

PUBLIC

THE PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 1, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART, ON TUESDAY, 4 OCTOBER 2022

SOUTHERN OUTLET TRANSIT LANE

Mr CHRISTIAN GONINON, PROJECT DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH, **Mr MARTIN BLAKE**, CEO INFRASTRUCTURE TASMANIA, DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH and **Ms SUK MAAN KONG**, PROJECT MANAGER, DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Welcome. I have a statement to read with respect to your appearing before the committee today. We are pleased to hear your evidence and thank you for the conducted tour we had of the site this morning. It is all very important for deliberations.

Before you begin giving evidence, I want to inform you of some important aspects of committee proceedings.

A committee hearing is a proceeding in parliament and this means it receives the protection of parliamentary privilege. It is an important legal protection that allows individuals giving evidence to a parliamentary committee, to speak with complete freedom without the fear of being sued or questioned in any court or place out of parliament.

It applies to ensure that parliament receives the very best information when conducting its inquiries.

It is important to be aware that this protection is not accorded to you if statements that may be defamatory are repeated or referred to by you outside the confines of the parliamentary proceedings.

It is a public hearing and members of the public and journalists maybe present - and this means your evidence may be reported. Do you understand? I need a clear 'yes'.

Ms KONG - Yes.

Mr BLAKE - Yes.

Mr GONINON - Yes.

CHAIR - Would you like to make an opening statement?

Mr BLAKE - If I may, Chair. I will be led by you to the extent of the background that you want. There is a history to this project that goes back to 2018. Would that be useful?

CHAIR - Yes, it would be useful to go through that process.

Mr BLAKE - In 2018, Infrastructure Tasmania, under my predecessor Alan Garcia, released a transport vision for Hobart. It highlighted the impacts of population growth on the Hobart transport system and it highlighted the need for dedicated transit infrastructure or

prioritised transit infrastructure on the arterial routes in Hobart, acknowledging that it is going to be very difficult to solve the peak hour commuter problems in particular, without a modal shift to passenger transport.

This is something that has been considered in detail by a separate parliamentary committee in recent times and that committee essentially reached similar conclusions to that of Infrastructure Tasmania in the past.

It was actually following that report by Infrastructure Tasmania that the Liberal government at the time made an election commitment to this particular project which was part of that overall vision released by Infrastructure Tasmania. The project itself dates back to that particular time. Since that time, there was that commitment made by the Liberal Party that then became government and the department has been progressing that election commitment ever since.

The need for it has only grown over time. We are now looking at prior to 2050, looking at population growth in the order of 60 000 people which has been estimated to result in an extra 32 000 journeys to work across the city in that time. The city, as members were alluding to before we started, due to the topography of Hobart, in particular the potential solutions to the peak hour travel challenge, are a bit more limited than they might be elsewhere. Cities that have developed in more recent times and have developed since the advent of the car in particular, where cities have not developed around rail systems and such as we see in Europe, this is a challenge that cities of this era are facing around the world and the solutions are not unique.

There is nothing unusual or different about what Infrastructure Tasmania originally proposed and the direction we are taking now to resolve the issue. There has been work done on alternatives such as things like tunnels for traffic that are bypassing the city. That does not address the challenge for commuters travelling in to or out of the city itself, particularly at those peak times, unfortunately.

Even in the event where a tunnel was constructed, at enormous cost and huge cost to public property, far more than the level that has ever been contemplated here, again, we are talking about marginal savings in travel time. Probably, to be honest, having to address this exact same issue anyway, because the amount of traffic that actually gets diverted into the tunnel or that similar bypass, is not sufficient to reduce the overall demand and the queuing and the delays that we experience at the entrances to the city in any case, from each direction.

Nor does it address the issue we also have which is a longer-term issue than the peak travel in to and out of the city challenge, which is the fact that our city system is set up for a unidirectional flow in the morning and the afternoon peak, and the residual flow over the bridge in the morning peak is now starting to become a challenge as well, in addition to that. It makes it even more challenging and will even further accentuate the need for the modal shift onto the public transport.

CHAIR - If I might ask, you say 'residual flow' over the bridge. Are you talking about those vehicles coming from the south through to the bridge and travelling to the eastern shore? Is that what you are saying?

Mr BLAKE - That is correct, Chair.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Or are you talking about traffic coming back in?

Mr BLAKE - The way we have set up the contraflow system around Hobart is to favour the predominant traffic flow. However, as demand grows over time there will be a growing challenge in the contra direction. It also becomes an issue the more the work environment is decentralised around the city. Increasingly, as people are not working in the city, this challenge actually gets exacerbated.

Now, it has been suggested in the past that a possible solution to traffic congestion in the Hobart environment has a potential to actually worsen it. Unless, we can develop a public transport system able to cope with that contra flow, as well as the traffic flow in to and out of the city, which is what people in Infrastructure Tasmania are working on right at the moment. It is a long-term passenger transport system that would do that.

What we are talking about today, obviously, is a relatively small bit of supporting infrastructure that contributes to that overall system and does not work in isolation from that, nor does it work in isolation from operational uplift and passenger transport services. That was probably an important bit of historical context or recent history. Suk Maan, the project manager from State Roads, will be able to take you through the details for the project itself. I hope that helps the committee down the track.

CHAIR - Any further comments in opening?

Ms KONG - Yes, a bit about the transit lane. The transit lane will operate Hobart bound between Olinda Grove and Macquarie Street as a T3 transit lane. This means it can be used by private vehicles carrying three or more people, buses, taxis, motorbikes and emergency service vehicles. This lane will become a near clear way on Macquarie Street from Gore Street to Molle Street, so it can be used by general traffic during peak hour each weekday. The longer-term plan is for the transit lane to extend all the way through from Kingston to Hobart to link up with the park and ride at Huntingfield and provide bus improvements all the way from the southern suburbs to Hobart.

CHAIR - To be 100 per cent clear, because some of the submissions may have been looking at the whole of the plan and the projects involved, what we have before us today is from Olinda Grove down to the commencement of the current bus lane.

Ms KONG - To Davey Street. We will join the bus lane.

CHAIR - No, but the project that is before us for the \$28-whatever-million is extending the bus lane that is currently there to Olinda Grove. Is that right? I am making sure that is clear.

Ms KONG - Yes.

CHAIR - It is not to say we cannot look at aspects around that, but that is what we are looking at today. Not the Macquarie-Davey works as such.

Ms KONG - That is correct

PUBLIC

Mr GONINON - We are not, but what we are trying to work through is to an integrated solution and that includes a range of elements.

CHAIR - I have no problem with that. I am saying when it comes into costings and things we are looking, we are only looking at the costings of this. Certainly, there will be other things we may wish to take on board in terms of the holistic planning. Members would understand that. In terms of the costings, we are only talking about that section with this particular submission, thank you.

We will go to the report. We normally work our way through page by page on the report that has been provided.

I will go to the strategic context of the project and ask the simple question, given all those projects that are involved in the Greater Hobart traffic situation, why now for this? And not wait for the other projects to be proven in terms of their effectiveness in reducing congestion? A number of submissions to us have raised why are we now looking at this to put in place now, before we know whether some of those other softer options may work to reduce congestion?

Mr BLAKE - Chair, in answering this, it is important to note I am answering in my opinion, but what was actually a decision of executive government. I can see a logic in it, in that if you remember going back a few years - it is quite acute, at the moment, but certainly, the sentiment in the public was very much congestion was a problem that needed to be solved urgently. There was a lot of pressure on politicians at that time to do something fairly significant about the congestion issue. The point you make about infrastructure of itself is a valid one: the fact that the government has introduced 60-odd bus services at the same time or immediately prior to, in total, makes a worthwhile contribution. There would be an issue if the transit lane was introduced in isolation of that and would be a questionable decision, but the fact we have seen that dramatic uplift in the bus services, which was actually a root of a lot of dissatisfaction, particularly south of Hobart.

CHAIR - Obviously, we all hear from the people who have put in these submissions, and then you will get an opportunity to come back to the table after those submissions and to deal with any particular issues you feel need to be dealt with. Quite clearly, some are saying, 'You do this now, all it is going to do is exasperate the problem at Macquarie-Davey, because that has not been dealt with and neither further down Macquarie Street'. You are simply increasing the possibility of congestion, because you are increasing the capacity on the highway by putting in the bus lane and having people who might be catching buses using that, but it actually frees up space on the highway and therefore people think they will still take their cars. I am sure you have read the submissions.

Mr BLAKE - I am familiar with the issues and do not think we have seen the submissions. It would be true, except the treatment does actually - as you say, it is a separate but closely related project - takes that lane, as Suk Maan said in her introduction, all the way through to Molle Street. We did actually consider the provision of a dedicated bus lane through Macquarie Street as an associated project. However, in the absence of the bus lane going all the way through to Kingston, there are significant deficiencies in that essentially - as you say, what we are doing at the moment creates some additional capacity in the system, which has obviously been something that commuters have called for on all the arterial routes. Now, the problem in the broad with that issue is the capacity within the city itself is limited. It does not

matter how wide you make the funnel on the arterial routes, you'll always get to a bottleneck due to the capacity of the city streets.

The use of Macquarie Street as a bus lane exasperates that particular issue, which then, in turn, leads to greater queuing. Unless the buses have access to a transit lane all the way to Kingston, it does not actually make sense to have a bus only transit lane in Macquarie Street itself. What we have done is effectively a compromise position which, particularly with the creation of a transit lane rather than a bus only lane, will incentivise carpooling as well as greater uptake of passenger transport.

Going back to your original question too, as to why now, we are certainly very supportive of the Government making these decisions at this time. We have obviously a culture in Hobart that traditionally the passenger transport uptake is quite low by modern standards, even in Australian capital cities. That is something we are going to have to address and it is a question of providing as many incentives as we possibly can.

Ms RATTRAY - Is that a Tasmanian thing?

Mr BLAKE - I think it's more than a Tasmanian thing. I think it relates to cities of this size that are growing from big towns into cities, and how you deal with what has been historically limited capacity to deal with that growth. I think it has got something to do with the size of the city and the growth of it, so I wouldn't necessarily say it was a Tasmanian thing.

I think we have had the luxury of being able to use the private motor vehicle extensively and there has been ample capacity to do that. It hasn't created a problem of itself. However, we are getting to a stage now where the behaviour will have to change, therefore we will have to provide the services and infrastructure to accommodate that.

Ms RATTRAY - Hence more buses and the ferries.

Mr GONINON - We are at that tipping point where we are going from being like a small town to a grown-up town whereby we need better passenger transport. I guess this project is trying to make bus travel as attractive as it can be as a mode of choice, as opposed to perhaps the mode of last resort. That is particularly for the journey to work. We are trying to get people out of their cars and into work. So, any of these infrastructure changes are more around trying to prioritise vehicles with the greatest person-carrying capacity. That is obviously buses and T3 vehicles to maximise the usage of limited road space, hence the park and rides and then working through into a T3 transit lane and then into the city.

Ms BUTLER - Is Hobart the only capital city now that still allows heavy vehicles to pass through the CBD area? Is that our status?

Mr BLAKE - I am not entirely sure about that. Our situation is a little bit different. In many of the other capital cities there's traditionally been conflict between the peak hour traffic flow and the port traffic. In our situation, obviously, the majority of our port traffic is in the north of the state. There is a small amount that accesses the Hobart port but not a significant amount of traffic related to that by any stretch of the imagination.

What we genuinely find also is that the trucking companies and the logistics providers will avoid that time of day whenever they can because, simply, it is less efficient and it costs

PUBLIC

money for drivers to be sitting in traffic. So, it self-regulates to an extent. Where it has become a problem in other cities is usually because of heavy port demand. The size of their economies and size of those transport tasks get so big that it is probably difficult to avoid at that stage.

Mr GONINON - I guess there's limited options to get up north or if you have to go through the key arterial, Macquarie-Davey, which is obviously a challenge.

Ms BUTLER - It comes back to that question: how much are we prepared to keep investing in trying to find solutions to that Macquarie Street issue? How many millions of dollars are we going to throw at that when 60 years ago it wasn't feasible, four years ago it is not feasible, 20 years ago it's not feasible? It is still not feasible to invest in a very expensive but robust solution. I suppose that's what it boils down to.

Mr BLAKE - I'm sorry, the solution that you're referring to is?

Ms BUTLER - To bypass the CBD.

Mr BLAKE - Oh, to bypass the CBD. Obviously, it's something that we have looked at in a lot of detail.

CHAIR - The Jacobs report?

Mr BLAKE - GHD did a detailed report of the costings which was overseen by a former CEO of Roads and Maritime Services in New South Wales, actually helped us oversee it; someone who had been involved in some of the construction of tunnels and so forth in Sydney. It is going to be very difficult to justify at any stage in the future simply because the impacts on the city itself are so significant to go above it. I mean, it would change all around any physical infrastructure that cut through the city would have a huge impact on the visual amenity of the city and the look and feel of the city.

The tunnel was the one that stood out in those terms as an alternative, as the Chair and another member alluded to. At \$1 million a metre, it is obviously very expensive. Not only that, but the actual impacts to the city. What the report showed was that if you want some access in to and out of that infrastructure in the city, it does involve the demolition of entire blocks in the city and it does not actually solve the problem. We would still be talking about the same sort of project we are talking about now in order to get people in and out of the city, as well as through the city, which is a different issue.

Ms RATTRAY - Might have to relocate the capital to the north.

CHAIR - That would not be the first time that has been suggested, I might say.

Ms RATTRAY - I am interested in 1.2, which is the project summary. We touched on this at the site visit. It is around being able to, if you like, police the requirements of a T3, so three persons in a car. We suggested that you could probably put a couple of dummies in the back seat, dress them up and have them ready to go, because we don't believe there's any technology that detects how many people are travelling in a car on a T3 lane.

PUBLIC

I am interested, for the public record, in what is envisaged around that because it would be quite easy to be running five minutes late and think, 'I will just whip in that T3 lane even though there are only two of us in the car this morning'.

Mr GONINON - You are correct in that statement. In other states that have T3 lanes, enforcement is a significant part of ensuring that those using the T3 lanes are actually maximising their performance. We are looking at that work, as we talked about this morning. Obviously, there are a couple of different solutions around but the technology is not great universally, so we are looking through all of that at the moment. Most states now tend to be looking at more of a manual way of doing that enforcement.

We will be looking at what we need to do to ensure that we can enforce the utilisation of those lanes because, as you say, it is paramount to their success. Evidence from other states suggests also that if they are not policed they are abused to some extent.

Given that this is such a significant change of behaviour that will be required for Hobartians or Tasmanians, education will be paramount at the front end of that as well, in terms of enforcement strategy, to make sure that people understand what they are doing and understand the rules.

We do have the Tasmanian road rules that provide a legislative underpinning for the T3 transit lane.

Ms RATTRAY - They have been in place since 2009, is that correct?

Mr GONINON - Yes, that is correct.

CHAIR - One other thing in the strategic context, there is the concept of the park and ride from Kingborough way. Other things noted in some of the submissions are the numbers being provided for there - in the 200s for car spaces yet we have many thousands of vehicles on this road. Why have they been made so small in comparison to the level of task expected of them with this T3 lane, wanting to fill that up with public transport usage? Why such a small set of park-and-ride facilities?

Mr BLAKE - The park and ride at Kingborough was driven by actual utilisation of that space for that purpose by people in any event. What we had was people were using that area as an informal area. The council, in particular, had some issues with what was happening there and we had complaints about car sales and various things. So, it was a logical place to provide a level of amenity for people wanting to catch a bus who did not have easy access to a bus stop.

Long-term, the provision on park and ride alone is not going to be successful if people have to drive through it. If you make the park and ride too big - I understand this has been done in other European cities, for example, where you simply don't have vehicular access to the centre of the cities and there are extensive carparks outside the city from which you catch the bus - but that wasn't the intention here. Certainly, they will have more utility in the regional areas, in that there simply isn't the ability for people to catch nearby buses, or much less ability for people to catch nearby buses.

Sorell and Huonville stand out as examples of where we can do even more than we're doing now in that space. The Derwent Valley Council has asked about New Norfolk, and

PUBLIC

Clarence Council has also asked about it. One of the things that we looked at with that particular site was the potential for expansion across the highway if we needed to, with a footprint over the highway. We did consider that. That is a decision that can be made later on, if necessary.

CHAIR - Can you describe where that is, for the record, and so that people listening in can understand?

Mr BLAKE - Yes. There is land on the opposite side - the northern side - of the highway.

CHAIR - Which location? We want to try to pinpoint the location.

Mr BLAKE - I am not sure how you'd describe - at Huntingfield, across -

CHAIR - Huntingfield? Right.

Mr BLAKE - The existing park and ride is at Huntingfield, and there's an area on the northern side of the highway.

CHAIR - That is fine, just so people understand where you're talking about, because there was another one at Firthside.

Mr BLAKE - There is a smaller one at Firthside.

Mr GONINON - Size is one of the key points in the site selection of the park and ride. It's one element, but there's quite a few different things. We had a chap who had expertise look at that and say, 'Where would you put a park and ride, what would work?'. You have to work through a range of criteria to establish a site that's going to work, and one of them is you don't want it in a really congested area and increase local congestion, for a start. You certainly want to make sure there's an existing bus network that's going to work and operate within it, so it's not out of bounds for an existing bus operating network.

With the park and ride we're also trying to encourage active transport and connectivity to surrounding communities. We want to improve and ensure the existing bus networks are good and not rely on a park and ride for those, and local congestion. If you can ride your bike or you can walk to a park and ride, that's a really good outcome. Therefore we're investing in parkiteers, which is bike storage facilities and the like, and strong amenity to encourage customer utilisation of those park and rides. We want to try to put the customer first, so we're making bus travel as attractive as it can be.

CHAIR - In that strategic context, as has been brought up in some of the submissions, why wouldn't you want to prove that park and ride was a viable thing and that people would use it, if you put on the services with the frequency levels that are likely to work, every 15 minutes in the morning or something like that - whatever is expected there to service the community. Why wouldn't you do that first - have people using buses - simply because it reduces congestion anyway, but it also might be more convenient for people to catch a bus if the service is there, before you went to the expense of doing this? In other words, proving the concept of park and ride first.

PUBLIC

I ask that question, because one of the submissions from Mr Blanks - and no doubt we'll hear from him - he gives a logical sequence of actions; establish the Macquarie Street clearway and evaluation of its effectiveness under present traffic loads (cost estimate not available but likely be minimal); if effective in improving traffic flow, then move on to resolution of the congestion at the intersections of the southern outlet road at both Davey and Macquarie Street, (cost estimate not available); if improvement in traffic flow is achieved then evaluate the success of the Kingborough park and ride service, albeit this would be before the construction of the T3 transit lane; then, if park and ride operation results in satisfactory bus passenger loads and the reduction in peak time, light motor vehicle numbers and travel times between Kingston and Hobart CBD then construct the T3 transit lane. Can you see that logic?

Mr BLAKE - I can, and I agree with the logic. It is exactly the same logic as we have used here. The Macquarie Street clearways don't work. If we were to put the Macquarie Street clearways in, the traffic queues would be longer than they are now and the buses would be at the back of that queue before they even had access to those clearways. It disadvantages both passengers on buses and users of light motor vehicles. I agree with the sentiment that you do what you can for the convenience of the bus users to make those bus services more reliable, at the same time you provide the uplift in services - which is what we've done.

There isn't a disagreement between ourselves and Mr Blanks there, with regard to the logic.

CHAIR - Okay.

Mr BLAKE - The other important point is to make sure that once people are on the bus - new adopters in particular, who have not taken a bus before - that they get a good experience and that they have a reliable and consistent trip in to the CBD. You don't want them getting stuck behind a queue and finding that they're not getting much or any benefit from what they would have got if they had taken their car. That's why doing those integrated projects in together provides that opportunity to do them together and get the outcome.

CHAIR - Interesting logic. We have looked at that strategic context. Can you tell us what the traffic flow is on the Southern Outlet at the moment? Do we have those figures? We don't have them in the report.

Ms KONG - Yes. On the Southern Outlet in the morning peak, city-bound traffic is 5500 vehicles. By comparison, on the Tasman Bridge, we have about 11 500 vehicles, and on the Brooker Highway near Risdon Road, 7500 vehicles.

CHAIR - I am talking about the total traffic on the Southern Outlet.

Mr GONINON - The northbound average daily traffic volume is 36 000 vehicles, and between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m. the morning peak is about 5500.

CHAIR - So, 5500, morning peak.

Mr BLAKE - That is what Suk Maan was referring to.

CHAIR - The southbound, you would think, would be the same - 36 000 for the day?

PUBLIC

Mr GONINON - Yes, approximately.

CHAIR - Give or take a few. Thanks. Other questions on those first two pages?

Ms BUTLER - Can I confirm and make sure I have this right in the practical sense. There will be a T3 which starts under Olinda Grove and that T3 will move down the Southern Outlet only to where the existing bus lane starts at the moment, or it joins that?

Ms KONG - It joins that and then it continues through the corner around Davey and Macquarie Streets and stops at Gore Street.

Ms BUTLER - So the T3 doesn't go down Macquarie Street? It only goes down through the top section of Macquarie Street? Also, that T3 runs through the intersection where you have the two lots of traffic lights and the incoming from South Hobart, and that crosses the Outlet itself for the South Hobart traffic to either enter that way, as well as the Davey Street traffic coming through that intersection as well. The T3 continues through that intersection and continues down to Gore Street?

Ms KONG - Correct.

Ms BUTLER - Okay. I wanted to confirm that is the case. It might be prudent to ask further questions; but I am not sure how that T3 section would work, where those double lights are, where you have all the incoming traffic - how buses would be merging with traffic trying to access South Hobart. I will ask for more clarification there, because to me, that would be adding more congestion, or exactly the same. I can't see how the top part, where there would be an additional lane, is actually moving it down there. I might need some talking through that as we go. Does that make sense?

CHAIR - You're saying it moves the congestion further down?

Ms BUTLER - Yes. A T3 lane would still be impeded by the traffic lights and the traffic cutting in from South Hobart, et cetera. Getting across is also difficult there, as we saw this morning when we were trying to access it on our site visit.

CHAIR - Do you want to comment on that now?

Ms KONG - Yes, sure. Part of the design, which is not part of this submission, is also looking at those two intersections, and things like potentially making changes to traffic signal phasing, to keep priority to certain vehicles and what not. So, we are still looking at rearranging those two intersections; they are in detailed design at the moment.

Ms BUTLER - Do you know when that work would be in place? Is that five years off or five months off? Because it could end up being just a bigger jam in a different place.

Ms KONG - We are actually working on that at the same time as Southern Outlet transit lane. To date, the focus is not in that piece of work today, but will happen concurrently.

Ms BUTLER - It's complementary to this project.

PUBLIC

Mr GONINON - You're spot on. It is critical to ensure that we get the scheduling and the programming right, so that it does work as best as it can, and you do get that flow through that intersection.

CHAIR - Have you done any surveys on the community acceptance of the park and ride method?

Mr BLAKE - It has only just opened, I think. The park and ride opened within the last four weeks.

CHAIR - Were any preliminary surveys done to test the temperature of the community to that concept?

Mr GONINON - I can certainly comment on the public display that went out on those park and ride facilities. Also, there are already another three facilities that we are doing planning around. We have just been out for public display on those, and that has provided us with a fair bit of input from the community about their thinking on park and rides.

In the main, there is general support for park and rides, but again, if we are going to utilise a park and ride, we want an express bus service. We want to maximise that. There is a travel time delay, because you have to drive to a park and ride, and you have to park. We want amenity - we want to be able to, where possible, have a toilet we can use. In some situations, if there's a shopping centre nearby, that's even better, because we can then use the park and ride and go shopping on our way home. Again, connectivity for bike riders and facilities for bikes and good bus shelters are important.

I guess there has been some concern expressed - and understandably so - probably from neighbours, who then have to work through a change of usage of land nearby to them. We are looking at what we can do around lighting, for instance, to try to ensure they are not impacted by lighting at night, and all those anti-hoon type of things.

Mr BLAKE - There's a small number of authorities on this subject around the country. There are not many people at all who specialise in this space. We engaged one of them, who actually prepared a policy document for us on the utilisation and location of park and rides. We are happy to table that as background, if the committee is interested.

CHAIR - It might be of assistance. Thank you.

Ms RATTRAY - I think we have pretty much covered the project scope, the problem and opportunity.

CHAIR - I think we have. Car-pooling was also mentioned.

Ms RATTRAY - We are not good at it in Tasmania. We like to drive ourselves.

CHAIR - Have there been any surveys in relation to car-pooling?

Mr BLAKE - Not that I know of, Chair.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Okay, thank you. Moving on to options evaluation. What sort of options did you look at before settling on this?

Mr BLAKE - As we talked about before, this was an election commitment by the Government, and it's not something we were disappointed that the Government elected to fund. Conceptually, I think it is something that Infrastructure Tasmania had thought through previously. In Hobart the range of options are limited. Going forward, we really are limited to modal shift to public transport, particularly for commuter traffic, and I suspect increasingly for movement around the city as well, not just into the city.

As we have discussed in passing, achieving that behaviour change is going to be incredibly difficult. I think there will, over time, be a movement to a larger number of services. At some stage, there will probably be a re-look at pricing. I suspect there will be a move to better buses. We're already talking about different fuel technologies, which again will appeal to people. Less noise and fewer emissions from these vehicles, particularly in the city, will help people make that decision and make buses more palatable. One of the challenges we also have with buses is that people don't like having them around. So, it's not just getting people to catch them, it's working out how they integrate into the city, which is part of the overall issue we have.

The strategy under Alan Garcia was that the only way to deal with this in Hobart was through greater provision of transit infrastructure in the city. The fact that the Government has introduced it with those services makes it appropriate. Working in the public sector, on behalf of the people of Tasmania, we were very grateful that this was something the Government elected to invest money into. It will be an investment that will eventually be mirrored on all our arterial routes, which is going to be challenging.

CHAIR - Looking at the proposal before us now, there were two options there. One was taking out 17 properties?

Mr BLAKE - Correct.

CHAIR - I think it's now five that are affected: two will lose some yard, and three houses. Is that right? What caused that change? What was the significant factor?

Mr BLAKE - I think it was the public sentiment, to be honest. From a purely engineering perspective, if the houses weren't there, there was an alignment that would have been selected by the traffic engineers; they would have said, this is the correct alignment, and that would be a theoretical approach. I think the commitment was made to do whatever we can to minimise the impact on properties. Through Suk Maan's project, and the consultants who have been helping us, it has been quite remarkable what they've actually been able to achieve. At one stage I was thinking we could reduce it quite a lot from the information we were getting, simply by not having a suboptimal road solution, but what they've come up with is even better than that.

CHAIR - The substation? Did that play a part?

Mr BLAKE - No, not directly. It was purely the impact on those properties. Although, having said that, Suk Maan, I think the solution the consultants arrived at was also cost-effective, in the end?

PUBLIC

Ms KONG - Yes.

CHAIR - You talk about the preferred option here. You talk about three, four properties which have already been acquired. Can I ask why that acquisition went forward before this committee signed off on it?

Ms KONG - There was mainly, especially on the two properties right at the end of the street, to achieve the appropriate sight lines, we will have to widen it, make that curve a little bit gentler, so that we know, at that point, based on the design we were confident that those houses were in the way, so we had to purchase them.

CHAIR - My question was why the acquisition went ahead before this committee signed off on it? I know you get riding instructions, and I can appreciate that, but this committee is here to assess this project. It has to assess it for value for money and all of those sorts of things. It seems to me that acquiring properties first, before it gets its tick-off is not a good process. I do not know whether you want to make any comment on that, but it seems to me to be a bit odd.

Ms KONG - That is not inconsistent with other projects. Even in other stages, we already acquire properties years before they have project designed up and confirmed. It is standard practice. Also, at the time the real estate market was really volatile and we were in discussion with the property owners because of the unknown of the rental market, we were trying to achieve the best outcome for them as well.

Mr BLAKE - I think, Chair, that is a good point.

Ms RATTRAY - So, you paid them the top dollar because the market has dropped now.

Mr BLAKE - No, we did not know that at that time.

Ms RATTRAY - You did not know the market was going to drop?

Mr BLAKE - That is right. There was a lot of pressure to resolve the situation. There will be a lot of discussion, I am sure.

CHAIR - I am mindful of the people who have lost their homes, their sense of place, and all of those sorts of things through compulsory acquisition for a project that might not get the tick off here. There are other options. There has to be an act, I think, Mr Secretary, if this committee decided to say this is not good enough, and we do not agree with the project being taken forward at this point in time.

Sorry, I am not pre-empting what the decision will be at all. I am just saying that there is another process that goes through parliament and that would be up to the parliament to decide. I just make the point -

Ms RATTRAY - And the Chair does only get one vote.

CHAIR - That is right.

PUBLIC

Mr BLAKE - I think, because there is a blending of issues here, and the point you make is a fair and a good one, Chair. As Suk Maan said, we do acquire properties in other examples for future alignments, which would not go through this sort of process. But I suspect, given where we were at in this particular project, it may have made sense to do that if viewed through your lens, in particular, as chair of the committee. I would only put another point to you that there was a lot of pressure on us for certainty and that was something we did our very best to provide as quickly as we could too.

CHAIR - Anyway, the point is made. It is what it is. The answer has been given, thank you. Any other questions?

Ms RATTRAY - In 2.2, when it talks about options analysis, it talks about during the preliminary design the department did further site investigations - a multi-criteria assessment - and considered feedback from the public consultation of September 2021. You talked about the change from the original design to the design that has been put forward due to the submissions that were received. You received feedback. Probably the minister said, 'getting a lot of flak from this. I think you had better have a look at it again', whatever that process looked like. So, is that the multi-criteria assessment? Can you give me some idea of what a multi-criteria assessment actually means?

Mr BLAKE - In general, this was a process that was led by the design consultants. The normal thing for them to do is to simply list the factors that are at play and how each of the options perform in accordance with each of those criteria. In this case, it was probably fairly clear cut.

Ms KONG - Those criteria usually involve cost, constructability, safety, impacts and how we are going to construct them.

Ms RATTRAY - The old SWAT analysis in some respects.

Mr BLAKE - In effect.

Ms RATTRAY - We do not do a T3 project every day on this committee so it is always good to know. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR - Further questions, onto on project costs. We have a base cost estimate of \$25.34 million, a contingency of \$3.38 million which is about a 13 per cent contingency. Interesting. A lot of contingencies are 10 per cent and we have seen some with 20 per cent.

Ms RATTRAY - We have.

CHAIR - Why 13 per cent? Is this the quantity surveyor's assessment?

Ms KONG - It is developed based on deterministic method where we come up with P50 and P90 costs based on the risk factor. It is determined considering all the risk factors that could eventuate, so that is how it is developed at 13 per cent.

CHAIR - You have settled on the P50 there rather than the P90?

Ms RATTRAY - We never got a P90.

PUBLIC

Ms KONG - The reason being, we usually only develop the P90 one for the Australian Government-funded project.

Ms RATTRAY - Okay.

Ms KONG - State-funded projects -

CHAIR - They just want the extra security, do they?

Ms KONG - We did have the P90 which was close to \$35 million.

CHAIR - With that total project cost estimate of \$28.72 million, is the housing acquisition cost included in that?

Ms KONG - Yes.

CHAIR - It is? Do we have any understanding as to the level of costs for the total housing and land acquisition? I am not asking for individuals because I appreciate that might be a little close to the bone.

Mr BLAKE - Some of them are estimates at this time because there are two acquisitions that have not proceeded yet.

Ms KONG - The partial ones.

CHAIR - The land?

Ms KONG - Yes.

Mr BLAKE - You probably haven't got an estimate for those?

Ms KONG - No. We do not usually notify a figure until the project is completed because we also compensate them for the time that is spent.

Mr BLAKE - A partial acquisition will enable the landholder to claim on a whole range of different things including relocation and various things.

CHAIR - It raises the question for those under that 17-house model, that were going to be acquired.

Mr BLAKE - There was never going to be 17 homes acquired.

CHAIR - Well, some of the submissions tell us that they were informed it was going to be but it ended not being.

Mr BLAKE - That is disputed.

CHAIR - Disputed?

Mr BLAKE - Absolutely.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Interesting. We will hear from those who have submitted.

Ms RATTRAY - It is in our paperwork.

CHAIR - It is in the papers, the original concept design, up to 17 properties.

Mr BLAKE - Affected. The alignment indicated that they were impacted but it did not demonstrate -

CHAIR - It is a concept design?

Mr BLAKE - And feedback informs us what goes next. It is not clear cut.

CHAIR - The point I was going to, was that when some of the property owners were approached, that causes all sorts of concern and angst. They do all sorts of things. Then to be told no, your property is not going to be acquired.

Mr BLAKE - This is a long story, Chair. Is this the right place to have it or do you want to deal with it under stakeholders?

CHAIR - Maybe we will do it as stakeholder engagement? That is fine and I do not have a problem with that.

Escalation cost, \$1.06 million, that is 3.69 per cent. Is that realistic? Knowing what some of our escalations have been more than 3.69 per cent.

Ms RATTRAY - Given that everywhere I drive around the state, there are roadworks happening somewhere and we do not have myriad companies that do this type of work in Tasmania, so are these real costs or 'we hope' costs?

Mr BLAKE - These are figures supplied by GHD. I actually agree with the committee, based on what I am seeing elsewhere, those figures look very low as escalation costs.

Ms RATTRAY - Out in the market.

Mr BLAKE - There is obviously a bit of flexibility there within our budget. At this stage, I am not panicking about it.

CHAIR - Not overly concerned?

Mr BLAKE - I am not panicking about it, but I agree, they appear low. I do not know, Suk Maan, whether you have advice from GHD as to why that figure was so low.

Ms KONG - Yes, Chair, that is between 2 and 3 per cent. That is consistent with the figure that is actually a formula supplied by the Australian Government. This is consistent with what has been supplied, usually 2 to 3 per cent escalation.

CHAIR - That is 3.69 and you are saying it is over what is normal? That gives you a buffer. Is that what you are saying?

PUBLIC

Ms KONG - Is that over, or is it under?

CHAIR - It is 3.69 per cent escalation cost.

Ms KONG - Yes.

CHAIR - You said 2 to 3 per cent. I am saying it is 3.69, so it is actually higher.

Mr BLAKE - I will not be surprised if that is a bit higher than that, Chair.

CHAIR - Okay, questions?

Ms RATTRAY - Before you head down the table, has there been some discussion with companies that carry out these works?

Mr BLAKE - Not at this stage.

Ms KONG - Not at this stage.

Mr BLAKE - It really is still very much at the early design stage. We have just been working through that process in variations iterations that Suk Maan's gone through. We are just at the point now we are settling on the alignment. This is probably the point now where we can be reasonably confident what the final alignment is going to be.

Ms BUTLER - Is there a chance that because it has gone from up to 17 properties affected down to a much smaller number of properties -

Ms RATTRAY - Three plus two partials.

Ms BUTLER - that is a really significant change. Yes, I understand there was a lot of public pressure that a solution needed to be found. I understand that, but it is still a huge change. Now, listening to this statement, I am getting the impression that even the plan we have in front of us might not be 100 per cent this is what we're going to do. Do you think there could be a possibility there may be a completely different design?

Mr BLAKE - The answer is it could be different, which is normal when we go to market, particularly if the contractors come back with a - what do you say, Suk Maan?

Ms KONG - Alternate design.

Mr BLAKE - An alternate - that is possible. Having said that, I would say what we were asking for is no greater impact on the properties. That would be the limitation we would put on that, I suspect. It could and would normally move, and it would not matter whether it was a building or a civil infrastructure, it would be quite normal for a contractor - if there is a better way of doing it, it would be normal for them to suggest that.

Ms BUTLER - There is a guarantee from the department there will not be a change in this design and some of those properties that now feel they are safe may still be at risk of being considered? There is a guarantee that will not happen?

PUBLIC

Mr BLAKE - As far as I am able to give a guarantee about anything.

Ms BUTLER - I think it is a pretty fair question ask, because there was a 12-month delay.

Mr BLAKE - I suspect our ultimate project sponsors in executive government would not be very happy with us at all if we did that. I do not think it is a way we would choose to go. I suspect if a contractor was to suggest it, the answer would be no.

Ms BUTLER - Thank you.

Ms RATTRAY - I asked this question at the site, about undertaking some of the works at the lowest period of where the traffic is going to be, night time I assume. There was not a definite answer that yes, we will be able to undertake some of the works at night, because that will be less disruptive than during the day.

Can we have on the public record your thoughts on how that might work? My understanding is that contractors need some direction before they take up a project because they need to know whether they are going to have to employ people of a night or day and how that works.

Ms KONG - With this project the consideration of densely populated area with residential area everywhere, the work would be undertaken during the day, unless there are some works we absolutely had to do at night time, based on impact or workers safety and might consider doing that at night time. That would be up to negotiation with the contractor.

Mr TUCKER - Following on from that, because I was going bring this up in 6.2 -

Ms RATTRAY - Have I got ahead of myself, have I?

Mr TUCKER - Yes. 6.2 - in road network performance during construction. The temporary reduction of travel lanes and speed limit would impact road users travel time. However, temporary lane closures will only be proposed outside the road network peak periods with travel being low and mainly at night time. Is that different from what you were saying there? Or is that the same as what you were saying?

Ms KONG - Yes, department policy is in the major commuting group. There is a certain block-out time the contractors are not allowed to work at peak hour. For example, they cannot start work before 9.30 a.m. Then with the lane reduction, we would expect that lane reduction would only happen outside of the peak hour.

Mr TUCKER - It says there it will mainly be at night time to ensure longer uninterrupted working periods.

Ms KONG - It depends on what work it is. Some work, for example, where we shift a retaining wall where there is tie-in work, it would be safer for the workers during the time of lane closure both ways, then that could happen at night time. It really depends on what type of work they are doing.

Mr GONINON - That is also being supported by the development of the traffic management strategy. That will help inform and guide us to where the risks sit and how we might be able to overcome and mitigate those risks. We would look quite holistically at that, including the role of public transport and other sorts of demand management strategies that can support the works to mitigate the impacts.

Mr TUCKER - The night time work with the residents along here - how will that disturbance be managed with the contractors around that area? People are going to be sleeping and you are working at two or three o'clock in the middle of the night and do not want them jack hammering outside your door.

Ms KONG - It will be stipulated in the contracts the conditions like stringent noise mitigation conditions can only have noisy work up until certain hours at night, maybe 11 pm and then they will have to stop all that jack hammering. We will consider that and put it in our contract.

Ms RATTRAY - Hope they do not have too many children in the house at 11 p.m.

Mr BLAKE - Works in urban areas are always extremely problematic. Even road surfacing, which is relatively straight forward, is highly challenging when you are trying to deal with heavily trafficked roads and people living nearby.

Ms RATTRAY - I knew I read about the night time. I said that up at the site visit. I read a lot of documents yesterday. It was reading day yesterday.

CHAIR - At least you do not get the name of your reports wrong. I said the Jacobs report which was a climate change report. Someone mentioned the Jacobs report. They did some work for you.

Mr GONINON - Also, Chair, we will look at some of the learnings from some of the other works in the urban environment, like out at Midway Point recently, and see how that played out and any issues and concerns that were expressed, what worked and what didn't.

CHAIR - Okay. We will go back to 4.1 because we did not quite finish there.

Ms BUTLER - I have a question to do with 3.2, the budget profile part of the project. I want to clarify the Hobart City Deal and the funding within that deal. Does money for this project you have budgeted here under state government contribution, is that part of the Hobart City Deal funding?

Mr BLAKE - It has been nominated within the Hobart City Deal but it was actually already committed by the Government prior to that. There is no additional money other than what was committed originally in that election commitment.

Ms BUTLER - So, it has already been budgeted and it is not going to be part of the Hobart City Deal?

Mr BLAKE - It has been nominated in the Hobart City Deal because it is consistent with the outcomes that the Government and the councils were looking for from the Hobart City Deal, which was that modal shift. This must have been included. I wasn't part of that

PUBLIC

discussion but I assume it has been included there because it is a project that contributes to the overall outcome that people were looking for.

CHAIR - Mind you, the Hobart City Council submission does not particularly support the concept, I don't think.

Ms RATTRAY - That might change after the end of the month.

CHAIR - It will be interesting to see.

Ms BUTLER - I am just clarifying. My understanding is the Hobart City Deal has a mixture of federal funding and state government funding as well. No?

Mr BLAKE - No, it is project-specific. There are allocations of funding for projects that are entirely Commonwealth government, there are allocations that are entirely state government, and there are projects that are a combination of both, so it is a mixture.

Mr GONINON - This project is funded through the Greater Hobart Traffic Solution output within the agency and a few other ones in that output.

Ms BUTLER - So it is purely state government funding, not previously allocated from federal funding?

Mr GONINON - The same with the \$16 million for the Macquarie-Davey bus improvement funding.

Mr TUCKER - Chair, before you move on, with the scope of the work, we have a lot of projects on the move at the moment that everyone is aware of. How will this fit in for capacity with contractors to make sure that we are going to have contractors that are going to be available to do this? We do not want to have a project coming forward when we are not going to be able to get a tender to do the job because they are too full up with work.

CHAIR - Cruelling our own pitch.

Mr BLAKE - We are having this discussion at the moment with all the government agencies and even outside the government agencies in the context of the pipeline we administer through Infrastructure Tasmania on behalf of local government, private developers, agencies. and something that the industry peak bodies are talking to me about at the moment, too, in terms of managing that supply and demand balance. It is obviously a very heated market across the country.

Ms RATTRAY - Which includes inflated prices?

Mr BLAKE - That is what it leads to, that is correct, when demand outstrips supply. State Roads is actually the shining example in this space. State Roads regularly talks to its contractors, so the peak bodies it will meet with, the Civil Contractors Association and the various other bodies, it will meet with them quarterly to discuss issues. It also has discussions about the program with the industry on a regular basis.

PUBLIC

There are signs of it happening a bit now and there have been some examples. There weren't any bids on a project for the West Coast last year. There were a range of different factors at play there. In terms of that relationship and the management of that supply and demand balance, the civil contractors in the state and State Roads manage that really well together. It is a very symbiotic relationship. It's actually a bit of a model as to how other parts of government could do this a lot better. I think we are already seeing the signs of, say, inflated prices and things hitting other areas probably worse than State Roads has been today.

I am not saying it's not hot, because it is. It is impacted by factors outside State Roads' control, for example, civil works in other areas such as irrigation schemes and things like that. Some of the contractors are involved in both and there is competition. The main thing for State Roads is going to be to make sure it is programmed before the Bridgewater Bridge really heats up. That's something that they'll be aiming to do because that's when those strains will become obvious, I think, within the market.

Mr TUCKER - It is a fine balancing act, isn't it?

Mr BLAKE - It is, yes.

Mr TUCKER - I know there's been a lot of work done on this area and that's why I brought this up. To try to keep that pipeline consistent all the way through so we keep those people employed - it's a difficult task.

Mr BLAKE - And it is a national issue.

Mr TUCKER - Yes.

Mr BLAKE - We are lucky here that, obviously, we're in a small market environment where you can have those discussions and it makes that a lot easier.

CHAIR - Of course, the longer it gets pushed out the higher the cost usually.

Mr BLAKE - Correct, yes.

Mr TUCKER - Sometimes.

Mr BLAKE - Sometimes.

CHAIR - Okay, looking at 4.1, key anticipated project benefits: improved travel times for both buses and transit vehicles. Some are saying that it's only an extra couple of minutes that it actually improves. Can you verify if that's the case?

Mr BLAKE - That is correct. It was some of my people who did that modelling. On average, that's correct. Ultimately, though, in passenger transport it's about reliability. That is the key thing. Those figures are on average. The issues that we have with reliability aren't the on-average days. It'll be the days where there's an event on the network, so that's when there'll be much greater travel improvement, obviously, than the average. The transit lanes are actually designed in part, the intention of doing this on the arterial routes, is to help address that.

It was part of a suite of things that, again, came out of the original Infrastructure Tasmania report that State Roads looked at implementing. Some of the early ones in that, for example, was the car removal in peak times, so stationing of the tow trucks around the network, which again, isn't revolutionary, it's not something that isn't done in other capital cities. It just hadn't been done here until now because of all those increasing demand factors we talked about earlier. It is actually that reliability when things get rough. It's not a magic bullet but it does help that reliability for those travellers on the bus.

CHAIR - The second dot-point, though - 'increased capacity for general traffic which will lead to travel time reliability', surely, that would only be at the end of all of these projects coming to fruition?

Mr BLAKE - The more the better, that's correct.

CHAIR - Because it's only going to stop at the CBD and back up from there, if that end is not -

Mr BLAKE - Correct, it makes the improvement for the length of the lane that's there.

Mr GONINON - Just to add a little bit to that response as well, obviously, if there's a crash, for instance, if you're in the transit lane and there's a crash -

Ms BUTLER - There was one this morning; there was a crash on the outlet.

Mr GONINON - you get that travel time benefit and reliability maximised to the extent of the length of the breakdown. But also, the two or three-minute savings for buses, in percentage terms we're talking about 25 per cent, because if you talk about the time it takes to get from Olinda Grove now to, say, Elizabeth Street, it can range up to 12 minutes. So, in terms of percentages, that's quite significant.

CHAIR - Okay. Over the page.

Ms BUTLER - Chair, if I can ask a question. I'm not quite sure where it would fit in the context of this statement. Could you provide, for the record, some of the measures the department will be taking to ensure that alternative routes such as Proctors Road will be made potentially safer? There could be an expectation that commuters, while all the work is going on on the Southern Outlet, will be looking to use alternate routes. Could you run through any measures that you're undertaking to address that issue?

Ms KONG - We are currently developing a travel demand strategy to manage the construction traffic. That mitigation includes encouraging people to take up buses. We are routing, which is using alternate routes, which is under consideration as well, but we have not made any decisions on exactly which route we are going to recommend people take. We will not do that without consultation with the surrounding councils.

Ms BUTLER - So, the work has not been undertaken yet about the alternative routes? How people operate if they can avoid traffic congestion if there is roadworks going on?

Ms KONG - We are developing a strategy. We have not completed that work yet.

Ms BUTLER - Do you know when that work would be done? Would that be done prior?

Ms KONG - Yes, it will be done before construction starts in the coming weeks.

Mr GONINON - It is a really significant piece of work. It feeds into that whole behavioural change bit that we talked about earlier, and in working with councils and giving people a big enough warning so they can help plan their trips. There is a lot to understand, a lot to work through.

Ms BUTLER - I can imagine a lot of traffic on Proctors Road,. It is a really thin road and it has quite deep -

Mr GONINON - The Channel Highway as well, and we know during the a.m. now there is quite a significant load on that Channel Highway, particularly during school drop-off period.

CHAIR - Are project time lines still accurate?

Mr TUCKER - March 2023 to October 2024 is 20 months, it is a long time for these people commuting on this road, to be going. Is there any way we can quicken up the process a little bit or not? We are seeing this on the Sideling at the moment, aren't we, with the heavy vehicles?

Ms RATTRAY - Two years.

Ms KONG - It is acknowledged that it seems to be a long time but we have to take into consideration not just the impact on the traffic during the day, but also being considerate of people who live around there. In an ideal world we would work all day and all night, but it does not happen like that. So, considering the complexity of the project we are talking about, retaining walls and working right next to rock cliffs, there is a range of considerations that we have to make before we come to developing this construction period. We will certainly do what we can to reduce the impact.

Ms RATTRAY - For the department to do that, do you go out on site and say to the head contractor, 'Come on, you are moving a bit too slow? We are not going to meet our time lines?'. Is that how you keep checks on the contractors?

Ms KONG - It is all part of the procurement process in the contract. We will nominate a construction period and then they will have to submit a program to us during the tender phase and that will be up to the tender evaluation committee to evaluate, based on the methodology and the program. We will take that into consideration. For example, if the contractor tells us that they can finish the work in 18 months versus a contractor said that they can finish in 28 months, we will take that into consideration when assessing the tender.

Also, we will go by what they are putting in the program. So, if they are delayed, and there are no valid reasons to justify the delay, there are mechanisms in the contract to expedite the program.

CHAIR - Looking at 6.1, major risks and proposed mitigation strategies, can you expand on that first dot point under implementation, planning process results in delays to commencement of construction, various options regarding planning approvals are currently

PUBLIC

being considered, including confirmation of exemptions, it also includes ensuring the elected members of the council are informed of the project. Is there anything else you can tell us about that? What sort of planning problems are there?

Ms KONG - We are not expecting that planning approval will be required. If it is required then we will have to go through and check all the boxes.

CHAIR - When you say you are not sure, is that because there are residential properties involved in this? Yes, albeit already acquired, that there is a problem with the planning scheme in that regard. Is that what you're suggesting?

Ms KONG - No. It's based on how the planning scheme is interpreted. The way that our designer or the planners, the advisers were pretty confident that as our works are within three metres of the road corridor, that the work should be exempt.

CHAIR - Okay, it's a matter of double-checking that?

Ms KONG - Yes.

CHAIR - What is the scope? The complexity of structural activities in retaining walls results in increased costs. You've got here: 'the geotechnical data gathered during the current design phase is currently being analysed to ensure the structure of design is refined and fit for purpose'. How likely is that to impact on the project as a whole, in terms of the line that you are wanting to take? Is there a significant risk there?

Ms KONG - We'll be looking at drilling holes into the ground, embankment, rock face and understanding if it is solid bedrock underneath the Southern Outlet. Based on the geotechnical investigation, we should have a good idea on how we are going to build the foundation, whether we are going to anchor them or build a big footing or piling.

CHAIR - The previous work on the Southern Outlet there, when that bench was basically left in there, I suppose you are not able to use that information that was available at the time back then?

Ms KONG - We won't rely on that information because it is dated.

Ms RATTRAY - I don't think the rocks change though, as far as I know. I did do science and rocks don't change.

Ms KONG - The technology has changed.

Ms RATTRAY - I'm not being flippant, I'm being serious.

Mr BLAKE - The assessment methodology does. The other thing is because we are moving the road across, the barrier, the retaining walls there are subject to some design challenges as well, aren't they? This is what the contingency is there for. This is in the contingent risks that would have been factored in.

CHAIR - It is significant stuff, bluestone, not many harder rocks.

PUBLIC

You have other risks there. Threatened communities of blue gums. Can you expand on that for those who might be interested and for the members?

Ms KONG - Yes, we have undertaken some natural values surveys that identified a corridor of potentially threatened species which is *Eucalyptus globulus* in the corridor where we are going to work. We have adjusted our design to change that so we don't impact on this area.

CHAIR - Is that on the valley side of the highway, or on the rock wall side of the highway?

Ms KONG - They are scattered everywhere but there is significant area on the valley side that has quite a few large blue gum trees.

CHAIR - Okay. Anything else on 6.1, 6.2?

Road network performance during construction.

Ms RATTRAY - A lot of 40s, 60s, 80s, I expect.

CHAIR - Second last paragraph on 6.2 - the temporary reduction of travel lanes, the speed limit would impact road users travel time. However, temporary lane closures would only be proposed outside of the road network peak periods. We have dealt with that.

To 6.3: native plants will be used in any landscaping. Where is the landscaping likely to be required? Most of it is taking out landscape, rather than putting it in.

Ms KONG - We have not got to that design detail yet. Where we have to do any landscaping, we will try to use native plants.

CHAIR - Okay.

Ms RATTRAY - We did not do much landscaping on the left-hand side going up. It's just a bit of a pull-off. Informal, I would suggest. Very informal, and a lot of gorse hanging around. That's all I saw.

CHAIR - Stormwater management: any particular issues there? Volume? 'Stormwater management considered in design to reduce run-off volume and flow'. Is there any major work in that regard? Extra width, meaning extra catchment. Have you got major pipes that need replacing as a result of that, or will the current pipes be adequate?

Ms KONG - At this stage I am not aware of any major stormwater works that need to be upgraded, so we will just be putting in new pits and pipes to connect to the existing system.

Mr TUCKER - Do you have a hydrology report with this, or not?

Ms KONG - I will have to take that on notice. I am not sure. I have not seen it.

CHAIR - Reusing of material onsite: that is something that is high on your radar?

PUBLIC

Ms KONG - Yes, where they are suitable.

Ms RATTRAY - What about that middle barrier? Are you going to be able to reuse that concrete barrier? Can you move that over?

Ms KONG - We will be looking at building a retaining wall, which is likely to be concrete. That will be a precast wall. It really depends on whether we can salvage them when we remove them. If they are damaged, we most likely cannot use them.

Ms RATTRAY - What a waste. I am big on waste.

Mr BLAKE - It is becoming an increasing - and you will see in the last dot point as well. We recently had a forum with the industry to arrange things, and this is coming up as their number one sustainability issue, which sort of surprised me, given we were talking about star ratings and different things for buildings. The reuse of materials actually came up as the strongest area of concern.

CHAIR - You have here 'sourcing of materials from nearby'. Is that likely? Are you talking about utilising some of the bluestone that is coming out of the site for the pavement, or something like that? Is that what is being envisaged here?

Ms KONG - It is something that we will have to negotiate with the contractor. It depends on whether they have the capacity to do that, too - to cart them away and crush them and then reuse them. Yes, it is something we have to consider.

CHAIR - As long as we are not giving it away to the contractor, because they pull it out - and then buying it back from them.

Ms RATTRAY - That is what happens. We are onto that now. We are not letting any of that go through anymore.

Mr BLAKE - They will typically do a cut-and-fill analysis, at least for the high-level volumes, where we do need to fill behind the retaining walls, if that is suitable material. That might be a potential avenue, particularly if it is coarse-crushed.

CHAIR - Even if it is fine-crushed - even if it is used in pavement, potentially - why purchase that product when we actually have it onsite? We found that up at Scottsdale.

Ms RATTRAY - And the Tasman Highway, on the Sideling project. They were going to give away what they did not need - and then they were buying it back for stage two, thank you very much. No.

Mr TUCKER - They were paying them to take it, weren't they?

Ms RATTRAY - They were paying them to take it away, and then buying it back on behalf of the Tasmanian people.

CHAIR - Okay, 7 - Stakeholder engagement.

PUBLIC

Ms RATTRAY - I have a question, Chair, about 7.1 - Ongoing regular engagement with the City of Hobart officers and elected officials. The only document I have in my paperwork is a letter dated September 2021, so I am interested in an update on that engagement with the Hobart City Council.

Ms KONG - Yes, we have ongoing discussion with the City of Hobart officers with regard to planning, traffic and design as well.

Ms RATTRAY - Other than this document that was provided in our pack, there isn't any other paperwork that goes with where your discussions are at this time, in October 2022?

Ms KONG - No formal documents like that - just through email exchange.

Ms RATTRAY - So, nothing has changed in the Hobart City Council's position? It is still as in this document?

Mr GONINON - We deal weekly at an officer level on a whole range of issues in relation to all the southern projects, including the Southern Outlet - so we will be talking about Macquarie-Davey, or the Southern Outlet, where we are up to, what the process is. We are currently working with council officers, particularly around options to support residents on Macquarie Street who may be impacted by parking changes. There is a constant dialogue at the officer level.

CHAIR - Some of the statements in the City of Hobart's submission talk about: 'demonstrates that transport/transit planning needs to have greater integration; other solutions need to be considered, including demand management, workplace travel planning, staggered start times and increase public transport and active transit use'.

Mr GONINON - That sounds to me the input into the public consultation on the Hobart transit lane, on the Southern Outlet transit lane, and the Macquarie-Davey bus improvement.

Mr BLAKE - Some of those are slightly different matters.

CHAIR - Not this particular project?

Mr BLAKE - Not necessarily. In fact, the primary issue that the Lord Mayor in particular expressed some dissatisfaction with is the absence of a Macquarie Street bus lane, in particular. I think there was a desire to generally improve the amenity in Macquarie-Davey streets as part of this.

CHAIR - We'll hear from them anyway.

Ms RATTRAY - So, this is not really specific to this project as such? I am pointing to the City of Hobart submission.

Mr GONINON - That's correct. It covers on stage two of the public consultation. Stage two was the Southern Outlet transit lane, plus the Macquarie-Davey bus improvement measures. In particular there is some commentary in there around some of the cycle improvements that are proposed on Macquarie-Davey. In fact, only last week we spoke to consultants who are doing some design work around that, to make sure they talk to City of

PUBLIC

Hobart about the input they provided on that, to make sure we understand some of the challenges and some of the improvements that we can make to the design.

Mr BLAKE - We did say we'd look at whatever we can, obviously within the budgets of those projects. Certainly, we have consistently said to the City of Hobart that we are happy to help. In lots of ways we are the tail and not the dog. They obviously have big ambitions for where they want the city to go. We simply provide the transport solutions to assist that.

Ms RATTRAY - In the covering letter that came with this document as part of our package it talks about a council resolution; as I said, this is back in September 2021. It talks about a small delegation, on behalf of council, seeking a meeting with the minister to discuss this council submission in an appropriate time. That is more the overarching City Deal.

Mr BLAKE - That meeting went really well. Christian and I were at that meeting with the minister, the Lord Mayor and some of the other elected officials. It was a very productive meeting. We've probably advanced those issues well beyond what is in that document there.

Ms RATTRAY - It is probably fair to say that the minister when that discussion was held is probably still the minister - which is most unusual.

Mr BLAKE - Yes, that is correct.

CHAIR - Those concerns with regard to business operators on Macquarie Street - was any resolution found there?

Mr GONINON - Obviously, the Hobart City public has expressed some concerns around the impact of some of the designs for Macquarie-Davey on businesses and local residents, being their constituents. We are working closely with individuals on Macquarie and Davey who may be impacted by changes to parking, and working with them to look at their individual circumstances are, and also to hear from them about what options, solutions, and issues they see and to try to come up with a range of measures that may help alleviate the impact on them. That also involves Collegiate School as well, as a key stakeholder being impacted as well.

We are doing some pretty thorough work with those individuals. It's not easy. This is a significant change for some as well, but we're trying to understand their issues and trying to work with them to come up with some solutions.

CHAIR - We will hear from them anyway, a bit later.

Ms BUTLER - Has any work been done by your department in relation to this issue, with maybe sequencing school start times at different times? I know Newcastle, for example, has done a lot of work in this. They have or had a similar kind of problem to us with a lot of traffic going through quite narrow roads at the same time so they have different schools starting at different times to reduce traffic congestion. It has been effective. Has there been any real work done in relation to logical solutions, as such?

Mr GONINON - Yes, that's been raised in passing as we've gone through this particular project, and about the whole congestion issue and how do we deal with it. There's a lot of policy levers potentially available to us, and they all need to work in concert to address the issue holistically. That's one that's been raised. Another is the fact that car parking is relatively

PUBLIC

cheap in Hobart, in Tasmania, compared to the mainland. My understanding is it hasn't been furthered in terms of Government looking at it from a policy point of view, but it's something that certainly would have merit, it would make sense. Particularly, it might make sense as part of a traffic management strategy for a big project like the Southern Outlet transit lane that will have impact.

CHAIR - In relation to that, one of the schools that has the capacity to significantly interrupt traffic flow is the drop off point for Collegiate. Has there been any discussion with them about either having an incursion into their property to get traffic right off that road or having people drop off in Davey Street? Going around the block and dropping off in Davey Street, which is less congested in the morning?

Mr GONINON - It is a really good question and it's something that we've been working on with Collegiate. We've probably had three or four meetings with their senior staff over the last few months around exactly that, around what can be done with them to assist with their access for drop-offs and pick-ups, and even potentially working with them to raise the idea of a school access plan to improve safety around the area, because they don't currently have one.

We are looking at other drop-off spots to replace those that will be removed as part of the proposed measures on Macquarie Street. We still haven't quite landed on the specifics of that, and we'll run those through with Collegiate when we arrive there. We had a workshop with City of Hobart officers recently to look at some of the parking options that may work and help support them through that.

Mr BLAKE - It was certainly an issue that was consistently raised - or has been over the years consistently raised - by travellers from the south, and this is the first time there's been a really serious look at it.

CHAIR - Anyway, it's just an idea that maybe you to go around the block and drop-off on the side and then come back down Molle Street; but it might cause more traffic.

Mr GONINON - Yes, it's not quite as straightforward as it sounds.

CHAIR - No, there's always a 'but'. Nevertheless, you are in consultation with them.

Ms BUTLER - I'm sorry to interject. There is a question that I meant to ask earlier, sorry to do this to you.

Ms RATTRAY - How far back?

CHAIR - Just go for it.

Ms BUTLER - The express lanes. The lane that has 'bus, T3 lane 2'; that's meant to be an express set-up, of sorts? But on that, you're going to have taxis, buses, motorcycles, emergency services.

Ms RATTRAY - Cars with three real people.

Ms BUTLER - Cars with three people in them - no mannequins allowed. Those buses will have to be stopping at bus-stops along that T line, will they not?

PUBLIC

Mr GONINON - On the Southern Outlet, they won't; from Olinda Grove, the first bus stop I've come across is the one in Macquarie St, down near the care facility, Vaocluse Gardens. We are removing one that's closer to the other side of Vaocluse, just to get more traffic flow.

Ms BUTLER - Those bus stops will still be within that lane. There's no capacity for them to pull into a bus stop; so, they'll be stopping in that lane, won't they?

Mr GONINON - They will need to pull in. What we are doing is extending so that the lane will come around the corner - the transit lane - and then they will merge into normal traffic. If you recall, where Molle Street sits there's a big left-hand turn into Molle St, so buses have to get out of that lane and across anyway, and then they will come back through into the bus lane. One of the design changes, particularly with Macquarie, is to try to give a bit more capacity for that left-hand turn into Molle St. About 25 per cent of the traffic that comes down Macquarie Street ends up turning left into Molle, often to try to get car-parking and the like, which is a very significant volume. That's where that extended clearway will operate and provide greater capacity, and storage for the vehicles to turn left.

CHAIR - Why not have two left turns into Molle, with one of them going forward as well? The bus station, that second lane, and people who are in that second lane can also turn left. There's two lanes in Molle St.

Mr GONINON - I suspect it's more of a general capacity issue for general traffic as well.

Mr BLAKE - It was a very large number of scenarios modelled around all this. I can't remember exactly how many, but it was a very large number.

Ms BUTLER - It won't really be express at all there then, will it. It will still be stop-start, stop-start.

Mr GONINON - In Macquarie Street, but the modelling still indicated I think a three minute travel time saving, which is 25 percent on what it currently is.

Mr BLAKE - I think it's fair to say it's no different than it is in that respect now, and the buses still pull out of the lane to access the bus stop; it's just not in the lane.

CHAIR - Okay. Stakeholder participation consultation - this is where we said we would get to, when we were talking about some of the mis-impressions we might have got.

Mr BLAKE - This is an interesting one. In discussing this with the residents and others, there's no doubt that this could have been done differently, and could have been done better.

Ms RATTRAY - How many times do we hear that around this place - 'could have been done better'.

Mr BLAKE - I am pleased to say that the way Christian, for example, is engaging with the business owners and the residents down Macquarie Street is an example of how things perhaps could have been done better. We were, of course, impacted by the unfortunate calling of an election at exactly the wrong time as far as our consultation period went, which meant that the bad news got out without any of the corresponding good news, which obviously didn't help. There was obviously some disquiet, and I think justified, that the consultants were doing

PUBLIC

the work without any departmental representation there. I think that was a fair comment, and again that was one of the things we have addressed subsequently.

Having said that, State Roads does what it does in terms of that methodology because of the volume of work. It simply does not employ the number of people it requires to undertake all that work itself. In some cases that's okay and it's adequate and it works. In cases like this it's maybe not the preferred approach. As I've said, that's something we have addressed. There's obviously differences of opinions in what was said.

We have been advised from our consultants what they thought they were saying and we have obviously some advice from the residents in terms of what they thought they heard. We have written material obviously that was provided to the residents I think was accurate at the time and remained accurate ever since. I am happy to table that for the committee's reference because that is an important document.

Ms RATTRAY - That would be excellent. Thank you.

Mr BLAKE - We will leave that with you now, if you like?

CHAIR - Please do.

Mr BLAKE - As I said, things could have been done a lot better and it just so happened the calling of the election meant that obviously did create some issues. There was a misapprehension that the mention of 17 properties meant there were 17 homes affected. You would have heard a lot and I think you quoted the 17 homes. That was unfortunate there was that misconception that 17 homes would have to be destroyed, because it certainly was never the case.

That then created the combination of maybe that poor initial approach - calling of a disjointed process, the confusion about a home versus a potentially impacted property together created a bit of perfect storm of adverse publicity around the project that obviously has not helped us ever since. I certainly would never like to see it play out the same way again.

Having said that, everything we have done since has been to minimise the impact on residents. Obviously, we have had extensive discussions with those people whose houses are directly impacted. Certainly, in terms of the negotiation process for those sales, I do not think they could have been more considerate as far as I can see. We did try very hard in that area.

CHAIR - Some residents feel as a result of those sorts of things happening in terms of misinformation or otherwise whomsoever issue it was, that they then did not go ahead with certain changes to their residence beyond the belief their house was going to be acquired and then to find out, no, it is not.

Mr BLAKE - That is correct.

CHAIR - Then going back to the market and finding they are paying thousands of dollars more.

Mr BLAKE - That is correct. I am aware of one case in particular where that was a fairly dramatic impact.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - One hundred thousand dollars, I believe.

Mr BLAKE - That is the position. We have had quite a number of discussions with those particular residents over the time - myself in particular. We did try to do whatever we could. We explored a whole range of options, notwithstanding there was a bit of disagreement about what precisely was said from either side. There are certainly two very different views. Notwithstanding that, we did everything we could. I understand the former premier even got involved in some of those discussions and also made separate inquiries and sought separate advice on that matter to see what could be done. Unfortunately, under the circumstances it didn't seem like there was anything in our power, which was extremely constrained, to do anything where there is no acquisition.

Ms RATTRAY - Do you mean with compensation?

Mr BLAKE - Correct.

Ms RATTRAY - Or pain and suffering?

Mr BLAKE - Correct.

Ms RATTRAY - We have done that before.

Mr BLAKE - I will put a caveat on this: I am not a lawyer and I cannot remember exactly what the advice was, but I understand there are some limitations too in terms of the changes - I think it is the Financial Management Act which covers the ex gratia grants which has some limitations in terms of how Government can treat those things. Again, please do not hold me to that advice. That is just my recollection of some complicated advice that was around at the time.

Ms RATTRAY - It is too late - it is on the public record. You are held to it.

Mr BLAKE - No stone was left unturned is all I am trying to say.

CHAIR - No doubt we will hear more from that. 7.2.

Ms RATTRAY - Chair, if I might, it is appropriate we get the response to this on the record. I was travelling home a few weeks ago and had the radio on and this particular issue was 'Topic of the Day'. I was on ABC because I cannot get any other channel much on the way home. There was a discussion with a landowner because there had been a statement made in the parliament earlier that day or week that this acquisition had been voluntary. The person who owned the property came on and said, 'not voluntary, but what other choice did I have?'. Obviously that tension between, yes, to say it's a voluntary acquisition, but the landowner felt they had no option but to negotiate the best outcome, because you can acquire it regardless.

It would be useful to put that particular example on the record of the discussions, without naming any names.

Mr BLAKE - It has been similar with each. Obviously, there are various options available to Government in this area and we work very closely with the Office of the Valuer-General in all this. The instruction to us was to be as humane and as reasonable as we possibly

could, and we were. The OVG was sympathetic in terms of the human impact of what was going on. The advice to us was an all-round and negotiated settlement is probably the best way of dealing with that and certainly was the way we proceeded.

Ms RATTRAY - Possibly the minister's words were not exactly the right terminology. It was not voluntary acquisition; it was negotiated acquisition.

Mr BLAKE - It was negotiated acquisition, which I suppose strictly - and not my job to defend the minister - but I suppose literally, it is correct.

Ms RATTRAY - Unless you can bring him in today, I have only got you. We will go with what we've got. Thank you, that is important to have on the public record it was not necessarily as the minister indicated it was and this is the process we have. Thank you.

CHAIR - Last sentence on 7.2: 'Relationships with owners of the 13 properties not required for acquisition remained mixed with some owners feeling frustrated and disappointed of the withdrawal of conditional offer'. Can you explain?

Mr BLAKE - This was a big issue last year in terms of the amount of time invested into it. Again, consistent with what we were trying to do, in terms of giving everybody as fair treatment as possible. The other issue, and to be honest I would do this differently if I had my time again, this probably comes back to the member's comment earlier, you probably hear this a fair bit but it certainly was a very important learning exercise for me in terms of balancing.

People want to be kept abreast of exactly where things are at. Things change and when exactly is the right time to be having the discussions about? Essentially, those discussions were ongoing. Effectively, people were finding things out as we became aware of them, which meant things did continually move as the situation changed. We were probably being a bit too open in terms of discussions about what could happen or what was likely to happen, which then subsequently changed.

As I said, if I had my time again I would probably resist the requests for that ongoing discussion, that ongoing dialogue under those circumstances.

Certainly, one of the challenges I ended up being faced with, was a lot of people who wished to sell their property to us, which probably isn't what you would normally expect when you talk about governments and acquisitions and things like that. But it certainly became my biggest challenge, as it played out.

CHAIR - Why was it? Why did they?

Mr BLAKE - It is a combination of different reasons. It depends on perspective. I can give you a range of views but I might be a bit unfair in how I portray it.

On the other side, there was certainly a feeling of trauma, there was certainly a feeling of 'I want to be out of here', of 'this could happen again' -

CHAIR - Of uncertainty?

Mr BLAKE - of uncertainty. And they were all very legitimate feelings under the circumstances which, again, I think probably weren't helped by an approach which was a bit of a running commentary and a running discussion. It was amplified then by what was going on in the media at the time as well. People were even more unsettled and more disquieted. That is one particular view.

Some people saw potential for advantage in the circumstances. That was another, potentially, in some circumstances. It was a mixture.

CHAIR - As mentioned earlier, some felt they didn't have an option.

Mr BLAKE - In some cases, that's right. There were those few ones. There was a choice. We didn't have to have that, which I guess is where the minister said it was voluntary, whereas it could have been done a different way. It could have been done under a normal notice-to-treat process. In that case, the parties both agreed it was in the best interest to do it that way. It was hard. It was hard on us and our staff and it was very hard on the residents. It was quite a traumatic time.

Ms BUTLER - For future purposes, will there be proper relationship consultants or communication experts brought in to manage something like this? Because it sounds like the communication from the get-go, in the middle of an election, shock announcement, et cetera - are there future learnings from this to make sure that what has happened in this situation, the damage caused to your personnel and also the community members involved - it was very stressful and also over a 12-month period, a long duration for a lot of stress.

Mr BLAKE - Absolutely.

Ms BUTLER - It is the roof over your head, it is your home -

Ms RATTRAY - And it is not finished yet.

Ms BUTLER - Exactly. Is there some strategy or some learning from this that can be put into use to make sure that other people don't ever have to go through this again?

Mr BLAKE - Yes, it's a - the only reason I stopped and started there is because different things you were saying triggered. I have come to the conclusion that it is very hard to get this right, no matter what you do. Having said that, there were definitely some improvements to be made. You mentioned the bringing-in of expert advice and so forth. That is probably what the department thought it was doing in the way that it was doing it in the first instance. Obviously, that of itself was not sufficient. It needed to be a blending of those different approaches. I have been paying attention to what has been happening around the country in similar instances. They are actually much bigger examples in some of the major projects where residents aren't consulted unless there is a decision to issue a notice to treat -

Ms RATTRAY - That has gone completely the other way.

Mr BLAKE - That's right. They have done that for a reason and that is, I suppose, to avoid the type of experience that we have seen here and that we have gone through in this process.

PUBLIC

Yes, is the short answer. What we are doing now is very different to what we were doing on the Southern Outlet and Macquarie Street, albeit the stakes are a lot lower. While parking is obviously important, the stakes are very different. But yes, we are going about things in a different way.

Mr GONINON - It is hard to give certainty when you don't have certainty. I know that sounds like - it's like, do you wait until you know specifically that you need to acquire, as Martin alluded to, three homes then go and tell those people those three homes are going? Or do you try to work through a process of engaging with people and giving them insight early on, which leaves you open to uncertainty, and then work through an informed consultation where you hear back from people then you make change to your design?

Ms RATTRAY - Well, you did, that's exactly what the department did, didn't they? Didn't you? You actually reacted to the submissions and feedback that you received -

Mr GONINON - We went the latter, yes.

Ms RATTRAY - changed your design, went from a possible 17 back to three and two partials, and here we are.

Mr GONINON - Yes, so that's the real conundrum of the whole exercise, not helped, as Martin alluded to also, by losing probably five or six months through the whole election matter, with the uncertainty for residents.

CHAIR - Not to mention COVID-19 too, which was one point in the lead-up.

Mr GONINON - Which was horrible, you can only imagine.

Ms RATTRAY - True.

CHAIR - Anyway, I'm conscious of the time.

Ms RATTRAY - It was a good question, honourable member, because it needed to be on the record.

I have a question at 8.2, if that helps.

CHAIR - Yes, go for it.

Ms RATTRAY - We received a very good submission in regard to noise. Just standing on that highway today, there is significant noise. It talks here about the base level noise. Logging has been completed and modelling is currently under way. But there was a really good suggestion in one of the submissions around a specific type of road base that has less noise on it. Is that going to be considered, using a specific type of road base?

Ms KONG - That is one of the mitigations that could be implemented. We also have others that we could consider.

Ms RATTRAY - Low-noise asphalt, it's referred to here.

PUBLIC

Ms KONG - Yes, we're aware of it and that will be considered. Having said that, we're only doing work on one lane, which is the transit lane so -

Ms RATTRAY - I suggest, from what I heard, every little bit helps. So, can we get a yes to that?

Ms KONG - Yes, that will be under consideration.

Ms RATTRAY - Good.

CHAIR - It will be under consideration.

Ms RATTRAY - I was hoping for a 'yes, we can achieve that'. Given the challenges that this project has faced, and I haven't come to a decision yet, but I think anything that the department can do to show the people, particularly those directly affected, that they are listening, they are taking into consideration what's being put forward, people have done a lot of work on these submissions, a serious lot of work.

Obviously, you can't double-glaze everyone's house, although they probably might like that. But sound insulation. You can also put in the concrete coarse sound abatement fencing. Oh, that's probably not in the concrete but there's a lot of methods obviously available to help reduce the noise level. Is that going to be in that modelling? That is the question.

Ms KONG - The modelling itself will determine the noise level, would establish a baseline noise level.

Ms RATTRAY - That has already been completed. You told me that.

Ms KONG - Yes, and then we will look at a projection to 10 years after the construction and then we will decide if noise mitigation is required and to what extent. Then we will consider different options.

Ms RATTRAY - I am not allowed to give direction but I'd suggest that it was a really good time to start with building some bridges with a community that feels somewhat aggrieved. This could be a first step. That is a comment only. No question. Do you agree?

CHAIR - There are considerations about whether that low-noise tarmac is also safe in wet weather and those sorts of things. Obviously, they have to be safe.

Ms RATTRAY - I am sure the department will do their due diligence there, Chair.

CHAIR - I am sure they will.

Ms RATTRAY - No further questions from me.

CHAIR - You sure?

Ms RATTRAY - Yes.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - The noise wall is certainly one that has been used on the Southern Outlet before, further down near Kingston, isn't it? Maybe there is an opportunity there, although some of them might not want their views taken away by a noise wall.

Mr BLAKE - I think that would be controversial.

CHAIR - It could be swings and roundabouts on that one.

Ms RATTRAY - I will leave that to the department.

CHAIR - Aboriginal Heritage is not something that has been identified at this point in time?

Ms KONG - No.

CHAIR - No particular issues. You have talked about the gum trees, the environment, flora and fauna, natural values assessments. Planning approvals based on exemptions within the planning scheme, it is not expected that a development application will be acquired. We have touched base on that.

I will point out that this process is really important for neighbours. There are issues that are outside the normal planning process. That's one of the values of this particular process.

Ms RATTRAY - And there are many, Chair.

CHAIR - So, it is important for us to give the opportunity and that's why we have submissions today. Okay, no further questions? I will not read you the questions I have to ask you. We will have a break of five minutes or seven minutes. We will just break. Then we will hear from our other witnesses.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.

The Committee suspended from 3.42 p.m. to 3.53 p.m.

Mr ANTHONY DICK BLANKS and Ms CATHERINE ELIZABETH PRIDEAUX
WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Welcome. You may have already heard this from the last witnesses, but I need to read this to you with regard to the evidence today.

I want to inform you of some of the important aspects of committee proceedings. A committee hearing is a proceeding in parliament. This means it receives the protection of parliamentary privilege. It is an important legal protection that allows individuals giving evidence to a parliamentary committee to speak with complete freedom, without the fear of being sued or questioned in any court or place out of parliament.

It applies to ensure that parliament receives the very best information when conducting its inquiries.

PUBLIC

It is important to be aware that this protection is not accorded to you if statements that may be defamatory are repeated or referred to by you outside the confines of the parliamentary proceedings.

This is a public hearing and members of the public and journalists may be present and this means your evidence may be reported. Do you understand?

Mr BLANKS and Ms PRIDEAUX - Yes.

CHAIR - Do you wish to make an opening statement?

Mr BLANKS - I do not have a great deal to say. I have put my opinions and my knowledge into the submission that I put in. I have some observations. I have been quite interested in the park and ride concept and that seems to be one of the major justifications for the T3 lane. I have been down at Huntingfield and over at Firthside having a look at what parking there is. I have some figures here, if I can pass those to the committee?

CHAIR - Yes, you can if you wish to submit them. They will be distributed. Tell us the nature of those, perhaps.

Mr BLANKS - These are figures on the use of the car parks for both park and ride facilities, how much space was available and how much space was being used. My attention was drawn to an article in the *Mercury* showing the minister and several other people at the opening of the Huntingfield park and ride and so I went down about lunchtime that day to count the number of spaces and to see what was there.

On Tuesday the 27th there were 26 vehicles in a 169-space car park, 25 the next day, 36 the next day. On the Friday, there were 25 but there was a bus which turned up, sat there for five minutes empty and went away empty. On Monday there were 38 vehicles. The use of the car park at the moment is about 22 to 23 per cent of the available spaces. That is despite the fact that there are trailers with 'park and ride open' flashing on the side of the road. If you went to Huntingfield this morning, you would have seen the one as you come to the Algona Road Roundabout.

More interesting was Firthside, Browns Road, which is a much smaller site. The counts there were 28 to 35 vehicles but it is quite clear that that particular place is being used as subsidiary parking for the trade factories across the road. The give-away is the number of four-wheel drive vehicles with big tradies tool chests in the back of them that sit there all day, or the fellows who come out about 12.30 p.m., drive away, come back with coffee and takeaway bags. Until something is sorted out about how you handle who parks where, the Firthside park and ride station will not be much good for anything.

CHAIR - An interesting observation.

Mr BLANKS - It was worth going to have a look to see what was actually happening, because I do not think anybody else had done.

Looking at the department's submission, it is nice to see that the project cost has come down. It was estimated in December 2020 that the cost would be \$35 million, now it is down to \$29.78 million so that is good news.

PUBLIC

My final thing I will add is looking at the map that is in the department's submission, coming back from Kingston yesterday, I had a look at the signs at Olinda Grove or at the top of Nelson Saddle. There is a big sign there saying 'trucks and buses must use low gear'. That has been there for a long time so I wondered what would happen if the T3 lane is going to have the buses in it. Are they, in fact, still going to require that as a safety measure? That is the reason it is there.

CHAIR - That the buses choose low gear?

Mr BLANKS - Yes, and the trucks. In fact, I came down the hill alongside a truck which was using low gear in the left-hand lane and he was roaring away with a load on the back. There are plenty of trucks which come down that hill, once they get around Cats Eye Corner, they let them go. You can hear the change of the exhaust brake as they change up through the gears.

All the way down the hill I had a Tassielink bus sitting hard on my tail as I was coming down at 80 kilometres per hour, which is the speed limit. There are some problems with enforcing things on that road. When there are three lanes, as I can make out from this - in fact, the diagram actually shows that you're going to have buses and taxis in the left-hand lane; in the centre lane you're going to have slow trucks; and the only lane that's going to be clear for light vehicle traffic is the right-hand lane - the centre lane - and it seems that's a recipe for an accident coming around the blind bend.

There are enough people who come around that corner and have to hit the brakes as it is, and to come around the corner and to find a truck where a truck shouldn't be - a truck should be over in the left-hand lane - is a problem. It's a traffic management issue. I don't have a solution. Whatever it is, it's going to require buses and other vehicles to change lanes at some point, but I don't think it's been properly addressed.

CHAIR - I'm wondering whether trucks are envisaged to use T3? Does it say that?

Mr BLANKS - No.

Ms RATTRAY - No, it's buses.

CHAIR - Definitely buses.

Mr BLANKS - My other points were raised in my written submission and are probably much more cogent. I had a lot longer to think about them there than I have here. That's really all I have to say. Thank you.

CHAIR - Can you fill the committee in as to what your relationship is with this development?

Mr BLANKS - I've lived at 15 Dynnyrne Road since 1983. My tie to the house is emotional rather more than monetary. It's the house that my grandfather built as a wedding present for my grandmother. It was sold out of the family and I bought it back in. He built bridges and houses, and none of his bridges had fallen down, so I thought the house he built for himself should be pretty solid. I'm not directly affected, other than noise. I'm on the top side of Dynnyrne Road but a lot of my friends are on the bottom side and have been in a state

PUBLIC

of much worry and agitation since the line-up to the last election when we got the news that things were going to happen. I don't know whether there's any more you need?

CHAIR - Are you still at 15 Dynnyrne Road?

Mr BLANKS - Sure, you'll carry me out in a box. It was my great-grandfather's cow run before it was my grandfather's house.

Ms RATTRAY - What a treat to be able to buy it back.

Mr BLANKS - I was lucky. That's a long time ago. I wouldn't be able to afford to buy it back now.

Thank you very much to the committee.

Ms PRIDEAUX - I have a few things to say about the department's submission under 6.1. I don't really expect an answer from this, but I wanted to raise it as an issue.

I am wondering how much money was spent on consultants in doing all the designing, engineering and everything that went on before they came to the commonsense solution that we all said in the very first place, which was to move the central retaining wall. It's so obvious. It's much cheaper. All the consultants had very grand designs of how they were going to build a fit-everywhere-type answer to this. They were going to come in, build however many lanes they wanted with the 'one size fits all cities'. Then, finally, as they came across other problems like finding that the telecommunications hub was sticking out into the Outlet so they weren't able to widen it anyway - those sorts of things. They were done after all these people were traumatised and the consultants had gone ahead and said that the whole of the other side of our street was going to be demolished - these sorts of things that went on in those early stages.

Now, the department says it has records of these consultations but they've never provided anything. They've said we were exaggerating and lying about all these things, but Meg is going to deal with those types of issues in detail.

In relation to Tony's submission which I haven't read, we have used the park and ride buses in the UK and they're excellent. Nothing like the ones out here, I'm afraid. Basically, they work on the basis that in order for it to be successful, it has to be so attractive as to be seen as a preferred mode of transport, and that is what will get people onto it.

Ms BUTLER - Are the park and rides free?

Ms PRIDEAUX - Yes, the park and rides are free. They use zero energy buses. They have a very, very good advertising campaign, where they have 'drive to work' zero free emissions, et cetera. There could have been an incredible lot of things done with publicity for school kids like badges, all these sorts of things, as to how you can attract people to take up the park and ride. None of them have been done.

Just for the record, York City has had park and ride for 25 years. York and the UK are not progressive places, but they are similar to Hobart in that they are old historical buildings that can't get knocked down or that they don't want to knock down. So, they developed this park and ride system. They also put roofs and solar panels on top of every car space in these

and are progressively working through that. I have done research on all that but I didn't put it in as a submission.

In one of the park and rides in Leeds, the extra solar energy that was going to be created would fuel 700 houses. They are big things. Plus, they provide the energy for the park and ride security, lighting, everything. I've written to the state department raising these issues and I've just been told 'we have our experts'. I've sent them copies and links and things, but I'm always met with 'we have our experts'. In other words, go away. None of that type of stuff has been implemented in this. It is just a very bare bones thing.

An example also with this T3 lane is that on the island of Jeju in South Korea they have a very big IT industry. One of the things they have developed is a traffic management system where they have gantries across the freeways. When an emergency vehicle is leaving place A, they press a button and it has arrows going out, so you have two lanes, the traffic goes to the extremes of the two lanes and there is enough room down between the two of them for the emergency vehicles to go through. All those sorts of things. I have told the department about these things but they don't seem interested at all. It has been very, very frustrating just getting, 'Oh no, go away'.

I've worked in the public service for 20 years and other people here, longer; but I've found it absolutely disgusting, the attitude of the department people. They have really undermined our trust in public governance, in the public service, in their honesty - not the individual people but things that are said, like the one you mentioned with the minister saying that when you look at it he may not have said the truth, but he didn't say an untruth either. There has been a lot of that go on - a lot of people being told their houses were going and then the weekend before, 'oh, no it's not', and they have already gone looking for other houses and all this sort of thing. It was just one big mess.

CHAIR - Some of those were consultants as opposed to the department, or not?

Ms PRIDEAUX - I can't say those particularly. This is just third hand from me, but the consultants were particularly awful. We got affected by that because, essentially, they said to people - this is the people on the other side of the street - that you will have to leave, because this is all going and it will be all dust, dirt, trucks, noise and you won't be able to live here. So we were looking at having our house facing onto this mess that they were talking about. These were the consultants. This was denied then by the department, but that's their problem.

I would like to refer the department to a person at Melbourne University, who was speaking on the radio, who specialises in the consultation processes between government and infrastructure project and infrastructure development. I wonder whether any of the people in State Growth have had any training or any education at all on how to run a consultation process, apart from some Mickey Mouse thing. Maybe they have; I don't know. I am just wondering if they have had anything like that?

Plus, the Bendigo Council, has a completely different model for consultation with the public in relation to all development. I think one of the other speakers is going to speak of that later, but that's the Bendigo Council. That's all I have to say.

CHAIR - Thank you.

PUBLIC

Mr BLANKS - Chair, may I come back for a second bite?

CHAIR - You can, bearing in mind -

Ms PRIDEAUX - Two minutes.

Mr BLANKS - It will be two minutes. Back in December 2020, a report was produced, which has been released to somebody else under right to information. The thing that's interesting is that it identified residual risks that would be difficult to deal with. The department had this and should have been forewarned, because it says here:

Stakeholder risks are that the project is poorly received by the community, with negative press. Stakeholders and public are not engaged in the project. Dissatisfied stakeholders result in media attention. Project land acquisition is difficult to obtain and poorly received by the community.

Negative press, so not only should they have known, but they had it in writing from their consultants.

Ms PRIDEAUX - In 2021, was it?

Mr BLANKS - In 2020. It's on page 68.

Ms PRIDEAUX - Yes, 2020. It was really gross - grossly poor.

CHAIR - It seems like there are some lessons to be learnt.

Ms PRIDEAUX - Quite a few.

CHAIR - And they have acknowledged that they do have some things to do.

MS PRIDEAUX - The education process would be good.

CHAIR - Any questions for the witnesses?

Ms RATTRAY - It was a very good submission, thank you very much. It outlined your concerns, and even gave us that initial estimate price, that cost. Thank you.

Mr BLANKS - I had some good teachers.

CHAIR - You may not have been aware, but I actually quoted that logical sequence.

Ms RATTRAY - I think Mr Blanks did.

CHAIR - Interesting sequence there. Thank you for that. If there are no other questions? Thank you for your time. I just need to reiterate that, as I advised to you at the commencement of your evidence, what you've said to us here today is protected by parliamentary privilege. Once you leave the table, you need to be aware that this privilege does not attach to comments you may make to anyone, including the media, even if you are just repeating what you said to us. Do you understand?

PUBLIC

Ms PRIDEAUX - Yes.

Mr BLANKS - Yes.

CHAIR - Thank you for your time and your submission.

Mr BLANKS - May we sit in?

CHAIR - You can still sit in. Absolutely.

Mr BLANKS - Thank you. It pays to ask.

CHAIR - Not a problem.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.

Mr CADEN McCARTHY, MANAGER, CITY MOBILITY, CITY OF HOBART, WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

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

Do you understand?

Mr McCARTHY - Yes.

CHAIR - Thank you. Would you like to make an opening statement in relation to the submission that you have provided?

Mr McCARTHY - Yes, thank you Chair, and thank you all for your time. I have been updated on these projects, and I'm looking forward to providing the city's perspective on this - hopefully in a way that's useful as well. I must confess, I haven't been with the city for a very long time, and I'm actually new to Hobart generally as well.

CHAIR - Welcome to Hobart.

Mr McCARTHY - Thank you. I may have to get back to you or take on notice any questions about historical projects or policies. I may not have understanding of some specific areas, and might not know the places as well as you do so intimately. Having said that, I'm very grateful to be speaking to you and to offer the city's perspective.

It's important to begin by stating that, as a concept, the city is supportive of the project's overarching strategic objective to provide more sophisticated, reliable and attractive public transport services and experiences between the city and the southern areas of Greater Hobart. We will support any efforts to promote public transport that can absorb additional travel demand from this region as it continues to grow.

It is always quite difficult to introduce a fairly new type of infrastructure into a city that is kind of growing. A city of this size may not be as familiar with it, as may be some of the largest cities. We think, especially when it comes to implementing transit priority lanes this type of infrastructure could have a really important role in the Greater Hobart region overall future transport network.

However, having invested this sort of money in this project and the need of demonstrate the benefits, we do think the community deserves a bit more benefit from the investment that has been put in and to that, we have a few points to raise from our perspective that refers to our submission.

Firstly, on the compulsory acquisition of properties, in our submission, the city did urge the state to explore all options before proceeding with compulsory acquisition of properties. I am not familiar with the details of the process, however it is, my understanding is that since the early stages, the state Government has been working to try and really minimise the impact of this. However, obviously the community is incredibly stressful and the city's position is that no shortcuts should be taken and this should be done in good faith and that every option is really explored before proceeding with such a serious measure.

A quick point on the Kingston town centre, we know there are some urban renewable works with improvements to liveability and walkability in Kingston town centre. We think that would be really positive not just for Kingston, but for the city as well, in terms of it will help retain some of the economic activity into Kingston as it continues to grow and might avoid some of those unnecessary trips along those major corridors and free up some accessibility, within the City of Hobart. But in the order of delivery, it would probably be our preference for the works in Kingston to be completed at this stage, or be close to, so that can start to have an impact before the southern outlet works are completed. But, it is what it is.

The primary focus on the city's submission I can go a little bit more detail on is on Macquarie and Davey streets. We talk about that quite a bit. The city was broadly supportive of the initial concept in 2020 to create bus lanes for the full lengths of Macquarie's and Davey streets. However, that obviously has been changed and instead of ranges of treatments proposed to help facilitate increased bus movement within the increased traffic capacity of Macquarie and Davey street as part of this project and we do feel that is a bit unfortunate.

We understand that it can be difficult to get this thing done, particularly first off the bat, but overall, we do feel the initial concept including those transit lanes along those corridors would have been more beneficial to the city. But, if they are not installed in the first place, we think that at least they should be future proofed to enable that to be pursued at a later stage or soon, because we still think that could be really positive for these corridors.

Part of the treatments on Macquarie and Davey streets do involve those on-street parking removals and we do understand that might be required with this project. Certain areas or parking might not no longer been the highest and best use of the space along those areas, but

the city has really requested that any removals really be carefully considered. That solutions are really explored to mitigate like a lot of the negative impacts, because they can have consequences not just for visitors, or local businesses, or people wanting to use those car parks. It can have an impact on the overall street environment. But we are working with the state quite closely on this. And they are working with us in good faith to try and come up with some solutions, particularly to those areas that might be most negatively impacted by the removal of some of that parking.

At the heart of much of the concern in the city submission is that the approach to Macquarie and Davey streets seems a little bit narrow-focused, without a lot of consideration of the variety of complex functions those streets do perform. Because Macquarie and Davey streets will always be under a lot of traffic pressure with different uses competing for space. Cars are going to want to move freely and uninterrupted, parkers want to be able to park easily in a stress-free environment,

Pedestrians want to walk freely, easily and safely and in a pleasant environment as well and cyclists want the same and businesses want a good trading environment, so it is quite a dynamic environment. It is often good to create a decent place that people want to stand, talk, sit and dwell and create an environment like that as well.

There is a bit of a risk that with these corridors now being in control of a state roads authority, not saying that it is overall a bad thing, but there is a bit of a risk that the sole focus can become moving people as far and as fast as possible. A roads authority will really carefully monitor movement and make suggestions on how to improve movement for the performance of the region. Traffic professionals have really have sophisticated methods of understanding where a traffic issue is and can be occurring or is likely to occur and how to solve those issues.

That can be really successful, particularly on regional roads, but in really dynamic urban environments, where urban streets have a variety of functions, it can be devastating if not really carefully considered and if that narrow focus is taken. The traditional response to traffic pressure is often when we experience that bit of pressure we often try to accommodate that traffic pressure by easing it and accommodating that demand.

We are trying to solve the immediate problem that is in front of us. We make roads a little bit wider, we make intersections a little bit larger and with each stroke of intervention without a clear vision of the overall corridor, you can really make things a bit more hostile to users that are not vehicles. If we try to solve traffic problems on a dynamic street environment, you can quickly erode what makes those places worthwhile visiting. That is at some of the heart of the city's submission.

The concern with the change from the initial concept to the current version, is that it is quite a change in the feel and function of those streets, Macquarie and Davey, not only as places for buses and vehicles but for people and surrounding land uses as well. In the absence of reverting back to that initial concept at this stage of the project, the city certainly would support improvement of amenity along those corridors. That can be achieved by reallocating some space for street trees, improving sidewalks, environments and the environment for people walking and dwelling on that street and any other measures that could improve the public realm and overall walkability of that area.

What is needed longer term - and probably outside of the scope of this project - is a multidisciplinary area approach to set a clear vision for how these streets should look, feel and function in the medium to long term, that can guide any intervention that the state or the city would like to make. You are choosing how you want those streets to look, feel and function and then try to create an environment that facilitates that instead of trying to respond to little pressures as they arise.

There are too many examples of urban streets that become more desolate as we try to move people as far and as fast as possible until they become something that nobody ever really intended to create, the city or the state. We would look forward to working with the state on that.

That is the heart of some the concerns. It is not saying that we feel negatively about the overall project. We want to make sure, particularly with those treatments on Macquarie and Davey streets, that they are carefully considered and we are working closely with them. We think maybe a broader approach needs to be taken to set a vision for those corridors that considers them as a multi-modal corridor that is not only for the free-flowing movement of vehicles alone.

A quick point on the operation and enforcement of transit priority. With a new T3 lane that people are going to have to become familiar with from the southern corridor, it is going to be important to ensure that the project stays true to its strategic intent, even after it is constructed and delivered. We need to make sure that enforcement is potentially carefully considered in those first few months, to make sure it is being used as it is intended.

It is important to also note that the changes to the Southern Outlet overall, even if done thoughtfully and successfully, will still result in more vehicles entering the city of Hobart and it will not solve congestion long term or avoid more pressures on our urban streets. It is important to remind ourselves that the state and local governments of the greater Hobart region really do need to work together on a sophisticated approach and a balanced approach to congestion management overall that does not rely on infrastructure alone. And creating a more balanced network where this not such reliance on one modal being important while pursuing efforts to manage that travel demand. Some of those points were made in the state's hearing as well.

We think that during that construction period, particularly, the city and the state does anticipate that there could be a city-wide impact on congestion. The overall network could be quite congested, particularly over a month or two where the construction of the transit lane is happening.

Ms RATTRAY - A month or two?

Mr McCARTHY - At least. Yes.

CHAIR - Eighteen months.

Mr McCARTHY - But there could be a period where it is particularly bad that impacts the entire city network. We will be looking forward to working with the state Government on a range of interventions to help manage travel demand during that period. We can investigate

what those interventions might be with the state, and we can implement a range of them. We are looking forward to doing that with the state.

We think that could be a good way of testing some measures and initiatives longer term that can be used to support infrastructure upgrades in the future as well and could potentially be a catalyst for implementing some good measures in travel demand management and congestion management that are probably more balanced and more sophisticated in terms of having a diverse approach.

Thank you for the time and I'm happy to take any questions on the city's submission.

Ms RATTRAY - Thank you very much, Caden. I am a tad confused. I'm not sure whether the Hobart City Council supports this submission or not. Is there a definitive answer to that?

CHAIR - Sorry? Which submission? The project?

Ms RATTRAY - Sorry, this project that's before us. Obviously, you've talked a lot about the overarching plan for the Hobart City Deal Southern Projects. That's where you put a lot of your focus. This project that I have to make a decision on, I am interested in where your council sits at this point in time. It seems like you're happy to have it as long as it doesn't take a car space and it doesn't impact on the movement of traffic. It's not quite clear.

Mr McCARTHY - The city, in our submission, states that we do support the overall design objectives of the project, so we do support the implementation of a T3 lane, provided it is implemented in a carefully considered way. It's not that we don't support removing some car-parking bays. We certainly are willing to consider that. But in our submission, there were a lot of comments around the impacts on Macquarie and Davey streets, primarily. Obviously, we have concerns, particularly initially, with the compulsory acquisition of properties on Dynnyrne Road. There were some comments in there on that.

Overall, with the construction of a T3 lane, we are supportive and we think that providing a better and more reliable public transport experience along that corridor that is fairly high-frequency, but it is just our preference to have that continued through Macquarie and Davey streets as well, as opposed to stopping short of that.

CHAIR - You're saying the whole project, in its concept, is supported. Is it an issue of some elements of it being approached in a different way?

Mr McCARTHY - That's right, yes.

Ms RATTRAY - In the project that we have in front of us, are there some other ways that the Hobart City Council wants to pursue that? You did say a couple of times about working with the state Government on outcomes. Is there something that you consider they haven't got right at this point in time with this project?

Mr McCARTHY - We would certainly look to be working with them on developing some of those travel demand management initiatives, particularly at the start of the construction process, to make sure that the project is delivered successfully and that it's not just filtering more vehicles into the city, and just expanding the capacity. But we are supportive of a T3 lane

PUBLIC

being installed and a high-frequency, reliable public transport service being built along that corridor. We think it could be really effective, especially as opposed to just trying to create more capacity for vehicles along the network.

We do have some concerns about the amount of capacity of vehicles that could be accommodated on that corridor if the T3 lane is abused and not used as intended and it's suddenly carrying a lot more vehicles along the Southern Outlet than it currently does. That will have significant impacts for the city if it's abused. But provided that it functions and that those strategic objectives stay true, and it's delivered in a thoughtful way and enforced, then we do support that initiative because we think it could have quite a good effect at encouraging people to catch public transport when they wouldn't otherwise.

Ms RATTRAY - Thank you.

CHAIR - Isn't that going to that point about providing extra capacity on the Southern Outlet possibly being not a good thing, it seems you're saying, as opposed to providing greater public transport options? How do you achieve that? Clearly, if people aren't going to be travelling in cars it's going to be increasing the capacity for carrying people on the Southern Outlet.

Mr McCARTHY - I mean increasing private vehicle use capacity on the Southern Outlet.

CHAIR - So, taking people out of private vehicles, putting them into buses is making more space for private vehicles in the other two lanes?

Mr McCARTHY - Yes, but we feel that the evidence states that, over time, as the Kingston area and the southern areas grow, that capacity that is freed up will be chewed up and you'll eventually get to a state where travel times are the same as they are.

Ms RATTRAY - We will be back here again.

CHAIR - What are you saying is the ultimate solution in achieving the goal of the T3 lane? That is what I'm trying to get my head around.

Mr McCARTHY - We do think a bus priority lane will be effective in carrying a lot more people via public transport. Particularly if that southern area is growing, we think it will be an important solution.

Ms RATTRAY - Are you saying only a bus, don't put the light vehicles on with the three real people in them and don't put the emergency vehicles, and don't put - what was the other thing?

CHAIR - Taxis.

Mr McCARTHY - Not necessarily. We are just conscious of trying to encourage the state to make sure that that system isn't abused and that people are actually using it as a T3 lane.

CHAIR - That it's effectively monitored?

PUBLIC

Mr McCARTHY - That it's effectively monitored and that single-occupancy vehicles aren't using it and all of a sudden it becomes a much higher-capacity corridor filtering a lot more cars into the CBD environment.

Ms RATTRAY - But don't you want a lot more cars into the CBD because then they come and shop and they eat and they - I mean, it's a bit of a double-edged sword here, isn't it?

Mr McCARTHY - The preference is that there's a more balanced network because, as the state said, if you have a larger funnel opening and you're getting to that point where they're all hitting a point, you're just going to hit congestion anyway.

The preference is that they would be travelling either by bus or bicycle or any other mode, hovercraft, whatever, but that the network is really balanced. We still certainly want a lot of people in the CBD and we want it to be a vibrant place that people come and visit. But we need to have a balanced network to have a successful, accessible, liveable city.

Ms BUTLER - You raised bikes. I wanted to ask you a question. I know bike usage on the Southern Outlet is not the issue here. I am talking more about Macquarie Street and Davey Street. Is that area bike friendly and pedestrian friendly at all, even with the new design according to the Hobart City Council?

Mr McCARTHY - With the new design there are some measures in there to include some spaces for bicycle users. We are working with the state to try to improve that where we can. There are some bicycle head start facilities at certain signals and some space for allocated lanes to allow those movements. It is still a pretty hostile environment for a bicycle. You would have to be a pretty confident cyclist to use Macquarie and Davey streets.

There are some zones and some of those bike lanes that are being put in are to help people just get to the next block where they can get on to a friendlier cycling environment. It's trying to help those cyclists to navigate and get off again as opposed to travelling along the whole corridor. It's still a pretty hostile environment for a bicycle.

In an ideal environment, you would have a better more bicycle-friendly environment along both Macquarie and Davey streets. Our focus, particularly from the city's perspective has been trying to improve the bicycle environments on the surrounding corridors. Part of this work is trying to plug the gaps to try to help people reach those streets.

Ms BUTLER - For the record, on page 7 of your publication, it states:

As the 2019 MRCagney parliamentary submission to Greater Hobart's congestion details ...

And at the bottom of that quote it states:

Further research has shown capacity improvements only reduce congestion for seven possibly 10 years before the adverse impacts re-emerge.

Was that what you were referring to previously when you were talking about if you create more space for traffic then more traffic will come?

PUBLIC

Mr McCARTHY - Yes, that's correct. It does have an impact, especially in the short-term but if you look at it from a long-term perspective it's not going to stop traffic pressure on the city streets necessarily. More people will be able to use that corridor but that capacity will eventually be consumed by more vehicles that use that corridor if that extra space is created for them.

CHAIR - In some of the diagrams here you show the bike heads are not in the right place - you call them bicycle boxes. On Davey Street there is one and on the corner of Davey and Molle Street then it goes right across the head of those lanes. Are you saying they are not something that you want to see?

Mr McCARTHY - No, there was some commentary about some of the design in this submission that we've been trying to work with the state to rectify. We want to get stuck into some of the nuances of the designs of the bicycle head start facilities at certain intersections and cut-offs to try to fix those little points so that a bicycle doesn't just run into a dead-end at certain points or really struggles to get across lanes.

CHAIR - It's got somewhere to go.

Ms BUTLER - The practicalities: what does this look like in real life if I'm on a bike?

Mr McCARTHY - Exactly, if you're looking at it from the street view or if you're riding on a bicycle we want to make sure that they're not being accidentally pushed out into traffic at certain points. They're little safety things that we're working with the state to try to improve.

CHAIR - Clearly, some of that's for projects further down the track but there is one that we experienced this morning when we were coming down Davey Street to do a right on to the Southern Outlet. It's a pretty fraught manoeuvre to make. You don't get much of an arrow, do you at that point?

Ms RATTRAY - There was no arrow.

CHAIR - Are you talking with them about those sorts of things?

Mr McCARTHY - Yes, we've been most recently discussing some of the impacts of the on-street parking removals mostly and trying to find solutions to those businesses that are particularly negatively affected. However, some of those little design features of those two corridors are part of ongoing discussions with the state.

CHAIR - Unless there are any other question, we have covered the main issues. Thank you for the submission and I reiterate to you that as we advised you at the commencement of your evidence, what you've said to us here today is protected by parliamentary privilege and once you leave the table you need to be aware that privilege does not attach to comments you may make to anyone, including the media, even if you're just repeating what you have said to us. Do you understand that?

Mr McCARTHY - Yes. Thank you.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Ms MEG SMITH and **Mr TONY DELL**, SOS HOBART 2021, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Thank you for appearing and for your submission. It is very much appreciated. As we have told all the witnesses, and you have no doubt heard a few times, I must formally let you know that a committee hearing is a proceeding in parliament. This means it receives the protection of parliamentary privilege. This is an important legal protection that allows individuals giving evidence to a parliamentary committee to speak with complete freedom, without the fear of being sued or questioned in any court or place out of parliament. It applies to ensure that parliament receives the very best information when conducting its inquiries.

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

Messrs SMITH and DELL - We do.

CHAIR - Would you like to make an opening statement in support of your submission?

Ms SMITH - I would like to make an opening statement. I have timed it, so it is within my 10 minutes. I would like to make some comments on what we have heard here today. I have five comments to make.

I think the Hobart City Council was referring to the phenomenon known as 'induced demand', where you create capacity, and that capacity is soon taken up by more demand. I just wanted to make that clear.

I would also like to ask Infrastructure Tasmania exactly how many trucks use the Southern Outlet between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m. Trucks, from a standing start, making their way across two sets of lights is actually quite a lot of space, so we estimate that you can get between eight and 10 cars across those lights for every truck.

State Growth and Infrastructure Tasmania, I would like to note, seem to be building a park and ride based on what they think commuters want, rather than having done any robust consultation to understand exactly what will motivate commuters to use the park and ride.

I would like to bring to the committee's attention that the cost we were initially quoted was \$35 million. At a meeting with Martin Blake and Michael Ferguson, the estimate that was given to us was \$74 million. It is interesting that it is now at \$28 million.

Ms RATTRAY - Did you say \$74 million?

Ms SMITH - \$74 million was the cost that was given to us.

CHAIR - Was that just for this project, or for the whole?

Ms SMITH - That was our understanding. We were only there about this project.

CHAIR - For just this T3?

PUBLIC

Mr DELL - We understood that to be the case.

Ms SMITH - We did not believe that \$35 million was actually going to be able to purchase 17 homes and build the road, when it initially included a cantilevered lane on one side.

I also would like to point out that Mr Goninon talked repeatedly of the T3 lane bringing a 25 per cent increase in the transit time. I think this is deliberately misleading. This is an increase of 25 per cent to one small segment of a commuter's journey and there remains an average of two minutes maximum to the standard commuter journey. I wanted to point that out.

CHAIR - You are saying that he was suggesting a 25 per cent increase - or decrease?

Ms SMITH - Martin Blake, earlier this afternoon, referred to a two-minute saving of time, and Christian Goninon on a number of occasions used the expression that it was a 25 per cent saving. I wanted to make sure the committee is aware that it is a 25 per cent saving of the time journey only from Olinda Grove to those lights. It is not a 25 per cent saving on your commuter time - on your overall journey time.

CHAIR - No, from Kingborough to -

Ms SMITH - From wherever, sorry. I will now read my statement:

Thank you for the opportunity to speak here today and for accepting our submission that details our street's concerns about the proposed Southern Outlet T3 bus lane, or as it is known on our street, Ferguson's Fifth Lane Folly.

In trying to put together what I wanted to say in these 10 minutes, I have grappled with the sheer enormity of the challenge my neighbourhood has faced these past 18 months. It is there I want to begin. I want to clarify for the committee that SOS Hobart 2021 was the outcome of a meeting held in April last year, in my lounge room, with representatives from the homes initially affected.

I want to confirm we are not professional lobbyists. We do not have engine rooms of analysts or access to well-heeled consultant specialists. We are just a neighbourhood of ordinary citizens attempting to engage with the democratic process, requesting accountable and transparent decision-making processes from our elected politicians and public servants.

For me, our experience is best captured in the conversation I found myself having with a political aide of Michael Ferguson earlier this year, who questioned why SOS Hobart 2021 was not celebrating our victory with the recent announcement that only three homes had been acquired.

I remember feeling immense frustration at the time as I again attempted to explain what it was we were trying to achieve. We were trying to achieve transparency about how the original decision had been arrived at, what other options had been explored, and how well this solution had been considered to meet future need - questions that still remain largely unanswered, because surely as residents who are asked to surrender their homes for destruction, we were entitled to ask and to have our questions answered. Have you looked at every option?

Is this really a solution to the problem? How much will it cost? Will it still be a solution in five or 10 years' time?

Let me take you back to March/April last year, to those original individual meetings Dynnyrne Road residents had with WSP and Pitt&Sherry engineers, themselves representatives of State Growth, after representatives received a suitably vague letter from an officer of the Department of State Growth, hand-delivered the day before the state election was announced. Completely coincidental timing, we have been assured.

In these meetings, we were told all three levels of government and all sides of the political spectrum were supportive of the plan to demolish our homes, and that we would be homeless by Christmas. I wonder if you can imagine our distress. Michael Ferguson could not, after casually brushing this aside at the very beginning of our first meeting.

Yet it turns out these were only the first of many half-truths and mistruths that we have been subjected to.

In numerous meetings and letters with ministers and senior public servants, Dynnyrne Road residents were promised many things, including the cost-benefits of the proposal and options report what other ideas have been explored by Government and why they have not been implemented and current and projected traffic modelling.

What we eventually received was this, proof all this would amount to would be a maximum of two minutes -an average one-minute of time saved in a small window for commuters - with no indication of the timeframe before continuing housing development boom, coupled with ongoing inadequately funded transport infrastructure, would close this window yet again.

In truth, this group of public servants cannot seem to design their way out of years of siloed and mismanaged planning decisions by any other method than to increase the size and number of available roads stock. A prime example of the phenomena of cognitive bias. And to quote Abraham Maslow: 'If the only tool you have is a hammer, it is tempting to treat everything as if it were a nail'. In fact, to quote Martin Blake this afternoon, the more, the better.

Infrastructure Tasmania with all good intentions, is little more than a main roads Department tasked by State Growth to take a narrow view to the problem of congestion. By their own admissions, the only options they have properly explored were a T3 bus lane, a tunnel or a by-pass. It is hardly surprising that the T3 lane won the price for the most cost-effective solution. But let us not pretend this is a solution to Hobart's growing pains.

Ferguson's fifth lane folly amounts to the picking up of the political palatable parts of any real solution required, as this Government lacks the political fortitude to make unpopular changes required for significant commuter behaviour change. Even SOS Hobart 2021, a group of city planning amateurs, have sourced several viable low-cost no-cost solutions that could be easily implemented by this Government, but which has been purposely ignored. But do not take our word for it.

There are nuanced and mature approaches to tackling city congestion in the immediate and longer term on display across the globe. All pointing to strategies of integrated and

consultative urban planning, green field development levy's, integrated and well-resourced public transport systems and the limiting of major arterial roadways to transport industries at peak commuting times.

As other cities are learning the value of liveability, this minister, State Growth, and Infrastructure Tasmania are failing us. They are blind to the opportunity of building of the legacy of this beautiful, historic and unique city by seriously addressing this issue with courage and creativity. Dynnyrne Road residents are wondering then, why are politicians and public servants so wedded to infrastructure solutions that focus on road building.

Unfortunately, though this is not just about good planning and sensible investment to solve a complex problem, that Michael Ferguson, economical with the truth and misleading by fallacious argument, has painted Dynnyrne Road residents as greedy and selfish, is beyond forgivable. That he has attempted to pit inner city residents against those of Kingston, Huon and the Channel, is abhorrent.

No politician has a better view of the southern outlet congestion than all of us who live on Dynnyrne Road. What we have been attempting to do is demand a mature and adult conversation that explores real solutions, is accountable to the public and transparent about who wins, who loses, and who benefits.

Sorry, I just realised how angry I sound.

Ms RATTRAY - I think passionate is the word, we will use passionate.

Ms SMITH - Thank you, my last paragraph:

As it stands, the bus lane extension or clearway will run out of steam at Molle street funnelling more traffic into a city already crowded. What SOS Hobart 2021 seeks is an end to a hard hat photo opportunity for smiling politicians, present company excluded. We demand real and sustainable solutions for all commuters and resident of southern Tasmania to transport, life-style, and congestion problems in a process that is accountable and transparent to all citizens across the state. Thank you.

Ms RATTRAY - Thanks very much, I expect that was not easy to write, let alone deliver. We do appreciate when we get representations and this submission was extensive in itself and again thank you. You have put in at 5.2 some low cost, no cost solutions and it almost took me back to the pandemic really, when you talked about staggered public servant work hours as the largest employer of commuters. How did you get that information that most of the people that are public servants worked that way and they come from down that way?

Ms SMITH - The submission suggests that as the largest employer in the city, that state government could look at staggered public work hours for public servants, not necessarily that those public servants work down the south of the state. Logically, as the largest employer of people we would imagine that a significant number of those people would live there and that any staggered work hours and flexible working options would benefit the transport infrastructure from any suburb, whether you lived in Claremont or Sorell.

Ms RATTRAY - Like starting at 9.30 instead of 9.00?

PUBLIC

Ms SMITH - Imagine if Service Tasmania started at 7 in the morning and finished at 7 at night.

CHAIR - People are not coming in.

Ms SMITH - Not everybody has to come in at 9.00. It is that whole picture is the problem; the resource which is the Southern Outlet, or is the manufactured demand, which is when we want to use the Southern Outlet as most of the time the Southern Outlet is empty. It is a manufactured demand that starts at about 7.30 and finishes at about 9.10. If we could manufacture that demand differently, there would be nothing wrong with the resource.

Ms RATTRAY - You also have here: reducing the use of the Southern Outlet by heavy transport between 8 a.m. and 9 a.m. The situation where they are already on the Southern Outlet and something happens, or do they just choose another way - I am not as familiar as others with how that works, being a northerner.

Ms SMITH - Every capital city in the country, as far as I am aware except for Darwin, has limits to when heavy vehicular traffic can access through which I think Martin talked about briefly earlier. If that industry looks to use that lane before 8 a.m. and after 9 a.m., then you have taken out a large clump of those vehicles that, as I said earlier, when they cross that line.

Ms RATTRAY - Hence a truck is eight vehicles, I do not think there quite eight vehicles.

Ms SMITH - No, it is not eight vehicles, but you watch that truck and watch all the other traffic on the either side lanes move across that green light and then you watch that truck, it is not just the cars that make up the truck's size. The truck takes a long time to accelerate and it is all the other cars that are going in the other two lanes. If you restricted that movement you would have a much better use of the resource.

Ms RATTRAY - Right. Then you have suggested better school drop-off and pickup solutions.

Ms SMITH - Some of the responses we received from community feedback was that for schools there is a lot of pressure to bring your child into school, a lot of government schools in the south, in those southern areas do not have before and after school drop-offs. You have to enroll your child at Albuera or Princess St, you have to have the child in the car by 8 a.m. so you get up to drop the child off, to go to work and do not want to take the bus. If you had after or before school you could take the child at 7.30, you could get on the park and ride, come up to work, then go back and pick the child up so you do not have to use your car. This is the sort of soft infrastructure that Infrastructure Tasmania does not seem to understand.

Ms RATTRAY - The next one is phone app technology. I listen to the ABC and it tells me whether the traffic is slow or not.

Ms SMITH - I think it was me that you were listening to that day on the ABC. My neighbor, Catherine, can explain this much better than I can.

If you want people to use the park and ride: I'm a mum; I've got to get in the car; I've got to make it to my job at the Royal at 9.00 a.m.; I've got to drop my kid off. If I can't guarantee a carpark in the park and ride, I'm going to be on the Southern Outlet driving to work, and I will

PUBLIC

probably never use that resource again. I went there once. It was full of tradies vehicles. I couldn't park my car. The kid was late.

Ms RATTRAY - Because they start at 7.00 a.m., so you were too late.

Ms SMITH - This is what we would ask: if you're going to properly fund, if you're going to do infrastructure park and ride, do it properly. You can have apps - not very expensive - that you have on your phone. I can book my car park the night before, guaranteeing that I've got somewhere to park my car. The app lets me in the gate, I don't have to compete with tradies, I don't have to worry about Kat missing the bus. It works; because if it's a negative experience for people, they'll never do it again.

Ms RATTRAY - I agree wholeheartedly. I really appreciate that. I just thought there are options and I was thinking, 'oh, how does that work', so I appreciate that explanation.

Ms SMITH - I think park and ride is more than just a carpark. You need more than just a carpark to make a park and ride actually make an impact.

Ms RATTRAY - You might need a childcare facility, leave them there all day. All right, thank you very much, thanks chair.

Ms BUTLER - I would like to thank you both for this amazing submission. There's been so much work put into this over a long time, so thank you, for that.

The appendix B, where you provided case studies of different people's experiences from your street, that was very informative of the journey that you've all undertaken together. I imagine the culture within your street with that shared experience amongst all of you must be quite strong now. Can you tell me a little bit about what the culture was within your street prior to this happening, and now? Just for curiosity's sake?

Ms SMITH - Yes, we had a community forum in October last year that I MC'd, and we had to leave the venue early. I'll say what I said then: we'd like to thank Michael Ferguson for bringing our street together. We had yearly Christmas parties, but I can tell you now, everyone who lives on the street, I know what house they live in. The experience has been incredibly distressing for all residents. There's all sorts of generations on the street - there are young children, there are older retired - thank god - people helping us out, there's a range of different groups. We have attempted to support each other as best we could, both those people who've been directly affected and our neighbours across the road, because even though our houses were impacted, the neighbours across the road were faced with losing friends, and substitute grandchildren.

Ms BUTLER - I would like to ask you another question based from your submission, and I will quote, it's at the top of appendix B in the case study.

So, not because they don't want the committee to understand how this has impacted them, but because they cannot find the energy to engage with this subject again, or they are fearful of the implications that being a visible part of this submission might bring.

PUBLIC

Can you run through what you mean by people within your street fearing implications, and what some of those implications may be?

Ms SMITH - I think you're probably wondering why we don't have the whole street here with us?

Ms BUTLER - Yes.

Ms SMITH - Make no mistake, houses from 8A to 42 are all behind our submission and indeed the work that we have done. We, indeed I, am a public servant here in the State of Tasmania. A number of residents on the street are public servants. There is concern about the implications of getting involved publicly in this campaign.

Ms RATTRAY - I think it's a bit late now; you're here.

Ms SMITH - I have always thought, I'm at the end of my career, so it doesn't really matter. But I know that other people are younger and they have had reservations in being seen to be here today. There are also teachers -

Ms BUTLER - When you say 'implications', what kind of things could potentially happen to you, is that consensus? Could you talk us through for the record, because it is an important point of our governance?

Mr DELL - I am not in the residences that were directly affected. I am also on the top side of the road. I live at number 39 and there are a couple of young people around me whose workplaces have suggested to them not to get involved.

Ms SMITH - I don't know that we can say any more about that.

Mr DELL - I don't want to say more than that.

Ms RATTRAY - Private workplaces?

Mr DELL and **Ms SMITH** - No.

Mr DELL - One of them was a private workplace but at least one was not.

CHAIR - I will take you to page 24, which is in your conclusion:

Given that by the Department of State Growth's own admission, the policy and conditions precedents are not in place to enable the transit lane to be effective in reducing traffic congestion, we submit that this is not a good use of public funds.

Obviously, your experience in the lead-up has been far less than desirable from what I am hearing, I do not want to put words into your mouth, in terms of the process. At the end of the day, looking at the whole project, as to what the vision is, as to what they want to achieve, do you see an ultimate benefit of that whole project working to the good of the community? Or do you think that the softer options only should be dealt with, as you've outlined?

PUBLIC

Ms SMITH - We've said from the very beginning that we would take one for the team if we thought it would solve the traffic congestion and if we thought it was a good use of public funds. But we don't think it will solve traffic congestion and we don't think it's a very good use of public funds.

We have heard today from State Growth and Infrastructure Tasmania's submission so many unknowns and so many unanswered questions. How can they give us a realistic amount of money as a projected figure if they aren't even sure how they're going to do it, what the final design looks like?

We are about to enter a series of, everybody is building their way out of COVID recession across the globe. I know that Infrastructure Tasmania purports to have great relationships with private contractors. However, this is a global and a national market. They will need expert machinery skills requirements. I have a Master of Economics and Regional Development. The reality is demand and supply will be considerable forces. Everybody is going to be doing the same thing so the ultimate price is something I would be very interested to know what that is and how they come to that.

If I had \$35 million to chuck around, I'd be doing something at the Royal.

CHAIR - I think you've answered my question. You're speaking on behalf of the whole group of SOS Hobart 2021?

Ms SMITH - Yes.

CHAIR - How many people would that be, how many neighbours?

Ms SMITH - Seventeen homes.

Ms RATTRAY - We have a picture in your submission but I have noticed that there's probably a few that are not in your street like Mr Johnston, Vica Bayley, perhaps Ella Haddad. I am not sure where Ella lives.

Ms SMITH - Can I be really clear? When we found out about this, the first person I rang was Elise Archer. The second person I rang was the Labor Party. The third person I rang was the Greens. We went to every colour on the political spectrum. We've not played politics. We have just attempted to get some accountability and transparency.

CHAIR - You have approached it apolitically is what you are trying to say.

Ms SMITH - The people who showed up were the people who showed up. That was on a Tuesday morning. We had teachers, nurses, public servants. Not everybody can take time off.

Ms RATTRAY - Absolutely, I understand that. Just asking if that's a representative group of who you are representing here today.

Ms SMITH - So, houses 8A to 42, which would be, probably, a good 50 people, not including children.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - I think your submission is very fulsome and it would have taken you more than two minutes to put this together. Thank you very much for that.

If there's nothing else for you to say and no other questions, it remains for me to give you the statement that we do for all witnesses. That is to advise at the commencement of your evidence that what you have said here for us today is protected by parliamentary privilege. Once you leave the table you need to be aware that privilege does not attach to comments you may make to anyone, including the media, even if you are just repeating what you said to us. Do you understand?

Ms SMITH - We do. Thank you very much for your time.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.

Mr GERRY WHITE, PUBLIC OFFICER, CIRCULAR ECONOMY HUON, and **Dr LIZ SMITH**, CIRCULAR ECONOMY HUON, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Welcome. Before you begin giving your evidence, I need to inform you of some of the important aspects of committee proceedings. A committee hearing is a proceeding in parliament. This means it receives the protection of parliamentary privilege. It's an important legal protection that allows individuals giving evidence to a parliamentary committee to speak with complete freedom, without the fear of being sued or questioned in any court or place out of parliament. It applies to ensure the parliament receives the very best information when conducting its inquiries. It's important to be aware that this protection is not accorded to you if statements that may be defamatory are repeated or referred to by you outside the confines of the parliamentary proceedings. This is a public hearing, members of the public and journalists may be present, and this means your evidence may be reported. Do you understand?

Mr WHITE and Dr SMITH - Yes.

CHAIR - Would you like to make an opening statement in support of your submission?

Mr WHITE - Yes, I will start and then Liz will take over. One thing I did want to say about the department's submission was that I was surprised that there was no mention at all about greenhouse gas emissions, both the impact during the construction stage and what the long-term ramifications of another lane on the outlet were. Just to comment on that.

In terms of our statement, and we provided the submission that you have seen, a number of points I want to bring out from that. One is that we, Circular Economy Huon, support the Hobart City Deal objective of reducing congestion. We particularly like the introduction of more express buses and also ferry services on the Derwent River. We think that's good. But in their introduction, there have been some serious omissions that have not allowed it to be as successful as it should have been.

The second point I want to make is that in our submission the data on Geocads website shows exactly what the traffic flows are on the outlet. As we have said before, it's between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m. coming in on the northbound and between 3 p.m. and 6 p.m. on the

southbound. The figures there were straight from the Geocads website. Congestion only occurs on the Southern Outlet in the morning and not in the afternoon on the southerly journey.

The morning congestion is due to the volume of traffic in the city of Hobart. It is not about the adequacy of the Southern Outlet to bring traffic into Hobart. The congestion is occurring not on the Outlet where the money is proposed to be spent, but within the city itself. It's the number of vehicles.

Congestion is caused by low occupancy levels in private cars, predominantly, many of which are single occupancy vehicles. If measures are put in place to significantly address the issue of low occupancy, then one car can take up another three cars in terms of traffic on the Outlet. If it is one bus, it is between 20 and 40 cars that can be taken off the Outlet. That has already been discussed this afternoon.

The result of providing more road space is that it encourages demand, and we have talked already this afternoon about induced demand. There are some classic examples of where that has happened around the world and there are lots of examples of that. Probably the worst is on the Katy Freeway in Houston where they started off with 12 lanes and they ended up with 23 lanes, and it's taking increased travel time. There are many examples of this.

The Government needs to implement policies and plans that lead to behavioural change in the way that the community and business views transport. It is about applying data analytics to provide public transport; commuter minibus; public transport on demand; carpooling arrangements; and active transport that is fit for purpose, is attractive to the public, is cost efficient and improves mobility for all. There are lots of examples of that around the world.

In our submission we concluded by quoting from the Smarter Cambridge Transport Report, which was given to the UK Government in 2016:

The name of the game is 'modal shift'. Long term reductions in congestion require people to switch to a more sustainable, space-efficient modes of transport: walking, cycling, buses, trams and trains. Though some relief may be gained from increasing the efficiency and capacity of the road network, this will always be short term: the iron law of induced demand will see to that. ...

... To achieve modal shift in towns and cities, we need to invest in improving sustainable transport modes and, at the same time, reduce capacity, access and convenience of urban road networks for motor vehicles. This requires a revolution in transport planning: no longer can the motor vehicle be king of the city. We must design urban roads and streets to be attractive and convenient places to walk, cycle and use public transport. Where compromise is necessary because of lack of space or safety concerns, it is motor vehicles that must give way.

The state has already addressed these issues, and to achieve it, I think the best example of this is the Integrated Transport Strategy that was put together in 2010. Mr Chairman, you signed that document, so you would be familiar with it.

CHAIR - I declared an interest.

Mr WHITE - Good, there is nothing wrong with being interested in a document. This was followed up with the RACT that looked at a Greater Hobart Mobility Vision for 2018.

These are plans that are talking about integrated transport and planning. This is the answer; not an extra lane on the highway. The City of Bendigo is an example of where an integrated transport plan has been applied in Australia. There are lots of examples elsewhere. I follow a website and an organisation called Intelligent Transport. They talk about what is happening in Europe, America, Asia and around the world, and there are lots of good examples.

We believe that the expenditure, whatever it finally is - whether its \$30 million or \$40 million as Pitt&Sherry said, or \$70 million that Meg mentioned - is an outrageous misuse of taxpayer money. Instead, money must be invested in services that improve sustainability and are about integrated transport systems. Integrated transport systems will still cost money and they need investment, but that's where the money is for the future, not for the short-term increase of traffic on the Southern Outlet. Those are my comments.

Dr SMITH - Could I follow up from that. In thinking about this, there was a lot of talk earlier this afternoon about changing the culture to use of public transport rather than private cars. I thought it might help to start with young people, because they are used to using public transport. They use it to get to school, a lot of them.

In 2021, the Tasmanian Youth Forum addressed transport issues and 388 young Tasmanians aged between 12 and 25 years, attended this forum. In the introduction by the CEO of Youth Network Tasmania, it says:

Environmental considerations and sustainability featured strongly in discussions with alternative, sustainable forms of transport favoured by young people.

Transport disadvantage, particularly in urban fringe, rural and regional communities, generated robust discussions, with young people identifying multiple barriers to economic and social participation in their communities.

In thinking about a wellbeing economy in Tasmania [and I guess that is what we all want] and ensuring that young people have all that they need to grow and thrive, the ability for young people to move safely and efficiently in their communities must be prioritised. Access to affordable, available, appropriate and safe public transport is an important vehicle for social inclusion, particularly for young people reliant on others to get where they need to go.

They came up with some solutions through this forum and it says:

They want to be able to get about safely and comfortably using efficient, timely and appropriate transport without the current impediments they identified.

They understand that the culture reliant on petrol-guzzling, carbon emitting personal cars is fast becoming untenable. Our future means of transport must

PUBLIC

be based on energy-efficient, environmentally friendly transit networks, with a variety of readily accessible low-cost options, that enhance equity of opportunity of education and work for generations to come.

They want to be involved in decisions regarding their futures, the future of their communities, and the future of Tasmania. They want governments and other transport providers to take note of their ideas, to be more proactive and to increase their investment in an essential determinant of their aspirations.

So far today, we haven't really thought about young people, or we haven't talked about them, anyway, and it's critically important that the young generation is taken into account when we look at the difference between the hard options as they are called, and the soft options. Thank you.

CHAIR - Thank you for your submission. It is interesting to read some of the things you have to say. The part that you quote from reducing traffic congestion pollution in urban areas, that second section in your conclusion:

To achieve modal shift in towns and cities we need to invest in improving sustainable transport modes and, at the same time, reduce capacity, access and convenience of urban road networks for motor vehicles.

You talk about reducing capacity - this is trying to increase capacity by increasing public transport. Are you saying that the Southern Outlet itself needs to be, in some other ways, constrained to what it is now, so that people will then be more inclined to use public transport?

Mr WHITE - Absolutely. We think that the Southern Outlet could transport a lot more people. We are also aware it is only the two hours in the morning where congestion is occurring, because of the city build-up. But if we had a whole range of things, and I mentioned them earlier, such as public transport which is attractive public transport. That includes electric buses. There are so many examples from around the world where countries are buying thousands of electric buses. We're saying, 'Isn't that good, we are going to try a trial with two electric buses'. I'm pleased we are doing it, but that is one example.

The other thing is, that -

CHAIR - Are you saying we should be going in more holus-bolus?

Mr WHITE - We have the benefit of clean power here, so we will be putting clean power into buses. That will compensate for one of the things about noisy buses and people not liking buses that was talked about earlier.

The whole business of a transport system, you need to look at where people come from and where people are going to. At the moment we will have a park and ride but how do people get to the park and ride arrangement? Within other countries they looked at mini bus services, mini buses on demand, commuter transport that gets people to park and rides.

CHAIR - That is an expensive thing. The most expensive part of public transport is the driver. It is half the cost. If you are going to have mini buses which carry fewer people, isn't that working against us?

PUBLIC

Mr WHITE - It is all going to cost. We are talking about the comparisons of the cost of this motorway compared with something that will build volume for the future. It means less in the high infrastructure, but more about solving problems so that more people will take up less space.

For us, it is about improving mobility for everyone. Liz was talking about young people, but the same goes for old people and for the less well-off. So it is a social means as well as a general means of transport.

CHAIR - As far as this project is concerned you think that it is not money well spent? Try the softer options first.

Mr WHITE - Yes. I was going to say, if this was not rude parliamentary language, it is arse-about. Really we should be trying the soft options first. We should be looking at how we can increase occupancy in vehicles, and systematically doing it through an integrated transport plan. Then, if that failed, we look to other options.

Ms RATTRAY - Do you see any other options? There have been some attempts for park and ride for some time in the southern part of the state. It appears that they have not been very successful, or not being taken up to the level that was anticipated, expected, or even hoped for. Is there any option but this T3 proposal?

Mr WHITE - I think there is.

Ms RATTRAY - I read out those soft options earlier, and I got some clarification, which I appreciate.

Mr WHITE - I think the park and ride can be done, and it can be done well. Comments have been made about that. We can take the basic facility, both of those in Kingston, and they can be connected up so that we can get better use of it. I live south of Huonville. Then you look at the range of park and rides that could be provided and should be provided for a linked up service to come up to Hobart that are not there and not being considered at the moment.

Grove is a classic example. We do not need to expend millions. There needs to be a space for buses to pull in, for cars to park, but it is not about the main centre, it is the small townships. If you go down the Channel, we are talking about Margate and Snug, Kettering and Woodbridge, the same thing can happen. You do not end up with one big volume of traffic that people need to drive to, but people can get to their local park and ride system which does not require a lot of infrastructure, but it needs thinking through.

CHAIR - A hub and spoke model.

Ms BUTLER - Like going to the train station.

Mr WHITE - Yes.

CHAIR - Just an observation for when you do another submission. Table 1, vehicle movements, Southern Outlet, date Friday 26 June 2021, it is actually Saturday; 26 June was a Saturday in 2021, but whether that is - you might need to check that.

PUBLIC

Mr WHITE - The reason I included two dates was because I did not want it to be specific to a day, so that it was consistent, but thanks for pointing that out.

CHAIR - Saturdays are very busy days too.

Ms RATTRAY - One last question, if I might, Chair. In your submission you talk about there are 65 bus stops designated by the Department of State Growth, many of which are without even a stop sign or a hard stand, or shelter, or seating, or lighting. If those 65 were upgraded, do you think more people would use them?

Mr WHITE - I'm sure they would, if there was a people focus about bus stops.

Ms RATTRAY - Thank you.

CHAIR - Your observation was about spending money on those sorts of upgrades, rather than big infrastructure upgrades?

Mr WHITE - Yes, and it will cost money.

CHAIR - Before you go, thank you again for appearing. As I advised at the commencement of your evidence, what you've said here today is protected by parliamentary privilege. Once you leave the table you need to be aware that this privilege does not attach to comments you may make to anyone, including the media, even if you're just repeating what you said to us. Are you aware of that?

Mr WHITE - Yes.

CHAIR - Thank you very much.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.

Mr MERVIN REED WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Thank you, Mr Reed. It is nice to see you. I need to read this to you first.

A committee hearing is a proceeding in parliament. This means it receives the protection of parliamentary privilege. This is an important legal protection that allows individuals giving evidence to a parliamentary committee to speak with complete freedom, without the fear of being sued or questioned in any court or place out of parliament. It applies to ensure that parliament receives the very best information when conducting its inquiries.

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

Mr REED - I am fully aware of that, Chair.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Would you like to make an opening statement to support your submission?

Mr REED - First, I would like to make it clear my original submission was made by me as a resident who has been impacted. I live in Tolmans Hill. The noise attenuation in Tolmans Hill will be a problem, as well as further down in what is not really an outlet but freeway.

Thank you for the opportunity to add some further data to my submission. This project has a chequered history. For a \$30 million project, it seems to be a bit of a mess.

The first design saw 15 or so homeowners presented with a notice of intent to compulsorily acquire their homes - a notice not happily received by anybody, landowners included. They found out with their lawyers that there was no appeal. This was some years ago, and we have been designing this mess ever since. So we get to an alternative engineering design, when they were originally told no alternative designs existed.

The Department of State Growth was asked to redesign the creation of the third down lane from the top of Tolmans Hill, to see if we actually needed to turf some -

CHAIR - Top of Tolmans Hill - I think you mean from the top of Olinda Grove?

Mr REED - Tolmans Hill is where it starts.

CHAIR - At the base of Tolmans Hill.

Mr REED - Yes. They were asked to see whether we actually needed to turf the 15 families out of their homes, which would be a key or political objective, I am sure.

The Department of State Growth then found out there were no engineering plans for the existing roadway on an 'as constructed' basis, which there generally are for state roads. These are generally kept on an 'as constructed' basis, and surveyors survey the finished road.

Ms RATTRAY - Where do you think they went, Merv? There would have to be something.

Mr REED - No idea, Madam Deputy Chair. Further substantial public funds have been expended to have the whole road resurveyed by electronic surveying equipment. That went on for night after night, to have an engineering-based design of the road to work from.

The committee might inquire how much has been spent on this process, including drilling to determine the geomatics. Who authorised this, and how was it paid for?

The public concerns at the loss of homes saw the redesign reduced to compulsory acquisitions of three homes, it now appears. It should never have been necessary, if competency of the project had been apparent from day one. Why could this not have been done two years earlier?

Current concerns with the project are what now needs to be included. I noted in my earlier submission that the road noise concerns of residents had been ignored by the planners. There are no noise studies - even desktop - that show the impact on the ground to residential

PUBLIC

homes of the additional road noise generated by this freeway development. I find today, in the submission from the department, one little line saying, 'we have actually started taking baseline studies'. Isn't that nice?

If such studies and solutions do not exist, how can the committee defer the project until they can be supplied to the impacted residents of Dynnyrne, both sides of the road and Tolmans Hill?

If such solutions do not exist, I fail to see how the committee can approve the project. In this case, it will be over to the committee to report to parliament that the proposed works are not in the public interest, as set aside under section 16(5) of the act, until the matter of noise attenuation from the proposed works is remediated. This noise attenuation may cost in the order of \$6 million and therefore needs to be included in the authorised cost base of the project to be approved by the committee.

The reason is simple: the residents will have noise levels increasing by some 25 per cent, impacting their amenity, with no remediation proposed in the works that this committee is examining in the public interest. This noise will be of concern medically. Remediation is required.

To assist the committee in its deliberations, I would now like to turn to the issue of the noise remediation works required.

Noise reduction panels: the committee will notice there are no noise reduction panels planned for the freeway even though these are mandated for building high-volume traffic roads in residential areas. Effective noise barriers generally reduce noise levels by 5 to 12 decibels, reducing the perceived loudness of traffic noise as much by one-half. These noise barriers include absorptive panels and reflector panels. There are a number of agreed international standards or conventions for noise levels. Many of these identified noise levels can be medically demonstrated to cause harm - or provide guidance on levels that may appear to have no observable detrimental impact, but ultimately do.

This is now regarded as a reasonable agreement on the latter, and these levels are regarded as long-term noise harm levels. These principles were adopted by the Department of State Growth in 2013. They may be about to be rediscovered.

Noise amelioration measures can measure noise through vehicle and non-vehicle responses. Vehicle responses target the source, which is the vehicle. Non-vehicle responses measure target noise between the vehicle and the impacted property. Generally, there are alternatives.

I point the committee to the fact that noise panels are installed on the other end of this freeway at Kingston, to obviate the impact of noise on the residential areas adjacent, and the amenity of the residents. It therefore follows that the design arrangements for this expansion of the freeway now provide the opportunity for the Government to install noise panels on both sides of the road, reducing the increasing noise impact.

If the noise panels are not installed, residential areas on both sides of this freeway will be subject to increasing noise levels that will be medically harmful and clearly not in the public interest. If this is the case, the project should be refused until amelioration is provided.

Low-noise asphalt: I noticed Madam Deputy Chair picked that one up. This is a mix that has been used elsewhere in Australia on freeways to reduce the hum. There is a background hum that is produced by tyres on asphalt. By doing this you reduce the level of hum by about half. Remember, we have this freeway that is fully loaded with traffic probably six or seven hours a day, sometimes more. It is not a problem with having it applied because the same machines that put the normal asphalt on put the low noise asphalt on. It is just a different mix.

I would ask that this measure be considered as a requirement for noise reduction to residents impacted by the project. If the low noise services are unable to be agreed with the Government then the Government will have to determine what harm impact it will have on people medically and provide alternative measures, sort of like double glazing and all sorts of other stuff.

Looking at this project, I thought why do we have a freeway with an 80 kilometre speed limit, up and down the hill? Why do we not have a lower speed limit which would reduce the noise impact. There is no particular reason why a substantial grade hill such as Tolmans to Davey St needs to be undertaken at 80 kilometre per hour. There is very little effective electronic signage to gauge slow moving traffic.

The committee should be aware all the freight from the southern part of Tasmania comes up and down this freeway as there is no alternative. Three years ago, the Department of State Growth had an opportunity to add to a project to update the Plenty Link Road connecting New Norfolk with Huonville and decided not to. That is their problem: millions of tonnes of freight, including log trucks, B-doubles, fresh food trucks, all of the road base for southern Tasmania, and of course normal semi-trailers use this hill every day. Trucks cannot, of course, speed down the hill.

CHAIR - Is that the Jackson's corner one you are talking about linking New Norfolk.

Mr REED - It runs from Lonnavele to Lawitta in the Derwent Valley and it was proposed to put a rail head in at Lawitta in the Derwent Valley to pick up the log traffic from the Derwent Valley and the Huon Valley and also provided as a freight road. All the freight went on the road and, because it would be a freight only road, it would be subject to off-road diesel claims and would be welcome by the freight industry. Because you have a freight up there, another state-owned company, TasRail, would increase its revenue.

CHAIR - What did you call that road, what is the name of that road.

Mr REED - Plenty Link Road is a currently constructed road. The Plenty Link Road is owned by the state and has all the road reserves already in place so it is a really simple deal.

The reduction of the speed limit from 80 to 65 kilometres per hour would be not detrimental to use times, but would make significant differences to noise level generated. I ask the committee to consider this noise reduction measure as a mandated committee requirement for the project to proceed.

Summary: This project may be of value to traffic management in Southern Tasmania. There are lots of pros and cons in this regard, however, the project has substantial deficiencies

PUBLIC

that unless these are addressed and mandated to be built and included in the project, then the project must be refused under section 16(5) of the act.

The alternative is that the committee report the project as incomplete to both Houses; the committee looks forward to an amended project design that will reduce harm to the public to be provided to it at further hearings. The noise abatement proposals need public scrutiny before coming back to the committee.

I thank the committee for this opportunity. I am happy to answer any questions.

Ms RATTRAY - Thank you very much, Mervin. Your suggestion that the committee send it back and say its incomplete and welcomes an opportunity at later time to look at a revised project, does that not spread out the angst, uncertainty and the concern the community has? Does that not help the health and wellbeing in that respect? What do you think about that?

Mr REED - Madam Deputy Chair, not necessarily. The major concern, as I understand it, was the impact of the initial notices to treat for compulsory acquisitions without any understanding of what the road design was going to look like. Then with the Government saying, 'There's another way to do this, we come back with only three houses' and so that level of angst has departed.

Then there's the design issues, and now we're going to have a road that's going to have a moved central barrier, that's going to have to be redesigned. I would be sceptical if the \$30 million project cap would ever be achieved. In terms of stretching it out, there are many projects that go to parliament, both national and state parliaments, that are set aside by a parliamentary works committee for further information. It wouldn't be the first time.

Ms RATTRAY - Thank you, I just thought I'd ask the question, because we did hear from that SOS group.

Mr REED - And the public understand that you're acting in their interest.

Ms RATTRAY - We don't take our role lightly here, I can assure you. I think just the length of time that we've put into this today shows the community that we are very committed to the role of scrutiny.

Mr REED - The committee has asked all the right questions.

CHAIR - The speed change is an interesting one. A lot of people would say, 'It'll take us longer to get to town', but then it may indeed reduce congestion at the same time. It would be interesting to ask that question of the department.

Mr REED - I am sure it will be, Chair.

CHAIR - It is how many vehicles are reaching the end point in a certain period of time, and if the speed limit is reduced, it may actually have an impact on congestion to a degree. It is an interesting question to ask. Other questions? No? We have covered the noise side of it?

PUBLIC

Ms RATTRAY - I got some more information in regard to my low noise asphalt, so thank you.

CHAIR - Yes, there's some interesting questions about the serviceability of that when it comes to wet weather and all those sorts of things, whether you're aware of any information on that, your low noise bitumen.

Mr REED - Yes, I can flick that through to you, Chair.

CHAIR - I was interested to know whether there's a weather issue.

Mr REED - It is a regular product. I'm sure the Department of State Growth can ring up somebody who supplies asphalt and get it from them.

CHAIR - That is okay.

Ms BUTLER - I have a quick question. Noise reduction panels, you talked about them briefly.

Mr REED - Sorry, I'm really hard of hearing from my naval service, it destroyed half of it.

Ms BUTLER - Noise reduction panels, do you know much about noise reduction panels? I suppose when the outlet was originally built in the 1970s -

Mr REED - 1960.

Ms BUTLER - In 1966, was it?

CHAIR - The 1960s.

Ms BUTLER - Yes. Those standards wouldn't have been part of building the Outlet.

Mr REED - No.

Ms BUTLER - Now when there are modifications to the Outlet because of the high build-up and the density, do you know much about noise reduction panels? They are very expensive, are they not?

Mr REED - Let us preface that by saying in another life I used to work for the Department of Defence for a number of years. When you build airfields, one of the criteria the parliamentary works committee asked us was, what are the noise spoils going to be and showing this on a big map around the airfield. Some of these aircraft put out 140 or 150 decibels up to two or three kilometres with full afterburners. So, you have to be reflective of the public good.

Also, with roads, these noise reduction panels, and I'm sure everybody has driven down the Tullamarine Freeway, are normal. They have a mix of what's called reflective and absorbing panels, and they're offset all the way along. The panels themselves are nothing magic in terms of construction. They're either precast concrete with a facing that has motifs on it that

PUBLIC

have a number of angles that push the sound in various directions, or they are specifically timber, or they are specifically structured in such a way that they have multi-angled faces. There is nothing hard about building them. They're generally steel frames, concrete footings, dropped in with a crane, bolted down.

Ms BUTLER - Thank you.

Ms RATTRAY - I can see another advisory role.

Mr REED - I have, Madam Deputy Chair, a fulltime chartered financial planning practice. I've been sitting here this afternoon and losing money.

CHAIR - You say you're about the consultation with Dynnyrne and Tolmans Hill. Are you aware of any consultation that happened on Tolmans Hill?

Mr REED - No. About a third of Tolmans Hill is impacted by the freeway noise, particularly the Attorney-General's home.

CHAIR - You write that:

The recent reversal of road designs "set in stone" by the Minister on the Bass Highway illustrates the point.

Mr REED - I heard about that. I thought that was really interesting.

Ms RATTRAY - They were going to have an overpass.

Mr REED - That was a ministerial decision. Somebody wasn't going to wipe out a whole bunch of houses in their backyards.

CHAIR - That's where they had those accidents with a school bus, wasn't it?

Mr REED - There was a different design outcome.

Ms RATTRAY - Burnie Court.

Mr REED - Everybody was happy.

CHAIR - Not everybody was happy, I have to say. That's one I voted against. Unless there are any other questions, I thank you for your evidence and simply say to you what you said to here today is protected by parliamentary privilege. Once you leave the table, you need to be aware that privilege does not attach to comments you may make to anyone including the media, even if you are just repeating what you said to us. Do you understand that?

Mr REED - Correct, I understand that fully, Mr Chairman.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Mr MICHAEL JAMES HANLON WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Before we begin your evidence - the committee will hear this for the sixth time today - the committee hearing is a proceeding in parliament. This means it receives the protection of parliamentary privilege. This is an important legal protection that allows individuals giving evidence to a parliamentary committee to speak with complete freedom, without the fear of being sued or questioned in any court or place out of parliament. It applies to ensure that parliament receives the very best information when conducting its inquiries.

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

Mr HANLON - I do.

CHAIR - Thank you. Would you like to make an opening statement, as we don't have a submission?

Mr HANLON - I don't have a submission. First of all, I want to thank you for your time, at this time of day. I'm making a statement of my experience towards this whole project as being a resident of Dynnyrne Road.

CHAIR - Whereabouts?

Mr HANLON - 18 Dynnyrne Road.

Ms BUTLER - We drove past your house today.

Mr HANLON - You would have. I've been fortunate to be able to purchase property in Victoria, in the past. When you purchase new property, you are given documentation to say if there are any proposed works going with this property. So, when I came to buy my forever home in Dynnyrne Road, in December 2018, there was no such disclosure. So, I thought this is safe, this is great, its good, nothing could interrupt us from being in our forever home - myself, my wife and family.

Then, of course, the Department of State Growth letterbox-dropped a year later, two years later. I asked, when it was passed into my hands, is this about compulsory acquisition? - 'Oh, absolutely not. My gee, you've got a lovely garden, oh that is beautiful, you must do a lot of work'. And I said: 'yes'. 'Well, we would like to have a face-to-face meeting, can we have a face-to-face meeting?'. 'Yes, sure - when?' 'Next week, like we are already meeting with other people next week'. This is the week before Easter of that year.

So, we have our face-to-face meeting and we were presented with 'we are going to have to do this', and what have you. I asked 'what is the design?' We were shown a picture at distance, we were not allowed to have it, to see the design, because 'it is not finished'. We were also told that we should have this meeting privately, not to be in conjunction with any other households. We asked about the design - 'Are there any options?' 'This is our preferred option'. I said, 'Yes, but what other options are there?'. - 'This is our preferred option'. 'So, you do not

have another option?' 'This is our preferred option. Most of the homes on this side of the street will be acquired to enable this project to go through'. No details were handed over to us at that time.

As I was seeing these two women out of my home, I said, 'You like my garden?' 'Oh, it's a beautiful garden'. I said, 'I've got some works coming up next month, between \$10 000 and \$15 000 worth of reinstalling some retaining walls. So, I should stop doing that.' 'No, go ahead as normal, keep going'. I said, 'Okay, I don't understand'.

We had a meeting with Martin Blake and we asked questions like 'what is this design?' 'We don't know yet. It still hasn't been finalised'. Lots of questions were asked. Then we had a second meeting, and we were told at that meeting that, 'You shouldn't have been told that your house is going to be acquired because we don't know that for sure'. I asked Martin, 'Who gave the authority that we were to be told in our homes that we were likely to have our homes acquired?' 'Don't know'. 'Well, it has caused a lot of angst. Who is accountable for that angst?' 'Don't know'.

But he did say, 'Well, Michael, I've got some very good news for you', and he put this diagram in my hands. It is an aerial photo of my home with a dotted line on it. It just states that is 18 Dynnyrne Road, final design will determine extent of acquisition. As you can see, it's a formal document. Can you see the formality of the document? I think it was done by a year 9 student at high school. There is nothing to say that that is a formal notification to me that my home will not be acquired, but some land will. I asked Martin, 'How much land?'. 'I don't know, because we do not have a final design'.

I think there was a total lack of professionalism in treating us with this sort of information.

One of my neighbours, two doors up, had only bought their home six months earlier. I asked, 'Why are you not attending these meetings? Surely you would be frustrated, like I am'. 'Oh well, I work for the Government so it's probably a better idea, I don't'. I said, 'Well, do you know what the impact is going to be on your house?' No, we don't'. I said, 'I received a picture from Martin Blake'. 'Oh, we've had no picture'. I said, 'Well, go and ask them. They will give it to you'. He was presented with this picture, via email, of the impact on his property. I will not tell you what number. Professional consultation, details provided. 'So, who is accountable for all of this?' 'We don't know'.

We were asked then to meet up with their PR person, Chris Clark, to talk about the process. I said: 'Well, if we are not going to get answers definite, one way or another, is there any point in meeting?' 'Oh, we are meeting with everybody, and you should be part of it because we are already meeting with many other people'.

I gave him a list via email of eight questions I wanted to put to him. 'Can you give me answers'. 'No, I am not in a position to do that'. He said, 'Come on, we should still meet'. I said, 'No point meeting if you cannot answer my questions'. 'Well, everybody else is meeting Michael, why aren't you?'

I do not know, probably about eight or nine emails and a number of phone calls later, I met with him and he said, 'There is nothing more I can say to what you already know'. I said, 'Well, I put your communication to me via email when I said don't and via phone when I said don't as harassment. You harassed me into making a meeting time with you'.

PUBLIC

As Martin Blake quoted earlier on, there has been a lot of pressure to get this thing moving. I think I have been treated as an unwelcome obstruction to the plan to build this piece of roadwork. No respect for myself or the sanctuary of my home was afforded to me at any level. I have been left with no control over the future of my forever home. All of that has been taken away.

When we bought our forever home, we chunked in an extra \$50 000 because we were so keen to have it. It was above and beyond what we could afford. Now our house is worth nowhere near that amount of money and it probably will never be.

During the public consultation sessions that were online, I was privileged to notice the TV animated ads, saying this is what we are building, we are building a bus lane, a T3 lane, while the public consultation was going on.

In December 2021, I noticed surveyors at the intersection of the Outlet to Davey/Macquarie. A year after we were told it was going ahead, surveyors were surveying. A week later, we had a letterbox drop saying, 'In December you will be hearing noise at night as we are doing soundings on the subterranean structure'. In early February I think it was, we got a letterbox drop, 'We are coming onto your property to do drilling to get core samples to find out what the substructure is'. I would have thought you did all those sorts of things before you do anything else.

During this whole process, a big price has been paid. 'It is a valuable learning experience' has been quoted a few times today. I wonder, that valuable learning experience, who has paid the price for that. I think it is the residents of Dynnyrne Road and I am one of them. My health is not great. My blood pressure is high and it is now higher, so is my anxiety level, so is my stress level and my medications have been upped, all since we got this letter given to us on our doorstep.

We are not as happy in our forever home as we once were. It is a very sad indictment on the leadership of the Government of this state who, I think treat the taxpayers like children or like idiots. That is a formal government notice to me that my house is safe. You will note there is no identifying documentation on it whatsoever. Martin put it in my hand and said, 'Michael, you will be very happy to receive this'. That is because I am an idiot, or I am only a taxpayer, or I am only a resident and I am of no consequence to the Government of this state. I thank you for your time this afternoon.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Ms BUTLER - Thank you. Can I ask, would you be able to speak through what it is on that piece of paper -

Mr HANLON - I have a picture with it. Yes, certainly. It is an aerial photo of my home and on it there is a dotted line which is just a dotted line near our fence -

Ms BUTLER - The front yard or back yard?

Mr HANLON - That is the back yard to the Outlet. I said to Martin, 'How much land does that represent?'. He said, 'I don't know'. I said, 'Could it be one, two, three metres?'. He said, 'I don't know until we finish the design'.

PUBLIC

This is a blank piece of paper with an aerial photo of my home, 18 Dynnyrne Road; some property acquisition will be required. The final design will determine extent of acquisition. The dotted line is the full extent of proposed alignment. There is nothing else written on the paper. There is no letterhead; no signature; no name; no date; nothing. Martin Blake said to me as he put it into my hand, 'Michael, you will be pleased to receive this because we're not taking your house'.

Ms BUTLER - Was there was another document as well?

Mr HANLON - The other document was one of my neighbours.

Ms BUTLER - Could you explain for the record what that looks like.

Mr HANLON - That looks like a very blurry picture of a part of a house with what looks like the Southern Outlet on one side. There is a red dot in the centre of the house; there is a blue dot overlapping the red dot. There are, I do not know if they are parallel red lines going on the boundary of the property and then there are a number of blue lines - some straight, some dotted, some thick and some thin - which go along the edge of the property adjacent to the Southern Outlet. Again, there is nothing on the piece of paper aside from that image.

CHAIR - Do you wish to leave that with us?

Mr HANLON - If you would like it, I am happy to leave it.

CHAIR - If you table it.

Mr HANLON - I should do that.

Ms BUTLER - That is fine.

Mr HANLON - I am happy to leave that if you so desire.

CHAIR - Thank you. Your angst is noted. I am sure every member of the committee understands that.

Mr HANLON - And that is just mine.

CHAIR - Can I turn your mind to the actual project? What is your attitude to the project?

Mr HANLON - My attitude to the project is a cart in front of a horse. I have not lived in the state for a long time but everybody I am associated with and I have said this is happening - I knew beforehand and I said it doesn't make sense to funnel traffic into the Macquarie/Davey Street couplet because that is a bottleneck. As soon as people come out of Davey Street, turning right in the morning they want to go up Macquarie Street. They are crossing over four lanes of traffic. When I am coming out of Davey Street to go down Macquarie Street, I am wanting to cross over four lanes, we are doing this and, yes, there is a right-turn lane but no right-turn arrow.

I nearly got wiped out going through that just a couple of weeks ago because everybody starts putting their foot down on Antill Street at the last set of lights before the Outlet. They

PUBLIC

start going from there which is like a death race 2000. Everyone speeds up to be the first around the corner; to be the first to get up onto the right side of the lane, so you do not get stuck behind a truck or a bus. You can do your 80 or maybe a bit more to get up and get going. That intersection in the morning is absolutely treacherous during the peak coming-in times.

I think there are various other options before creating a wider funnel because it is only a funnel and everybody I know has been on my back saying, 'You poor bugger'. A tin of white paint and a will to see something happen would cause a clearway lane and you'd be home and hosed.

CHAIR - Thank you. Do we have any other questions?

Ms RATTRAY - No, thank you for your time.

Ms BUTLER - And for waiting all day.

CHAIR - It has been a long wait.

Mr HANLON - Yes. Chair, do you have something to say to me?

CHAIR - I do have something to say to you.

Ms BUTLER - For the seventh time.

CHAIR - For the seventh time. So, as I advised you at the commencement of your evidence, what you've said to us here today is protected by parliamentary privilege, and once you leave the table you need to be aware that privilege does not attach to comments you may make to anyone, including the media, even if you're just repeating what you've said to us. Do you understand?

Mr HANLON - I do.

CHAIR - Thank you, Mr Hanlon.

Mr HANLON - Thank you for your time.

CHAIR - We appreciate your verbal submission.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

Mr MARTIN BLAKE, CEO INFRASTRUCTURE TASMANIA, DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH; **Mr CHRISTIAN GONINON**, PROJECT DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH; **Ms SUK MAAN KONG**, PROJECT MANAGER, DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH, WERE CALLED AND RE-EXAMINED.

CHAIR - You have heard all those submissions. Is there anything you'd like to state straight-up before we ask other questions of you?

PUBLIC

Mr BLAKE - I suppose there is a couple of things, Chair. In general, the commentary about public transport is interesting, because I think if you went back to 2018 you wouldn't find this discussion in the public domain, certainly not in political circles, in terms of the best way to go forward with public transport.

From that point of view, we've come a very long way. It's very good to see that debate happening. It does seem to be that there is a misunderstanding of the intention of the project as far as passenger transport goes. People are seeing it in terms of increasing capacity rather than facilitating more reliable and effective and more attractive passenger transport, which is disappointing, because that is the purpose of the project.

There is also a bit of misunderstanding in terms of Macquarie Street, in particular, that there's something that's readily available to get the buses down Macquarie Street faster without creating untenable traffic problems further up the Southern Outlet that include the buses themselves. As we said, the buses are delayed more by having that bus lane than they would otherwise in the Macquarie outlet case.

CHAIR - Sorry, did you say the buses are more delayed?

Mr BLAKE - Correct. What happens is the queues actually get longer on the Southern Outlet than they are currently and the buses are caught up in that queue. The actual time it takes for a bus to get from Kingston to the middle of the city in peak hour is longer than what it is now with those bus lanes in place, unfortunately. Until a transit lane can be extended back to Kingston, it is counterproductive. If we can - and hopefully we will - one day get a transit lane back to Kingston, those bus lanes will become viable, and the works that are being done now provide for that in the future.

There was also a bit of commentary about the bicycle facilities. That was something that was thought through quite a bit. You will see, for example, on the consultation material for Davey Street in particular - a different project outside this one, but related - that is provided for. The reason the bicycle facilities aren't provided for explicitly in Macquarie Street is because we're contributing funding towards a dedicated bicycle lane in Collins Street, the next street down, which also joins up with the traffic lights across Molle Street which connect to the Hobart Rivulet Track. We have worked out a network operating plan with Hobart City Council for all the transport modes, including the bike network. It simply wouldn't make sense to put in more bicycle facilities in a parallel street. We just can't provide for it in every location. That was a little bit of interesting context for that.

Generally, I think it is great that we're have a discussion about the best way to provide passenger transport, and that's a major step forward.

CHAIR - When we had Mr Blanks here, he was talking about the park and rides, the Firthside one in particular, being used by tradies as opposed to people who might catch buses. Are you aware of that?

Mr BLAKE - In establishing both of them, we were aware that it was going to be a risk. The answer to the problem will lie in some sort of enforcement ultimately, particularly with the larger ones. The Firthside one was a little bit opportunistic in terms of the park and ride. It was where people were using the location as a park and ride informally but it was a very muddy, messy place to park your car, and particularly on rainy days it was an unattractive place

to do it. So it was really providing a level of amenity at a location that was being used for it originally.

At some stage we would like to be able to use some sort of enforcement for people who are using the passenger transport. How we ultimately do that is going to be difficult at that kind of location, as opposed to more of an enclosed location where you can see some sort of common ticketing solution able to be used in conjunction with some level of access. That is something that Christian is looking at right now with bicycle security. There has to be some sort of solution for it because again we are looking at locations like the Glebe in Clarence where there is a high risk of it being used as a parking lot as well so it will be an issue. It will be something we will have to resolve in the longer term.

Ms BUTLER - Could you argue, potentially, that the tradies cars being there is evidence that they may be car-pooling?

Mr BLAKE - Potentially.

Ms RATTRAY - And they only work half a day.

Mr BLAKE - I do not know. The member might be correct but we did see it as a risk even at the Huntingfield site where it is in close proximity to the Fork in the Road and other businesses. We recognise it is a risk and something we are going to have to monitor and, ultimately, enforce.

CHAIR - There might need to be a pass mechanism.

Ms RATTRAY - That suggestion about the phone app, I thought was an excellent suggestion, where you book your park.

Mr BLAKE - Absolutely and I have used similar things internationally. It's not like these are the only things that are happening in this space. There is a range of different initiatives happening across government, particularly in passenger transport area, that are working towards a much more user-friendly system and we will see those in time.

CHAIR - There was also an observation about buses and trucks still being requested to use low gear.

Mr BLAKE - That's very much a safety requirement. On that gradient they would simply need to for safety reasons. The brakes overheat and they can actually lose their brakes if they don't. So that's a really important safety measure. That would have been something in place ever since the outlet was built, in terms of a requirement and as a safety measure.

CHAIR - When electric buses are in vogue they will be able to regenerate power and put it back into their battery.

Mr BLAKE - That's an interesting background to the noise discussion. I am not a futurist but you definitely could conceive of a time when the noise on those roads and what's in the roads will be a lot more palatable than it is now.

Ms RATTRAY - In the meantime are you interested in lowering the speed limit?

Mr BLAKE - Lowering the speed limit is something we have looked at and is something we are generally quite interested in. There are always safety benefits in lowering the speed limit, albeit it's a trade-off with efficiency on major arterial routes like this. We definitely have a problem on that corner, in terms of visibility around the corner which is why we have the slow-moving vehicles ahead sign.

Lowering the speed limit is probably not going to have a huge amount of difference but it is certainly something we would always be prepared to look at. The only reason I say is that it certainly would reduce the risk of those rear-end collisions when there is queueing. I do not know, and this is where I suppose I question the asphalt idea, and just thinking about it at the back, and ideas like this, in that I suspect - and I do not know this because I am not an expert in noise. It's something that Suk Maan's research and specialists would be able to answer but I suspect the majority of the noise is from the braking and the accelerating of heavy vehicles up and down the hill. It may well be that the rest of it is fairly low-level background noise in comparison, albeit not insignificant. It would be interesting because, as I said, that is probably the major source of the most problematic noise.

Ms RATTRAY - And the installation of the noise barriers?

Mr BLAKE - Again, Suk Maan's work will help clarify that. Obviously, as was pointed out earlier, there are pros and cons to that for the residents. Some residents will be particularly heavily impacted by the construction.

Ms RATTRAY - By view, by amenity?

Mr BLAKE - Correct. Some of them would be extremely badly affected by that.

CHAIR - Up the top near Olinda Grove, from there down. A curved one, I'm thinking, might throw it out. It might also throw it towards residences across the valley.

Mr BLAKE - It could, and Suk Maan's specialists would be able to advise us on this. The first thing to establish is whether the construction of the extra lane will actually increase noise levels greater than what they would have been otherwise. I am not sure whether that is the case. We will need to let the specialists look into that. There is an argument that traffic volumes may be equivalent under both scenarios.

Ms RATTRAY - My final question is the project spend to date?

Ms KONG - I don't have it off the top of my head. I will have to take it on notice.

CHAIR - That's in relation to the costs associated with what? The geotech stuff? Are you talking about the full cost of consultants?

Ms RATTRAY - The full cost of consultants, public relations; there would be some acquisition costs as well. The full cost.

CHAIR - Which would be outside this project.

Mr BLAKE - No. It would be inside the project.

PUBLIC

Ms RATTRAY - Inside the project, in the \$28 million.

Mr TUCKER - Going a little bit off-track, Plenty Link Road. What studies have been done on that road? I know it has been looked at.

Mr BLAKE - My recollection is it has been looked at, at least twice. As a heavy vehicle route, it doesn't work. The gradients are too steep for the heavy vehicles, in one direction in particular, from memory. That was issue number one.

Issue number two is the cost. It is effectively a four-wheel drive track at the moment. The cost of the road - I don't know what that cost is but it is a very large number for what would actually be a very small number of vehicles that need to go to New Norfolk. The number of heavy vehicles that are actually travelling that route that ultimately go somewhere where the rail then goes, which is obviously a limited number of destinations, is very small.

It was originally proposed for forestry vehicles. It would have been logs going to Bell Bay, primarily, that it would have been targeted at. But, of course, that is a tiny amount of the heavy vehicle traffic we are talking about on the Southern Outlet.

There was another issue again, which was that the residents that lived in the vicinity of where the Plenty Link Road comes out, at Lachlan, I think, were very much opposed to the idea.

CHAIR - There was talk about the park and ride facilities having solar panels and the like, as in other places, and actually being far more functional. Was that considered?

Mr BLAKE - We are very sympathetic to that view. Across the board, we need to move to more sustainable infrastructure. It is something that we are very conscious of. In some cases, budgets make that difficult and to be able to get infrastructure that has the function that it has within the budget that we have got. That is going to mean we are just a lot more definite upfront about what we are specifying in terms of sustainability. We have some ideas about how to move that forward that are in train at the moment. We should have some news coming up by the end of the year about how we are doing that and how we are approaching that. It is something we are conscious of.

CHAIR - There is also observation around gantries and messages and the like. Is that part of your thinking?

Mr BLAKE - Absolutely. Whether or not it is part of this project is up for discussion. But we certainly are thinking, in relooking at what they call the lane use management system on the Tasman Bridge, which is all about to be upgraded and updated -

CHAIR - We've done that one.

Mr BLAKE - and the guys probably talked about the travel information system that we are thinking about as well. We have the ability now to be able to provide drivers in real time with what the travel time will be on the road to a certain destination, which is part of that. Yes, the overhead gantries and information about what's ahead, speed limits, and the ability to be able to vary speed limits throughout the course of the day is something else we are very interested in.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - With the lane use management system, what I was saying is we have looked at that project.

Mr BLAKE - Yes, I understand.

CHAIR - Hobart City Council was basically - proving of the amenity was their main issue.

Mr BLAKE - It sounded like the gentleman hadn't been there for very long. I think we need to spend some time with him specifically.

Ms RATTRAY - In fairness, he probably hasn't been on the entire journey for this project.

Mr GONINON - No, I gave him a briefing briefly on what we are doing with people in Macquarie Street the other day and gave him a bit of an overview of the project. But, yes, obviously he is coming from a long way back and that position has been vacant for a while at the City of Hobart so we will need to spend some time with him.

CHAIR - There was a question about how many trucks use the Southern Outlet during 7 a.m. to 9 a.m.

Mr BLAKE - We can find that out for you.

CHAIR - Is that an option to prohibit or limit their use of the highway?

Mr BLAKE - We did look at this. The volume and the space that those vehicles take up on the road aren't high enough to make a difference. That may change in the future. It is possible, depending upon economic activity, business activity, freight activity in the south in the future, and the need to travel at this time of day. At the moment, it is not going to make a perceptible difference on that particular corridor.

CHAIR - You have heard the angst from the residents through the process, especially the last one. Most unfortunate circumstance there.

Mr BLAKE - Yes, and the background to that was again, unfortunately, there was little bit of 'damned if you do and damned if you don't'. There was a discussion about, 'The department is in possession of some information and it's not information that relates to where we are going to end up. It is indicative only, it's worst case. Do you want to see it or not?' In hindsight, the answer should have been, 'No, you can't have access to it'.

Another problem was that it was highly personal information so it couldn't be published as a simple map.

I forget the exact circumstances behind it and I could certainly pull out the emails or whatever information I have and table if you like. But for some reason it was done in relative haste before an actual public meeting, where it was decided that that was what people wanted - that they wanted to see it rather than not be aware of it. So, the lead-up to that, again, was probably trying to be too helpful is the short answer.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Noise studies. Apparently noise harm levels were adopted by the department in 2013. Are you aware of those?

Mr BLAKE - We have noise guidelines. They are available on the website, and we can certainly table them. As I said earlier, what I'm curious about there, I can't see what's going to be - as I said, it's really using the low gears and accelerating up the hill that is probably the higher noise emitting. Is it higher noise sources? I don't expect those to increase as a result of this, but I could be wrong. That's what the noise modelling is designed to do.

CHAIR - I think we've covered most other things, unless you want to say anything else in closing?

Mr BLAKE - No, I don't think so. Thank you for your time. I think the questions have been very pertinent and very fair. Thank you for the way you've conducted your business. I think we've had a good hearing and it's been very interesting.

CHAIR - We certainly have enough information for us to think about.

Before you go, I need to ask some important questions. A lot of the submissions address these, and are very - shall I say - vocal in their submissions as to why these aren't the case. I want to ask the questions, and I want you to give me the best answers that you feel you can, in order to address the concerns that have been expressed.

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

Mr BLAKE - Yes.

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

Mr BLAKE - I think they are part of the only solution.

CHAIR - Even with the consideration of the soft options?

Mr BLAKE - To be absolutely frank and honest, with the population growth we're going to experience, and the level of demand increases we can expect, I think we'll need all of those. I don't think it's going to be a question of this or that. If we want to keep the level of amenity that we currently have now in our ability to move around the city freely, I think we're going to need the majority of those.

CHAIR - Are the proposed works fit for purpose?

Mr BLAKE - I believe so.

CHAIR - Do the proposed works provide value for money?

Mr BLAKE - I think so.

CHAIR - Even though there are lots of aspects that really can't be settled at this point?

PUBLIC

Mr BLAKE - I would go back to the original report, which found that the only real way to deal with increases in transport demand around the Hobart area is through increase of transit facilities on all the arterial corridors.

While in some respects this is incomplete in that it doesn't go all the way back to Kingston, and it doesn't join up with an entire Hobart network, at some stage this is going to have to be tackled, and this will be part of the solution.

I have no doubt that this is ultimately where we'll get to as a city, because we don't have another solution. Unless transport changes altogether in a way that we can't foresee at the moment, and the way we work changes in a way we can't foresee at the moment, this is the pattern that we're seeing in well-planned cities elsewhere, and I think this will be the future.

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

Mr BLAKE - Yes.

CHAIR - Okay, thank you. Of course, we have the other submissions and their opinions to weigh up as well.

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

Mr BLAKE - Yes, I do.

Ms KONG - Yes.

Mr GONINON - Yes.

CHAIR - Thank you. Thank you for your time.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.