAIR - The planning reforms are saying we should have higher density of population rather than everybody spreading out. Let us concentrate population, whether it is in Sorell at the centre or whether it is Hobart or anywhere, but certainly along public transport routes and where there is work.

Mr COSTIN - If we had a southern outlet, we would be as big as Kingston, I would think.

CHAIR - But the Southern Outlet is full.

Mr COSTIN - Because Kingston has grown proportionate to the capacity of that infrastructure.

CHAIR - There are vast tracts of empty land between Hobart and Kingston and between Hobart and Sorell.

Mr MULDER - There was another thing we explored with the light rail people. Their issue is that a lot of their modelling is based on coming from Brighton into the city and infrastructure around 2.5 or something has a new bridge at Granton without a new rail infrastructure, only road infrastructure, which creates some problems for the modelling. There was an assumption in there, I think, that a lot of people are talking about, that increased growth equals increased commuting. I do not know whether anyone has looked at some of this stuff, but surely there is increased growth out in Sorell areas with your irrigation and your farming projects and your commercial centres and some of that growth does not commute.

Mr COSTIN - Yes and we are hopeful that that translates that way. It is a very small example, but when the Telstra shop set up on the Sorell Plaza, we thought this is fantastic; more local work. When Coles set up in the Sorell Plaza, more local work. Interestingly, Telstra had no applicants from our area. There are a number of people working in Sorell at Coles who come from Seven Mile Beach and Acton. That is not a bad thing; it is just surprising that you do not get filled with locals, but they are coming from other areas. That the Telstra shop was not overwhelmed with applicants to work in the shop was quite surprising, given where we are in our demographic, by and large. I am hopeful that the rural-type solution is one that will bolster a lot of casual work and a lot of light industry support-type work for the change in product mix and the volumes. I see a lot more vineyards now with the controlled water delivery, taking up -

Mr MULDER - A lot of those lower skilled jobs, people commute for them. The higher paid people are off on their professions and their big jobs. It is that bottom area - and I think you referred to the school kids earlier on; that is the kind of work. That is the thing that puts pressure on public services. The number of times I have picked someone up hitch-hiking between Sorell and Midway Point or Sorell and town, who are doing it for work. Sometimes it is ridiculous hours of the night. They work in the bakery or they work in the fish shop somewhere and it is 11 o'clock at night and there they are, walking home, hoping to pick up a lift if they are lucky. I think that is a problem we have grappled with before with nurses and other people in town working shift work. I think this is one of the difficulties with mass transit versus public service. If your culture is mass transit, then all these people miss out.

Mr VALENTINE - It is also kids and sport and things like that.

Mr COSTIN - Yes, that is another separate issue.

Mr VALENTINE - I had to hitchhike home from Dunalley on a Saturday morning after hockey because there were not any services. I am going back a little while.

Mr VALENTINE - Park and ride. You might have covered this while I was out.

Mr COSTIN - We are still pursuing that - with or without. It is on our financial plan. It will be a very slow development; the infrastructure, the car park - culminating in a proper multi-lane bus park - proper disabled access which is quite topical at the moment, and capacity for probably 30 to 40 vehicles to park there. We are also doing the Neil Davis car park which is a 120-space internal car park behind Cole and Gordon Streets on the other side, which is a simple walk anyway.

Mr MULDER - Whereabouts is your bus terminal.

Mr COSTIN - At the moment they pick up outside Holts hardware shop.

Mr MULDER - Where are you going to have it.

Mr COSTIN - Down Station Lane where the old council depot is. There is a flat asphalt area there currently. We are going to improve that facility.

Mr MULDER - I thought that section behind the Gordon Highlander and the old Centrelink office?

Mr COSTIN - That is where we will put the internal Neil Davis car park.

CHAIR - Thanks very much, Bill. Is there anything you wanted to add that we have not asked you about.

Mr COSTIN - No. I wish you luck and hope it is a good outcome.

CHAIR - Thanks very much. We will do our best.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

Dr ANNA LYTH, UNIVERSITY OF TASMANIA, SENIOR RESEARCH FELLOW SUSTAINABILITY WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR (Mrs Taylor) - Welcome to the public hearings of this committee. All the evidence taken at this committee is protected by parliamentary privilege but I have to remind you that any comments you make outside of this hearing may not be afforded such privilege. The evidence you present is being recorded and the *Hansard* version will be published on the committee website as soon as it become available. That is all the formalities. I ask you to advise us of your field of interest and expertise. From your submission I understand you cover a wide range of areas?

Dr LYTH - I moved to Tasmania with my family four and half years ago. Most of my experience is out of state. I have about 20-odd years working on transport issues, starting as a student, honours and then a PhD in transport-related urban policy and the integration of planning. Transport policy - firstly looking at the implications for unemployment and access to employment in outer-western Sydney. My second round of research in the PhD context was around the implications of those things and also how we think about climate change policy. That was in the early 1990s.

CHAIR - Also in Sydney?

Dr LYTH - In Sydney in the western suburbs. That was through Macquarie University. I was then, for some years, urban planning manager with the NRMA. At the time when Sydney was undergoing its paradigm shift in thinking about transport and urban planning to understanding the link between urban form, how we lay out our cities and how we invest and think about paying for transport across modes and integrating those. That was significant time and I was involved a national leading project called 'clean air 2 000' with the NRMA which was about travel behaviour change. Given that congestion and issues in Sydney were significant at that time.

The NRMA was quite a surprising organisation to be leading that sort of initiative, but it recognised that people do not live in their cars all the time and had other interests and members were keen for us to think about things beyond roads. That was a big multi-stakeholder project and I led the research on that and also instigated a pilot for what now is TravelSmart - a national program that has been adopted by federal government as a program that it funds throughout the country to instigate travel behaviour change.

I then had a period of time in academia at Macquarie University. For the four years before this job, which I have only recently taken up at the University of Tasmania, I was a consultant. One of the projects I led was the first sustainable transport strategy for the university itself, which looked at the holistic issues of transport for all of its campuses around Tasmania. Many of the issues that you are talking about today are in line with the university being a key trip-generator and being concerned about a range of issues around

accessibility, its carbon footprint, its future economic growth and considerations for students and staff as well as regional development issues such as the Cradle Coast.

That is a bit of my eclectic background, but I have a transport theme running through most of what I have done over the years in the private sector and working with a range of organizations, stakeholders some high-level committees in New South Wales at the decision-making level as well. Now I am back at the university in a research-only leadership role.

CHAIR - And the research currently?

Dr LYTH - Some of the research I am doing now is improving our base-line data for the university itself, as part of the strategic planning process we have been through because the data recognising Tasmanian land transport is extremely poor compared to other states or other metropolitan areas. That has implications for how we plan and how we make decisions so the university is looking at putting in place some ongoing monitoring. That involves looking at some base line data and thinking about that into the future periodically. I am also supervising a student working on that. It is quite a significant project and I will hopefully be communicating with DIER on the usefulness of that data and how it integrates and corresponds with the data that they have around Hobart, because you are talking about a big trip-generator with the university campuses.

Other sides of my research in the past, which I hope to also take up in the future, has revolved around understanding the implications of travel behaviour and policy of different parts of society. I have looked at gender and travel behaviour, family life stages and award winning work on gauging population implications for car use and how we think about aging populations in urban places and their transport needs into the future. Other stuff that I do is mostly around climate change adaptation work but that is not the topic of this here.

CHAIR - There are implications. Obviously transport has implications for that as well.

Thank you very much for that. We have heard submissions about how difficult it is for students to access the university apart from ones who live quite a distance away like Bothwell or something. People who live at Sorell, we have just heard, and New Norfolk, that it is not easy for them to be able to make university schedules, so it is an area of interest for us as well.

Dr GOODWIN - One of my frustrations with the university has been car parking. I have been a post graduate student and then I have been a guest lecturer and then I have been just a visitor and it is always a stressful thing to have to go down to the university and try to find a car park. There is limited capacity there and I don't know whether the university has any plans to increase its capacity for parking. From the student perspective, alternative forms of transport are important and you've mentioned that ferry services could be an option.

Dr LYTH - One option.

Dr GOODWIN - There is also bike transport but issues with the traffic and concerns, but also a lot of university students probably use the Metro services, which seem quite good to me, but I am just interested in your comments on all of those issues.

Dr LYTH - In our analysis and trying to understand what the issues are, especially if we're talking about Hobart and the Sandy Bay campus - although now the university is decentralising even more, which has implications as well - it is quite overwhelming to think about transport issues as a whole, but if we break them down and look at the strategy - and unfortunately the data we have was only about where people live - a significant proportion, about 70 per cent, live in what we call the active zone, which is 2.5 kilometres around the campus. I don't have the document in front of me, so I would say please refer to the document for correct figures, but a significant proportion live in this active zone, which is where our strategy is involved around encouraging students and staff where possible to think about walking, cycling and jumping on the buses, which go by quite frequently. Then you get into the greater urban area, and a lot of students live in Kingston, the northern suburbs and the eastern shore, where there already are some reasonable corridors of good access.

CHAIR - Except they often have to change buses.

Dr LYTH - That was the key in terms of it being off the CBD and that has been a significant challenge, so changing modes is an implication there and there have been discussions through this process with Metro Tas about what could possibly be done in that regard. There are some challenges around addressing that, but it would be nice if some of the buses, at least, were able to pull in from Kingston into the uni on their way to the CBD. I understand that there are significant constraints around that, though.

Then there is further afield, the peri-urban areas, such as Sorell where, again, you would have more significant accessibility issues and perhaps different strategies. You talked about transit buses. I think they are very worthy of further investigation and certainly have been successful in other places and other cities. If you make them look and feel like you are on a light rail in many respects in terms of their frequency, in terms of how they are promoted, in terms of the information you get and your waiting stations, if you like, or bus stops near to areas or hubs of activity, I think you can go a long way with your bus lanes to address that issue there.

Mr VALENTINE - What about WiFi on the buses?

Dr LYTH - In terms of integrated systems of transport integrating with lifestyle activity as well, those sorts of things certainly make things much more attractive. Then there were other strategies around for those outer areas and further afield, thinking about things like car pooling, improving the university's technologies to facilitate working from home, studying from home, and online teaching, which is already happening in a significant way. We have significant videoconferencing facilities that are quite good compared to other universities I have experienced, and trying to promote the use of these things so that you're reducing travel as well. For students from that far afield, whether it be the lower Huon Valley area or some of the country areas, it is much harder to address the public transport issue.

We were breaking it down in terms of those sorts of considerations and context and different categories of access. I see the bigger picture of the urban transport challenge for Hobart being similar to that. I would like to think about the purposes of trips, what sort of change in lifestyles we're undertaking, what contributes to those trips that we make and therefore the constraints that lie around that in terms of our everyday lives, depending on the trips we are undertaking and why. By thinking about that, that's when we start to understand what sort of systems we might require. Of course the challenge is then homing into the priorities we have to invest in and put our energies into, because we could do all sorts of things.

CHAIR - And what sort of resources we have to do them with.

Dr LYTH - Exactly, yes. As I was saying to you, I did this submission in a bit of a rush and I would have liked to have spent more time on it but I guess that is a reflection of how time-poor we all are, but I was thinking about transport in terms of the local trips that people are making because that is really a growth area. That is where a lot of the travel growth has occurred in terms of zooming around town doing all sorts of things relating to our changing lifestyles and time constraints. Commuter trips are obviously very important and they are things we can tend to plan for more significantly and in a controlled way, so there are opportunities to focus on as well, but they require thinking about things in two different ways. It is not only about local councils being left to respond to the local issues, it is also about partnerships.

Mr VALENTINE - Integration, collaboration.

Dr LYTH - Yes.

CHAIR - That comes up again and again - that public transport needs to serve many different needs and one is the commuter and the other is within suburbs and local trips.

Dr LYTH - Yes, for the ageing population in particular. If we just think about the commuter we might be doing ourselves a disservice. We have to think about what society is going to be doing, how that will generate trips and what sort of trips they will be and when as we get older as a society. The research I have undertaken has shown that, unlike the past when we thought of older people as the bus users, the minimum service level - 'Let's look after the older people and they'll tend to use the bus' - that may not be the picture into the future. Yes, we will be needing to service that market significantly but the baby boomer population have grown up with the culture of using a motor vehicle so understanding how they will use that into the future is important. We will be needing to look at improving local access to local services making sure the local shops, the corner shop or café, remains there or emerges somewhere else in its locality and that we don't just have big shopping centres but we can also have our local communities, accessibilities and liveable neighbourhoods. We also have to think about the recreational movements that may be undertaken. Retirees may still work a little and there will be much more recreational activity happening during the working week.

Dr GOODWIN - They need to get to the golf courses.

CHAIR - Or the bowls club.

Dr LYTH - With the ferry issue, they might think, 'Let's go for a walk in Bellerive', and they live in Sandy Bay or further north, to expand their horizons in their own city. It is about accessibility throughout the city. One of my key messages is, thinking about that future context, not just the context we are in now or have been in the past.

The same applies to work I have done on families and life stages. Families are heavily reliant on vehicles and I have looked at how that might change over time. We talked about WiFi on buses or WiFi on everything and how with the new younger population coming through how that is embedded in their lifestyles. The nature of work, how we work, those things have been changing and will continue to change.

Moving to Hobart I saw so much opportunity. It is a wonderful place, it has lots going for it, but I could see it being undermined, having been to other places where it has been undermined in terms of continual facilitation of traffic and growth, if we don't look at the holistic picture of transport choice, availability and access. That really is the message for one of the key factors in building a strong and economically attractive city, and if we are going to have any sort of competitive edge into the future I think that is essential. That is not just the CBD, but beyond.

CHAIR - You mentioned land use planning and the importance of that in the urban context as well.

Dr LYTH - In terms of land use planning, obviously we have improved activity in that area so recently we have been undertaking regional planning which is great, because I was frustrated when I first arrived here. Being a teacher of planning, I directed the environmental planning course at Macquarie University for eight years, so coming here and talking about strategic transport planning I couldn't really give any great examples in Tasmania to the students. It is a significant issue and I'm glad to see it moving forward in that regard, but I guess in identifying the key growth areas where we are going to be investing and thinking about land use changes, encouraging development needs to be in partnership with thinking about those transport futures as well, and those things should be hand in hand, key corridors of development and key hubs of activities. That is all being thought about but perhaps some more thought and development needs to go into it as we review these planning processes.

I also think having transport agencies working more strongly together with other agencies that have an interest and responsibility in this area is really crucial. Agencies are not necessarily working in an integrated fashion on this and other agencies in other jurisdictions quite a while ago started working together in a much stronger way, although there has always been an issue with transport agencies versus planning agencies.

CHAIR - And economic development agencies.

Dr LYTH - And economic developments agencies, exactly - all those together. So integration of policy and plans are essential. Prioritisation of urban development and urban form and design densification may need to be occurring, I guess, trying to encourage public participation in that process, not just consulting through the usual invitation for submissions but getting people to understand what the vision and picture of Hobart might be in the future. I don't think there are enough visuals out there. We have visuals about buildings and nice plans at a local scale which people can relate to and get excited about, but we need to be thinking about the bigger regional picture and what Hobart would look like, for example, in the northern suburbs corridor if we really did this integrated land use planning and transport. What would it mean for your lifestyle? Those sorts of stories and engaging in those sorts of things I think are really crucial for getting the community interested because the other thing I see is a lack of engagement on the holistic understanding of the issue.

Mr FARRELL - Would it be fair to say, then, that as far as public transport and integrated transport goes that we are tending more reactive than strategic?

Dr LYTH - Yes. I definitely think more strategy is necessary. We think a lot about what needs to happen, like the light rail. It's all worthy of significant investigation but without that strategic thought and integration across all the issues I've been talking about, rolling it out is difficult, so the how is really important. I think one of the biggest challenges we face here is in terms of the how. That includes the integration across jurisdictions with local government. I think in some cases that is starting to be done well and I know that Hobart City Council had a great strategy promoting the need for that. Across agencies state government leadership in some of the strategic and policy issues is really important and I think that has been lacking, to be frank, in that regard. The public participation also seems to drop off the agenda probably because it costs a little bit of money and is not always seen to be a priority, but it is something that I think the public can be involved in and also make them feel good about their city, which has an economic and liveability wellbeing spin-off to people as well.

There is a myriad of other things that are essential in an integrated transport response, which I have heard mentioned in the previous rounds of discussion; like the parking policies at the end of your trip in the CBD, for instance, as long as you have good public transport to complement that - streamlined ticketing, good information on transport, how you know you haven't missed a bus - they are just little things.

CHAIR - Smart technology can help with that.

Dr LYTH - Yes. It's also about being confident with the system you are engaging. If you're not confident you're not even going to try it to start with. Once people try it and it seems to work all right, they'll tend to use it.

Mr VALENTINE - With the dispersion of the university now from Sandy Bay back into the CBD, that brings problems and issues of its own. So you see perhaps ferry travel being able to assist in that regard? I don't know how many students of yours would come from the eastern shore to the university every day - do you have a handle on that?

Dr LYTH - We didn't have data on that, so there is a lack of data and that is one thing we will probably know about in the middle of next year at the latest. We will get a better handle on all those questions about who is going where and coming from where. In terms of where they reside, there is quite a reasonable size pool of staff and students living on the eastern shore and generally a lot of them would just jump into their car because of the number of buses they would have to take. There are a number of people at the university and there is a fair bit of interest in the fact that we already have the Wrest Point Casino wharf there.

I looked at the ferry costing report that was done in 2009, and the university was mentioned as a possible destination but then it was undermined in terms of there being a market for a ferry because they just look at the catchment area as being residents of that Sandy Bay casino area and not it being the destination. They haven't really picked the market there. They have also said it's not really going to work because it will compete with a bus because the buses are really frequent from Sandy Bay to the CBD. That is not the point, really. The market isn't that market; the market is the eastern shore to the Sandy Bay casino perhaps in a triangle via the city or something like that. I would say that if the ferry solution is being discussed then the university would like to be involved. I know they are officially coming to talk to you next week, so I am not really a representative of the university, but certainly engaging with Corey Peterson, the sustainability manager, in any discussion would be useful and we'd be willing to provide any information we had in that regard.

Mr VALENTINE - You may not be able to give me any student detail but you might be able to give me the staff detail. Is it mostly equally north and south of the bridge?

FILE 29Mr VALENTINE - equally north and south with the bridge?

Dr LYTH - A lot of staff live within the very inner 2.5 kilometres - a couple of suburbs - around the campus. We get quite a number living in the Kingston corridor.

Mr VALENTINE - I meant the eastern shore.

Dr LYTH - Then there is the eastern shore and the lower northern suburbs. That is in terms of staff; students are a little more dispersed.

Mr VALENTINE - Are the staff from the eastern shore spread-out significantly?

Dr LYTH - I don't have the map in front of me, but it is mapped out in our report. It is focused on suburbs by postcodes.

CHAIR - You would get a spread between Bellerive, Lindisfarne and Geilston Bay?

Dr LYTH - Yes, you're mostly talking about Lindisfarne, Bellerive and a bit south of that.

Mr VALENTINE - It wouldn't be as far out as Sorell?

Dr LYTH - There are some students who live out there and who have some troubles with the buses. They can't come to a lesson because they have to leave to catch a bus or get a lift with somebody. There are a significant number of students out in those areas, but in terms of the core corridors and zones of where students and staff live, they are very reflective of what DIER would map in terms of public transport demand.

CHAIR - Would you be willing to table that information for us?

Dr LYTH - Yes. It's all available on the website and I can provide you with the link. I believe someone from UTAS is coming next week.

CHAIR - If we had it already, we'd be in front.

Dr GOODWIN - There would be students who decide to move to Sandy Bay so they're close to the university. There used to be a reasonable amount of university accommodation, but I'm not sure about these days.

Dr LYTH - At times that can be challenging. There are students who have said they would rather have not moved if they could get in to the university in other ways.

CHAIR - Thank you very much. You have brought up a couple of issues that we haven't looked at.

Dr LYTH - A core issue is looking at the scale of the challenges and the fact that society has a multitude of different behaviours and you need to remember that when planning for transport.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

**Mr DEREK JONES, CHAIRMAN, AND Mr JOHN HENRY LAWRENCE KINGSTON,
DERWENT VALLEY RAILWAY, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY
DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.**

CHAIR (Mrs Taylor) - Thank you very much. Welcome to the public hearings of this committee. All the evidence that is taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege but I have to remind you that anything you say outside this meeting may not be protected by parliamentary privilege.

Have you received and read the information for witnesses? We would have sent it to you with the invitation.

Mr JONES - I have read it.

CHAIR - The evidence you present is being recorded and the *Hansard* version will be published on the committee website when it becomes available. You will be able to read back what you said and what we all said and questions we asked you. Would you like to start by advising us of your field of interest and expertise?

Mr JONES - The Derwent Valley Railway is a heritage tourist railway. Traditionally, it has brought trains to the Derwent Valley from Hobart and from the Museum through the existing lines. It was, until a few years ago, a successful and profitable organisation that created employment in the valley and carried a lot of passengers to the valley. It was put off the line a few years ago by the then operators, Pacific National's subsidiary Asciano. Since then it has been in a period of hibernation but working strongly on restoration and renovation of all equipment and continuing training.

Just prior to it being put off the line, which was to do with Pacific National's opinion of the line with the state government, the Derwent Valley Railway had achieved the accreditation to bring passengers from cruise ships to the National Park which was only a few weeks away when we were put off the line. That was before my time of being a member of the railway, so I am only reporting those points.

We want to achieve a to return to the line and, in preparing information for this hearing, I have been looking extensively at how New Zealand handles the cruise ship market. This is very important to Hobart and is expanding and we are very strongly in favour of retaining the line to carry passengers to places like National Park.

CHAIR - Would you be looking at from New Norfolk or from Hobart?

Mr JONES - From Hobart if the line is exists. It is an ideal situation to carry rail traffic through to National Park.

There is another project which I think is important in this context of bringing cruise other passengers direct from the city. At the moment we're quite a long way along the line of

working on a new development at Redlands in the Derwent Valley, which is an adjacent property to the Salmon Ponds. The two properties are connected by an old right of way. We have had discussions with the owners of the Salmon Ponds and the developers of Redlands. Redlands is doing a tremendous development towards interstate and international tourists. I feel that instead of the Derwent Valley Railway being something that runs rail for the sake of running rail, we are setting ourselves up and working with the others as part of a major destination in itself. To go from the cruise ships, through the rail link - where MONA stands - and up the valley to transport passengers to Plenty station where they would be transported by conventional or period vintage transport to the Redlands development.

Redlands is developing, with Lark Distillery, a whisky still. The copper for the still has been brought from Germany already. I was talking to the developer of Redlands this morning on my way here and the still is well into manufacture. The product will be labelled and marketed as Redlands whisky. We all know Tasmanian whisky is leaping ahead in world markets and world interest. Redlands has the oldest bakery still in existence in Australia. The barley for the whisky is already in storage. The contract is with the Callington Mill for the grinding of flour. We are looking at being part of not a single tourist attraction for cruise passengers and the like from the city but part of the destination in itself, which can include all these aspects.

A couple of weeks ago there was a preliminary opening at Redlands and the Conservatorium of Music has offered - and it has been accepted - to supply young talent for weekly, fortnightly or monthly concerts. The director of the conservatorium was at that opening where we ate a meal from the ovens of the bakery, for the first time in many years. It was a pizza, but it was the first meal. The conservatorium has also offered the Derwent Valley Railway to put music on board trains coming from Hobart. That would be jazz and blues. The interesting thing about the conservatorium's arrangement with primarily Redlands, but secondarily the Derwent Valley Railway, is that it is constantly changing music. You have the broad aspect of the conservatorium, where supplying blues, jazz, quartets - so there is a changing variety. If you have a train running from Hobart to somewhere and comes back again, people don't go on it time and time again, but with this constantly changing aspect it is much more interesting as being part of a tourist destination linked with Hobart.

The newly-formed Destination Southern Tasmania and the new CEO, Ben Targett, became extremely interested in this development as being something new for southern Tasmania. They are excited about it and there is a lot of excitement in the valley about other attractions to the valley. The valley is also keen to continue this link with the city to bring people in. The valley is to a great extent a group of self-starters. This weekend the Tiger Trail Festival is an example of that. I sit on that committee and we have put in a lot of work to get people up there, tied in with 'Back to Maydena' which is also on. A lot of operators in the valley do not sit around and wait for handouts; they do something. If we have this railway link to the city tied in with other things we can do something of value and magnitude that is not simply a trip on a train.

CHAIR - Thank you. Do you know what the grounds were for the operators of the railway line not allowing you to use the line anymore?

Mr KINGSTON - Essentially it was because of the track condition.

CHAIR - They were not prepared to do the maintenance?

Mr KINGSTON - They had a lot of their own trains falling off the track and they did not want passenger trains falling off.

Mr JONES - It was an insurance liability.

CHAIR - You have had discussion no doubt with TasRail, as I know TTMS has, and it is very difficult to get to the issue of how much public liability you would have to pay and where would that come from and the maintenance of the track. They have clearly said that their remit is for freight and even once the Hobart to Bridgewater line is no longer used for freight after the Brighton hub comes in to operation, they will not be responsible for maintenance of the track. That is an issue with you are well? Where are you going to find the maintenance money for the track?

Mr KINGSTON - It will be an issue not only for us but also for other operators such as a light rail - which is a possibility. I think TasRail is a bit short-sighted in that, while it has no current use for the line, who knows what is going to happen in the future? I think it would be very remiss of anybody to remove that rail corridor.

CHAIR - I do not think that anybody is talking about the removal of the corridor, more about maintenance of the line.

Mr JONES - Derwent Valley Railway has previously maintained and built track itself. We have track-laying sleeper-changing vehicles, where crews are trained. As we are approaching this Plenty project I, as chair, have asked one of our track and rail heads to take a crew and retrain them and bring them up to speed on the track-laying equipment. We have our ballast wagons and our own work trains and we are keeping our accreditation for drivers and track-awareness up to TasRail standards. The loop at Plenty and the loop at National Park were built by Derwent Valley Railway and maintained through all those years and for the last 18 years the only trains to run on that, apart from the maintenance vehicles, have been Derwent Valley Railway and they have maintained standards on that track. This new project and the potential link with cruise ships has created quite a lot of excitement in the valley so much so that the Derwent Valley Council has looked at trying to facilitate our insurance problems as far as they can with their brokers. There are a couple of other people looking at those areas to assist us to get insurance on the line under a different regime from TasRail's.

This was part of the thing with Pacific National and this state of the line. We run light vehicles at 25 km/h. Pacific National's standard was for heavy freight which is probably 60 to 70 km/h. The line was not equipped to take the heavy loaded trucks of Pacific National. A lot of lines are maintained for low weight, low speed lines and there is those parts of Australia there is a completely different regime of quality.

CHAIR - What is holding you up from being able to run the service?

Mr JONES - Permission from TasRail. Although they have expressed that they may consider looking at some areas regarding the lease. All track is held and owned by the crown, leased to DIER who sublease to the operator, TasRail. If we can get some adjustment of that to start movement, we need to have another. Those conversations are being carried on.

Mr FARRELL - My understanding is, as far as this walk-to-wilderness rail experience goes, you could not maintain the Hobart section. They think I have a conflict of interest here, which I clearly do not.

Mr MULDER - What is this walk-to-wilderness stuff you are talking about?

Mr FARRELL - That was always the marketing. I am familiar with what the railway has been trying to do in the past. But the railway would not have the resources to maintain the section of line from Hobart to Bridgewater, so another use for that line would be fairly important for the Derwent Valley Railway.

Mr KINGSTON - I think that would be the only way it would be feasible, really. Another thing with the insurance is that most insurers look upon insurance of railways on a global basis, whereas we are a small operation. If we could get some system whereby we paid the insurance per customer mile or something like that, that would be a lot better.

Mr FARRELL - What do they do in New Zealand that is different?

Mr JONES - The railway is a destination itself. The railway to a destination, a ski service by rail. Cruise ships can take passengers from Dunedin. There are passenger services across from Dunedin to Christchurch and Auckland to Wellington. There are still passenger services running there and a lot of other small ones. Interlaced with them is the Taieri Gorge which is tied in with many destinations. Once you get there it is similar to what we want to achieve - not a railway running for the sake of a railway running, but a railway running for the sake of a greater tourist attraction that can feed from the cities in New Zealand, Dunedin or Christchurch.

CHAIR - Not just a rail trip.

Mr JONES - Not just a rail trip, but it is all aspects.

Mr KINGSTON - As Derek said, with cruise passengers, we had ventured into that area, but then we were stopped. I think it could be a lucrative area for tourist operators of all sorts. With the new terminal being built, if the railway line was to survive and into that area, passengers would only have a couple of hundred yards or so to walk to get a train.

Dr GOODWIN - What are the latest figures on projected cruise ship visits?

Mr KINGSTON - I am involved as a volunteer with the cruise ships. I think this year there are something like 35 visits and I think that is set to increase because Hobart is becoming increasingly attractive to this area.

Dr GOODWIN - And the more attractions it has the more attractive it becomes too.

Mr KINGSTON - Yes. In fact I think one of their criteria in choosing a port is the amount of attractions that are available for passengers at that particular destination.

Dr GOODWIN - They have to be day attractions because they are only here for a day.

Mr VALENTINE - The passengers actually vote. They have built it up over the years because the passengers say, 'We think that was a good destination'. They actually vote and that gives the company information about what is worth doing.

CHAIR - Some of those cruise ships are quite big.

Mr KINGSTON - They are. Some will have 4 000 passengers.

CHAIR - So you need a lot of attractions to get a lot of people out there.

Mr KINGSTON - I believe, but I cannot be certain on this, that one cruise ship company left Hobart off their list for that very reason - that they did not have sufficient, in their opinion, attractions for the passenger.

Dr GOODWIN - The great thing about cruise ships is that they bring in all those people and then all those people go back home and talk about all the wonderful places they have been and you get free advertising.

CHAIR - You might not get them coming on cruises, but visits in other ways.

Dr GOODWIN - Then you have a high level of repeat visitation anyway.

Mr VALENTINE - They might come back and stay in normal accommodation.

Mr MULDER - Just picking up on that cruise ship thing, given the speeds you are talking about, do you have time from the time the boat lands to run them up to the distillery and back again?

Mr FARRELL - The speed through Hobart suburbs was faster than 25 km/h; the slower section was from New Norfolk up on the disused section, so it did fit within the time frame.

CHAIR - But there wasn't a distillery then. That is going to take longer now.

Mr KINGSTON - We would be hoping that they could increase the track speeds above 25 km/h because that was a limit set by TasRail at that time because of the perceived condition of the track.

Mr JONES - As Craig was saying about having other users of the track, of course it will continue to be Boyer, especially with the new finance to go into catalogue paper, which gives it another extension of life, probably quite a long one, so that track is used as a high speed track. That is virtually on the door of New Norfolk, so from the city to the Bridgewater Bridge and to Boyer is in fact a high-speed track and then the lower speed track, which is only 15 kilometres from New Norfolk. I think it is 13 kilometres from New Norfolk to Plenty and that bit there. The rest of the track is kept to a very high standard.

Mr MULDER - You said there had to be other users on the line. Are you talking about the Boyer leg of the line, because the rest of it would just be the tourist trains? You are not envisaging Boyer bringing logs down the line.

Mr JONES - No. However, if there were another urban or suburban use, like the example of the Fremantle line which was about to be pulled up and is now an extremely successful suburban railway. It triggered the building of the northern line, which triggered an incredible expansion and formation of hubs of population on that line, so that came right to death's door. Then with saving the Fremantle line it extended.

Mr MULDER - So the stuff from Boyer to Plenty is okay as it is. You do not need to spend major amounts of money because you will only be operating lightweight and slower speeds.

Mr JONES - There is some money to be spent on it obviously and we have taken an estimate, and from information available there are 1 100 sleepers needed for that section. We are on TasRail's books to receive the next tranche of sleepers from changeover to concrete sleepers and they have already put us on the books for that. We have our own equipment to put those sleepers in, and our training, so there is money to be spent. The other day, with a couple of the other operators in this group of operators, I was pleased to say that we walked out of the meeting with \$20 000 donated to that effort alone. We can therefore get dollar-for-dollar possibility of grant money to take a substantial chunk of that money that is needed.

CHAIR - TasRail will give you the sleepers for free?

Mr JONES - Yes, they usually do. They are in good nick for our purpose.

Mr VALENTINE - Concrete ones are they?

Mr JONES - No, they are putting in the concrete and giving us the steel ones.

Mr VALENTINE - With further Norske Skog contracts, they have still to get their logs from somewhere. Are they going to need that line? They might use that line if the logs are from the Huon Valley. Is it a possibility?

Mr KINGSTON - That is a strong possibility but nothing has been said about it at this time that I am aware of.

Mr VALENTINE - That would solve all your issues, you would think.

Mr MULDER - I think one of the problems is that you have to load the log onto a truck and unload it and put on the rail and then unload it off the rail, so you are adding all those expensive movements.

Mr VALENTINE - No, but they have special trucks.

Mr JONES - In fact we saw them in the yards recently at meetings where they are doing a cradle which is loaded in the bush, or in the plantation, goes on the truck onto the train and it never needs to reload. They have developed this cradle now.

Mr MULDER - I guess there is hopefully an upgrade of the track if that should happen. Since this is really designed to suit some private enterprise, what sort of money do you expect to get from private enterprise, or are your lovely volunteers and committed enthusiasts going to be propping up a business?

Mr JONES - Whether we can be self-sufficient without government funding?

Mr MULDER - Yes, and further that you have development going up -

CHAIR - Will local operators help to support it financially?

Mr MULDER - I guess I draw the parallel with the Abt Wilderness Railway between Strahan and Queenstown and the fact that that is basically private money servicing a private enterprise, although I appreciate there was some government money involved in rescuing the thing. I do not have any trouble with government buying infrastructure but I do have some concerns about taxpayers underwriting the method of getting punters to a commercial venture.

Mr KINGSTON - Yes, however if that was to happen it would not be entirely for their benefit. For instance we run trips to Ross on Mothers Day and those sort of things as well as other trips that we might run.

Mr JONES - I have approach TasRail with the outline of the project we are trying to put together now. The line is maintained by law with weed clearing and fire access and it has been maintained for 18 years with taxpayers money but nothing apart from that. We run it and we have put a lot of work into it.

CHAIR - And the level crossings as well.

Mr JONES - Yes, but the thing is that track maintenance is mandatory and we have requested, instead of giving us a handout, to give us their contract. We can maintain it at a lesser level.

We have the equipment. We have the vested interest in the line and if we can receive an income, that alleviates the request for funding. My personal philosophy is that if someone can give us a job to create that asset or to maintain that asset, that alleviates handouts. That is where I would rather be. The Derwent Valley Railway was self-sufficient when it was running before. Running to Ross, that trip alone on Mothers Day gave \$3 000 profit. That's why it employed people full-time.

CHAIR - We were talking about Boyer and the fact that that line is maintained, so I presume Boyer will end up going to the Brighton hub as well?

Mr JONES - No, they would unload straight into their chipper.

CHAIR - At the Hobart port?

Mr JONES - No, at their branch line, in their yards.

CHAIR - Yes, but the other end?

Mr JONES - They go straight through to Burnie.

CHAIR - So they don't currently use the Hobart to Bridgewater line?

Mr KINGSTON - No, Boyer to Bridgewater. They load paper directly at the mill and it goes straight to Burnie every day.

Mr JONES - The containers for the chemicals and the process come in and then they're back-loaded with the paper going out.

CHAIR - The other issue is the Bridgewater Bridge, which you mentioned in your submission, and the need to maintain the rail access across there, otherwise you can't take people from the port.

Mr VALENTINE - Where do the chemicals come from?

Mr JONES - I'm not sure; I assume overseas.

Mr KINGSTON - It comes from Burnie. Our understanding is the Bridgewater Bridge is heritage listed and would need to be maintained anyway. Whatever happens to the rail line is another thing but the bridge is secure, I think.

CHAIR - Not necessarily with a lifting span, though.

Mr KINGSTON - I think so. If tourist boats are going up to New Norfolk they will need the lifting span operating.

Dr GOODWIN - We had some evidence about having it permanently in the lift position.

Mr KINGSTON - It wouldn't help a lot.

CHAIR - That's the problem. You can maintain it as a heritage thing to have the span permanently up, which would then mean -

Mr VALENTINE - In terms of your whole operation, how many trips a year would you be talking about using that line from, say, Hobart? I suppose you have the cruise ships, maybe up to 50 in years to come.

Mr KINGSTON - Whether we would be involved in all those cruise ships is another thing. As well as the cruise ships, we have other trips as well to national parks, which is another destination.

Mr VALENTINE - From which location?

Mr KINGSTON - From Hobart and New Norfolk.

Mr VALENTINE - From the regatta grounds?

Mr KINGSTON - Yes.

Dr GOODWIN - You could have other charter opportunities. I think you mentioned hotel chains, corporate events, conventions and the like. That could be an option, I suppose.

Mr JONES - Yes. The largest passenger train every to run in Tasmania was the Hash House Harriers.

Laughter.

Mr JONES - When Redlands starts its fortnightly or monthly changeable music, with various festivals and things and especially with major events such as Ten Days on the Island or the Festival of the Voices, which would be including them. If that becomes a regular fortnightly thing, it is an attraction better than a museum where you'd probably go once a year.

CHAIR - You are entirely volunteers at the moment, aren't you?

Mr JONES - Yes.

Mr VALENTINE - That's what I am getting at, it's not just the odd trip here and there. It is quite a significant use of that line, if the line could be -

Mr KINGSTON - It used to be.

CHAIR - Are you talking now about just running diesel or are you still talking about steam trains?

Mr KINGSTON - No, I am hopeful of running steam again.

Mr VALENTINE - From Hunter Street, I reckon. That would be excellent.

Mr JONES - The museum does have active steam at the moment. Ours has not been finished in its restoration because to do the steam testing is like registering a car. If you have nowhere to drive it we are just wasting money so until we have somewhere to run it we will not finish the steam testing, although it is ready to go. That means that between the museum and New Norfolk there is usage for transfer of vehicles and traction. If we are using steam, as we have in the past, it has come from using that Glenorchy to New Norfolk run and back to the Botanical Gardens and regatta ground.

Mr MULDER - What fires the steam?

Mr JONES - Coal.

Mr MULDER - Regarding the integrated transport bit, sure this is a branch line, but I think its underlying importance is not surrendering the Granton bridge.

CHAIR - Absolutely, and the issue of what happens to the railway lines once they are no longer used for freight and addressing the issue of how other users can use the line when it is just on a maintenance basis for TasRail. The solution that you have suggested about possibly subleasing a section of the line from DIER, rather than it being subleased to TasRail, might be a possibility.

Mr JONES - That suggestion came from TasRail in a conversation.

CHAIR - You have not got it in writing that they have offered to sublease it to you.

Mr JONES - No, we have not got it nailed down.

Mr VALENTINE - But what a way to get the Derwent Valley into focus in terms of tourism.

Mr FARRELL - When Tony made his comment about the value of the line, it might be seen by DIER as a liability and something that costs, but it is seen as an opportunity by tourism. That goes back to what other people said in their evidence about the social implications and all the other things that are not fully costed into these things.

Dr GOODWIN - You cannot take a silos approach to this; you have to have a cross-agency look at it.

Mr KINGSTON - If the rail line is to be retained and maintained I think that consultation should be done with interested parties - like ourselves, Don River Railway and the Transport Museum - as to what facilities are required. I do not think that TasRail could tell you for a start because they do not know much about passengers. Somebody in an office might design

a terminal that is totally inappropriate or unusable. I think it is important that the end-users have some input at least into the final design of the terminal.

Mr MULDER - I would not dispute that but the CEO of TasRail did point out that he ran Connex in Melbourne at one stage, so I would not say that he was not without experience of passenger lines. I am not too sure that it is matched by enthusiasm of passenger lines.

Mr KINGSTON - That is true.

Mr VALENTINE - He might not have personally been involved in the design of the terminals.

Mr JONES - The only other thing from these more recent conversations is the excitement that has spread through the valley. So many other people are trying to get this project together. It's very encouraging.

CHAIR - Thank you both very much for coming in.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

Mr JEMERY DAY, CSIRO BICYCLE USERS GROUP, WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR (Mrs Taylor) - Thank you and welcome. Thank you so much for coming. It is nice to have bicycle users for integrated transport, your input is very important. Welcome to these public hearings. All the evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege, but I have to remind you that any comments you make outside of the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. Have you received and read the information for witnesses we would have sent you?

Mr DAY - Yes, I have.

CHAIR - Thank you. The evidence you give is being recorded and the *Hansard* version will be published on the committee website as soon as it becomes available. Could you please advise the committee of your field of interest and expertise?

Mr DAY - I'm here today representing the CSIRO Bicycle Users Group. BUG is a term that has been used throughout the country.

CHAIR - There are lots of BUGs aren't there.

Mr DAY - There are lots of BUGs. It is a local-scale group that is interested in promoting bicycle usage for, in this case, employees of CSIRO located at Battery Point.

CHAIR - Just the Battery Point one?

Mr DAY - There is also a site in Sandy Bay but, no, we cover just the Battery Point site.

CHAIR - What did you want us to take away from your submission?

Mr DAY - Some of the decisions that people like you make can be long-lasting decisions that can have big impacts on people for a number of years. There are about 450 staff members at CSIRO in Battery Point. Quite a number of those people cycle to work from all over Hobart - from the eastern shore, from the north, from the south - and there are a number of facilities that cyclists use that have impacts on their life.

Some people used to come across on the ferry when it used to take bikes. Some people ride across the bridge. The bridge is one particular piece of infrastructure that I would like to emphasise to this committee has had an impact for generations. The bridge is, I think, an embarrassment in terms of its cycle facilities and that legacy has lasted since it was built and is going to last for a very long time. It is a very poor facility. I do not know if any of you have ridden your bike across that bridge.

Dr GOODWIN - I am too frightened to ride across.

Mr MULDER - I am nearly too frightened to walk across for the number of bells or non-bells that I get from people trying to run me over on their bicycles.

Mr DAY - Design decisions made some time ago for that bridge have had long-lasting implications. It means that if you cycle to work from the other side of the river, it is really difficult. It is a big impediment. Some people do cycle in spite of that bridge, but there are some people who won't cycle because of that bridge. I guess there is infrastructure in all sorts of other ways too. There is, of course, the intercity cycleway, which is fantastic. A lot of our staff use that and think it is fantastic. There are some little things like people coming from the south on their bikes. There is Napoleon Street. I am not sure if any of you have ridden your bikes up Napoleon Street.

CHAIR - It's a bit steep.

Mr DAY - There has been a lot of talk for years about having a walkway or cycleway going around the Battery Point foreshore. It has been talked about for a long time and it is a very difficult issue to resolve but it is one that would make a big difference to people who want to walk to work or cycle to work.

CHAIR - You would have thought it would have been easier in 1910 to do it than now.

Mr VALENTINE - Back then I think it was more about the slipways and things being an issue and a problem.

Mr DAY - We do have issues at the site with car parking. When I first started working at the labs there weren't really big issues with car parking. There were empty car parking spaces on the site every day. These days if you get to work late in your car you are fighting for a car park. Staff numbers are increasing; there is the IMAS development right next door, pressures on car parking are going to increase. There are all sorts of really good reasons to encourage people to seek active ways to get to work, either walking or cycling, in terms of health benefits and happier workforces. The Bicycle User Group would like to see people encouraged to walk and cycle to work, and have a more active lifestyle to be happier and healthier and encouraged to do that through the provision of facilities on site, meaning having bike parking facilities on site. We have been lobbying internally within CSIRO for that.

CHAIR - Have you got decent bicycle parking facilities and shower facilities and things?

Mr DAY - We have some. They could be better. There are really good shower and change facilities for the men.

Mr VALENTINE - Nothing for women?

Mr DAY - Not quite nothing. They are not quite so good. It is a bit like the legacy of the Tasman Bridge. The building that I am in at the moment used to be a workshop building, so it was largely inhabited by men. When the site was first set up there was a male change

room and locker room with three showers. There are single showers dotted around the site as well which are unisex showers, but the facilities are not as good for women as they are for men. It is difficult to tear down a bridge and build a new one and it's difficult to tear down a locker room and put up a new one. It costs money, so that's a legacy we have on our site. There are all sorts of these legacies around the city.

CHAIR - Bike parking shouldn't be an expensive issue to resolve, should it?

Mr DAY - It's remarkably difficult, though. When I first arrived there was no covered bike parking. There were bike rails outside and there are now three lockable sheds where you can store bicycles. One of those sheds has been full to overflowing for some years and we've been lobbying to have it made bigger for some time. It is a slow process. I guess all of you are aware of how slow lobbying can be sometimes and how long it takes to get your message through to get things to change.

Dr GOODWIN - Some bikes cost a significant amount of money and you don't want to just park them anywhere because they can be stolen or damaged.

CHAIR - And bits taken off.

Mr DAY - Yes, your speedo, lights, pump, toolkit. People used to often park their bikes in offices on site, but OH&S has jumped on that and said you cannot do it; you have to park your bike outside. I think it is great to have a bicycle user group that is active on site, that interacts with management, lobbies for facilities and gets involved in those kinds of issues. It would be nice to have integrated layers, from provision of facilities onwards. For that particular site there is nothing to be gained by having more facilities in Launceston and Burnie. Some people ride from Kingston, on Sandy Bay Road, and people coming down the intercity cycleway. Some people come across from the western shore and from Huon Road and Ferntree. People come from all sorts of places on bikes and it would be great to have active encouragement for more of that to happen.

Dr GOODWIN - Do you have any members using electric bikes?

Mr DAY - I don't know that there are any on site yet but I wouldn't be surprised if it happens soon. I know with the IMAS building next door there will be electric bikes available there for staff to use to get from campus to campus, from Battery Point across to Sandy Bay.

Mr MULDER - There's a shop out at Derwent Park selling electric bikes. I hear they are doing alright, so it won't be long.

Mr DAY - Linkages, too. The linkage from the intercity cycleway to CSIRO is not too bad but there are a few areas where it could be better. Coming past Princes Wharf it gets a bit tight near the end of the cycleway when you get onto the footpath along near Constitution Dock. Then it runs out and comes out to a traffic light and there's no easy way for bikes to get onto the road there. Linking that around Battery Point through to the university, through to Sandy Bay and Taroona, would be fantastic as well.

CHAIR - That would be something I imagine the Hobart council is working on, is it not?

Mr VALENTINE - They are.

Mr DAY - Some of those things are difficult, I know; it can take a long time.

CHAIR - How big is your group?

Mr DAY - We have approximately 80 members. There is a ride-to-work day every year in October. CSIRO has categories for different sized work forces - small, medium, large - and we regularly have the highest participation in our category, which I think is the largest of those. We don't win it every year, but we often do. There are people who cycle at lunchtime for sport. There are people who have a bike and store them in their sheds and we use them at lunchtime to go into town or to do short trips. It is a multi-use transport option. Some people drive their cars to Kingston, park and then ride their bikes to work. I know of someone who lives in Oyster Cove who does that. He and his partner both cycle over Bonnet Hill and come through Taroona.

Mr MULDER - It seems as though the only solution to the bridge is to put ferries back on so that you can cross.

Mr DAY - There are all sorts of solutions. You could be imaginative. One solution I could think of which I do not think would be very popular with anyone would be to take away one lane of motorised car traffic. If it was four lanes rather than five, there would be ample room on the bridge for a bicycle lane on either side.

Mr MULDER - We will not worry too much about the motorists or the people on buses, then, will we?

Mr DAY - When it was first built I understand there were four lanes on that bridge and they squeezed in an extra one at the expense of cyclists. You might want to laugh at that and dismiss it, but I think when it was first built that is what it was. Sure, traffic volumes have increased since then, but what is the alternative?

Mr VALENTINE - Put a lane underneath.

Mr DAY - There are lots of solutions.

Mr MULDER - Allow those who are comfortable to use the other thing but give them a ferry ride option; that is what I am suggesting to you.

Mr DAY - A ferry could be good but, again, there would limited services. I know some people did use the ferry when it was operating. There was a colleague of mine who used that regularly when coming to CSIRO, but that ferry shut down. I do not know whether there were two in the morning and two in afternoon or one in the morning and one in the

afternoon. It was not very flexible. If you want to encourage people to use alternatives, public transport, cycling and walking, you have to, in some ways, make it easy for them. That is the argument I make to the management at CSIRO all the time saying that if you want to encourage people to cycle to work, then provide world-class facilities. If you have showers, lockers, secure facilities to park your bike, then people are much more likely to cycle to work than if they have to lock their bike up against a pole outside and come to work in their smelly cycling clothes.

Mr FARRELL - I do not know if you have had any input into future bridge planning as far as the bridge at Bridgewater, the replacement bridge there, goes. Do you get any input into it?

Mr DAY - Not directly and in some ways that is probably a bit outside the sphere of influence for the CSIRO-BUG. We do not have any members that I know of who live at Bridgewater and cycle to work from there. There are probably people who are in our group who would be interested in that issue but I think it is probably outside our remit a little bit. I am not familiar with the plans for that new bridge.

Mr FARRELL - This topic of lack of integration has come up a number of times. If it were easier for cyclists to integrate with public transport, do you think there would be more use?

Mr DAY - Sure. I would like to say that cyclists are a bit like the Liberal Party; they are a broad church.

Mr MULDER - Is that from your experience or from your selective reading in the media?

Mr DAY - From my experience. My experience with cyclists is greater than my experience with the Liberal Party. There is a wide range of cyclists who cycle for a wide range of reasons. There are sports cyclists, recreational cyclists, families who cycle and casual cyclists and each of those groups of cyclists, and there are probably many more groups as well, have their own particular requirements and their own needs. For some people, being able to integrate with public transport would be fantastic. For other people who are gung-ho cyclists who will ride every day, they could not care less. For families with kids, maybe it is not going to work, but for some section of the cycling commuting population, that would be fantastic. People who might want to live at Fern Tree could cycle to work in the morning, but to ride back up that hill might be too much. That could make a big difference, even for people who do not want to go over Bonnet Hill to get down to Kingston. I know there are difficulties with integrating with public transport as well in terms of putting bikes on buses and capacity and all those issues. There is no real rail network to speak of here as well and integration of bicycles with trains is very good in a lot of places in the world. All those little things can add up and they will not necessarily appeal to all cyclists but they will appeal to some.

Dr GOODWIN - Your BUG, by the sound of it, are pretty dedicated users, since you do not find too much drop-off in winter. Is that a fair assessment?

Mr DAY - I guess I would go back to my previous comment and say that we are broad church. There are some cyclists who ride all through the year and there are some who will drop off, but a lot of them will keep going. We have found that ride-to-work day is a great thing to have because it gives people that added incentive to have a go and try it.

CHAIR - And breakfast!

Mr DAY - And breakfast. You have a few incentives like that so people will come along and try it and often they will find that it is not so bad. They get to work and they have had some exercise, they have breathed some fresh air and they feel quite good so they will try it again next week. Some of those people keep riding. Some of them will then keep riding throughout the year.

Dr GOODWIN - Do you have some who ride in together?

Mr DAY - That is uncommon although it is something that we have talked about as a BUG, offering that service if people are not feeling comfortable about riding to work. That is one of the nice things about ride-to-work day; there is the issue of there being a few more bikes on the road and feeling a bit more secure about doing it. For most people I find that if they are going to keep riding then being helped once or twice can be sufficient, but to actually organise to ride with someone else is difficult. I ride to work often and sometimes I meet up with someone along the way but I do not usually arrange it. Sometimes you might meet up with someone and you ride with them a little while, talk to them a bit and then you ride on because you are riding at different speeds. If you have too big a group you block up the road as well.

CHAIR - Most of our urban motorists are much less happy if there are two riders abreast because it means that they cannot scoot past you.

Mr DAY - It is only advising on routes that we are happy to provide to potential BUG members who want to try cycling to work. There is a lot of expertise within the group, and people who cycle from all different points of the compass. No-one from the Derwent itself but all the land masses around Hobart.

CHAIR - Obviously being able to ride safely on the road is a matter of concern for a large number of people who are not experienced bike riders, so how are you finding the changes that have been made within the Hobart CBD, like along Argyle Street?

Mr DAY - I think they are a great start but I think they are only a start. It is fantastic to have some of those things happening and I see them as being the bare bones of a skeleton and once that skeleton is fleshed-out a few more things will come together. People are very critical of that and say they are bike paths to nowhere but I think what a lot of people do not realise is that they are part of a bigger network and once it is connected up it will be something that will be much more significant. I think it is a fantastic start. I think that Hobart is a long way behind a lot of the capital cities throughout Australia. If you go to Adelaide, Melbourne or Canberra -

Mr VALENTINE - Canberra especially.

Mr DAY - Sydney is also spending a lot of money on bikes paths; Clover Moore just got re-elected, despite her controversial bike paths. If you look at a lot of mainland capital cities their infrastructure is a lot more advanced than Hobart. In some ways that gives us an opportunity to learn from the mistakes that have been made in other places and to get things right, so perhaps that is an advantage.

CHAIR - Partly to do with the width of our streets, too, I would think.

Mr DAY - There are geographical constraints indeed. It is only somewhere like Adelaide where it is pretty flat and the roads are quite wide and it is a lot easier to deal with. But there are solutions to pretty much all the problems you might come up against. The Sandy Bay cycleway has been talked about for a long time through council. It is still being talked about and still being tossed and turned. If that was implemented it would make a huge difference for those people who want to try cycling and are not confident.

CHAIR - They are talking there about a separated bike lane.

Mr DAY - There is all sorts of talk there.

Mr MULDER - Which model do you want to see implemented?

Mr DAY - I think the Copenhagen plan would be fantastic. The most recent model that has been put up is a botch job. I think it is a disaster because I see that as pushing the cycleway, making a glorified footpath a little bit wider than normal. You have cars parking opening their doors into the cycleway and into the bikes on the road as well. So you can park your car and get a bike with a door on either side.

Mr VALENTINE - Nothing worse than running into a door.

CHAIR - There have been a number of occasions when people do it deliberately.

Mr DAY - It is a danger. With the revised plan they are going to have cars parked right next to that so-called bike path and there will be bikes on the other side. The original plan, the Copenhagen-style plan, would have got rid of a lot of car parking and would have changed the very nature of the street and would have changed the atmosphere. It would be a place where people would go to and socialise in more. There was talk about putting in roundabouts, which would also address a lot of the other transport issues - cars turning right or left into Sandy Bay Road and that had difficulty, cars doing U-turns after dropping their kids at the school. I see that plan as being much bigger than a cycle and pedestrian facility. It was also a transformational plan to transform the whole nature of the roadway. I would like to see that get back up again, but I don't know if it will or not. For the sorts of people that we like to target in some ways, which is people who are new to cycling, that is the kind of facility that is much more likely to get them out cycling.

Dr GOODWIN - It is an important connector too, Sandy Bay Road, when you think about Kingston and the university, the city and all of those things.

Mr DAY - Indeed.

Mr MULDER - It is an important connector road and this is the problem for cars as well as cyclists.

Mr DAY - At the moment it is just being used as a car park. There are great big slabs of cars that are parked on the side of the road there with 'for sale' stickers on them.

CHAIR - Really?

Mr DAY - Yes, it is a well-known spot there. Council put signs up at some stage saying you can't do that on one side of the road, so they all moved to the other side of the road.

Mr VALENTINE - That is right; some people just don't get the message.

Mr DAY - Yes, they don't. In other capital cities clearways are used, and maybe it is not an arterial road like some of the big roads in the other big cities but the right to park your car on an arterial road seems to be sacrosanct in some ways and it seems very difficult to change the culture and change that from happening. That is one of the big objections to the proposed changes on Sandy Bay Road and I think that is a shame. People can park their car around the corner and then walk. It would be much more a place for cafes and for sitting out in. It is a lovely promenade; people walk up and down there all the time, they run up and down there all the time and I think it could be seen as being a destination in itself, and the changes could transform it.

Mr VALENTINE - It is flat and with more activity on the footpaths down there than anywhere else.

Mr DAY - It is scenic as well. You are walking alongside the riverfront, you can go down to the beach and it is a lovely piece of land.

CHAIR - It relates a bit to what Anna Lyth was saying about looking to the future.

Dr GOODWIN - Yes, it becomes more about liveability too and not just purely about commuting from A to B for work; it is about life.

Mr DAY - But also as a recreational facility. You will get families coming out along that path and going along there on weekends and using the cafes down at Lower Sandy Bay or going into the shops at the other end of Sandy Bay. It could be a facility that could get a lot of use.

Mr MULDER - It has been suggested a few times, particularly in relation to Tasman Bridge, to create a transit lane where you can run public transport, such as taxis and buses and possibly

bicycles on a transit lane. Do you see much merit in that and how is that different from just mixing with ordinary traffic?

Mr DAY - I do actually. I have spent a bit of time living in London and when I was in London there were a lot of bus lanes that would allow cycles in them as well, and they work really well. I found that cycling in London was a really good way to get around. It was partly because there was so much traffic on the road that most of the cars weren't moving anywhere and on a bike you could get through really easily, and the fact that it wasn't moving that fast because there was so much of it. You talk about Hobart having difficult geography and layout of streets; London also has some tricky, narrow streets and they have done a lot in terms of providing facilities, providing bike routes. In my experience that worked well in London, so I think that sort of thing could work.

Mr MULDER - I cycled a fair bit in Melbourne and quite often I lived 20 miles out in the eastern suburbs, so it was nice little commute of a morning on a cycle through the busy eastern suburbs. There were two kinds of bicycle ways. There were the ones that the Metropolitan Water Board had put through the parks, which are almost recreational ones unless you happen to live at the end of the recreational ones, but if you just got off the main roads, like Richmond Road, you only had to go one or two streets aside to find that there was a bicycle lane on a suburban street and you would cross over the main road and link up with other ones there. It seems to me that those are opportunities. In our desire to put them down main corridors we are sometimes forgetting that one or two streets aside there is a capacity to run a relatively safe bicycle path by painting some lines on a road that isn't an arterial road but could be used as an arterial cyclist commuter route.

Mr DAY - I think those solutions can be quite good sometimes. I jump back to that same cracked record of cyclists are a broad church. Some people will really like that recreational facility, but some will hate it. I am also familiar with the bike paths in Adelaide -

Mr MULDER - Some motorists don't like driving on roads either but they have to.

Mr DAY - In Adelaide there is a great cycleway along the River Torrens. As a recreational facility, it is fantastic. As a commuting facility, it is not nearly as good because it is slow.

Mr MULDER - In Melbourne they had the two kinds of laneways. Where there was a big arterial road and plenty of room on the side, by all means you had a multi-user pathway with the cyclists running up and down it. That was invariably fed by these suburban streets where you would run through. I think of the issue the Clarence City Council is dabbling with at the moment. The cycling fraternity is insisting that Clarence Street be used and that we take very much the Sandy Bay thing - you take off the parking, put in a dedicated lane et cetera. Right next to it runs South Street which has virtually no traffic on it, nice and wide and tons of room and it links up through the Bellerive village to the track over Riawena Road and onto the bridge or the ferry terminal.

Mr DAY - If I were cycling there, I would be on Clarence Street. For some people safety is the primary consideration and they would be on South Street. If you drive your car will you go the fast way or the slow way when you want to get to work?

I am telling you they are both the same length and they run parallel to each other.

Dr GOODWIN - I always use Clarence Street too.

Mr MULDER - Broad church or not, it needs to be recognised that we don't need to be creating cycle paths on Clarence Street and South Street just to meet different needs. Some of those offsets need to be made.

Mr DAY - Cyclists essentially owned the road well before car drivers did. If you go back to the 1990s, how many cars were on the road and how many bikes?

Mr MULDER - And horse riders had it before them.

Mr DAY - That's right; the road is a public shared facility. There is a perception that the road is for cars and motorists and cyclists don't belong there. I object to that. There are some people, and not everyone in the BUG I am representing here will agree -

Mr MULDER - And we pedestrians preceded horses, so perhaps the rest of the lot of you should bugger off.

Mr DAY - The other option is to share the facility, rather than say it is a facility just for cars or just for bikes. I think that is a solution we can move towards.

CHAIR - The Argyle Street solution is a concern to me because of the parked cars beside that. I am a recreational cyclist so I use the bike track. I am confident on the road, that's not my issue, but parked cars worry me. I am constantly on the look out to see whether there is anybody in a parked car.

Dr GOODWIN - I think it's good to be aware of parked cars all the time.

Mr DAY - My advice to a BUG member is, if you are riding in a place where there are parked cars, to keep a car door width away from the cars. That way, if they open the car door, they don't get you.

CHAIR - That is not always possible because of the traffic. Traffic wants you to ride as close as possible.

Mr DAY - In that case, for some of those roads, get rid of the car parking. I am not very popular for saying that sometimes.

Mr VALENTINE - I guess it's because of businesses that are there.

CHAIR - People want to park outside their houses.

Mr DAY - If you knock over a cyclist with a car door sometimes that results in death, which is not a very good outcome, especially for the cyclist. It is probably not very good for the person who knocks them off either.

CHAIR - You started off by talking about implications of what you do now. What we have done in the past is now difficult, if not impossible, to undo.

Mr DAY - Some of you in this room are involved in some of the decisions, maybe not all the decisions I am talking about, but when some of those decisions are being made I think it is very important to plan for sensible outcomes that will not leave a legacy like the Tasman Bridge and to try to avoid making those mistakes in future.

CHAIR - I think part of the difficulty is that hindsight is a wonderful thing. You do not necessarily know what is going to happen in the future.

Mr DAY - We do not know in 50 years time how many motor cars there will be on the road. Things may change dramatically so we might plan a six-lane bridge across the Derwent and have no cars in 50 years time for instance.

Mr VALENTINE - That is when we get our jet pack.

Mr DAY - Maybe, or get our bicycles. A bicycle is a very efficient machine -

Dr GOODWIN - Except when you get punctures.

Mr MULDER - When you have to call up someone in a motor car to come and pick you up.

Mr DAY - It is quite possible to fix punctures. I will give you a lesson how to fix a puncture. It is reasonably straight forward.

Dr GOODWIN - Thank you. That would be good.

Mr MULDER - Free? In a bike-lane?

Mr DAY - Yes, indeed. In terms of the work that goes in and the output a bicycle is an incredibly efficient machine, so I think it offers an opportunity that we would be crazy to ignore.

CHAIR - Many of the small problems you can fix yourself as you go along.

Mr VALENTINE - Carry one of those pressure packs so that you just blow it up and it seals off the puncture.

Mr DAY - Yes, that is one of the solutions.

Mr MULDER - I am trying to work out why you don't put solid rubber tyres on them but, I think we are outside the terms of reference now.

Laughter.

Mr DAY - Back in the 1890s they all had full rubber tyres. You are quite right.

CHAIR - Thank you very much, Jeremy. It was really helpful of you to come and talk to us. Have we covered everything you wanted to say? Is there something you want to leave us with?

Mr DAY - I cannot think of anything else to add.

CHAIR - Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

Professor PETER NEWMAN, DIRECTOR, CURTIN UNIVERSITY SUSTAINABILITY POLICY, WAS CALLED AND EXAMINED BY TELECONFERENCE.

CHAIR (Mrs Taylor) - Thank you for taking our call today and for your relatively brief submission. I know you have had many thoughts and have had many words about the potential northern suburbs light rail project. Kristie and Ben Johnston came in today as well to the hearing and talked to us about that project.

We would like to hear your views perhaps a little more expanded.

Prof. NEWMAN - I am a professor of sustainability at Curtin University and I have been involved in the development of Perth's rail system since 1979 when the railway was closed down. I was a local councillor in Fremantle and a young academic who believed strongly in reducing our dependence on oil and this seemed like a bit of a problem. I began the group that essentially brought a change to the priorities in Perth so that we did embrace rail. For the last 25 years I have worked both within and outside government to do each of the next stages of the upgrading; the electrification, the extension to the northern suburbs, the extension to the southern suburbs, and now a light rail system which was announced two weeks ago. That is since I made this submission. A \$1 billion light rail system in Perth will be our next phase. It is a bipartisan agreement now.

CHAIR - Where will that go?

Prof. NEWMAN - It starts off by going to the north-eastern suburbs. If you look at Perth it now has a heavy rail down the corridor of each of the main corridors but the north-east is missing out. It has only buses that run very crowded and rather stuck in the traffic. The main part of it is a concept that I have put together called, the Knowledge Arc Light Rail, which runs out to Curtin University in one direction and to UWA in the other and goes through the city along the east-west axis. That brings in a lot of the development sites and particularly the knowledge-oriented developments that are occurring in that region. It is linked up with a new hospital that is being built and so on.

There is widespread interest in this. Yesterday, the committee for Perth had a big meeting where 500 people came to talk about their new plan for the next 50 years in Perth when it goes to 3.5 million which is hard to take in as a long-term resident here. The key to it is the next phase of the rail. We have come a long way in embracing rail and now building it in as the core piece of infrastructure that makes our city work.

I come from a background of having thought and written a lot about this. I have lots of data on it and given talks all around the world and those sorts of things. What I have learned most is by being in the system and knowing how you get things done. I took three cabinet minutes through the cabinet to get the electrification for the northern line and the southern line. I was in the office working on these things, so I know how hard they are. I know the lobby groups that try to stop them. I know the kind of public servants who do not particularly want to change anything. I also know that the public are desperate for this

technology and will do anything to get it up and running, despite the fact that most people say, you do not deserve a railway. That is certainly the case in Hobart where you, along with Darwin, Canberra, Newcastle and Parramatta and other places that are looking at light rail, all get told by the experts, no it will not work, you are too small or you are too low density or you are too something.

CHAIR - That is right and that is exactly the criticisms that the proposal has faced and one of the reasons why we, as a committee, want to get some more information and try to debunk some of those myths, if indeed they are myths.

Prof. NEWMAN - I believe they are myths. We have just been involved in the Doncaster rail project. There were five local governments that got together and employed our group, along with ARAP, to look again at the Doncaster Railway in Melbourne which was first promised in 1890 and still has not been built. It keeps being put off because they say it is not really right for rail. Whatever that means. We have done a detailed study which shows it is entirely feasible. That is the game I am in. I do not believe that there is a 'one size fits all' but there are certainly many common factors that you can now find in cities around the world that have been able to get their light rail system going. The opposition to it is highly political. They say that anything a train can do a bus can do better and cheaper and it is complete nonsense.

CHAIR - One of the reasons this committee has been set up is because we realise how low the public transport use is here in southern Tasmania and it is presumably partly because cars are so well catered for and the bus system does not solve all the transport needs. You say in your submission that wherever rail is put on as an alternative, public transport use increases.

Prof. NEWMAN - Yes. It is much more than the ACIL Tasman report anticipates. The most recent example in Australia is the southern railway where there was a busway for part of the route down the southern corridor. It was quite well used; it was getting 14 000 a day down that corridor in the buses. It was replaced with a railway, it has now been running for three years and the growth last year was 19 per cent and they are now up 70 000 people a day. That is exactly five times the patronage. The kinds of things that ACIL Tasman looked at were a 20 or 50 per cent increase over the buses, not five times. It is hard to imagine how that can happen until you see that you can beat the cars down that corridor. If you design it properly and make it fast enough you can get a far superior trip. People in Perth - who love their cars - in low density scattered suburbs, like any other Australian area built around the car with no plan for public transport, and no plan for rail ever, have embraced it because it is faster, it is better.

It is increasing dramatically because the traffic is getting worse and the public transport is getting better. It has almost reached its 2026 expected patronage in three years. That is the most recent railway line built in Perth and yet the ACIL Tasman report did not look at it in detail. They said that they could not understand why patronage had gone up so quickly and just left it at that.

CHAIR - We are constantly being told that people in southern Tasmania love their cars and it would take a miracle to get people out of their cars.

Prof. NEWMAN - It is not a miracle it is just a matter of having a better option. Exactly that was said about Perth. The first thing was, why would we have a rail system at all? We then brought it back and electrified it. 'What a waste of money, you will not get people out of their cars.' Well, there was a doubling in the use of the electrified rail system because it was faster. Then the northern suburbs, where there was never any plan for a railway, and they only ever considered putting in a bit of a bus way - that took off. The minister said she had never known such cynical pressure being put on her by the media and others that it would not get people out of their cars. Some people were saying there will be no more than 300 or 400 people using this line. You should see what it is like when you have got 70 000 people a day using it.

CHAIR - We are being told that our population is too small.

Prof. NEWMAN - The corridor this runs down is a long thin corridor that a few years had 30 000 to 40 000 people in it and now has a few hundred thousand. It is about the size of Canberra. There are other parts of Perth where the light rail is planned, the north-east corridor, for example; that is certainly no bigger than Hobart. You can look at each of the areas where light rail has been planned in our big cities -Parramatta, how big is that? They are very seriously looking at it.

Mr MULDER - Talking about catchments, we are talking about a catchment - not of the whole city of Hobart - simply of its northern suburbs which is estimated to be a maximum of about 80 000. I am wondering, do you have any knowledge of rail that services a catchment like that down a central corridor servicing a city?

Prof. NEWMAN - There are lots of small cities in Europe and even in America there is one whole city of 50 000 that has a light rail now.

Mr MULDER - Is that a light rail network or a single corridor we are talking about?

Prof. NEWMAN - You have to tailor it and with 80 000 the potential is there, particularly if you can build into it the fact that you are going to attract development along that and you will have potential to get another 20 000, 40 000 or whatever in the next x years. In particular they will want to go in that catchment if it has a light rail there, so you have to look at that as well.

Mr MULDER - That crosses another area, which is increasing density.

Prof. NEWMAN - We can talk about this value catcher.

CHAIR - We are not a growing city, though, our population as a whole in Tasmania is very, very slow growth.

CHAIR - Our economic circumstances are not the same as Perth's.

Prof. NEWMAN - Yes, I am aware of that.

Mr MULDER - My point is that 70 000 to 80 000 is sub-optimal and it needs to grow somewhat before you could have a viable -

Prof. NEWMAN - The reality is that this is a way of enabling development to occur. Maybe some people will come to live in Hobart because of the train. Maybe you will get businesses forming around the centres that are likely to attract other people and attract the kind of economic development you are looking for.

CHAIR - So we would be looking at not just commuters.

Prof. NEWMAN - This is the role of visionary infrastructure to attempt to achieve a different future.

Mr MULDER - There are two issues there, Peter. One is the fact that the capacity to grow - short of creating really high density residential areas through those northern suburbs line, because one of our issues, if you are familiar with Hobart is the fact that there is no guarantee that we are going to keep the bridge across the Derwent open. This line might have to service from Granton to Hobart and the capacity to grow the population in that area is fairly limited.

CHAIR - The bridge will stay open, just not the railway bridge, so you can have a park and ride at Granton.

Prof. NEWMAN - I understand the issues. I have looked at aerial photographs along that route. It seems to me that there is an awful lot of space. It is a redeveloping area because it is older middle suburbs many of which are getting to the end of their lifespan and buildings that need redeveloping. It is not without its potential.

My approach nowadays to building rail is to get only a limited amount of planning done by government. You get to a point where you say that you can see potential value in a project of this kind. This is what they did with the Gold Coast light rail. You call for expressions of interest on how to make this work. Those expressions of interest are not only about the engineering of it and the building of stations and the costing of the rail cars, but also about the potential to develop around stations and help pay for it out of that redevelopment. So the consortiums that form will have expertise in light rail from various other parts of the world and they will have local expertise in the potential to develop around preferred stations.

That approach is the basis of a public/private partnership. You still need clear government guidance, but it is not of the detailed kind where particular public servants will just refuse to budge on anything because they know best. That kind of Stalinist approach is not helpful, particularly when you are looking for innovative ideas. You may well get people coming in to forms these consortiums who have worked in catchments with 80 000 people and have

experience in how that number has considerably increased after light rail has been built. That is the kind of approach that I would suggest could be done in a way that can enable you to get a more optimal outcome.

If you can't get any consortium forming that will say that it is going to work then you will have done all you could and you can give up. At the point where a particular public servant, working with a consultant who is being told what to say, concludes that it is not viable that to me is only a challenge. It is the first step and you have got to go on.

CHAIR - You were not impressed by ACIL Tasman consultancy report then?

Prof. NEWMAN - I felt they were limited. Having spoken to some of the public servants who helped guide this, that from the start they were not desperate to show that a railway could be feasible.

CHAIR - I think one of the difficulties we have is that there is now no-one within our infrastructure department who is concerned about rail transport. When the Tasmanian railway system was given over to Pacific National the staff in the department, who were concerned with passenger and freight rail, went. There is nobody in the department who is responsible for rail.

Prof. NEWMAN - We nearly got to that position as well. We have built it up now and we have a very good team.

That is an issue and what does a government do when that is the case, because when you are asking for advice you will only ever get what they are used to and that is sub-optimal.

CHAIR - They are working on improving roads for cars. I suppose that is their focus.

Prof. NEWMAN - Yes, and improving buses. The bus-oriented work is laudable, but it is not enough. I think there are alternative approaches. I offered to help the Minister in this, but they chose to do otherwise.

CHAIR - Would you still be willing to help the Minister?

Prof. NEWMAN - Absolutely.

CHAIR - Thank you. It is nice to have that on record.

Prof. NEWMAN - We work in nearly every state now.

Mr VALENTINE - Can I ask you to expand a bit more on this 'value capture' you talk about?

Prof. NEWMAN - The mechanism is this: if you put in a light rail the value of property in the corridor, will go up. We have measured this in Brisbane. We are measuring it now in Perth. Treasury is now totally convinced that this is what they want to do here in Perth. We can

measure it and you can see the effect. It is around 22 - 23 per cent in Brisbane and it has been much the case since the 1980s that the value of land around railways increases, with similar kinds of suburbs, comparing with and without rail. If you are increasing the value, the idea is that some of that value increase can be captured to help fund the railway. The mechanism is this: the local government rates will go up, not because the council is increasing the rate, but because the value of the land is going up, so you will be paying more. The stamp duty that is paid when you sell the house will be higher because the value of the land is higher. The capital gains tax that is going to the federal government will be higher when you sell the property because the value of the land has gone up. All you need to do is say, 'We are not increasing taxes, we are just ring-fencing that value increase. We are hypothecating it and saying it should go into a special fund because it was caused by that light rail. If you don't build the light rail you don't get the value increase.'. It's a mechanism for putting together a fund that is coming into local government, state government and federal government. We are saying, 'We are using that to raise the finances that are needed'.'

When you have that diversity of funding sources, and the other approach I suggested with land developers as well as private-sector involvement, you can put together a package that will enable an alternative way of funding it. We have done a study for the committee in Perth and we have done it now for the Doncaster rail project. We have a new technique which can go into the corridor and work out the value uplift that occurs. Then you can map that whole area and use that as the basis for saying, 'that's where the accessibility benefits will be', and we can channel that benefit back into helping to fund it.

Mr VALENTINE - That sounds very interesting. I guess the only extra step we would have to have is stopping it from going into consolidated revenue.

Prof. NEWMAN - You have Treasury on side. They have to realise that this is money they wouldn't have received unless this was built. You have to convince them to hypothecate it. If you do it from the start, when they go to their bankers to get the money to develop the loan, you can show that it is based on a serious piece of work demonstrates quite clearly in model data that there is going to be a flow of funds that can help to repay that loan.

Mr VALENTINE - This has been put forward before in a different guise by someone we may hear from later. Land value capture is not a theory; it has worked in certain places, I presume.

Prof. NEWMAN - Yes. It has not yet been done properly in Australia. The Gold Coast light rail almost went down this track, but in the end they just put a broad transport levy onto all ratepayers on the Gold Coast. They raised \$120 million and used it to help seed the funding that then came from the state and federal governments. That was an indicator of their commitment to it and it was politically very acceptable for the local people to put \$20 a year into a fund that raised that money because they were going to get a light rail out of it.

Dr GOODWIN - Has this value capture effect that you are talking about been validated elsewhere in terms of the impact on property values around the corridor when you have rail?

Prof. NEWMAN - Yes. We have collected studies around the world of the value capture mechanism and the residential value goes up somewhere between 20 and 25 per cent. Almost every time we have been able to show that. Commercial values can be significantly increased; it could be 60 to 80 per cent increases in commercial value. The work we are doing for Treasury here is trying to pin that down and we have had an added dimension which is, if you have feed-in buses to a railway, you extend the corridor outwards. That increases the value along that part as well, but not quite as much. We want to know precisely how much it is and that is what we are working on right now.

CHAIR - Does that still apply if your population is not growing, if you are just shifting people from one place to another, or shifting their shopping habits from one place to another, because are you not losing value somewhere else then if you are adding value along the corridor?

Prof. NEWMAN - The best way to see it is as a concentrating mechanism. If you can focus development you will be adding value. It is called agglomeration economies. It adds productivity; it adds value above and beyond what you had. It is not just redistributing. That is the big issue that treasuries are looking for. If you are just shifting things around, there is no overall benefit, but I think we have been able to convince our Treasury, that agglomeration economies do happen and rail is the way to make that happen. No other infrastructure does that, not nearly as effectively. The others may to some degree, but rail is particularly good at it.

The Crossrail project in London which was done for the Olympics cost \$6 billion and was funded at a time when they had very little money because of the GFC. When they did the agglomeration economies and added that into the cost/benefit ratio, they found that it was very significantly improving the whole city. So they have gone ahead and built it. It is not yet fully complete, they did the bit for the Olympics, but it is a very big new rail system for London.

Mr VALENTINE - I guess it will lose value somewhere. The beauty of this one is that the government owns the corridor.

Prof. NEWMAN - It will be very much easier when governments own corridors, that is for sure. You will not own all of it, but you will own some of it, and that is a much easier mechanism when you have government owned land because the value of that will go up and you will be able to sell that land, or make it part of a package for redeveloping a station or something like that.

Mr VALENTINE - Yes, that is right.

Prof. NEWMAN - You need that more entrepreneurial approach to this infrastructure and you have a very exciting opportunity to help build a future for Hobart that almost any other piece of infrastructure will not do for you.

CHAIR - Peter, we have been thinking, about where the committee go and have a look, but I think we should send some Treasury officials or the minister or something over to have a talk to you about the Perth corridor.

Prof. NEWMAN - We do get quite a lot of visitors these days because it is quite an interesting project. We also send them to some of the light rail cities in America where they have done this value capture and they have done significant development around stations. You can see how vibrant it is and how well it works. That process is worth doing.

CHAIR - Could you name some of those cities for us?

Prof. NEWMAN - Portland is the one I immediately send people to because they were one of the first to put light rail in a corridor instead of a highway and it has been brilliantly successful. The most recent addition to their light rail system has been done without cost to government and that works extremely well. It helped to redevelop a whole area that was very rundown. Portland is good, Vancouver is good, Seattle is good, those three up in the corner there can be done together and there is a whole lot happening in Washington DC that is pretty good. There are a lot of smaller cities in the US that are now building light rail that may be of particular interest to Hobart. I could help set up that visit if you were wanting that; I would be very happy to help.

Mr FARRELL - New Zealand has been mentioned a couple of times as far as a comparable model goes around the Johnsonville line in Wellington; do you have any knowledge of that?

Prof. NEWMAN - I have been in Wellington recently and we have just been asked to submit to a project there to look at value capture and how it could help fund the next phase of rail in New Zealand. You know that Christchurch is very keen to build a light rail. It was their number one request out of all of the things they wanted for the future city as they rebuilt it, so that is being built into their plans but they are not quite sure how to fund it. I do know a bit about it and Wellington is certainly like Hobart. It is very beautiful. It has all of the terrain limitations that also focus development in some places and then long gaps between development and scatter on the fringes that is similar to Hobart. They do have a good rail system and it is very well used. Some 20 per cent of journeys to work are carried on rail there. That is higher than any Australian city.

CHAIR - We are looking at about 4 per cent, I think.

Prof. NEWMAN - We were down that in kind of area and we are now up to about 10 per cent and it is growing.

CHAIR - That is one of the barriers we have to overcome; the concern that the number of people catching public transport will not change and it will take some off the buses and onto a train or off the buses and onto a ferry if we had other modes of transport. Our theory is that it will increase the patronage rather than just spread it wider. It is hard to fight that claim.

Prof. NEWMAN - One thing to remember from my presentation to you is that that is what will happen. You will not get this simple transfer from a bus to a train - that is going to cost you a lot and it is not doing anything other than just shifting. That is not what will happen. You will get significant increase in patronage, but you will also change the city and that is the value. You will get to the point where, like yesterday with 500 people - and we are not talking about anyone from the Green community or anything; this is the business community who paid \$500 for a lunch - it was very good for my soul because they all said what we need is more rail in this city. That has been a 20-year transition from saying this is not a rail city. It can happen.

CHAIR - One of the difficulties I personally find, and it is one of the reasons why I was keen for this committee to be set up, is that we have two ministers responsible. We have a Minister for Sustainable Transport and we have a Minister for Infrastructure. Whenever you talk to one they say, 'Yes, but I don't have all the responsibility for it; the other minister handles it'. If you are talking about subsidies and Metro you are talking to one and if you are talking about roads or railway lines or whatever you are talking to the other because that is infrastructure. I find that quite difficult.

Mr FARRELL - Peter, from what you are saying it probably sits better with the Minister for Economic Development than either of the other two.

Prof. NEWMAN - I have never said that but I have certainly hinted that. In reality it sits with the Premier because it is something that cuts across every area of responsibility. It is a fundamental economic mechanism for a city. It is something that will improve the environment. It is going to save on energy. It is going to improve the bus services because the bus services will feed into it and enable them to grow in different ways. People will drive to it so you need upgrading of the roads. You need better cycling and walking facilities as well. It cuts across, but it is remarkable when you put a team together how quickly cross-government support follows and they have got something to build their visions around.

CHAIR - That sounds inspiring.

Mr MULDER - One of the blockers we get from our bus services is this idea that a train corridor will take people off buses. I note that you have used a couple of examples where in fact the train replaced the bus almost as evidence that people would prefer the train to the bus and that would have an impact upon the bus services. Do I read you right on that?

Prof. NEWMAN - It didn't really. People transferred from buses to trains but you also transferred a lot of people out of cars and in order to get people to the stations you needed to have integrated connecting bus services. They grew so quickly that you had more buses, more bus drivers, and more bus use than you had before but you also had the increase in rail. The public transport system as a whole grows significantly and buses are critical to making it work. In any low density city like we have you have to bring people to the train stations. It is not just walk-on like in Europe or in some of the big American cities. You have to have integrated ways of getting there. There will be some walk-on but mostly you need that

integration. When you do that you can get different bus routes. You can take a bus into the station one side and out the other way and you are going across the city in a way that you didn't have before. There are many new options for buses that come out of building a corridor fast rail service that is linked by buses.

Mr MULDER - That is some of the unique characteristics of Hobart. It is not a broadacre thing where it is easy to cross the river. It is not easy to walk over the mountains to Huonville. You are talking about, particularly on the western shore, a strip that runs lineally and then we are only talking about half of the strip, the northern half, as the catchment area for the thing. We have also come across the idea frequently where some of our bus people I think are trying to be two things at once. One is a relatively high-speed transit corridor and then almost a community service obligation to have feeder routes that feed the various train stations on that particular feeder route. Is that what you are talking about with your bus increases.

Prof. NEWMAN - Yes. The feed-ins will be moving around out in the corridor. They can be smaller buses, but they are really only doing those short trips that link. Then the train will run quickly down the corridor. That is the advantage. People do not like to transfer if you are going from one bus to another bus but they do like to transfer up to a service that is going to take you very quickly down that corridor and be faster than the car. There is no great loss in time but you do need to have an integrated service. Being able to see that in operation is one thing that you would benefit from if you came to Perth because I think that we do that integration better than any other city.

Dr GOODWIN - Peter, we have not touched at all on ferries. I am not overly familiar with Perth but do you have much in the way of ferry transport?

Prof. NEWMAN - We have a fairly minimal ferry service running across to South Perth and back. It is quite well used. It is one of the parts of public transport that almost makes money. We do have an integrated ticket that will go bus, ferry, train, so you do find that people use that. The zoo is in South Perth so people use the ferry to go to the zoo but they come by public transport and it is just the one ticket; that integrated ticketing system is an important part of it. There have been plans to extend our ferry service in various directions but the funny thing about Perth is that we love our river so much that we do not allow development on the edge of it. It has been a constant issue that you cannot really run a proper ferry service unless you have reasonable development at the points where the ferries come. There are private ferry services that run down to Fremantle and up to the vineyards but it is not as well developed as it could be. It would need to have the same kind of land development opportunities built into some of the sites along the river. There are two big developments occurring: one around the new stadium which is going to be built at Burswood, and the waterfront development in Perth and a number of other sites along the way, which mean they are planning a new ferry service that will join them together. We will see how well that works. The best ferry service is the one in Brisbane, which does work well and has been a very important part of Brisbane's public transport.

CHAIR - If we are talking widely about transport what do you know about pod cars?

Prof. NEWMAN - I went and saw the Mazda pod cars. I rode in one, I nearly got run over by one, which would have been a great headline. I am not convinced that they are going to be much. They are a bit of a toy, like a monorail in Disneyland kind of toy, and they do not carry enough people. You are going to have something with extensive infrastructure to build, with magnetic strips in it and concrete rights of way and then you put four people in these cars. It is not different to an ordinary car, except you cannot drive it. You just sit in it and it ferries you to where you have pressed the button to go. They can carry about 5 000 people an hour at maximum down a corridor. You can get something like 2 000 down a freeway lane and you can get on light rail between 10-20 000 people an hour down a corridor. Heavy rail like ours can get 50 000. So there are very significant capacity increases, whereas the pod car is not a lot better than having ordinary cars on a freeway lane.

CHAIR - I am asking you this because we have had a submission about pod cars.

Prof. NEWMAN - I get them all the time.

Mr VALENTINE - You talked earlier about facilities at the nodes. I am of the mind that you need childcare facilities and things like that so people are encouraged out of their cars and can leave their kids there and catch the train and whatever. Do you have any evidence?

Prof. NEWMAN - It's something that works very well at rail station developments. Shopping, childcare and education facilities in themselves. A number of schools, English classes or things like this go well around stations because there are a lot of students who want to be close to the station.

Mr MULDER - Often these things stand and fall on the extent to which governments need to subsidise public transport. Lots of people have made assumptions about rail being a lot cheaper in terms of operating costs than other forms of transport. Do you have any dollar figures around the cost per kilometre per passenger for running something such as a rail service?

Prof. NEWMAN - There are figures on this. I had to review this when the northern suburbs railway was being planned because the consultant suggested that a busway would be cheaper and better. I got in two experts to help me and they had assumed the same operating costs. It was fairly easy to show that railway operating costs are a lot lower because you have one driver carrying 600 people compared to one driver with a maximum of 100 in a bus. The reality is they go a lot slower in the bus as well, so the overall capacity down a corridor is significantly easier to manage with operating costs. The main thing is the wages of the driver. You don't need guards or ticket people - all those things have disappeared from modern rail systems. Security is building up again to provide some other operating costs. When it is electric, it's considerably cheaper than any diesel system. Electric transport is approximately one-tenth of the fuel costs - probably even cheaper than that in Hobart - and that operating cost is significantly better as well. If you get people in your train, it will be significantly reduced compared to a bus service. The myths around that are alive and well, that it is a higher subsidy. It is usually based around the extra subsidy because you are

having to pay more capital to make it work. I have suggested there is a whole range of ways you can reduce that capital.

The interesting thing about our southern railway is that we were able to pay that off from the start because we sold our gas company. The overwhelming political and public support was to use that money to pay for the railway. It is making money down that corridor because it is so efficient and there's no capital cost.

Mr MULDER - I was wondering whether we could access the actual dollar amounts surrounding, say, buses versus passenger train?

Prof. NEWMAN - I haven't looked at those numbers for a while but I am very happy to look at them again. The person I worked with on this is another Tasmanian; James McIntosh is doing a PhD with me. He is coming back to live in Battery Point again at the end of this year. I will get James to get some figures together for you on the operating costs of bus and rail and we will send it in to you.

CHAIR - That would be very helpful. It is a question we have asked probably half a dozen times over the days of hearings and haven't been able to get any firm figures. Obviously it depends on how many people travel. What we are looking at is the cost per kilometre per passenger I suppose?

Mr VALENTINE - Peter, you mentioned electric was a tenth of the cost of versus diesel, were you talking about the energy or were you talking about the whole kit and caboodle, including the cost of maintenance of diesel engines and all those sorts of things?

Prof. NEWMAN - No, I was just looking at the fuel cost.

In terms of fixing things - I used to be on the board of Transperth here - a major part of the cost was keeping buses on the road, whereas trains generally last 50 to 80 years, which is extraordinary - but they do - especially the new ones.

Mr VALENTINE - Electric motors don't burn out as quickly as diesel motors by the sound of it.

Prof. NEWMAN - Yes. Electric vehicles are going to cost us about a dollar a night to fuel, so that is the comparison of the cost of running an electric car compared to a diesel or petrol car.

Mr VALENTINE - Did you say a dollar a night?

Prof. NEWMAN - Yes, a dollar a night. You fill up each night and it will cost you about a dollar to refuel an electric vehicle.

Mr VALENTINE - Oh, a car!

Prof. NEWMAN - In cars, yes. If you look at the fuel cost, electric transport is very cheap in terms of its fuel requirements.

CHAIR - Thank you very much, Peter, I think you have been extremely helpful. I am going to steal some of your quotes - I will attribute them - some of your sentences are good quotes for our report. I think that is everybody's questions answered. We would like to keep in contact with you and get back to you if we have more questions. We will look forward to getting those figures from you.

Prof. NEWMAN - Certainly. Thank you.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.