

PUBLIC

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL SELECT COMMITTEE ON GREATER HOBART TRAFFIC CONGESTION MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 2, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART, ON TUESDAY 12 NOVEMBER 2019.

Ms ANNA REYNOLDS, LORD MAYOR, **Mr NICK HEATH**, HOBART CITY COUNCIL, **Ms KRISTIE JOHNSTON**, MAYOR, **Mr TONY McMULLEN**, GLENORCHY CITY COUNCIL, **Mr DEAN WINTER**, MAYOR, KINGBOROUGH COUNCIL, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR (Mr Armstrong) - Welcome, everybody. The evidence today is being broadcast.

All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege. I remind you any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded that privilege. The copy of the information for witnesses is available and if you have not read it and not aware of the process, the evidence you present is being recorded and the *Hansard* version will be published on the committee website when it becomes available.

Ms REYNOLDS - Thank you to the Legislative Council for your interest in this very important issue for Greater Hobart. We welcome the opportunity to provide evidence to you today, but we also welcome all the work you are going to be doing over the coming weeks to investigate these issues.

We note Greater Hobart is the fastest growing area of Tasmania and our concern is there is not the infrastructure or even the sort of policy and planning infrastructure inside government ready for this growth. That includes public transport planning and planning to deal with some of these congestion issues. The work of the Legislative Council will provide some really important input into that policy vacuum. We feel very concerned the capacity is not there to do the future thinking about Greater Hobart growth, including traffic, public transport planning and planning more generally.

That said, we are all very supportive of the work that has happened in the last 12 months to establish the Greater Hobart Act and the Greater Hobart City Deal, because this is the beginning of what we believe is a change to provide some of the governance structure required to be thinking about Greater Hobart as an entire city and the planning required for this. As part of this, the city deal is a really positive initiative. We have all signed on to it.

In particular, the main thing we wanted to use this inquiry for was to highlight some of the projects been agreed to in the City Deal. We are not as confident as we would like to be that the projects will be delivered in a timely manner to really assist traffic congestion. We would like to ensure through our advocacy that these projects do receive adequate funding in a timely manner. At this stage, some of those projects are certainly flagged as City Deal projects, but we are not entirely sure all the resources required to deliver those projects have been flagged. We think it is an important priority for Greater Hobart to push for full delivery of those projects in a timely manner.

As part of that, we want to draw particular attention to the inquiry work of Infrastructure Australia - IA - on the Bridgewater Bridge project. The reason for that is because we believe there needs to be work done to improve the crossing at Bridgewater. We particularly see value in

PUBLIC

there being a crossing that allows for a light rail service to go all the way to that very fast growing part of Greater Hobart.

What concerned us was that the IA advice came through to us after we had signed the City Deal. It raised some particular concerns with the design being promoted by the state Government.

We wanted to ensure that the inquiry was aware of that IA advice and even recommend that, as part of your inquiry deliberations, you seek your own briefing from Infrastructure Australia on its report because while we have included it as part of our submission, we think that speaking directly to them would be a valuable extra piece of evidence for the inquiry to hear.

That covers what is in our submission at the very high level. I will pass to the other mayors to focus on some of the priority projects we believe are essential for dealing with Hobart traffic congestion.

You will notice the major focus is to try to increase the reliability and number of public transport services, which we believe is the absolute priority in dealing with Hobart traffic congestion.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Ms JOHNSTON - Thank you very much and thank you for the opportunity to provide evidence today.

As the Lord Mayor indicated, we are very concerned in regards to the growth of the city. To make sure we facilitate that growth, we need to ensure we have the required infrastructure, particularly for us in Glenorchy.

The focus for us is around urban renewal and the opportunity to provide the infrastructure that will lead to that urban renewal and also affordable housing, to make sure our community is well connected.

You will see in the submission that the Glenorchy City Council has made a collaboration between the three municipalities of Glenorchy, Hobart and Kingborough. We particularly focus on our rail corridor. It is a key deliverable under the Hobart City Deal, not only in terms of a transport solution to our growing traffic issues, but also, importantly, an urban renewal project that will lead to greater economic development in our city, connecting some of the most disadvantaged people in the Greater Hobart area to better employment services and education.

It also provides really important connection with our tourism facilities, which is very important.

We are very focused on the rail corridor. We worked very hard under the Hobart City Deal negotiations to get the rail corridor to be quite explicit as a corridor we are talking about.

You will see reference to the Northern Suburbs Transit Corridor, which refers exclusively to the existing rail corridor.

For us, the project about Hobart/northern suburbs rail is critical. It could extend from Hobart all the way out to Bridgewater. You will see in our joint submission that we are talking about

PUBLIC

Hobart to Bridgewater services. That is dependent, obviously, on whether there is a crossing at the Bridgewater Bridge.

That is why we are concerned about the Bridgewater Bridge in terms of its viability as currently proposed by the state Government, but also the amount being put forward to fund the Bridgewater Bridge under the current proposal.

I am in complete agreement with the Lord Mayor that we need to have a significantly improved crossing at the Bridgewater Bridge. I agree with my Brighton colleague that that is very important. I also note that my colleague at Brighton is very keen on having rail infrastructure going all the way to Brighton to ensure that community, a very disadvantaged community, can access good public transport which is reliable and which connects their communities to important services.

Any crossing of the Derwent River at Bridgewater needs to have rail access. That is really critical for those two communities, in particular.

I'm happy to talk in detail around the Infrastructure Australia submission, as the Lord Mayor indicated. I thoroughly recommend that you get a briefing from them in regard to that. It highlights problems with the current proposal the state Government has put forward. I have been long enough on council to see a number of iterations of the Bridgewater Bridge design. The initial design back in 2010-11 was an \$880 million design. It is now a \$586 million design - [inaudible] a \$576 million design with additional funding from unknown sources to make it a \$633 million one. It still does not meet the requirements in terms of the actual objectives of what they're trying to achieve. It wouldn't actually make it faster to cross the river, which is ironic, but it provides some real issues for our local communities, in particular no rail across that bridge. I am happy to talk through those particular issues.

I want to highlight that from the Glenorchy City Council's perspective the rail corridor is really an underutilised asset at the moment sitting vacant. We don't have rail services along that, but it connects all our CBDs - it connects our major tourist attractions and it connects the schools in our communities, which is really important for transport to alleviate the situation on the Brooker Highway and the Main Road corridor. The Main Road corridor is an incredibly busy corridor but we have a vacant corridor - a transport corridor - that's currently underutilised. We welcome the commitments from the City Deal to deliver on that, but again note that the funding there is far short of what is actually required to achieve that particular project.

CHAIR - Thank you, Kristie.

Mr WINTER - Thanks for the opportunity today. I guess congestion in Hobart isn't as significant as in Melbourne or Sydney, but it is far more significant than it should be for a city of our size. It reflects poorly on all levels of government in that we're in this position where new growth has outstripped the ability to service and connect people from various parts of the city.

There is a land use planning issue here, where we have done what the textbooks tell us we should not do, which is centralise employment and services in the middle of the city and have people living in the outskirts and everyone trying to travel in and out at the same time, but that's where we are. Having said all that, we're still early on in the lifespan of Hobart and I think we have the opportunity to resolve these issues pretty well.

PUBLIC

We had a council meeting last night and my colleagues implored me in very strong terms to continue to advocate for better bus services. One of the frustrations I've had watching this debate over the past year and longer is the perpetuation of this idea of ferries, for example. I think it's a lovely idea, but the simple fact is we are underserved by buses - it's pretty easy to spin up better bus services for a community and yet we've been talking about it for years.

My colleagues last night asked me again to raise the issue of a lack of bus services and the fact that at peak periods, Metro is still constrained by not having enough buses to service the peak demand in Greater Hobart. That's the situation we're in. Surely, the easiest and quickest way to resolve some of these issues is to invest in more buses and in Metro.

I've been reading Metro's annual report from last year. I know the business is working as hard as it can, but it's not good reading. Again the business has lost a significant amount of money; it's missed key targets. The Auditor-General in his assessment last year of the previous year's annual report, in volume 2 of its Government Business 2017-18 Analysis, said that Metro is relying on equity contributions in a service contract with the Department of State Growth to maintain its bus fleet and it has generated losses in each of the past of the four years, and you can add another year of losses to that. It goes on to say that some businesses - and Metro is included in this - are reliant on government funding and commercial industry support to maintain sustainability and are not expected or likely to generate profit sufficient enough to provide returns to government. The for-profit corporate structure of entities like Metro may not be appropriate unless a significant improvement in the financial performance is expected, and it's not expected.

The structure and governance of Metro itself is called into question by the Auditor-General and that ought to be part of your consideration as part of this. Metro isn't in a financial position - it doesn't have the freedom to - as I understand it, they can't even buy a bus without the minister or the department telling them they can buy a bus.

The Disability Discrimination Act compliance is only 70 per cent, so only 70 per cent of its buses are actually compliant with the DDA. Last year, they missed key targets when it comes to getting buses to locations on time. This is a significant contributing factor - the fact people do not want to get on buses. My personal experience with buses in our area was that even if 87 per cent of the time, they are on time that is actually not enough for a commuter who needs to get into work and do business. It is a critical failure in the model. If people lose confidence in public transport services, they are more likely to get back in the car. We had another workshop with the Department of State Growth last week and it pointed to evidence that showed over 80 per cent of people travelling into Hobart from our area are doing so as the driver in the car. Not just in a car, they are driving the car, pointing to a lack of carpooling and public transport.

All these issues are not terribly difficult to deal with, but they require investment in Metro and probably a review of its actual structure and they should be a key consideration of this inquiry.

CHAIR - Thank you. Does anybody else want to anything?

Ms JOHNSTON - I may add that often we hear when we are talking in the public domain about public transport that we need to change hearts and minds and see an increase in public transport, perhaps, before we invest in the infrastructure. As the Mayor of Kingborough, Mr Winter, articulated, the problem is the infrastructure is not there for people to actually utilise. We can do a lot of work to try to change hearts and minds and behaviour in members of the public,

PUBLIC

but if they cannot catch a bus because the bus is full, not there or does not go where they need, they are not going to continue to try to use public transport.

For us, the critical issue is we need the infrastructure first and then do the work to change hearts and minds. If you do not have the infrastructure to underpin the actual service, you can change hearts and minds all you like, but it will not last very long and will not bring about a sustained change in the cultural behaviour of our commuters in particular.

Mr HEATH - If I can put a general manager's perspective on this, because I know the mayors have put theirs, at officer level there has been a long history of cooperation between the councils and state government, particularly the Department of State Growth, and this predates the City Deal. For a long time, the most senior officers in council and state government have met, attempting to address the issues of congestion around Hobart. It is not new nor has it come to the table recently because of issues; it has been going on for some period of time. The City Deal has just provided a framework for those discussions to continue. It is not necessarily the catalyst for those discussions, it is simply a framework.

The absolute critically factor from where I sit is that we continue to have strong partnership relationships as we move forward to try to address the issues. I do not make any political statements around what has been said but I think we need to continue those relationships, continue talking and continue to address complex problems because they are wicked problems. I do not think any one person, agency or council has the solutions - a combined approach is what we rely on.

We have written to you in relation to the comments attributable to Metro in its submission. Particularly the comment made in its submission that regrettably Metro understands that local governments have not been as responsive to some of the suggestions. Hobart City Council steadfastly denies that comment. We have worked closely with Metro and have a MOU - signed as recently as September last year, so the ink is virtually just dry on it - which I can tender in evidence if you wish. This MOU sets out the fact there is a strong working relationship with Metro which deals with issues as and when they come up. There are three pages of issues in there that we worked closely with Metro on.

Some comments were made about the council not supporting the so-called Midson reports back in 2016. The council made a number of suggested changes as a result of those Midson reports to assist with congestion around the city at the time. The council has invested heavily in bus shelters - look at Franklin Square and the mall. The work we are doing with our retail precinct upgrades such as Lenah Valley and Newtown are all designed to improve the pedestrian experience and amenity, including bus facilities at those locations. Council is strongly of the view that we work closely with Metro and we work closely with other stakeholders. Our very strong submission is that those partnership relationships should continue because, as I said in my earlier comments, no one party has the sole solution to what is going on around the city. It is a partnership approach. I wanted to say that from a CEO's perspective rather than a mayor's perspective.

Mr McMULLEN - I have two or three dot points to add. The first would be that Metro advised us that its capacity is fully utilised at peak periods, so if there is an underlying assumption we need to get more people onto public transport, Metro does not have the capacity at peak periods to increase that any further. There is clearly some need to invest further in additional peak capacity for Metro.

PUBLIC

My second point relates to transport being a derived demand. Transport and housing development go hand in hand. As Mr Winter said, we have done a lousy job in Greater Hobart of coordinating land use and transport over decades. We now have an opportunity with this improved focus on sustainability to start to rebalance the equation, and I think that is really important. We see great opportunity around the transit corridor in Glenorchy in linking people to transport through development along the corridor. We see a great opportunity to move people closer to transport.

In the past 50 to 60 years, we have been moving people away from transport systems. It is now time to start to design our cities and retrospectively move those people back towards a designed public transport system.

My final bullet point is in relation to public transport generally. It is a question of focus. Who is our public transport supremo? In the state Government, do we have a person at a senior enough level whose sole focus is public transport? I think the answer is that even at deputy secretary level in the Department of State Growth, the deputy secretary who has public transport in their portfolio has a range of other responsibilities. I wonder if there is not an opportunity to look within the state Government at a senior person with sole focus on public transport?

Mr VALENTINE - It is an issue I have been well acquainted with over at least 25 years since I was on the Hobart City Council. I am acutely aware of the fact that each council has its own issues in its own areas. I understand the state Government wants to achieve certain things and the federal government wants to achieve certain things.

Do you feel that there is the right environment at the moment to have a shared strategic vision? Before you answer that, I appreciate that the City Deal is there but are there gaps in building a strategy that might prevent gains being made? Can you comment as to whether you think there has been enough consultation with local government and whether there has been a fuller understanding of what the problems and issues are at local government level? I am not asking you to bag the governments out, either state or federal. We have to get to the nub of the problem. That is what this inquiry is about.

Could someone address the strategic aspects?

Ms REYNOLDS - I have a couple of comments in that respect. I did touch on it in my opening statement - that is that we do not have a public transport authority in this state. I don't know for sure that we are the only state not to have a public transport authority, but I suspect we might be. I can't think of a state that does not have a public transport authority. Until recently we didn't even have a policy person on public transport in the government. I understand a junior research person with a focus on public transport has recently been appointed, but I think you'll find that everyone in passenger transport in the state bureaucracy is signing contracts with bus operators and there are multiple bus contracts but it's nobody's responsibility to plan and advocate for and have those big, overarching policy responsibilities for the delivery of public transport in this state. I think that is a major gap.

While we are on the lack of policy grunt inside the government, I don't think we have adequately sized policy resources in the area of strategic planning, either. There is a very small planning unit within a department but, again, for a growing state and a growing city, there aren't sufficient senior policy thinkers in either land use planning or public transport policy and

PUBLIC

planning. Until the minister, the parliament and the Government have more people actually working to develop the systems, implement them and oversee them, we will always be struggling to catch up.

These city deals are great, but who is really in it? Of course, we will all contribute what we can to deliver them, but there still needs to be some of that basic infrastructure in the state bureaucracy to deal with these key growth issues.

Mr VALENTINE - I understand and appreciate that response. Quite often, local government fails to be heard properly. I am wondering, if you had something like this structure that you are talking about, whether it might get to the point where local governments are not being heard properly. Is it the case that it needs this upper-level person in charge of it, or is it more a forum or some form of - and I hate to say it - committee?

Ms REYNOLDS - We've got that through our new Greater Hobart Act, in Hobart anyway.

Mr VALENTINE - Is that going to deliver?

Ms REYNOLDS - It's too early to say because it is early days, but in terms of the resourcing -

Ms SIEJKA - Is it resourcing solely in terms of infrastructure? It sounds like it is also coordination - that is the point of the role, which is a lot of we've got plans, but not that aspect.

Ms REYNOLDS - That's right, exactly. I'm not just saying it is infrastructure money; I'm saying literally senior policy thinkers inside the government to help with the strategic land use planning we have to deliver as part of the Greater Hobart Act and also the public transport planning we have to deliver as part of the City Deal. I don't feel there are enough people in that senior policy planning side of the government for us to liaise with. We have good access, as the general manager said; we've got committees, but then all these other people have multiple other responsibilities.

Mr VALENTINE - The question I asked was: yes, that is the Greater Hobart Act and a state-based act, but it doesn't tie in the federal government, as far as I am aware. You can have a federal member go out and spruik project *x* because they think that's the best way forward and then the federal government comes on board and says, 'Yes, we'll give so much to this particular project' and it's not in line with what the Greater Hobart group is trying to achieve. Do you see that there is that bit of a disjoint, and does some work need to be done there to tie in all levels of government?

Ms REYNOLDS - I think the City Deal is a pretty good start in that respect, so I'm not as concerned about some of those governance structures because I think the City Deal and the Greater Hobart Act provide that. I hear what you are saying about the federal government and favourite projects of local members, but that's probably an issue all over the country. My understanding is that, generally speaking, in other states, in that sort of regional and strategic planning, there is a very strong relationship between state government, regional council organisations and local government.

That then goes up to the federal government through things like city deals. Infrastructure Australia is meant to be insurance against local members putting forward their favourite projects.

PUBLIC

That is why Infrastructure Australia is there, to provide that insurance policy, to ensure that any federal government money has an independent party assessing projects and making sure that it is good value for money for the federal government.

That is why we were so concerned by the Infrastructure Australia advice in this particular project, which was a core part of our City Deal. We signed up to it in good faith and then saw the IA advice. That is where our concern comes from.

Mr VALENTINE - There is a need to have all the information on the table before you go down the path of looking at something that is worth, I don't know how many million it is these days, \$500 million or something.

With respect to the Bridgewater Bridge, while that is being discussed, do you see that if that is fixed, it will do anything to reduce the Greater Hobart traffic problem? Is it going to exacerbate it by bringing people closer to the city quicker?

Ms JOHNSTON - The new Bridgewater Bridge project would actually touch our municipality. Currently it is outside the Greater Hobart municipalities, but it will eventually touch on our municipality.

The suggestion is that the traffic congestion is not on the crossing itself. It is on the intersections on either side, the roundabouts on either side.

We agree there needs to be significant improvements to that particular crossing. The Infrastructure Australia report highlights that there are other options available, and suggests the state Government give consideration to some of those, that they have merit at a more affordable project cost while still delivering some of the key outcomes.

Mr VALENTINE - Like what options?

Ms JOHNSTON - By using the existing infrastructure and expanding that to provide four lanes across the river, and providing pedestrian and rail access across it as well.

They are looking at a significantly cheaper operating model there rather than the necessarily high bridge.

At the moment the proposal is for a high bridge, which would be the same height as the Bowen Bridge. To do that requires quite a long run up to the crossing, which is significant infrastructure. There could be an opportunity to use the existing causeway, to expand that to provide four lanes across the river crossing, and then to do some work on the lifting span. To change that lifting span, whether it be up and down or a swing bridge, to allow the ferries to be able to go up the river.

There are alternative options on the table. The state Government has put forward the gold-plated version as a preferred option.

Ms HOWLETT - It's a very important piece of infrastructure, the Bridgewater Bridge, and we have to get it right. It connects north and south. It is vitally important.

PUBLIC

Ms JOHNSTON - We agree with that. It is a really important piece of infrastructure. We want to make sure we are providing good connections across the river.

A concern I have with the current proposal for the Bridgewater Bridge is that it doesn't allow for rail crossing to go across the new bridge.

Taking on board what my colleague and the mayor of Brighton have said, they need a new Bridgewater bridge but they also need better public transport and they need that rail service to go across there.

One of the key concerns highlighted in the IA report is if they were to commission the new bridge, as proposed in the report, there is no plan for how they would decommission the old bridge.

The suggestion is that you have the old bridge decommissioned so you could facilitate ferry or boat access up the river. You would need to leave the bridge span up on the old bridge. That would mean it would never come down again once you left it up for any length of time. You would immediately cut any rail access across the old bridge.

Infrastructure Australia raised concerns about the cost of decommission. I suggest the new bridge would mean there would not be maintenance on the old bridge. You would not have rail across the old bridge in the long term, which would be a concern for the Brighton community.

Mr VALENTINE - There's 16 000 people. How many people are in Brighton? And growing.

Ms JOHNSTON - And Southern Midlands. It is really important. A rail corridor going from Hobart all the way up to Brighton would not only service the Hobart, Glenorchy and Brighton community; it would also service the New Norfolk and Derwent Valley communities as well with park and ride facilities, and also Southern Midlands. The traffic congestion, particularly our side of the river, is at that particular roundabout, not on the bridge crossing itself. The bridge crossing is quite fast if you can get onto the bridge; it's on the actual roundabout itself, and that's traffic heading up to the Derwent Valley or trying to turn right to head further up to the Southern Midlands or to the Brighton area.

Ms HOWLETT - Are you saying you would rather we amend the existing bridge as opposed to having a new bridge?

Ms JOHNSTON - I'm not an engineering expert, but I think there is an opportunity to review the actual design and to come up with a design that achieves benefits within reasonable cost but that also, importantly, provides rail access across it. Certainly, Infrastructure Australia has suggested there is more work to be done in looking at the existing bridge and how that can be optimised to carry the capacity we want it to carry in the future, but with also maintaining the rail access. I strongly encourage the state Government to look at that as a viable option - certainly a more affordable option it would seem - at this point in time, which would provide the same benefits to the local communities.

Mr ARMSTRONG - If there is not rail, the Derwent Valley Railway's tourist railway would never - unless you bus to Bridgewater and then -

PUBLIC

Ms JOHNSTON - That's correct. Certainly, passenger transport is obviously a real feature, for Glenorchy in particular but heritage rail as well - the Derwent Valley scenic route up there would have to be world class in travelling. The river is really important. If you were to cut rail at the Bridgewater Bridge, whether for passenger or heritage, you really are cutting options for the future.

Even in terms of freight itself, I know that the state Government has made assertions that there would never again be freight on rail coming into the Port of Hobart, but that might want to change in 20 years time depending on the cost of roads and infrastructure and things like that. If we cut the rail link at the Derwent River and the Bridgewater crossing, we are really cutting our options for the future of heritage rail, tourist rail, for passenger transport and also for freight.

Ms SIEJKA - I direct my question to you, Mr Winter, but certainly welcome anything else. You were talking about Metro and the need for greater infrastructure and resourcing there. I know from, say, Clarence - and you have just mentioned Glenorchy - that a lot of the time when work is done to ease one area, it just pushes it along further and it becomes a big issue. I just want to know what your ideas or thoughts were around particular things that you can partly lead from your side. I realise things like park and ride options have to be something that's appealing to people - all those sorts of things. I guess from a local council perspective, what are the sorts of things you guys have done to progress some of those options and how would you see that actually working?

Mr WINTER - We are community of 40 000 people without a major bus interchange. We are 15 kilometres from the Hobart CBD. You wouldn't find that in too many places and I think that is a major failure.

Ms SIEJKA - Clarence has one, for example; Glenorchy has one.

Mr WINTER - Clarence has one, Glenorchy has one, and we don't. We have - it's sort of a bus shelter but mostly -

Ms SIEJKA - Where is your central point?

Mr WINTER - On the Channel Highway at Kingston, outside the banks and stuff. Most of the time you see kids sitting on the steps of the bank to catch public transport. It's a huge failure, council included, over time to not have a proper bus interchange there. Thankfully, in terms of the partnership identified during the City Deal discussions 12 months ago, the money is now there from the state Government to assist us to build a major interchange. There is also money from the state Government, which we really appreciate, for park and ride facilities. They have just completed a study that looks into where they should be located. They have identified Huntingfield as the first priority for the state Government and we expect them to get that underway as soon as possible. The issue with all that is that you need the frequency of bus services and that is the concern here: without the frequency of bus services and reliability of bus services -

Ms SIEJKA - It's not just the frequency, though, it's where it goes.

Mr WINTER - Where it goes, yes.

Ms SIEJKA - Outside of that main bit.

PUBLIC

Mr WINTER - That's true. I guess it's park and ride partly so you can focus your bus services in the same place and have that additional frequency.

Ms SIEJKA - It's not going to be a whole solution, though; anything like that would be part of a solution, I would think.

Mr WINTER - It is part of the solution from Metro. Metro has told us it does not have enough buses to meet peak demand in Greater Hobart. At the moment, people's experience of buses is - according to Metro's report - that only 87 per cent of them are on time. If you are on them during peak times you are probably squished, standing up, whatever, and all those things go against it.

My perception of Metro is it has a brand issue now - it is a pretty tired brand. It is losing money; it has lost money again for the fifth consecutive year and not just a little bit of money - it has lost significant money every year. Only 25 per cent of its revenue actually comes from ticket sales. The rest is massively subsidised by the Government. It is not really operating as a business in the normal sense.

Ms SIEJKA - You raised about the fleet as well - that in terms of disability, it was age unfriendly.

Mr WINTER - Yes, only 70 per cent of their buses meet the Disability Discrimination Act.

Ms WEBB - There are new buses coming.

Ms SIEJKA - I know, but there were issues with some of the buses that have come already.

[ADVISER?] - They have until 2022, so not very long to get it sorted.

Ms SIEJKA - No.

Mr WINTER - I do not want to make this sound as if I am attacking Metro. There is a structural problem where Metro does not have the autonomy to actually make decisions about where the buses go, how many buses -

Ms SIEJKA - A conduit.

Mr WINTER - Yes. It has a contract with State Growth. State Growth decides where the buses go, how many buses there are and it responds to the contract it has in place to deliver a service.

As pointed out by my colleagues, in other states there are different structures around. Looking at some of the structures that exist in other capital cities and states may be part of the response that sees us with a more strategic approach to public transport, which does not currently exist.

CHAIR - Do you have anything else, Jo?

Ms SIEJKA - I have a question on another topic but we will flow around.

PUBLIC

Ms HOWLETT - Dean, you said in peak time buses are 100 per cent full. Is that the same in Glenorchy and Hobart?

Ms JOHNSTON - Absolutely. The Main Road corridor is Metro's busiest corridor across the state and certainly they are full at peak time. We work closely with Metro trying to ensure we have the infrastructure for them to facilitate faster travel times. We are happy to work with Metro in terms of bus optimisation, signalling - we have one of the very few signalling priority intersections in Glenorchy. But if someone turns up and the bus is full, it is a negative experience for them and they do not feel the need to come back again.

Ms WINTER - For my own benefit, would those commuters be predominantly schoolchildren as opposed to business people coming in from the city?

Ms REYNOLDS - There is both. The school bus services take a significant number of buses in peak time.

Ms SIEJKA - It would also depend on the route?

Ms REYNOLDS - Yes. There are a number of over-crowded school bus routes. There has been publicity about that. You want children catching the bus to school, but the school bus services are separate services to the public transport services and every bus is utilised. Every bus is very busy because you have the mix of needing buses for school bus services, plus commuter services so there is no capacity to add extra services when there is a high-in-demand service at peak time.

Ms HOWLETT - In regional areas it is very difficult to incentivise people to get on the bus. We can see buses go by 50 per cent full.

Ms REYNOLDS - Some of that is cost. Look at the Sorell services - and we hear often about the services to Cygnet and Huonville and those sorts of ones where it is just not attractive to people to pay \$16 for a one-way ticket to Huonville, or something. Some of those high growth areas of Brighton, Sorell and similar areas are not Metro; they are other contracted services, but for a whole range of reasons, they are not attractive to people, including cost.

Ms WEBB - You pointed out there is no-one with key responsibility for public transport within state government and perhaps everything could flow from that if that were in place. It is not just a matter of lack of capacity of having enough buses, because we could change some infrastructure arrangements - things like putting in extra lanes so buses can run on them and putting more buses into the system. How do you see the things that sit around that helping with the change of habit that the Mayor of Glenorchy, Ms Johnston, talked about earlier - that once you have things there, you need to get people to choose to use them? Do you see that an equal investment is needed in surrounding elements like smart ticketing systems, network planning and timetabling and even branding and marketing to change habits? Do you see that a package of investment is required, not just one element or another?

Ms REYNOLDS - Absolutely.

Mr WINTER - The other part of that is the ability to track where the buses are and allow users to see where the buses are. One circumstance in which I found myself too regularly when I

PUBLIC

was commuting to the city was that if I knew a bus was not coming, that was not as bad because I could find another arrangement and if I knew it was only five minutes away, I could wait, but the problem was I did not know. I remember one morning waiting for over an hour for the bus to come and it never arrived.

Ms WEBB - To follow that up, have you in your conversations with either Metro or the government talked about the full suite of public transport investment required beyond putting in extra lanes or building an interchange, beyond actual infrastructure stuff? We talked about that full suite. Have you noted an understanding and appetite to address a full suite of investment? We don't hear about that so much through the media; we hear about the big building things or creating infrastructure.

Ms REYNOLDS - I know my general manager would like to speak as well. We raised this as part of the City Deal discussions - that it can't just be about the infrastructure, it has to be about the services and the ability for the Metro, as the main Greater Hobart provider, to run a better service and have more buses, have more drivers, have more marketing and have better real-time information. We tried to raise that as a part of the City Deal. We got a small reference to it. There is certainly a reference to it; it was a last minute -

Ms WEBB - Not necessarily with allocated funding?

Ms REYNOLDS - No, we are planning to continue to advocate for a greater budget allocation to public transport services, not just these infrastructure projects. The services have to increase. When we have raised ideas with Metro about marketing there has been a little bit of, 'Well, yes, we would like that, but the problem is that if you promote bus commuting to commuters, we have a challenge because we do not have enough space for our peak services. Our peak services are full. We are interested in promoting the off-peak times, which is the whole idea of the free buses before 7 a.m.' They would like to get people right across the day. The main concern around congestion is peak time travel. We have that fundamental disconnect that they do not want to promote peak time commuter travel because the services are already busy. They are keener to spread the peak.

Mr HEATH - I want to pick up on that point and say that we have had numerous conversations with Metro and State Growth about funding smart apps and real-time data, but the conversation always comes back to who is paying for it. It is a question you need to put to State Growth and Metro. You can have these great ideas, you can talk about smart apps, you can talk about real-time data and you can talk about bus shelters. Who actually pays for it?

Hobart City Council, as I said in my opening remarks, has been prepared to pay for bus shelters around Franklin Square. State Growth contributed towards the bus shelters currently being constructed in the bus mall. There is no structured funding arrangement. As Mr Winter has pointed out, Metro is struggling. It is not keen to pay for new bus shelters or stuff outside its remit. This is a conversation you will probably need to raise with others. At officer level we have come up against all the time, 'Who is paying for it?'

I was keen to move the discussion beyond public transport into a broader discussion on mobility. As a city, you are probably highly aware that Hobart is facing huge growth and huge demand on its infrastructure. Managing congestion is one of the outcomes of that. We have a broader mobility plan - it's not just about public transport. We are working very closely with, for instance, Rufus Black and his teams as the university seeks to move into the city, to improve

PUBLIC

cycling and walking infrastructure. Anything we can do - we are building bridges to connect the university campuses to the city and building bridges to connect across the Tasman Highway to link the Queens Domain to Macquarie Point and beyond.

The mobility issue for us is public transport, yes, but we have a limited lever we can pull there as a council. Building other infrastructure such as cycleways, pedestrian infrastructure and connecting the city is what we are very much about so that people do have options. You can ride your bike now through the city out to the botanical gardens; you never could do that before. You can ride up the side of the rivulet to South Hobart. We are doing work at Molle Street so you can safely cross Molle Street and then go down Collins Street. We are looking at Campbell Street outside the hospital to make sure we provide safe pedestrian and cycling access through there when the new hospital opens.

The congestion issue isn't just limited to getting people onto public transport - yes, it is a very important element of it. Making the city function - not just for now but also in 10 years time when all these new hotels, new hospitals and new university infrastructure comes online - is the work we are doing now and the work we are doing with the State Growth and UTAS to make sure we are in a place to cope with that. Otherwise we'll have a city that's just going to get more and more congested if we don't start thinking ahead.

Ms WEBB - Can I have a follow-up question on that?

Mr HEATH - I thought you might be asking that.

Ms WEBB - I have plenty of questions but we are not going to get to them all. Lord Mayor, you talked earlier about the lack of policy expertise at a senior level within government. I'm also wondering about the expertise within local government. The general manager has just described a plan of investment that local government is undertaking. Within local government, how do you know that you have the right expertise to do cost-benefit analysis of this project rather than that project, or that making these changes will deliver for the needs we are going to have down the path? Where does that sit for you?

Mr HEATH - I think where local government does it really well and is ahead of the pack is consultation. We have a sophisticated relationship with our community. We are the local level, if you like. We do our planning, visioning and capital works allocation by sitting down and talking to our community. We plan well in advance. In our renewal of the retail precinct upgrades, if you look at New Town, we have been having conversations with that New Town community now for the best part of three years. It's a bottom-up process that's driven by the community. Yes, okay, we have to allocate the capital and the resources to build it, but I think we have a deep understanding of what community expectation is and what our community wants. That's what we use and that's how you develop your vision and your strategic planning, and that's how you allocate your resources: by understanding what your community wants, and local government does that better than anyone.

Ms WEBB - I agree that local government does a good job of that. There is an understanding what the community wants and perhaps needs, but then there is also examining and prioritising projects to deliver and evidence-informed, cost-benefit analysis and actually delivering an outcome. That is more the side of it that I am wondering about: expertise and how you go about knowing you have invested in this because you know it's going to deliver. If we

PUBLIC

were to come to you and ask you to show accountability around that, is that something you are confident you can do?

Ms REYNOLDS - We often do. If we were to invest a significant amount of money in a separated cycleway, we would undertake traffic analysis. Generally, you would buy that in probably through consultants, but I think there is now a lot of expertise in local government around the country in active transport. There are all sorts of guides; there are even global guides on how to design streets. Some of this stuff is actually easily available. Any of us could travel anywhere in the country and we would be able to meet with local government, or our general managers would be able to meet with local governments that have developed active transport infrastructure and those kinds of things.

Ms WEBB - I am going to push you one more step further. I understand you can go and find information about how to build these things and how to do it well.

In terms of a change and an outcome you want to see happen in the city, how do you decide, or have the expertise to decide, a separated cycleway should have money spent on it as opposed to upgrading x number of bus stops, or putting money into focusing on public transport? How can you show us you have the expertise?

Mr HEATH - There are two things to say to that.

First, the Lord Mayor is saying we have strong networks. We do not invent something and just do it. We network and go and look at other cities. The key is we have had a strong track record of doing study tours, finding out what is going on in other jurisdictions and what works.

The other thing driving our DNA, in terms of the upgrade of the city, is the work we did 12 years ago with Jan Gehl, a world-renowned city planning, city-visioning architect who spent the best part of three months in Hobart.

The evidence-based plan we have from that is our DNA and drives our thinking. It is not just Australian. It is worldwide. He has worked in Perth. London and New York.

Jan Gehl has a well-recognised process. Hobart, a city with people in mind, a plan we did in 2010, is driving our DNA now. That is evidence-based and we have tested this in other jurisdictions to make sure it works. If you look at what Perth has done with its urban renewal and its vision, the city is coming back and flourishing. We are following the same model other jurisdictions have used through the work Jan Gehl did.

Ms REYNOLDS - The same thing with a transport strategy - which we haven't submitted as part of this inquiry, but can submit it. That involved a number of discussions with stakeholders, including government, freight companies, pedestrians and cyclists.

There was about two years of work and then research about what is best practice - thinking about what streets are suitable for what types of modes of transport. This was quite a detailed piece of work and informs a lot of our decision-making. I am not saying every single council in Tasmania has the capacity to do in-depth transport strategies -

Ms WEBB - Not all of them would need to.

PUBLIC

Ms REYNOLDS - No. We have certainly done that. We can submit this as part of our evidence.

Mr HEATH - If you would like to see it all.

CHAIR - We need to wind up in the next few minutes.

A quick question on park and ride. It has come up in our submissions from the Eastern Shore, the northern suburbs, the Huon and channel areas. At the present time, Hobart has a bus mall in the centre of Hobart. How would you see that working if we have all these buses coming into Hobart? Do you think there would have to be another transit station in the city or would the bus mall handle it if you have more buses all of a sudden?

Ms JOHNSTON - From our prospective, our focus is on the rail corridor. So, what we would envisage for the centre of Hobart is an integrated public transport hub. The Circular Quay, if you like, of Hobart.

It has ferry connections to Clarence, if that is appropriate method from Clarence. It would have a bus mall that would facilitate the buses coming from the south. It would have rail connections that would facilitate access from the north and would become an integrated hub.

The bus mall is an important component of that, but not the only method in which people would be travelling into the city. From Glenorchy's perspective, we would see a public transport centre at Hobart as a hub of integrated public transport systems.

We need to acknowledge that in the Greater Hobart region we have quite unique geography and one solution will not fit every scenario. We need to be able to provide an integrated system that addresses the needs of each of our communities and makes sure we make the most of our unique assets.

Ms REYNOLDS - I will ask Nick, because there has been a lot of history. The City of Hobart has looked at the location of bus malls over the years. Did you want to comment on that?

Mr HEATH - We did some work with Parsons Brinckerhoff in 2016, which was a co-funded state, federal and local government contribution. We looked at 30-odd sites throughout Hobart City as to where the bus mall should be located. The work said the bus mall should be located where it is.

That is why the strategic decision was made to make some investment in the bus mall, as is, where is. You might want to ask State Growth when it comes in - there is a tender or consultancy to look at the bus mall again, which I know is being driven by State Growth. As to where the future of the bus mall is, it's in the hands of others at this time.

CHAIR - Thank you. The member for Hobart might have a final question.

Mr VALENTINE - With respect to the projects you have at the back of your submission, are they in priority order or would you see certain of those brought forward in terms of criticality?

Mr REYNOLDS - They're not in priority order, they're just what's in the City Deal.

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - I appreciate that, but can you give us some understanding of what you see as the most important projects? No, if you can't that's fine; I'm interested to know.

Mr WINTER - We would all say the ones in our area, Rob.

Mr VALENTINE - This is the point; this is what we need to know, whether there's a consensus of projects.

Mr WINTER - We can see the consensus in the submission in the fact that we've done it together and put the list together.

Mr VALENTINE - I can appreciate that and I can appreciate that each of these might have interest for your own areas. In terms of reducing traffic congestion, you don't have -

Ms JOHNSTON - I think the take-home message from the fact that we've collaborated to put these particular priorities together demonstrates that the total estimated additional funding required is \$367 million or less. Against some of the other infrastructure we have on the cards - the Bridgewater Bridge, \$633 million to address a very small component of the Greater Hobart traffic issue - there are some relatively cheap solutions on the cards that would go a significant way to addressing Greater Hobart's traffic issues. Whether it be down south, east or north, it is affordable to do that.

When we're talking about traffic solutions on a national scale, you are talking billions of dollars for many of the projects, but in Hobart, we have some very relatively easy to deliver cheap solutions that would futureproof our city in terms of the growth we are experiencing at the moment.

Mr VALENTINE - Thanks for that. I had to ask the question.

Ms WEBB - You're not prioritising them here now, but are they prioritised in the City Deal?

Mr WINTER - They are not funded in the City Deal.

Ms WEBB - No. They're mentioned but -

Mr WINTER - I think all of them are mentioned, but they're not funded in the City Deal.

Ms WEBB - There's no commitment to them?

Mr WINTER - Yes. I will try to wrap this up. No-one is arguing against upgrading the Bridgewater Bridge. We all agree it's a project that needs to be done. Even physically it looks bad and needs to be upgraded. The Infrastructure Australia report is a really easy to read, easy to understand and clear report that says that the current design does not stack up. It says that the benefits of the project are only 50 per cent of the total costs. It also says that one thing that State Growth could do is think about a different design.

One of the suggestions, and the one they actually suggest, is what the Mayor of Glenorchy, Ms Johnston, said earlier, which is to work on the existing causeway and upgrade that. There is a whole bunch of reasons why that is a good idea. It is also cheaper. The idea of the list is to say, 'Here are all the things you could do if you listened to Infrastructure Australia. You could still

PUBLIC

upgrade the bridge and you could do all these other things that are going to have a much greater impact on fixing congestion in Greater Hobart.'

Mr VALENTINE - Better outcomes?

Mr WINTER - Yes, better outcomes.

Mr VALENTINE - Thanks very much for that; I appreciate that.

CHAIR - We have just about run out of time. Thank you for making your time available today. It has been very much appreciated. Thank you also for your submission.

We have hearings for the next two days. We will see what comes out of that and then we might have to hold some more.

Thank you very much for coming here today.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Mr DOUG CHIPMAN, MAYOR, **Mr IAN NELSON**, GENERAL MANAGER AND **Mr ROSS GRAHAM**, GROUP MANAGER ENGINEERING, CLARENCE CITY COUNCIL WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Thank you, and welcome to the public hearings of the Legislative Council Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion. All evidence taken in this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege and I remind you that any comments made outside the hearing may not be afforded that privilege. A copy of the information for witnesses is available if you have not read it or are not aware of that process. The evidence you present is being recorded and the *Hansard* version will be published on the committee website when it is available.

I advise the procedure we intend to follow is that first you are provided with an opportunity to speak to your submission. We are seeking information regarding the terms of reference. I remind you of the information provided to you on the information for witness sheet; however, if you are concerned about the nature or the appropriateness of giving of any evidence, we can do that in camera. We have until 11.15 a.m., but we are running five minutes behind schedule, so if you'd like to give your opening statement.

Mr CHIPMAN - Thank you, Chair. In the first instance, we greatly appreciate that the Legislative Council is conducting this inquiry into traffic congestion in Greater Hobart. It is something very much relevant to the City of Clarence as well. As you would be aware, Clarence and the south-east corridor has seen substantial population growth over the last decade. Clarence's population growth is expected to continue at 1.3 per cent, which is higher than the Tasmanian population at around 1 per cent.

Clarence is actively and strategically planning for future growth. For example, we are working with relevant landowners to complete a structure plan for Droughty Point to eventually join the suburbs of Rokeby and Tranmere.

Currently, Clarence has approximately 4500 housing lots to be released over the next two decades, and it is understood the Sorell Council will have approximately 1800 housing blocks over the same period coming online.

While this growth has many beneficial aspects for Clarence and the region, I consider it to be a major factor influencing future traffic congestion in the region. We need to find better ways to balance development and traffic management outcomes.

I will take a little time to iterate some key points from our submission. The traffic system is failing during peak hour periods and is highly susceptible to system shocks such as accidents, causing negative impacts on our community, both socially and economically.

Apart from population growth and ineffective use of cars, our submission identifies a multitude of causes for traffic congestion. These include a lack of Tasman Bridge capacity, the lack of a regional transport strategy, limited alternative routes, relatively cheap CBD parking fees, and that the CBD acts as a key employment hub.

All levels of government must play their role in developing suitable solutions and this must start with an overall southern transport strategy. The coordination of an approach from all three levels of government is critical to the identification and implementation of possible traffic congestion solutions, now and in the future.

PUBLIC

Our submission also identified a number of practical solutions that could be implemented, with key suggestions being implementation of intelligent transport systems; establishment of park and ride facilities; increased use of alternative forms of transport, such as electric and pedal bikes, buses, ferries et cetera; incentivising public transport use; decentralising CBD employment and education hubs; and development of suitable bypasses or alternative routes.

A major component in any consideration of the issues and potential solutions should be the implementation of the Hobart City Deal under the Greater Hobart Act. I am sure the committee will be familiar with both the deal and its implementation plan.

Much of the work currently planned to ease congestion, such as improvements to the Tasman Highway, will only funnel more cars to the bottlenecks closer to the Hobart CBD. While these planned works improve certain areas of the highway, they don't seem to tackle the big issues that reduce traffic congestion. Our communities need investment into substantial game-changing infrastructure that addresses the transport challenges now, to ensure that the future generations are not lumbered with wicked traffic problems to address in the future.

I urge the state Government to undertake some bold actions regarding traffic congestion, such as increasing the Tasman Bridge capacity, changing the Metro model to address peak demand periods, incentivising public transport and creating strategically placed park and ride facilities, creating new employment and educational hubs outside the CBD, and increasing alternative modes of transport such as cycling and ferries.

It might be of some curiosity that we haven't joined with the other three metro councils in making our submission. The only point of difference we had with them was in regard to their interpretation of the Bridgewater Bridge. We accept it has been funded and that both levels - federal and state governments - have committed to that project and we didn't see any utility in suggesting that moneys be diverted from that into other projects.

CHAIR - The main issue they had was with the rail, with the current bridge -

Ms HOWLETT - They don't want a new bridge.

Ms WEBB - I think we should move on, Jane. They want an evidence-informed bridge. I don't think it is our role to talk about that here as a committee.

Ms HOWLETT - Sorry, Meg, I am just responding to the mayor. The mayor just happened to bring it up.

Ms SIEJKA - Thank you for bringing that up; I did wonder myself.

Mr CHIPMAN - In every other sense we are on the same page. We are partners under the Greater Hobart Act and the City Deal and we are very supportive of all of that.

Ms SIEJKA - There are a few tricky areas in Clarence that are partly the responsibility of local government to manage in some states - and I think it's federal in some of them. Some of those key intersections that get clogged, if you try to address some of those - and I will use the Mornington roundabout, which we've talked about a lot. There has been research done recently

PUBLIC

that shows it has increased 40 per cent in 10 years or something. If you did use some of the small things they suggest to push that on, it will just become a bigger problem down the road.

What I am keen to know is: you had a real focus on public transport in your submission, but I'd like some clarity about how you see local government's role in getting to some of these solutions, appreciating that you do need that strategic look in infrastructure and investment. What things do you think you can contribute from local council that would improve some of these things?

Mr CHIPMAN - It's probably no surprise that we have been lobbying the state Government in particular but also the federal government over many years, particularly in regard to the Mornington roundabout -

Ms SIEJKA - It's the example I know best, as you know, Doug.

Mr CHIPMAN - and access into Rosny Park. We see some linkages there which would unload the Mornington roundabout.

By way of history, 15 years ago the Mornington roundabout was a failed roundabout. The Hon. Vanessa Goodwin, myself and the council lobbied for upgrades and just over 10 years ago, the roundabout was upgraded with a 'Cheap Charlie' solution, quite frankly.

Ms SIEJKA - I can see that history where different attempts have been made. I guess you have a number of intersections like that in the area.

Mr CHIPMAN - We have a current plan to unload the roundabout, first of all by having ramps between Gordons Hill Road and the Tasman Highway, which would reduce queueing and provide access towards the east, including to the airport from Bellerive and Rosny.

At the moment, you have to go through the Mornington roundabout to do that and traffic coming from the east in the morning has a choice only between Rosny Hill Road and the Mornington roundabout to access that whole area. Unloading the roundabout by providing those ramps is the highest priority for the Clarence City Council and we have been lobbying the government accordingly.

Ms SIEJKA - Clarence is quite a large area outside of Pembroke - I know it does exist - but in terms of those areas other than lobbying and pushing, what sort of role or particular things would council really like to see happen?

Mr CHIPMAN - There are two other ways to reduce traffic congestion in Greater Hobart. We need two ring roads - an inner and an outer ring road. The inner ring road would connect the Mornington roundabout to the East Derwent Highway up through Flagstaff Galley. The outer ring road would connect the Brighton logistics hub to the airport up the Richmond Road and Back Tea Tree Road onto the Brighton bypass. The inner ring road and the outer ring road are essential to future development of Greater Hobart.

Ms SIEJKA - And the other things you have highlighted around park and ride and ferries, regarding all part solutions, but that is a big planning.

PUBLIC

Mr CHIPMAN - With 65,000 cars a day going over the bridge, you are going to need a lot of ferries to make a significant dent. There are really strong reasons we have the ferries, and they include making them pedestrian- and bike-friendly for people to commute between the eastern and western shores using those basic means. Of course, some people will want to travel by ferry by parking their car. But the main park and ride benefits would come from significant park and ride hubs at, say, Rokeby, Cambridge, Sorrell.

Ms SIEJKA - And there is space there.

Mr CHIPMAN - Maybe even Richmond. With express buses connecting from those four park and ride facilities into the CBD.

Ms WEBB - When you talked about game-changing infrastructure, are things like the ring roads and the park and rides what you meant or were there further things?

Mr CHIPMAN - They are the key big projects.

Ms WEBB - Okay, sure.

Mr CHIPMAN - They can be enhanced with smart traffic management and all the other things, but the game-changers are the inner and outer ring roads and the slip roads onto Gordons Hill Road from the Tasman Highway.

Ms WEBB - When you talk about incentivising public transport, can you expand on what your thoughts are on the way to do that and what it might look like as an incentivised system?

Mr CHIPMAN - Absolutely. The other three metro mayors and myself met with Metro and after some forensic questioning, it dawned on us that even if we provided free bus services for everyone in peak hour traffic, Metro could not cope. Metro is designed around providing continuous services most of the day, which it can just meet. It is severely constrained in terms of what it can provide in terms of peak services. That means it needs more buses and drivers if it is to be of any further use at all in peak hour traffic.

Ms WEBB - You mean incentivise Metro to put more services in place? I interpret 'incentivise' as meaning incentivise people to use the public transport.

Mr CHIPMAN - Well both - first of all, you need to provide Metro with more resources so it can increase its capacity. We also need to incentivise people and encourage them to use public transport. There are two dimensions.

Ms WEBB - And is that through price? That is what I was trying to pick up what you meant about the incentivise part. Is your thinking for free or cheap services? I want to make sure there was not something else missing.

Mr CHIPMAN - An example of a great incentive would be if we had free bus services for schoolkids.

Ms WEBB - So price incentive, thank you. That is fine.

PUBLIC

Ms HOWLETT - The three previous mayors stated at peak hour buses are at full capacity. Is it the same on the Eastern Shore?

Mr CHIPMAN - Yes.

Ms HOWLETT - So, there is no point offering incentives for people at that time of day.

Ms WEBB - That is what he is saying - services first, then incentivise.

Mr CHIPMAN - I think more could be done in terms of widening the peak hour period.

Ms HOWLETT - Would your peak hour period start from 7 a.m. in relation to the buses?

Ms SIEJKA - Not the cars on the bridge with the Metro buses.

Mr CHIPMAN - I think the two are very closely related. The traffic starts building up from 7 a.m. and I think the buses probably start building up about then, too.

Mr VALENTINE - So many questions. So many areas to deal with.

I am interested in the aspect you mentioned about the Flagstaff Gully ring-road. What is being done to address that? Is there any movement by council to press this with the state or federal government? Have there been any origin-destination surveys to show it would be beneficial? Can you give us an understanding of it?

Mr CHIPMAN - I might invite the general manager to comment on that, or even Ross.

Mr GRAHAM - Back in 2012, council tried to set aside land. We did a study including the option of going through Flagstaff Gully Link Road. Of the options, council found a preferred one going through Geilston Bay Road. Council was looking at that time - Doug, you might remember - at setting aside a road reserve for future use; it wasn't to be done right at that time. Some of the local residents lobbied and council decided not to proceed any further. I think that was in 2012. We haven't moved any further on that.

In terms of a local issue, Begonia Street has a gravel road and cars are going through that. We have just received origin-destination data for that, which found about 250 to 300 cars in the morning are going along South Arm Highway through the Mornington roundabout and up the gravel road of Begonia Street towards the Geilston Bay and Glenorchy region.

It is not a significant number of cars in terms of the number using the entire network, but for a gravel road, and those local residents -

Ms SIEJKA - And a funny entry point, too, on that road.

Mr GRAHAM - That's right.

Ms HOWLETT - There is not a great deal that is unsealed there, is there?

PUBLIC

Mr GRAHAM - No. It is a small section, but for the local residents - I think what the mayor is saying is that it's the long-term planning. It might not be needed right now, but it is setting the road reservation aside.

Mr VALENTINE - It takes a long time to do that, doesn't it? You need to be looking 20 or 30 years out.

Mr GRAHAM - Exactly. That's right.

Mr VALENTINE - We only have to look at the old Bellerive to Sorell railway and how that land has now probably been consumed back into private ownership. Or a lot of it.

The question is: has that been seriously considered in terms of light rail service through Clarence to Sorell, and beyond?

Mr CHIPMAN - We used to have one, of course.

Mr VALENTINE - That is what I am saying. That corridor existed and I am assuming that a lot of it has been privatised. Has it been seriously considered by council to promote the possibility of light rail?

Mr CHIPMAN - It is not seen as practical. Council hasn't seen it as practical to push at this stage. We have been lobbying very hard for that inner ring-road through Flagstaff Gully, and it gets a mention in the recently released infrastructure report for the 30-year infrastructure pipeline the state Government has issued.

There is some resonance with us wanting that. Hopefully under the City Deal and the Greater Hobart Act, we can start increasing the pressure for that project to be progressed.

Mr VALENTINE - You say the regional strategic transport planning processes seem to have stalled.

Mr CHIPMAN - Previous ones certainly have. We hope under the Greater Hobart Act that we will be able to -

Mr VALENTINE - It becomes reinvigorated.

Mr CHIPMAN - Absolutely

Mr VALENTINE - Is there any talk of bringing the parties together to do that, by the government, that you know of?

Mr CHIPMAN - The Greater Hobart Act is still being [implemented?] We haven't had our first meeting under the formal terms of the Greater Hobart Act yet. It is certainly high on the agenda that we start addressing traffic issues and strategic transport planning.

Mr VALENTINE - I just wondered. Because it is obviously critical to solving all these issues, one wonders why that has stalled.

PUBLIC

Mr GRAHAM - The Southern Integrated Transport Plan was done in 2010 with DIER at that time, the Southern Tasmanian Councils Authority and the 12-member councils. It had 16 regional actions that talked about park and ride and such things. Many of those things are happening now, but the government is looking at the main highway corridor, which is its level of control. If we are all working together on having consistent strategies, then regionally, we feel, we will be better off. We see the City Deal as being a way to reinvigorate that regional strategic move forward.

CHAIR - We heard from Hobart City Council, and I think you mentioned it, about moving government departments into other areas to help with the traffic congestion. Have you had any conversations with federal or state Government about moving government departments into your area?

Mr NELSON - As the City Deal process was being established, there certainly was discussion about creating regional commercial hubs, not necessarily specifically moving government departments into regional areas or out of the CBD. Certainly, the conversations we have been having have been multifaceted in the sense that part of the transport solution is not just providing alternatives but actually taking the need away to work in the CBD.

This notion of regional commercial centres is quite intrinsic to the notion of a traffic solution because it will create its own economy. Within that, there would be an expectation that government has an involvement and a presence. In terms of actual specifics, we haven't got to that point at the moment, but there is certainly an implication that those sorts of conversations should be had as part of the overall solution.

Mr CHIPMAN - In some ways it's already happening. When you look at what has happened at Cambridge, TasNetworks has moved out there; Hydro Consulting is also out there now. There are other government agencies in Rosny Park, including Housing Tasmania and WorkSafe Tasmania. There is some of it already there, but we need to build on that.

Ms SIEJKA - I wanted to give you the opportunity to provide information or learning that you might have had from your Age Friendly Clarence work. Part of, say, with public transport, is trying to get older Tasmanians on transport but also their movement. Is there any work you have been doing in that space that would be of use for us to know?

Mr GRAHAM - No, but we are trying to make sure our facilities are disability-friendly in terms of access at bus stops and when they get to the Rosny CBD area, increasing access ramps through our municipality; in a budget sense we do that on a yearly basis.

Mr NELSON - I can probably add a bit to that. We've recently completed some work with Dr Peta Cook, who has been doing a qualitative study comparing essentially two groups of people: older residents and younger residents in Clarence.

Ms SIEJKA - Very similar issues often.

Mr NELSON - The point is, Dr Cook was always looking at where there are similarities in their needs and where there are differences and trying to understand what is driving those. In many respects, it's the precursor to that next stage of asking what does that mean in terms of urban design and how do we actually create an age-friendly city. The issue that a lot of people have been focused on is that age-friendly, in a lot of people's minds, means older age. We have taken a

PUBLIC

much broader view and looked at it from a youth point of view as well as our older citizens. The next stage will be to start to integrate that into our planning to better consider how we might respond to those issues.

Ms SIEJKA - Will that urban design research be available through the council website, or is there anything we could receive? It seems that there is a real focus on public transport across a lot of the submissions. I think those two age groups are consistently the two that come up as a key concern.

Mr NELSON - Certainly. I will need to check whether that information is publicly available at this point but if it is, I am certainly happy to make that available to the committee.

Ms SIEJKA - Thank you.

Ms WEBB - Given your comment around the stalling that seems to happen around strategic planning and also comments we have heard from the other councils potentially around a lack of a coordinating focus for this work across levels of government and across areas, what role could this inquiry best play or what outcome could we best achieve through this process that would contribute to good action on this issue?

Mr CHIPMAN - In a sense, this inquiry may be a little bit premature because our work under the City Deal is not yet underway. The most productive outcome from the committee would be to focus on what would be our agenda under the City Deal and the Greater Hobart Act - projects you have discovered through gaining your evidence that would be useful to Greater Hobart would be good food stock for us when we meet in committee to consider our strategic plan.

Ms WEBB - Can I pick up on another part? It is great to hear about the thinking and planning you are doing around the age-friendly area, and that it includes various ages. Thinking more broadly about transport equity, is this a concept you actively have, within your consideration of needs and solutions in your local government area, as a point of discussion and thinking?

Mr CHIPMAN - I am not familiar with the term 'transport equity'.

Ms WEBB - Maybe I have made it up. You have quite varied demographics across your local government area, and transport equity would take in transport needs. Accessing transport challenges is going to vary across different demographics, whether age, socio-economic or even geographical. Thinking about trying to achieve equality of access to transport, whether related to services, cost or whatever, is that something you would consider? Or not necessarily something you would consider, by the sound of it?

Ms HOWLETT - I think that is what you are doing now. You have a very broad area, part of which is not regional but out of suburban areas as far as Opossum Bay et cetera, and I think you are already considering and looking at that from what I have -

Mr CHIPMAN - It certainly has been an issue and that context we have been in to bat for better bus services to Richmond, Opossum Bay and Seven Mile Beach. This has been a constant dialogue we have had with Metro and the state Government, because it is not only Metro that provides those services.

PUBLIC

The work Dr Peter Cook has undertaken identifying what people would like to see as improvements in Clarence, what they do and don't like about Clarence and how things can be improved is also going to be informative in that regard. Beyond that, I am not sure we have proactively sat down and looked at transport equity.

Mr NELSON - A lot of our work to date has been focused on how we might make transport options more accessible to people. Using buses as an example, the park and ride option is partly focused on taking cars off roads, but also making that an acceptable and preferred choice over driving. This is particularly for people who are in regional areas who can come to a hub location and then take a bus for the rest of their journey. Coupling this with those alternatives around it, different commercial centres at the CBD are not the only choice, is really important. When you start to overlay things like good walking trails, good bike paths that do not necessarily - or certainly in the City of Clarence - need to be along roadways, you can create alternative networks that give people choices about how they transport themselves. What works for them and how they combine options together. That's where a lot of our thinking has been going. Then the next step I think is: how do we actually make that equitable for the most people possible? There's not a silver bullet in any of this; it's a lot of different initiatives that come together as a whole package. That's the issue that probably highlights the value of the City Deal and the way the Greater Hobart Act is designed to operate: it brings those parties together to sit around the table to talk about what might work and what won't, whereas before - and this is a gross oversimplification - we might have been talking to each other but we weren't necessarily around the same table picking apart what's a good idea and what's not. The City Deal really gives us that opportunity to delve into some detail and talk about a package of solutions as opposed to one project.

Mr VALENTINE - You were talking about ferries and about walkers and cyclists. Have you done any work on locations other than Bellerive and whether there is a demand for ferry services? For instance, you might think about Lindisfarne, South Arm and those other locations that might take a lot of traffic off the road if those services were provided. Have you done any background work on any of that?

Mr CHIPMAN - Certainly, a ferry solution between the CBD on this side of the river and South Arm or Opossum Bay would be very attractive to a lot of people because it's a long commute with peak hour traffic from down there into town. I think there are many reasons we should be pushing that. Lindisfarne -

Mr VALENTINE - Maybe Geilston Bay too; I don't know.

Mr CHIPMAN - Absolutely. I am familiar with the suggestions that we move down that path and council was very supportive of it.

Ms WEBB - Are there any studies into it or investigations into the actual likelihood it would deliver the outcomes we hope for or think it might provide?

Mr NELSON - Not at this stage that I am aware of. Ross may have some more information, but most of the work I am aware of has been focused around Kangaroo Bay and meeting the commitments focused on by the state Government. One of the discussions that has arisen in a very informal sense through the early City Deal discussions around the implementation plan was the possibility of a park and ride facility in the Rokeby area. It's a natural bottleneck, if I can call it that, and a catchment point. There is certainly some land in the Rokeby area that comes onto

PUBLIC

the water frontage that might form a possible site for a ferry terminal. The mayor raised earlier the work we are doing at the moment around Droughty Point planning. Certainly if that were to go ahead in future years - and again this is one of those 20- to 30-year future plan issues - that sort of development might well make Rokeby a viable site for a ferry terminal, coupled with a park and ride facility.

Mr VALENTINE - Do we have the depth of water for that?

Mr NELSON - I'm not sure. At this time, it's just looking at possible locations. There are some options there but beyond that, no actual study of options.

Ms WEBB - In terms of the viability of Kangaroo Bay and a ferry across to the CBD, can we look to a cost-benefit analysis or a viability analysis of that?

Mr CHIPMAN - That has been done by Metro recently at the request of the state Government.

Ms WEBB - Is that available yet? Do you know if it will be publicly available?

Mr CHIPMAN - It's my understanding the report is publicly available. I haven't seen the Government's response to it.

Ms WEBB - But from your side of it, you haven't seen that yet?

Mr CHIPMAN - Yes, I think we have seen that report from Metro, but we haven't seen any response from the Government yet.

Ms SIEJKA - I am curious. I think it's clear that there is probably a bit of tourist interest in that sort of thing, and it would be good for business from that perspective. Understanding that you haven't done research yourself, do you have any particular opinions on that commuter traffic being diverted to ferries? Do you think that is feasible or is it all quite dependent at this stage?

Mr CHIPMAN - I could make three points. One, you would have seen the announcement just recently that UTAS is teaming up with Chambroad for the hotel and hospitality school in Kangaroo Bay. In that sense Kangaroo Bay will become a small campus, at least a presence, of UTAS. The intention is that UTAS would have its students doing some work at Sandy Bay, maybe some in the city and maybe some at Kangaroo Bay. There is an intention by the state Government to build a new ferry terminal in Kangaroo Bay as part of the hotel school complex. It is envisaged there would be a lot of student traffic taking advantage of the ferries under these situations. In terms of Kangaroo Bay and Sullivans Cove, the thought has been to get one leg up and running and prove that we are into the technology, we are able to provide the service, before expanding it to other areas on the Eastern Shore and maybe the Western Shore. There is another opportunity we believe that could be emerging because of the new golf course going in down at Arm End. Part of that whole proposal will require a ferry service between Opossum Bay, for example, and the centre of Hobart. There are a lot of moving parts. I have just tried to capture what some of those might be.

Mr NELSON - If I can add a little more to the mayor's comments, the ferry proposed for Kangaroo Bay, we understand and support, will have a focus on walkers and cyclists. It is not necessarily primarily focused at people driving into the Rosny area parking and then going the

PUBLIC

remaining distance across the river. The question you would ask yourself is: why would you do that? If we are focused on the commutability of rate payers in Clarence and the way they might get themselves to Kangaroo Bay, whether via walking or riding or some other means of alternative transport, the ferry then becomes a viable option for crossing the river as a suitable and safe alternative to going across the bridge. We think from that perspective the ferry has an immense opportunity to change the way people want to travel to and from the CBD from the Eastern Shore.

Ms WEBB - Do you know whether that is what Metro has looked at in its assessment of that project?

Mr NELSON - I understand that is the case.

Ms WEBB - And is that because there is not parking available there to have a significant commuter park and ride.

Mr CHIPMAN - There is not much space there.

Ms WEBB - Just to change the topic a little bit. Around your internal expertise and the way you plan and prioritise the resources that you as a local government deploy on public transport infrastructure and other movement of people projects, how do you decide which projects to prioritise? Do you prioritise public transport over active transport? Do you put money into ferry, or future focus other sorts of technology initiatives? At the moment do you have an approach that you bring to that? Do you have the internal expertise to do that prioritisation and cross benefit of weighting against each other?

Mr CHIPMAN - I will ask Ian to expand on this. Lots of people come to us with lots of ideas. There are lots of great projects.

Ms WEBB - There are a million things you could do.

Mr CHIPMAN - In a sense there is a practical consideration that leads to a logical flow. You have a big reservoir of projects, there is a pipeline and to a large extent there is a natural order in which things flow out. Some things are really important and achievable. Other things that might be important to us are not achievable for all sorts of practical reasons, other than just resources. So there is a practicality overlay to how we schedule work.

Ms WEBB - Practicality would be a principle underlying some of that decision-making?

Mr CHIPMAN - For example, it might require us buying or resuming land. There are time constraints on how quickly you can make a start.

Ms WEBB - Would there be other underpinning principles you would apply? For example, that you value making sure public or active transport is optimised. Do you have underpinning principles?

Mr NELSON - Ross may have some further comments. From our perspective, we try to work in an evidence-based environment as much as possible.

PUBLIC

As the state Government would do, we will commission studies or conduct our own research trying to quantify the need and useability of particular initiatives we might wish to progress. Then, as the mayor has said, focusing that in terms of what we can afford, how it is going to be delivered and the progression of some of those projects.

Projects of significance within the city will usually progress through a planning phase into a resourcing phase and so forth. They might take a number of years to materialise, but there is a gradual working through and those issues get revisited every year, in terms of our budgets and estimate and annual planning processes to make sure they have the right priority.

Priorities can change as councils change, and the demographics of the city change. It is very much a living process for us, but as far as is possible, it is evidence-based.

Ross was talking about the issue of Begonia Street earlier and the traffic studies we have been doing there. Begonia Street has been on our radar for a long time. So has Flagstaff Gully Road. Those issues develop over time. Priorities come and go, but again we are - to some extent - subject to external agencies such as state and federal funding, and what we can do. That is where the issue of working with other levels of government becomes really critical to delivery for us.

We have quite an extensive list of things we would like to do if we had the money, time and capability, but we pick and choose where our priorities are.

Ms WEBB - That is what I am interested in - the principles on which you do that, or the rationale on which you say, 'We could do this or this, and because we have a principle of optimising public transport, we are going to do this one, or we might have a different principle and we will do that one.'

Mr CHIPMAN - I can give you an example. We set as a really high priority developing the Bellerive Beach Park into a regional park. We started that. We have been through phases 1 and 2.

When phase 3 was doing the boardwalk along the dunes, we ran into technical problems in terms of coastal protection, which I am sure Ross can illuminate.

There is also a sense in the community, because we are such a large community. We have urban areas along [inaudible] the Derwent, but we also have Meehan Range, Richmond Valley, down South Arm and Seven Mile Beach. There is also a sense within the council that we should be sharing the goodwill and the projects so all our communities benefit from our capital program.

CHAIR - We have just touched on our time. Can I say thank you, Doug, Ian and Ross, for making your time available today? We very much appreciate that and also your submission. We have another two days of hearings, so it is going to be a couple of interesting days, and hopefully we can come out with some good recommendations from the process. Once again, thank you.

Mr CHIPMAN - Thank you very much, Chair. If we can provide any further information, please do not hesitate to contact us.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW

PUBLIC

Mr GRAEME LYNCH AM, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, AND **Mr KEITH BROWN**, POLICY ADVISOR BUILT ENVIRONMENT, HEART FOUNDATION, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Welcome to the public hearings of the Legislative Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege. I remind you that any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded that privilege. A copy of the information for witnesses is available if you have not read it or you are not aware of the process. The evidence you present is being recorded and the *Hansard* version will be published on the committee website when it becomes available. I invite you to give a 15-minute statement on your submission, following which the committee can ask questions. If there is anything that you don't want to be made public, we can look at going in camera. I invite you to make your submission.

Mr LYNCH - Thank you very much, Chair and committee members, for the opportunity to speak to our submission.

Traffic and active modes of travel are a really complex system and I'm sure you have seen that from the 40-odd submissions you've had to review. At the Heart Foundation we recognise that traffic congestion is linked to wider patterns of movement which, in turn, link to settlement patterns, to land use planning and to transport planning.

The Heart Foundation advocates for the creation of healthy spaces and places to improve health outcomes by offering healthy lifestyle choices in communities in which people live, work, play, study and, importantly in Tasmania, visit. Traffic congestion can impact on the community and the economy of a place with connected impact on health and wellbeing, including heart health. Traffic congestion is linked to a predominance of vehicular traffic, with limited infrastructure for more active modes of travel and public transport. As we said, we recognise this is a complex systems issue.

At the Heart Foundation we are particularly concerned about equitable solutions so that we don't leave anybody behind when we talk about solutions for infrastructure development in our communities. I know this committee would be very aware that two-thirds of the Tasmanian population are in the bottom two quintiles of social and economic disadvantage. The great majority of people who use our public infrastructure are people who are in real danger of being left behind.

This committee is no doubt aware that there is a real social gradient related to health and wellbeing outcomes in our community. People who are socially and economically disadvantaged certainly bear a much higher proportion of mental health and physical poor health outcomes and all the associated things that come with that.

To introduce the Heart Foundation's background in this space, I have been with the Heart Foundation now for nearly 11 years. Very early on we saw the importance of the built environment in creating better opportunities for Tasmanians to enjoy health and wellbeing.

Many of you would know Rob Nolan started with us about six years ago to work specifically in this area of the built environment and planning. Rob's a life member of the Planning Institute

PUBLIC

and he's made a submission to this inquiry separately or PI and also the Heart Foundation, of course.

Keith, my colleague here, has been with the Heart Foundation now for about 12 months. He's emigrated to Tasmania - not a two pound Pom. but a modern version of that.

Mr VALENTINE - It was a 10 Pound Pom, actually.

Mr LYNCH - Keith has a lot of experience in planning; he is a planner. He is very embedded in the planning community here in Tasmania. He works for the Heart Foundation three days a week and he also works in a private consultancy for couple of days a week. He is very committed to the work of the Heart Foundation.

We also have working out of the office in Hobart Dr Kate White, who is a manager nationally of Active Living in the Heart Foundation; she is responsible for coordinating and writing a number of policy documents at a national level.

As you would see from our submission around the Greater Hobart traffic issues, we've been very involved both with the Hobart City Council and its draft transport strategy. We've made four submissions at the various phases of that. They are attached and referred to in our submission.

We have also been closely engaged with the RACT with its future mobility strategy for Greater Hobart. At the Heart Foundation we've been talking to the RACT as an identified stakeholder for eight or nine years around these issues. We commend the work that it has done.

There are just three documents referred to in our submission that I would like to physically show you. One is the *Blueprint for an Active Australia*, for which links are provided. This is the Heart Foundation's key advocacy document with the evidence around all the things in our submission that could be a very useful reference for a committee and public policy design.

We also have a document that is eight years old but is still very relevant. This is *Healthy Active by Design*, which was developed and adopted specifically for Tasmania from work of the Heart Foundation around Australia. It's a compendium of case studies that looks at the unique issues we face here in Tasmania where we don't have the greenfields developments you see in other places. A lot of what we need to do here is retrofit.

Finally, there is a more recent tool, the Healthy Active by Design resource that's available on the web which has many case studies and evidence.

Ms SIEJKA - Would it be possible to have digital copies of those sent to us? How does that work, Rob?

Mr LYNCH - There are links in the submission but if you would like us to email those to you, we can certainly do that. We will provide those to you.

Ms SIEJKA - It might be good to include in the report.

Mr LYNCH - Over the last decade the Heart Foundation has been very actively involved working with planning and working with government at all levels - at a federal, state and local levels. This really addresses term of reference no. (3). We've been advocating for a long time

PUBLIC

around a state policy in the planning system policy. That was the focus of a submission we made jointly with a number of stakeholders. Meg sat in another committee room, when we made representations to the Joint Parliamentary Select Committee - a committee of both Houses of parliament around preventative health. The recommendations from that committee are still very much alive today, and are shaping public health policy in Tasmania.

We are also very actively involved in statewide planning reform. We were very pleased with the support of the Legislative Council. Rob Valentine was particularly supportive, where we got the only none machinery change into the Land Use Planning Act and there was an objective around health and wellbeing in the objects of the act.

We've been strong advocates within the planning system for a streets code, which would address many of the issues in the Greater Hobart area about how we make streets places not just motor vehicles but for all users. We're also engaging with the Tasmanian Planning Policies that are being talked about to provide some strategic direction.

We are very strongly engaged in the link with the equity of active travel and health and wellbeing. There is one document - I don't know whether committee members are fully aware of this; some of you may be - that I would seek permission to table if I may. I think I have enough copies here. It is a statement from the Tasmanian Government that was an output from the Premier's Health and Wellbeing Advisory Council, and a statement signed by the Premier and the Deputy Premier, now the Minister for Mental Health and Wellbeing. It is a Tasmanian statement about working together for the health and wellbeing of all Tasmanians. It is quite a shift in the way the Government is starting to look at contemporary public health policy and around how we should frame it and look at the sorts of issues this committee is facing about traffic in the Greater Hobart area. It is very easy to be seduced by one mode of transport - motor vehicles - and not look at the broader picture.

On the right-hand side, there are five or six dot points that recognise the health and wellbeing of all Tasmanians is enhanced by natural open spaces, by our fresh food and air and water, our economy and culture and that our communities are strong and diverse. We can all reach our potential and have better health and wellbeing if we can participate fully in society and, of course, transport is one of the key ways people can participate in society. It is important we have an opportunity as Tasmania grows to plan our communities in a way that creates healthy, liveable and connected spaces. We need to continue to take practical action on issues that impact the health and wellbeing of current and future generations of Tasmanians. Those relationships are our strengths and most importantly health and wellbeing is the foundation of successful and bright futures for Tasmanians.

So, this is a statement from the government about working at an intersectoral collaborative level across all aspects of policy, across all agencies of government with the community and business. As a set of principles adopted by the government, it provides a good guidance and starting point for this committee in its deliberations around the many issues and interests you will hear about in terms of shaping recommendations.

Within our submission is a range of specific recommendations based on the evidence we put forward for the committee to consider. At the Heart Foundation, we do not see it as our place to make specific recommendations about allocations of whether a particular piece of infrastructure should be preferred over another one. That is the role for politicians and agencies and so on. Our expertise really is around the very strong evidence for the impact physical activity, access to

PUBLIC

healthy food and social inclusion can make to the health and wellbeing of Tasmanians. This is our strength and the evidence we can really bring to this committee and transport in the Greater Hobart area is about social inclusion, access to health food, access to public open space and access to all the services and so on we provide.

Those are my introductory comments and I am very open to answering any questions.

CHAIR - Thank you. Do you have anything else to add?

Mr BROWN - The only points of detail I would like to add reference the blueprint document; we are happy to provide pdfs of or links to copies.

Ms SIEJKA - It would be good to include in our report.

Mr BROWN - In particular reference to this document, which was revised and republished in May this year, there are action areas on specific topics, including a number of the issues Graeme has discussed. I particularly draw your attention to action area 1, built environments, and action area 4, active travel, that clearly relate to what the committee is considering.

CHAIR - Thank you, Keith.

Ms HOWLETT - Graeme, this is a great collaborative document. When is this going to be implemented?

Mr LYNCH - It was actually signed on 14 August, so the Government has made the commitment, as you can see. The Premier and Deputy Premier has signed it, so it is very much an authorising document. It is authorising a new way of working. The work of the Government and the Premier's Health and Wellbeing Advisory Council advising the Government is now: how do we put in place some governance arrangements to ensure we join up decision-making? That we have common key performance indicators we look at. Mutual benefits from activities - again, in the area of transport, there are a lot of vested interests, but there are interests that support both transport getting around, but also health and wellbeing, economic development and active travel is good for business. It is joining up all of those things. The governance arrangements are something that advice is now being provided to Premier and Cabinet and, of course, for Cabinet and heads of agencies to start to think about a new way of working.

Ms HOWLETT - Preventative health would be a major component of this.

Mr LYNCH - Absolutely. Language is an interesting thing when we talk about health. This document was very deliberately written for everybody to read and understand in very simple language. When we talk about health and wellbeing, we are talking about all the things that contribute to that, including preventative health - being more physically active, eating healthier food, better mental health and so on.

Mr VALENTINE - I am well and truly aware of what your impetus is in the Heart Foundation and health in all policies. Obviously this would be a classic opportunity for implementing some of that. What do you say to people who might push the line of, 'We need major infrastructure, this is tinkering around the edges; we need tunnels, we need to reduce the congestion, that's what we need; this really isn't going to provide a great deal of inroads into the congestion problem'?

PUBLIC

Mr LYNCH - The Heart Foundation and public health advocates generally are not against motor vehicles and personal travel. It's necessary in our modern society. As I said, it's a complex system issue we are dealing with. The issues we specifically raise in our representations, with respect, we don't think are tinkering around the edges. They can make a significant system change in the way of thinking and the way of approaching things, but, as I said in my opening remarks, it may well be that there are some infrastructure solutions that could be implemented.

We have read the 40-odd submissions that have been made so we are across what has been recommended. They are all made with good intent and they have come from various aspects. One thing we would say is that there might be \$1 billion or \$2 billion tunnel solutions, for example, but we really need to think carefully about what we might be able to do with that \$2 billion in other areas.

Mr VALENTINE - In terms of more effective projects that will deliver the same outcome.

Mr LYNCH - Exactly. A number of them are outlined in our submission, but they are around things like creating better access to public transport and looking at the way that's organised or about how we manage parking of vehicles, park and ride. Keith, you might like to add a few other comments in relation to that.

Mr BROWN - It's an entirely valid question. I was referring to some of the points in our submission. Presumably you are well aware of the statistics. Looking back to when we referred to the City of Hobart draft transport strategy, there are some interesting statistics in there; it cited that 83 per cent of all journeys to work were by car, a higher proportion than any other Australian capital city. A small percentage change in trying to improve public transport or active modes of transport, be that walking or cycling, potentially has a big impact proportionally.

Other submissions have made more detailed representations and experts in fields who could talk about public transport in great detail, but I think the potential for us to make a difference in public transport and active travel are there before us. The RACT's work on the mobility vision strategy that we have been engaged with highlights some of those, for instance. As Graeme said, any advice we give is not against one mode of transport, it's more trying to be representative, looking at our society, equitable choices, recognising there is a need for the motor vehicle, but there is also an opportunity for other modes of transport as well.

Mr VALENTINE - You are looking at the long game, not the short game?

Mr BROWN - Yes, and also taking a step back. Graeme referred to my context in terms of coming from the United Kingdom and practising there, and having an awareness of what's going on in other cities, both within other state capitals, territories within Australia and internationally. Many other cities are addressing similar problems, with different geographical, physical geographical and social issues. It's notable that a lot of places are really looking to make a different stepped change, particularly with public transport and active travel, and recognising that the benefits are multiple. We can sit here and talk about the health benefits, but we often talk about the co-benefits: what's good in terms of planning for health can also be good for business. We have a separate document that is literally titled 'Good for Business', which we would be happy to provide to the committee as well.

PUBLIC

Mr LYNCH - It is a long game. It is complex. They are difficult problems, and it comes back to sound planning principles. As I said in my first opening remarks, it is about how we plan our settlements - where we place people.

Many of our difficulties come about because we place people on the fringes of our cities where they don't have access to motor vehicles, they don't have access to transport, and they don't have access to all the other things that lead to a healthy life. Settlement planning is an important part of this longer term gain.

CHAIR - You said you had worked with the Hobart City Council on walkways and so on. What is your involvement with Glenorchy and Hobart when they are talking about walkways? Do you just look at the picture of a recreational walk or do you also look at linkages towards different areas and services? Does that come into what you are doing with the Heart Foundation, or do you just look at recreational walks?

Mr LYNCH - On the point of local government: we are very closely engaged with local government. We sit on various committees and advisory bodies with the Hobart City Council.

Clarence, particularly, which were in the room before - we actually are on two of its committees providing advice. We have done a lot of work with Glenorchy and some of the councils in the north and north-west.

The environment in which we live is now an obesogenic, unhealthy environment created by the way modern society has organised itself. It is no accident we are seeing these huge rates in mental health looming.

We are very much about creating environments that make healthy choices easy choices. Whether that is recreation, which you mentioned, which is part of it. It is about children, how they commute to and from school. It is about how people get to and from work. It is about how visitors to our state get around. It is very much about that connectedness and making sure we create environments that actually make healthy choices easy choices. We often refer to it as health by stealth.

If you create an environment where it is much easier to actually take your car and park and walk, and you don't have the hassles of parking, that is a much better outcome.

To give you an example at Salamanca: the Gehl report and others said we should remove the cars from the waterfront. You will hear business and the community saying, 'That is going to absolutely devastate our commercial activity on the waterfront', yet when you look at the busiest time at Salamanca for the commercial businesses, it is on Saturdays, when it is a walkable, easy connected place.

It is easy to get into the city, because there isn't the weekly traffic. I think there is a tipping point, in the short term, in Hobart. We see this when the school holidays come along, when that 10 per cent or 15 per cent goes off the roads. We don't have the same problems.

That is as it exists today. This committee is obviously going to be looking at recommendations well into the future, not just in the next five, 10 or 15 years. We have to have our eye on the long game.

PUBLIC

Ms SIEJKA - Urban planning is coming up quite a lot, and we are obviously looking at Greater Southern Hobart region for traffic.

Are there any particular low-hanging fruit ideas you have in terms of urban planning? There is obviously short-, middle-, and long-term planning to consider. Is there something that should be happening that is not at the moment?

Mr BROWN - In our response we set out a number of suggestions related to our inputs to other consultations. Just by way of context, we talk a lot about the question of walking. From a Heart Foundation perspective, it is obvious. Walking is good for your health, but sometimes people ask, 'How does public transport fit into that?'

I draw the committee's attention to the statistic we cite about 29 per cent of public transport users achieve 30 minutes a day of their physical activity just by walking to and from the bus stop. That could also relate to park and ride, for instance.

I think in the Greater Hobart perspective, park and ride is a good opportunity, noting that people do need their cars, but if you drove part of the way, stopped at the park and ride, and then took the rest of the journey into the city, that could be on a bus. That could be on a dedicated bus route, if some carriage way space was freed up on particular key routes into the city; equally, in terms of the northern suburbs and others have placed responses on whether that be light rail or whatever form that may take. Ferries are another opportunity area as well, but I think with all those points, we would say that in terms of looking at public transport within park and ride, we then need to think at the first and last mile - the connections at both ends to give people the opportunity of walking and cycling facilities to make it the easy choice. Graeme earlier referred to trying to make these things -

Ms SIEJKA - Is that the sort of inadvertent activity you don't even know you are doing?

Mr BROWN - Yes, absolutely.

Ms SIEJKA - We all prefer that.

Mr LYNCH - Behavioural change is very difficult. We all know that from our personal experience. We have to look at these solutions and this why the Heart Foundation invests so much time and effort in planning and creating healthy environments that - again, it's that health by stealth, the easy choices.

Mr BROWN - In terms of low-hanging fruit, there are a few bigger-picture ideas - just by acting on a few key junctions - sometimes it's connectivity, whether that be for pedestrians crossing particular streets or cycle networks being able to get from one point to the Intercity Cycleway or the rivulet route -

Ms SIEJKA - That seems to be a theme the councils touched on - some of those major intersections that each one has but there might be a barrier, whether it's bus infrastructure, or in Clarence you could cycle but then you get stuck in a really messy area and then you either then take your life into your own hand or you use another route - those small things as well.

Mr LYNCH - One of the really good gains has been - and Jan Gehl articulated this very clearly - that you look for an opportunity and you have a plan. This is where planning comes into

PUBLIC

play. When you are looking at connecting, as the Chair asked us about the connecting areas and so on, you look at all the bits on the gradient that you need to do. When you get the opportunity you plug it in -

Mr VALENTINE - You do it slowly, gradually over time.

Mr LYNCH - Yes, gradually over time all of a sudden you've got a network and everybody says, 'How the hell did that happen?'

Ms SIEJKA - That's what happened in Victoria.

Mr BROWN - Yes, and that's very valid, looking to what other cities have done, of a comparable size in particular. There are precedents out there where people, bit by bit, have identified a short list or a medium list. Cumulatively, it makes a big difference - while acknowledging there are needs sometimes for a bigger picture, grand idea as well, subject to funding.

CHAIR - You quite often see it in local government where they'll start a walkway and it finishes up linking and it could link up to a park and ride.

Mr BROWN - We have some excellent examples in Greater Hobart. The eastern Foreshore Trail, for instance, in Clarence is a fantastic facility. The Intercity Cycleway is also a good facility. Others - the Bicycle Network Tasmania and so forth - are advocating hard for improvements within the city core. I think within the city core that's important, recognising how we can improve the environment for people. Our definition is in peak pedestrian areas; that's where people want to go to work, shop, school, destinations. We give some priority to people in terms of active modes of transport.

Ms SIEJKA - Before we move on, are you aware of any other jurisdictions we should consider looking at? If there's any in your particular field, are there are particular places doing it well?

Mr BROWN - Yes. Graeme refers to this. This is an online resource and it has hundreds of case studies and we can search by state and territory and, for instance, movement network. There are a range of instances.

Ms SIEJKA - There's nothing that springs to mind for you?

Mr BROWN - A very recent example I would highlight, and I acknowledge it's a different scale of city, is that the City of Melbourne has been working on its transport strategy, which I have some paper details on. I would refer you to that because they have actively put forward and promoted active modes of transport and public transport as a priority within their city core. The City of Yarra, also within the Greater Melbourne metropolitan area, has done some very strong work on speed control on certain streets - not all streets, acknowledging people need a vehicle. Speed is a big impact on people's usability of space, as a pedestrian, cyclist or other active modes of transport.

Ms WEBB - You mentioned some of data about the percentage of people who use different modes of transport. Do you have particular target suggestions we could be aiming for as we look ahead and what we might implement?

PUBLIC

Mr LYNCH - From a physical activity point of view, there are physical activity guidelines the Australian Government produces that we promote. The one that would be best known to most people is 30 minutes of moderate physical activity each day can improve health outcomes, not just for heart disease but for a whole range of chronic diseases. That goes back to what Keith is talking about using public transport. It is no accident that people who live in the big cities in the world are the healthiest people and a lot is because of that. That is one target that could be built in.

Ms WEBB - To focus as I am mindful we have limited time. I meant modes of transport: driving your car, being on a bus, being on a bike or walking. Do you have suggested percentage targets we might aim for when considering what we implement in this area? From where we are now to where?

Mr BROWN - That is a good question and the statistic we looked at before was around 83 to 84 per cent of the regular car-borne trips into Hobart.

Mr LYNCH - There is a really simple answer. It would be great if all commuting to and from Hobart -

Ms WEBB - Sure, if everything that wasn't cars was higher.

Mr LYNCH - within the Greater Hobart area was all active travel would be a great goal to work towards. But of course, it is complex. Every setting is different, Meg, in terms of what you might aspire to but certainly, more is better.

Ms WEBB - That is fine. I was checking whether you had anything specific in that area.

In regards to the statewide planning reforms: you mentioned, Graeme, in your opening statement that you have been involving yourself in the process. Do you see opportunities specifically that we could be aware of in this inquiry which would bear fruit for the issues we are looking at?

Mr LYNCH - I definitely do. I referred to the Tasmanian statement - the principles contained there - which are a statement of government intention. It has been our view for a long time that the opportunity presented by the State Policies and Special Projects Act is a vehicle to have an overarching long-term strategy for what is valued in Tasmania. That would pick up these types of principles, when we are having these sorts of discussions, and balance them against economic development and other sectoral issues. What do we really see Tasmania looking like in the next 10, 20 or 50 years? We do not have that anywhere in Tasmania.

Ms WEBB - Which would please us then when we consider we could, to (a) or (b), not necessarily have the agreed principles underpinning why we might choose (a) over (b) or (b) over (a).

Mr LYNCH - Exactly. We are still talking to a whole range of stakeholders. Everybody sees the void in terms of the longer term beyond the life of parliamentary tripartite support for that sort of commitment. This is the beginning of an authorising environment. But if it is in the State Policies and Projects Act, it is then owned by parliament.

PUBLIC

Ms WEBB - Do you think we have we missed the boat, Graeme, at this stage?

Mr LYNCH - No, it is very much alive.

Ms WEBB - I note your focus on the equitable and socio-economic gradient that exists there. I am interested, because you have worked 'intensively' with Hobart City Council and mentioned you have worked with some other councils. Noting a lot of our lower socio-economic areas are outside Hobart City Council, when I asked about transport equity of a council in this room a short while ago, there was a lack of connection to that concept.

Mr LYNCH - Yes.

Ms WEBB - Do you see there is greater opportunity for you to be talking with targeted councils around their approach to transport and equity?

Mr LYNCH - Yes, absolutely. Keith has been very engaged at Brighton, for example, around the longer term development of Brighton, particularly in the most recent development of the public open space activity there, then the connectiveness. Certainly, that is a place where we really do need to focus, because a lot of the great work the Hobart City Council does is still being done in the more advantaged communities.

Ms WEBB - Indeed. One thing I am interested in asking many who come before us is: what do you see this inquiry could best deliver in this area as a contribution, given this conversation has been happening in lots of different ways? What could we best focus our outcomes on?

Mr LYNCH - If I were sitting where you are sitting as Legislative Councillors conducting this inquiry, the biggest contribution would be a set of really strong principles around the shape of Greater Hobart and how it is going to look - not as an immediate fix - but in the next 10, 20, 30 years. That is the biggest contribution. Once you have that in place, then all the sorts of things in our and many of the other recommendations before you will become much easier to look at in terms of what resources should be applied because there is nothing there that is not worthy. Whether it be a tunnel under, it is a matter of allocating scarce resources to get the best results. We need to be very clear with the tunnel proposal, for example. There is a whole range of environmental issues. There are issues about isolating certain parts of the city. It is about having those principles strongly in mind that decision-makers can then look at what is the best allocation of the \$1.5 billion, say, for the tunnel or could it be done in other ways. To me, that is the work of this inquiry because it is going to be very difficult for you to come up with a menu of specific capital expenditure activities. It is almost impossible for you.

Ms WEBB - And perhaps not our role.

Mr LYNCH - With the greatest respect, it is not your role.

Mr VALENTINE - Have you met with the Greater Hobart councils to discuss the initiative you talk about? It almost goes to what Meg was saying. One page 4, point 3, Strategic planning processes between Commonwealth, state and local governments, you talk about, at the Commonwealth level, the Heart Foundation calling for government support to fund and implement a cross-sector action plan for physical activity. Have you actually met with the Greater Hobart councils collectively with regard to that or is that something you have scheduled to do in the future?

PUBLIC

Mr LYNCH - Not specifically with the Greater Hobart councils, but we are very closely engaged and work very closely with the Local Government Association. We are very actively involved in a whole range of activities there. Meg would be familiar with the peak bodies that continue to meet regularly to talk about these sorts of issues. That is, with the building sector, the property sector and so on. We are very actively involved in partnership with [inaudible] and local government.

At a national level we see the need for a national physical activity plan and transport strategy. We are also strongly advocating across the country for a dedicated spend - this is part of the KPI, if you like - from infrastructure budgets around the country to be dedicated and siphoned off for infrastructure development. In Tasmania, for many years we have been arguing for a 5 per cent allocation out of the State Growth budget on roads and infrastructure. Part of that ask is for this to be matched by local government. The funding for that local government has to come primarily from the Commonwealth. It is not going to come from ratepayers necessarily, but local governments for many of these solutions are the appropriate delivery mechanism. Very actively involved in that area, both in a Tasmanian context, but also more broadly in a national context.

Mr VALENTINE - Another thing you talked about was student transport and how during school holidays the problems almost melt away. Do you have much discussion with major schools about providing better options for their students to get to school, rather than mum or dad rocking up in their SUV?

Ms SIEJKA - [Is that] trying to be a stereotype?

Mr VALENTINE - No, not trying to stereotype but you know what I am saying? A lot of people do it and, yes, it does cause some significant issues - 8 per cent of traffic for a start.

Mr LYNCH - The premises of Premier's Physical Activity Council - which preceded the Health and Wellbeing Advisory Council - certainly had a working group specifically engaged not just with the state school system but also with the independent schools. That work is still ongoing through the Department of Communities. We are also strongly working through a body Keith is now chairing, the Tasmanian Active Living Coalition, which has stepped in to take the place of the Premier's Physical Activity Council and will form part of the information and advice to the Health and Wellbeing Advisory Council to Cabinet. Keith might like to say something about schools because there is another involvement with the Hobart City Council that is coming up.

Mr BROWN - Yes, another document. The Heart Foundation has another document called 'Active Travel to School', which is exactly in the space that you are talking. That is not saying that we are speaking with a particular school in the Greater Hobart area but it is a good example of a document and some guidance that we would welcome the opportunity to speak about with relevant local authorities and partners. We have started to have conversations with some other councils within the Greater Hobart area with regards to that. We recognise that patterns of school transport, as you have just reflected on, are a big part of that. We also acknowledge in that document, and will share it if that would be useful to the committee, there are a number of factors that go into people's choices in terms of why those changes are made. I believe from memory in that document there is a statistic from the 1970s that three-quarters of school-aged children were moving to school through some form of active or public transport. That's sharply reduced. I cannot cite that statistic exactly but if we share the document with you there is a lot of information about the impact of travelling to school in terms of the built environment.

PUBLIC

Mr LYNCH - There is an excellent case study at Port Sorrell.

Mr BROWN - That is very true.

Mr LYNCH - Where a new school was built with planning for active travel. There has been an evaluation of that and the number of children cycling and walking to school has been greatly enhanced. It was built into the settlement planning so it was perceived as safe, with separated cycleways and so on. It is harder to retrofit but that is part of the longer term approach.

Mr BROWN - The Active Travel to School document that I refer to, while having high-level principles, also get down to some case studies. It was worked through with consultants and put a financial figure on, for instance, streetscape improvements, such as a corner junction identified on a walking route. A local authority can say 'That is going to cost us x thousand dollars but the impacts in terms of improving walking and cycling is measurable'.

Mr VALENTINE - I think you might have even been involved in initiatives like the Walking Bus and that seemed to be a good initiative and seemed to get some good outcomes.

Mr LYNCH - Children can get their hour-and-a-half of physical activity just by going to and from work. We often say if physical activity was available as a medication, everybody in the population would take it, and the population -

Ms WEBB - Can you give it to me in a bottle?

Mr LYNCH - And the health and wellbeing of the population would be greatly enhanced.

Mr VALENTINE - Some who drive their cars, say, to the Domain and park there and walk half an hour to work would say they are getting theirs.

Mr LYNCH - That is park and ride.

Mr BROWN - That is an informal version of park and ride.

CHAIR - I think we are all done and we are on time. Thank you, Graham and Keith, for coming along and giving your time today and your submission. We appreciate that. We are going to have an interesting couple of days listening to witnesses. Hopefully we can bring something out of this committee for the Government to look at.

Mr LYNCH - Thank you very much, Chair and members. If there is anything else you require from us, please let us know. Keith has made a note of some of those additional documents we will send as a pdf and a link.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW

PUBLIC

Mr CRAIG RICHARDS, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, BICYCLE NETWORK, WAS CALLED AND EXAMINED VIA TELECONFERENCE AND **Ms MARY McPARLAND** WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Mary, I welcome you to the public hearings of the Legislative Council Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion. All the evidence of this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege. But I remind you that any comments made outside the committee may not have the same privilege. A copy of the information for witnesses is available if you have not read it. The evidence you present is being recorded and the *Hansard* version will be published on the committee website when it becomes available. We will ask you to give a small preview of your submission and then the committee will ask questions and the same will apply to the other witnesses. If there is anything you think you want to have in camera, you can ask for this to happen.

Ms SIEJKA - Do you need Craig to do the oath?

CHAIR - No, we do not apparently. Mary, if you would like to start with a small overview.

Ms McPARLAND - My submission was addressing the traffic congestion through modal shifts. We know during school holiday times, traffic significantly flows a lot better. It is not actually a huge reduction in the number of cars, it is cars are so space inefficient it does not take many cars off the road to actually make an impact on traffic congestion. We believe providing more opportunity for active transport, particularly for those shorter journeys. People who are living within five kilometres of their destination and are driving - to shift them out of their car into other modes. Walking for shorter distances; biking, described as smart walking because you get four times the distance with the same expenditure of energy so it is practical or public transport.

My area of focus is primarily cycling; the ability to travel five to seven kilometres is about the ideal. We often hear, 'Hobart is hilly', and parts of it are, parts of it are not, but we also have new technology. Ebikes are all the rage at the moment, they are coming down in price and we are seeing more of them. I get overtaken on the Intercity Cycleway by a really old lady and realise she has a an ebike. There is a lot of opportunity, but the biggest barrier is safe places to ride. Most people who would be interested in riding. Based on surveys, we know about 60 per cent of the population is interested in riding, but there is no way they are going to ride under the current conditions. What's currently out there at the moment is providing for very experienced or confident riders. When we put in painted bike lanes on the road, that makes it better for that existing group of riders; it makes their level of comfort a bit better, but it is not really going to attract new riders until we actually separate them from motor vehicle traffic, and that is through separated cycleways.

The submission the Tasmanian Bicycle Council did - Cycling South is a member of that and it's our state body - was really focused on the CBD. At the moment we have the Intercity Cycleway that takes you to the edge of the city, we have a South Hobart Rivulet track that takes you to the edge of the city and then you are left to mix it with really heavy traffic.

Separated cycleways are physically separated barriers on the road. One of the big challenges is the discussion around road space and how it is used. Macquarie and Davey streets have just had their clearways put in because they felt that moving traffic in the morning was better than having people storing their private property on that bit of road. I think the conversation around the Hobart CBD is going to be how we use the space. At the moment, cars are very space-

PUBLIC

inefficient; they take up a lot of space. We prioritise them because we can't let them hover around for too long because the roads get congested. The problem with that is that they have always been prioritised to the detriment of [other road users], with narrower footpaths and no space for cycling.

What we are looking for is probably removing some on-street parking to reallocate that space to move people, [to have] better footpaths and separated cycleways.

CHAIR - Craig, did you want to make a statement before we go into questions?

Mr RICHARDS - Yes, sure. Similar to Mary's position, our position is that if you're going to remove congestion from your cities, you need to come up with safe, energy- and cost-efficient ways to move people around.

From the human perspective, humans are looking for the most convenient way to move around and the added bonus is, if you can provide a healthy way that improves their health outcomes, that obviously is a great thing as well.

When it comes to Hobart, it has been very much a car-centric city but to be a city of the future, it can't continue to be a car-centric city. When it comes to the space limitations, it just doesn't work to move people around that way. As we have seen with many other cities around the world, they have gone the way where they prioritise active travel as their most space- and energy-efficient means of moving people around; second, they have prioritised public transport; and, third, their private vehicles, particularly with so many being single-occupant vehicles, are the ones that get the least priority.

As Mary mentioned too, we know in Hobart there are a lot of people who are interested in riding a bike. Over half of the people in Hobart are, but the key reason they don't want to is that they don't want to run the gauntlet with motorised vehicles, particularly given the differential in the weight and the perception of feeling unsafe amongst that.

In the recommendations we make in our submission, as Mary mentioned, we are talking about introducing a series of protected bike lanes to Hobart and a number of key streets have been identified, like Campbell Street, Collins Street, Elizabeth Street and Harrington Street. Another key one, of course, is to fix the Tasman Bridge. There is a provision there for bike riders but I know personally, from when I did it for the first time a few months ago, that it is incredibly narrow and quite daunting. That no doubt stops a number of people riding.

Another important one is to integrate public transport and bike riding as well and so, in the city, to provide priority for the bike riders so they can move around in an efficient way, with end-of-trip facilities and looking at other incentives. That's in our submission as well.

The last one is that it is important to prepare the case well for bike riding. It's a very compelling case for a way to move about the city, but it does involve change and for some people it's counterintuitive. That can, as a result, get some opposition, particularly when it comes to things like on-street parking, which some people believe, particularly those running businesses, is a key to their financial future when in fact the evidence points to the opposite: if you do provide spaces for more people to come and places for them to come into your city by bike, you will get more people as a result of that. You get a more vibrant economic community as well as a more vibrant visible community.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Thank you, Craig. Jo, do you want to lead off there with a question?

Ms SIEJKA - Yes, sure. This committee looks broadly at transport and traffic across the greater southern region. Urban planning, how we can improve what we do and how we do it, has come up in a lot of the submissions - not so much infrastructure, just smart planning.

In terms of design across the greater system, and I appreciate you have chosen to focus on the CBD, but like the Tasman Bridge, there are those feeder points: what would you see as the priority for cycling and to get cyclists now and reluctant cyclists to engage in that greater network?

Ms McPARLAND - The problem at the moment is that we have a very sporadic and disjointed network. You couldn't really call it a network, because network implies there is an interconnected set of routes and we don't really have that.

One of the things we have been looking at the moment is the Sorell to Tasman Bridge corridor and, as part of that, looking at an intercity cycleway style cycleway alongside the highway. It would actually give people an alternative, because at the moment there isn't any. As Craig said, the bridge is a challenge. It is all these little stress points that are off-putting.

I think the challenge with cyclists is they always gets the scraps. Cycling is never prioritised. Even things like road crossings - the Mornington roundabout is a perfect example. You have a fantastic cycleway leading up to both sides, but how do you cross that road?

Mr VALENTINE - Fear your life.

Ms McPARLAND - Absolutely. It is often for local trips. It is the little, short trips that will make a huge difference. If you live out in the middle of Woop Woop, a car is going to be the most efficient because you can't provide a proper public transport service. That is where the car is fine.

The problem is when people are using their car for local trips and for trips that could be done perhaps in a bus. They are the ones you really want to be trying to shift.

It is really difficult to tell someone to get on a bike when there is nowhere for them to ride where they feel safe and comfortable.

CHAIR - The Southern Outlet is a perfect example.

Ms McPARLAND - Yes. They have done a lot of work on Bonnet Hill. Again, that is fantastic for those riders who already use it. It has made the road a lot safer for drivers and people riding over there, but it is not accessible to the average person who wants to go down to Kingston from Bonnet Hill to the shops. You are not going to do it with your family. It is not that kind of environment.

I think that has been the biggest challenge. The reason why we focus on the Hobart CBD because, if you start in the middle and work out, it is those short trips, it is the CBD that is actually -

PUBLIC

Ms SIEJKA - That's the low-hanging fruit.

Ms McPARLAND - Someone who lives out in the middle of nowhere and drives to the Domain and parks and walks in is not part of that CBD congestion. That is actually okay. Focus on the CBD and work your way out for the cycling.

Ms SIEJKA - Most of those pressure points are identified within local councils and other areas.

Mr RICHARDS - Just a couple of small things. One thing to think about is that your bike commute is only as good as the worse piece of infrastructure. If you are going five kilometres and 100 metres of it is terrible, people won't ride as a result of that.

While bike networks tend to grow in a piecemeal fashion, a great opportunity if you're looking to change congestion which some cities have done - London, Seville, some of those cities - have said they can't afford to wait 20 or 30 years for this to happen, and they have really accelerated those networks.

The only other thing to think about is in some areas further away from where a lot of people are moving around - shopping precincts, education precincts - getting more people riding. We talk often about local streets, where you are not going to have separated bike infrastructure everywhere. Where you can, you can calm traffic and reduce the speed limit in those areas. They provide more liveable places for people to live as well, while being more comfortable when they are in a situation where they are having to interact with vehicles.

Ms WEBB - Rob, did you want to follow that up?

Mr VALENTINE - It was in regard to the Domain comment. I was interested in that statement. You said they are not part of the congestion. Some would say they are, because in fact they have to come across the bridge and if those spaces were not available, they might think maybe catching a bus is not a bad idea.

Ms McPARLAND - They are actually a good audience to be targeting, because they are already doing multimodal trips. They are doing a car and a walking trip. If you can shift that to a bus and a walking trip, because sometimes the bus does not get you exactly where you want to go, but having a little bit of a walk at either end is not a terrible thing. They are a group worth targeting. It is for those who drive and live in Sandy Bay or Battery Point,

Mr VALENTINE - Or New Town like me. Guilty.

Ms McPARLAND - Or New Town and they drive into the CBD. It is probably the audience you are trying to tackle. Like you said, it is not a huge number of people you have to start to change. It is something like 6 per cent to start to see a difference in congestion at those peak periods of the day, which is primarily the morning and the post-school afternoon. As the low-hanging fruit, targeting those shorter trips and giving the people in those areas opportunities to take different types of transport modes rather than just driving is where the biggest wins will be.

Mr VALENTINE - Some say people will choose cars over bicycles because they have to do an extended trip after work, pick up children from child care, which might be a fair way away, or they have to use the car during the day. I am sure I am in that category and others might be too.

PUBLIC

Isn't part of the issue that people see cars as a really important utility and getting them out of their cars is not such an easy thing to do?

Ms McPARLAND - Part of the challenge is someone who uses their car for 100 per cent of all their journeys and then someone says 'Maybe catch the bus, maybe take a bike or walk or get a taxi.' It is almost like shifting their 100 per cent of car journeys to 100 per cent of bus journeys or 100 per cent of bike journeys. Some people had said to me in the past, 'I have to sometimes go to Launceston.' I am not saying ride your bike to Launceston, and that is the challenge. It is saying it is actually a smorgasbord. On the day you need to go to that special appointment, you need to take the car, but the next day you do not have that special appointment would be a great day to take the bus. You might ride your bike in and then a terrible storm comes in and you catch the bus home and you leave your bike at work and then you catch the bus in the next day and ride your bike home. There are all these mixed journeys. I think one of the challenges is that people are creatures of habit and doing the same thing every day is the challenge, but you can change those habits. Suddenly you get into a new habit; I actually enjoy walking down to the bus stop and meet my neighbour at the bus stop. It is creating those new habits.

CHAIR - People with bicycles - 'I live down the Huon and to catch a bus into work is all right, but not if I lived out of the town'. It an issue for cyclists as soon as they get off the bus, if they had an interchange, where they could store their bikes? Has that ever been raised.

Ms McPARLAND - It has been raised. I sometimes work a couple of days a week over in Rosny Park and some of my colleagues live in South Hobart. They would ride their bike into the Hobart CBD, the bus mall, and lock their bike up and catch the bus over the bridge. They are doing those multimodal trips, but there was never anywhere really safe or under cover to park their bike. Having bike parking at transit hubs is quite valuable, because some people could even leave the bike. For example, if you lived on the Eastern Shore and worked in New Town, you could catch the bus into town and then your bike is waiting for you in a nice secure lock-up where you can ride up to New Town, you can ride back and bus home. It is all about having those little bits of infrastructure that remove some of the current barriers.

CHAIR - That is one of the issues. I know people who live in the country. They can get a bus into the city, but then they might work at North Hobart or somewhere and getting connecting vehicles, or to the Eastern Shore, whereas if they could access their bike -

Ms McPARLAND - Two bus trips is always a bit hard because you always have waiting, whereas it is great if you can get off and there is something waiting for you. Either you can walk or straight onto a bike. That is the challenge.

The other think probably worth mentioning is micro-mobility. There is a lot of them around. It is electric scooters in Brisbane. The bike share schemes in many of the European cities are huge. It is almost like an extension of the public transport system, but for those really small journeys where you get off a bus and you need to go a short distance, people were getting on to these - what they call micro-mobility - scooters and we're not really catering for it. Where would they go? They're either on the footpath in these high-congestion zones where people are walking, or they're on the roads with the traffic. That's where the challenge is, and that's where the separated cycleways have a role to play.

Ms HOWLETT - Mary, are they the ones that you can hire?

PUBLIC

Ms McPARLAND - Yes. They're like an app.

CHAIR - Do you have anything to add there, Craig? We know that you're there if you want to interrupt at any time.

Mr RICHARDS - Yes. One that I might mention to you which I have seen works very well is in Darwin. Darwin is a slightly smaller city than Hobart, but it still has about 100 000 people. South of Darwin - obviously you can't go north of Darwin - there's a place called Humpty Doo. They have quite a big park and ride facility there where a lot of people are riding their bikes and then getting the bus into town, to work and other things from there. I've seen that work really well and that's probably, I am guessing, 10 to 15 kilometres outside Darwin so generally the average person - and here we're not talking about trying to convert people into lycra and clip-in shoes-type warriors, we are talking about ordinary people in ordinary clothes who will ride in those 5, 7, maybe up to 10 kilometres, but if you try to push them to 25 kilometres, they're not going to do that. That's one place that the committee might want to look at where that has worked, and it has worked very well.

Ms HOWLETT - It would be worth having a look at.

Ms WEBB - Knowing that currently we have active transport covering a certain proportion of people who are doing trips but the bike part of that is quite small. I wonder: do we have evidence-informed, achievable targets for what you would like to see as a percentage using bike transport? When I say 'evidence-informed', I mean where it's been demonstrated somewhere else that a shift to that percentage can be achieved through the sorts of things that you're proposing.

Ms McPARLAND - Certainly, where they've implemented separated cycleways. There are studies from Auckland and even Sydney that show that when they put in the cycleways, they've seen 200 to 300 per cent increases in usage on a particular route when they converted from, say, a bike lane to a protected bike lane. That has been borne out around the world.

Separated cycleways have been around a long time in European countries, but we were always different. Australia was a different type of country. The US and Canada were different types of countries; they wouldn't work there, but now it's the new norm, say, in New York. All these countries that were very much like us have decided that separated cycleways are the way to go because the evidence is there that the people are using them. It's not the current cyclists in the lycra, it's families, elderly people, people with the sit-up-and-beg bikes with the basket on the front and their groceries in it. It's a real shift and we don't see that kind of rider around Hobart because they are not accommodated in the way our road network is set up.

Ms WEBB - For some it's the topography. I accept what you said about ebikes but a vast number of Tasmanians cannot afford an ebike in this current pricing environment.

Do you have an evidence-informed target that if we were to implement these separated cycleways, in the first instance in the CBD, we could expect to see a certain shift?

Ms McPARLAND - Yes.

Mr RICHARDS - If you look on page 4 of our submission, we talk around a 10 per cent target when the current mode-share target is around a 1 to 2 per cent situation. There are a couple of examples there. One is Vancouver and another one is Seville, which I mentioned earlier.

PUBLIC

The build pretty quickly went. They went on a significant build where they built 80 kilometres of bike network in just 18 months, which in bike terms was fairly rapid, but they realised they needed the trip numbers to increase from about 3 million through to 15 million in the space of five or six years. I would think it's a fairly modest target in Hobart if you build enough infrastructure and also provide enough other programs, you could get your mode share to 10 per cent reasonably quickly in that three- to five-year space.

Ms WEBB - When you say 'enough' in terms of the various infrastructure or programs you mentioned also, what do you mean by 'enough'? Are you talking about what you proposed in your submission where you say we could expect to hit 10 per cent of people using bikes - to go from 1.5 per cent to 10 per cent?

Mr RICHARDS - Yes, that's correct. Obviously, you have to back that with the expenditure, which is mentioned in the submission. The plans that have been prepared are very good and they show that networking can be built into the city where there some good feeder routes. That is the sort of target we should be aiming at.

Ms WEBB - Do you have a picture of who are your likely transferers, to transfer from one mode of travel to bikes, within that shift from 1.5 percent to 10 percent? Do you know who those people are likely to be?

Mr RICHARDS - Obviously there is a large number of people who are interested in riding bikes. It does come from there, but we are looking at who is the most likely. Most likely they are going to be people who are living near the bike facility.

So 60 per cent is a big number, but you are looking at the people who are living within that range, particularly in the city, but also the ones who are living closest to the corridors, where the current facilities are.

If they are currently close to the intercity cycleway, I think they are a better target than those living further away. That's where your most likely shift is going to come. They are most likely going to be people who are coming into the city regularly.

Ms WEBB - Do you have other characteristics you can point to as evidence of who makes the shift?

Ms McPARLAND - When you say the 1.5 per cent, that is across the whole region. If you break it down into census data pockets, nearly 7 per cent from Taroona ride in on the Sandy Bay Road bike lane. South Hobart is another pocket, and New Town is another pocket, that section of New Town into the intercity cycleway.

It is actually breaking down the data and understanding where people are coming from. They are the people coming from areas that actually have a demographic and infrastructure that supports their journeys.

Ms SIEJKA - It's distance as well.

Ms WEBB - When you talk about the demographic for cycling, can you elaborate on that more? Is that the demographic you expect to see expanded?

PUBLIC

Ms McPARLAND - When you look at most people living close to the city, there are higher home values. It is a different demographic. They are often the ones with lots of cars, often a free car-parking spot at their workplace, so driving is really incentivised.

They are the target group. They're actually the most set up for a modal shift because they are so close to the CBD. As I said, Taroona is a very high cycling mode. They are often interested in a whole range of social issues as well - climate change, liveability of their cities. They are often educated around that stuff as well. They are actually a group you can engage with.

Mr VALENTINE - Is there an age group? A cohort?

Ms WEBB - A range of demographic characteristics. You have some information about demographic. I am wondering about this picture of who we might see shift modes. What does it look like? What things could we expect?

Ms SIEJKA - We are also looking at multi-modal stuff. You said they are people who may well easily transfer

Ms McPARLAND - We are also seeing the city change too. A lot of development is happening. We are seeing apartment buildings, the university is moving in, so we are going to see a lot more students. We have a whole range. We have people who are downsizing, so they are selling their house in West Hobart and buying an apartment in the city so they can walk, and actually [inaudible] themselves.

It is going to be a real mix of people. People who want to have a nice liveable city and want to be close to the services they want don't want to have to drive a car to go from Battery Point to North Hobart for dinner if there are other ways of doing it. At the moment there are no other ways.

Mr RICHARDS - One thing I could say around the demographics is what we have seen when we do provide, pretty much anywhere, good places to ride, particularly from people thinking, 'What's the gender demographic?' Well, the gender demographic is the complete representation of society. People riding bikes now tend to have a male skew, but once we provide good places to ride we get almost instantly the 50:50.

And also, from the age side of it, as well. When we are looking to build these facilities, if we build them in the way that they satisfy the 8- to 80-year-old test - people of all walks of life ride.

And while it's true some people may be more predisposed to start, once it becomes a habit, others join in quickly to do what their peers do.

Ms WEBB - Where would you suggest we find the best similar example to Hobart, that could demonstrate that evidence?

Ms McPARLAND - Sydney is probably the closest in terms of not having to go overseas, because it is relatively new in Australia.

Ms WEBB - No, I am happy to go overseas. I am more interested in what is similar to us topographically, size, potentially what we could imagine investing and that sort of thing. We

PUBLIC

have tackled this challenge and demonstrated this outcome successfully which shows what Craig just mentioned about a range of demographics and ages and genders responding to a change of mode.

Ms McPARLAND - Do you have any suggestions, Craig? I was recently in London. I lived in London 20 years ago and would never have dreamed of riding my bike in London. I visited there a couple of years ago and they have what they call cycle highways, I think.

CHAIR - It is actually in your submission.

Ms HOWLETT - They are in New York as well, aren't they?

Ms McPARLAND - It was astounding. It was absolutely astounding, the shift in that period of time. We stood there one morning just watching people, no lycra to be seen, there was no-one in lycra. Everyone was in their office clothes.

Ms WEBB - If you have to go up hills, you cannot be in your work clothes.

Ms McPARLAND - Although the ebikes are really getting more popular. Bicycle Network has an ebike expo coming up. It is interesting who turns up to those things because it is across all demographics. It is a replacement for a car. A car is an expensive asset to own. If you can replace a car with an ebike, it is much cheaper to run.

Ms WEBB - Do you advocate incentivising ebike purchase or access?

Ms McPARLAND - There would be benefit in that if that meant that you were getting cars off the road.

Ms WEBB - Is that something you have looked at in your proposal or would look at suggesting?

Ms McPARLAND - Have not looked at in detail. We are a one-car family, always have been a one-car family, and a multi-bike family. We use the car and the bikes depending on the trips and who is going where.

Ms HOWLETT - Mary, you made a statement before that because ebikes are becoming very popular there has been a reduction in price. What is an average ebike worth now ?

Ms McPARLAND - A decent ebike is around \$2000. So compare that to the cost of a Hyundai.

Ms HOWLETT - Is there anywhere in Tasmania where we are doing it well from a cycleway point of view.

Ms McPARLAND - Probably not in terms of transport cycling. Cycling has often been seen as a bit recreational, intercity cycleway, Clarence Foreshore trail, but they don't really connect people to work places and places of education and we have not -

Ms SIEJKA - There are pressure points, aren't there.

PUBLIC

Ms McPARLAND - And again there's that lack of network, of actually connecting into destinations.

Ms HOWLETT - So we have more of a destination cycleway currently.

Mr VALENTINE - That brings me to my question, and it is about bikes on buses. Do you want to comment on that? How much conversation have you had with Metro recently about bikes on buses and whether they are accommodating anything?

Ms McPARLAND - I have not had any direct conversation with Metro, just through some broader submissions around public transport to the Department of State Growth. I will just give an example. A friend of mine's son lives at Seven Mile Beach and goes to school at Rose Bay. He catches the bus to Rose Bay High and after school he has hockey practice. There's an off-road cycling route all the way from Rose Bay High to the hockey centre, but he cannot get his bike to the school to do that journey. His parents have to pick him up then they have to drive him to hockey hang around and then drive him home. I know there was a trial of bike racks on buses. Particularly with low floor buses there is opportunity for luggage space at the front that can accommodate prams, wheel chairs and bikes. That is a policy change.

Mr VALENTINE - Hang them up by the wheel.

Ms McPARLAND - Even more basic than that, a large standing space at the front of buses can also be used for large items and allowing bikes on at the discretion of the driver. If the bus is absolutely packed, obviously it is not going to happen. That is a policy change that could be a trial.

Ms SIEJKA - They have done that in Victoria, all their transport has those areas.

Ms McPARLAND - And bungee cords to secure things so that they do not move around and see how that goes. Again, it is one of those barriers - I do not want to ride my bike, what if I get a flat tyre and I have to get a bus home?

Mr VALENTINE - I did the Ride To Work Day this year and I could not leave here until late at night. Riding at night is always a little more risky. I got home okay, but if there was a bus and an opportunity to put a bike on it, it would have been a no-brainer.

Ms McPARLAND - Particularly when the bus only has two passengers and you can take your bike on board.

CHAIR - At certain times of the day.

Mr VALENTINE - I wonder if you had talked to the private bus operators coming from further out - Huonville, for example - for bikes on those buses. Have you had any conversations with those?

Ms McPARLAND - I have not any conversations with those; I must say the focus has been on starting from the centre and working out rather than the other way around.

CHAIR - That is the issue with people living in Cygnet catching a bus to Hobart, they have to get to where they want to go.

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - If they had a bike, they could put it on the bus.

Ms McPARLAND - By having that city-based network, it is within the city journeys they replace.

Ms SIEJKA - The example you used is really valid because in many regional areas, it is very difficult for kids to get to after-school sports or other activities. As it often becomes more socially acceptable as you get older not to participate in sport, all these things put you off more and more. In terms of an education health perspective, it is a very good point.

CHAIR - Just following up on Meg's question, you said Sydney is doing it well.

Ms McPARLAND - Sydney is a very congested capital city, the largest city in Australia and they have decided they need to give people alternatives to driving. They have been tackling separated cycleways on key routes and just announced a large amount of funding to start linking them up. They targeted a couple of key routes technically easier to do than some of the others and now they are starting to do the more difficult bit, where the space is more restricted. Certainly, they have seen a huge increase on the routes where they have put stuff in.

CHAIR - There has been a big increase in users?

Ms McPARLAND - Yes, around 400 per cent jump in the number of users over five years.

Mr VALENTINE - Do you know or have any figures with respect to why that has occurred? Is it simply because the congestion is there and they want to have a timely trip into their place of work and by providing more highways, you are reducing the congestion and therefore reducing the impetus for people to go to a bike.

Ms McPARLAND - Congestion is not going to go away, it is going to get worse. One of the challenges is actually how do we prevent it from getting worse? How do we actually give alternatives to people who do not want to sit in a car stuck in traffic? Some people are always going to choose to drive their car. Based on some of those surveys, about 30 per cent will never ever ride a bike or catch a bus - they are going to take their car.

Ms SIEJKA - You have to consider physical abilities too.

CHAIR - Did you want to add anything, Craig?

Mr RICHARDS - The key reason people choose to ride is convenience once they work out it is the most convenient means to get to where they want to go. The other reason that gets people riding bikes is that as humans we tend to do what others do and once we see our neighbours doing it, we join in. They are the two ways that really make a difference. In the situation you are talking about it is really people concluding it is the most convenient way for them to get where they need to go; because of the congestion they face, vehicles tend to not be the most convenient. Once they start doing it, they suddenly realise it is good because it improves their lifestyle significantly in the time they get to spend outdoors enjoying the fresh air. Some people find it is a good way to de-stress at the end of the day.

Ms WEBB - The proposals you have for the CBD will have an impact on other traffic flow?

PUBLIC

Ms McPARLAND - Not necessarily, because we are only looking at removing on-street car parking. You are removing people reverse parking, looking for car-parking spots and doing that circulating. The grid we identified has large off-street car parks available people can use. It doesn't impact on the traffic flow; traffic is determined by the capacity of intersections and it doesn't impact on that at all.

Ms WEBB - Okay. So that's a key pillar of what you are suggesting. The infrastructure changes that would go into the CBD under that proposal wouldn't impact on traffic flow -

Ms McPARLAND - Only people parking their cars. That would enhance traffic flow. If you remove people searching and circulating for on-street car parking and reverse-parking in or coming out of car parking spots, you are actually improving the flow of traffic.

Ms WEBB - So you are not seeing it as displacing any other amenity for transit of cars?

Ms McPARLAND - The movement of people in cars, on bikes or on foot wouldn't be compromised. It's trying to reimagine how the space is used. We are so used to seeing cars parked on our streets. That could be a wider footpath with a row of trees and a separated cycleway instead of just storing private motor vehicles. But that's part of the challenge too because people are so used to seeing that and so used to driving and parking in front of the front door of where they are going, that to say we are going to remove 10 car parking spots from a block would be the end of the world for some people.

Mr VALENTINE - I think that gets back to how you do it and doing it gradually - you take one out here and one out there and all of a sudden you have a clear space and people are not so concerned about it because they realise it actually brings people to their shop. It's interesting. That was talked about that earlier with the Heart Foundation.

CHAIR - Do you have any closing comments, Craig?

Mr RICHARDS - No. I just want to say thank you very much for your time and for considering this important issue.

CHAIR - Thank you, Craig and Mary, for making your time available, your submission and coming along today. It's very much appreciated.

Ms McPARLAND - Thank you. It's always good to talk.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Ms MADELEINE OGILVIE MP, ELECTORATE OF CLARK, PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA, WAS CALLED AND EXAMINED.

CHAIR - You know the process, of course.

Ms OGILVIE - I am familiar with the process.

CHAIR - I will ask you for a short statement then we have 30 minutes, and then we will come with some questions to you.

Ms OGILVIE - Perfect. Do I need to make a declaration as an MP?

CHAIR - No.

Mr VALENTINE - I think you did that when you became an MP.

Ms OGILVIE - I do not know what the rules are around committees; anyway I am happy for you to publish everything. I promise I will not defame anyone. I think that is the main reason that is there.

Thank you very much for having me along. I will take the opportunity to make a short statement and to run through some of the issues as I perceive them coming out of my electorate. I am particularly here today to talk about people who live in Clark and those who commute into Clark, particularly from the gateway of Kingston and the issues we have with the Southern Outlet and the intersections of Davey and Macquarie streets, but also the Brooker Highway and Sandy Bay Road being key problem areas. I foreshadow I am going to make some suggestions around how I think we can perhaps organise ourselves a bit better around long-range planning. I will also point to the AAMI and RACT report on dangerous traffic roads. I think the top nine were in my electorate - so nine out of 10 were in Clark. I might make the mistake of calling Clark, Dennison. You can amend that on the record for me if I do that.

It is an issue of great concern. I am a self-described school-run mum. I have three kids who I transport around the traps in Clark. Quite often I am caught in long traffic jams, which we have noticed are increasing in frequency, intensity and duration. It is adding to the stress of daily lives for people in my electorate. I get a lot of communication from people who are frustrated with this. I note that the Government has tried to put some measures into place already, particularly around clearways, which does seem to be helping somewhat. Some funding has also gone into reports looking at the data needs around traffic and people movement so as to make good decision-making possible. In the interim we still have this problem and it is driving people crazy as I have said in my various submissions to *The Mercury* on this matter.

I will not repeat the written submission that I gave, but I will speak to its headline points. One of the things I think we could do better when we look at the issues of traffic and transport and human movement, whether it is ferries or roads, cycling, pedestrians, car transport, buses, is to think about that fully integrated system. The difficulty we have from an engineering perspective is that we have legacy modes of transport and each one of them needs an upgrade in its own right. The business case for improving transport and traffic, and particularly our roads, has to be incredibly strong. It is about productivity, not just about those who are trying to use the roads to do business and deliver goods, be tradies and get to work on time, but also people who wish to get to doctors' appointments on time, particularly people coming from Kingston. I heard a lot when I

PUBLIC

was doorknocking in Kingston, from older folks who were nervous to go on the Southern Outlet and into town and could not work the new Hobart City Council parking meters. They were saying to me, they would prefer to stay home or asked why there couldn't be more services in Kingston.

Some of it is about where we have our services located. Things like wanting to use the hydro facilities at the Aquatic Centre. That is something that could be provided in Kingston, just to alleviate some of that traffic off the Southern Outlet.

I am a big believer in making life easier for our customers and our customers are our constituents. I do not think we have really nailed that down yet.

When somebody wants to make a complaint or hopefully wants to say something positive about our roads and transport, there is no single point of contact for them to be able to do this. It is very difficult to find out who is responsible for which particular road or piece of transport they want to talk about.

One of my recommendations to this committee is perhaps you could consider whether there is a need for an organisation with a single point of contact.

It is something we have used in the business sense before. I come from a telecommunications and infrastructure background where life is complex. We want to try to make it as easy as we can for constituents to make one phone call to say 'This is the problem I have with traffic or transport in my area', rather than having to make a phone call to the council, to the state government, to the federal government, to their local members, state lower or upper House. By the time you have done that, nobody is really quite sure who is responsible or accountable for fixing the problems they are encountering.

What that might look like, I am not quite sure, but in the olden days we had the Office of State Works. I am not sure if we need to go that far, but certainly a frontend where our customers - for example, our voters and ratepayers - could have that single point of contact would be beneficial.

I am personally in favour of using small tunnels to alleviate pinch points. I am aware of course, these are major infrastructure projects. Having now been up to Brisbane and travelled their tunnel system, where you can move from one side of the city right across to the other side, even from the airport right through under Brisbane and out the other side, with great ease. This has assisted, not only drivers, but also bus transport and trucks moving commodities. It has generally improved the productivity of that city.

Looking at other major cities, the use of flyovers and tunnels, in particular, is very helpful. Thinking of Shanghai, San Francisco, Paris, all these places I have been, and some places I have lived. It does help a lot.

Clearways and traffic flow management are also helpful.

There is a great amount of energy around light rail, but we also need to consider whether, if we are going to implement a light rail system, it exists only on the current or existing track system or there is a desire and a need to take it further out to Kingston and perhaps New Norfolk and Brighton.

PUBLIC

If we are going to reinvent and revise how we do this sort of transport, let's zoom up and take a big picture perspective on that.

With the ferries, everybody loved the ferries when they were around, although it was a sad reason the ferry system came on board. The timing is right to do a pilot for Derwent River ferry system. Something could be done at the height of tourism season, working in conjunction with, perhaps, Incat - which I know has access to the boats - Mona and others that have an interest in getting people onto the water and up and down the river.

When it comes to buses, rethinking and revisioning Metro is a good idea. A transport organisation funded more fully to do other elements of transportation would be a smart idea.

One of the things we have been thinking and considering in our office is a pilot of a Canadian-style small bus system for schools. Schools with a huge amount of traffic around them and transport needs such as Lenah Valley might be a good example, where people live fairly close by. One of these Canadian-style school little minibus systems could be a way of helping the school home mum not have to get in the car in the beginning, and perhaps have a nicer day - because at the end of the day we all want to enjoy our lives.

I don't think we have heard enough about walking - pedestrians and walking tracks. There is a lot of good stuff happening around Hobart. In particular, in Sandy Bay, there are some lovely pedestrian walking tracks that go through the back blocks all the way up into Mount Wellington. I believe that particular track that starts at Princes Street Park was walked by Charles Darwin when he came out. There are very old historic walking places and I'm not sure we are really maximising those urban walking tracks or have focused on those. That is something that would be very good for the dog walkers, pram walkers and older folks - anyone who likes to walk, all the folks who like to get out and about.

With cycling, some of the things we have been thinking about in conjunction with the cycle networks are an extension of that cycleway so that it runs the full length, effectively, of my electorate into Kingborough. Can we get some cycleways happening that are fully connected between Claremont, Bridgewater and New Norfolk all the way into Kingborough? But they would have to be segregated. Part of the problems we have with the cycleways at the moment where it's causing traffic pinch on Sandy Bay Road is that it has actually taken up space of the dual carriageway for the bikes. We can resolve that if we get some better parking in place. The next layer to it is a desperate need for improved, probably multilevel, parking facilities, particularly around the university and also in North Hobart.

There is land in North Hobart. The government already owns some land there. I think it has been allocated to the Police Association. There is a perfect spot there where we could resolve that parking.

As an aside, I have been doorknocking the local businesses in North Hobart and Steve in one of the shops there said to me their main problem is getting enough people through the door to sell enough product to make enough profit to stay open - a standard business problem - but they have to get the people there, and the parking is causing a barrier to getting customers through the door.

These are the highlights of what we have been thinking about. I am aware we have a small amount of time so perhaps as an opening statement that is sufficient.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Thank you. Where you say a ferry system, would you be talking Kangaroo Bay to Hobart?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. I think at Kangaroo Bay it is possible to have a ferry there. I met with Bob Clifford and looked at his proposal for what it could look like. Using existing jetties - and I am thinking the DEC and Mona have ones as well - or perhaps ones that only need a modicum of support. We could actually run a pilot. That might be a really good way to start. Even if it's a summer thing, people would like that. It's the height of the tourism season, so I think it's a great idea.

CHAIR - The pilot Canadian-style small-bus run - I am interested in that. How does that work? Most of our school buses, I would take are -

Ms OGILVIE - Big old Metro things.

CHAIR - and full probably - are they?

Ms OGILVIE - Full as a boot. My kids take the buses. My son, who is at St Virgil's at Austins Ferry, takes two buses to get to school. The St Virgil's buses are just chock-a-block, they are full of St Virgil's kids, but that's a senior school thing. If we can get that light rail corridor open again, we would see those kids get onto light rail, so that's where your big customer base would come from.

But we are thinking about the primary school bus systems they have in Canada, where they get picked up at the door and the teacher is on the bus. I know that by the time you get to child number two or three, anything that alleviates having to get into the car with a number of kids is a good thing. If you're able to walk one out and put him on the bus to get to the local school, that would be good.

Ms SIEJKA - You were talking about - I don't think these are the words you used - an authoritarian, overarching -

Ms OGILVIE - Single point of contact.

Ms SIEJKA - Single point of contact. One of the things we heard about this morning from a couple of different stakeholders and from a couple of different angles was the need for something like a public transport authority or a greater authority. The planning is happening but I guess it's the coordination of that and also that strategic overview. Given what you said, which was not exactly public transport, but it was broader, what are your thoughts?

Ms OGILVIE - I completely agree with you that there is a need for a public authority that deals with the overarching program of work and the engineering program of work on this. In parallel there is no reason we could not immediately set up a single point of contact, a phone bank of people who can do the running around behind the scenes to help people solve their problems.

Ms SIEJKA - You are thinking of an integrated -

Ms OGILVIE - The interface, yes.

PUBLIC

Ms SIEJKA - One of the other criticisms is the need for an integrated system. It would help if the system was integrated for that contact person.

Ms OGILVIE - Absolutely, I think you need both.

Ms HOWLETT - As a supplementary to that, is there any other jurisdiction that actually has that?

Ms OGILVIE - I have looked at what New South Wales and Queensland have done. I think by the time you have an integrated system set up, you have effectively delivered your single point of contact because people will ring them. In our scenario where we are putting the jigsaw puzzle of legacy -

Ms SIEJKA - It is where that responsibility lies.

Ms OGILVIE - You need an organisation that is responsible and authorised to resolve issues. People also need somewhere to call. With those two things as an interim measure, I think we could immediately put a single point of contact together because behind that you could have the council. They would know who to sort out the problems with. A customer service interface is a missing piece that we could do straightaway.

Ms HOWLETT - You mentioned you would like the Government to implement small tunnels to improve the productivity. What is your cost estimation? Where are you proposing these tunnels?

Ms OGILVIE - Tunnels are incredibly expensive. Not only are they expensive but you need 20-year planning. It is big engineering, which is great for jobs. The Southern Outlet is in desperate need of help. That is obvious. I know there are plans for some sort of western by-pass. My view is that if you were going to implement a tunnel system, you look at those pinch points. We call Hobart traffic the octopus in our office because you have that CBD area and all of the limbs are coming through the CBD. If we are to truly open up Kingston and create that gateway to the Huon for housing, for services, for all of those things that we know could be sited there, we need to alleviate that pinch point quite urgently.

There are some views in the engineering community - I believe there is dolerite under there and it is still achievable that a small tunnel that runs from Tolman's Hill and under Macquarie Street, coming further down Macquarie Street, perhaps even towards the railway roundabout would be enough to by-pass that chunk of the city where other arterials are pushing through. I am a big fan of tunnels because I think it is the ultimate long-range fix. Of course, budgetary issues could be in the way.

CHAIR - Everywhere else in Australia where there are tunnels, there are tolls.

Ms OGILVIE - Nobody likes tolls. You can have a toll but only when there is a proper alternative way. People need the choice of whether to choose a tolled or an untolled road. I am not a big fan of tolls but at the end of the day, if, for example, I was running a business and I needed to get my tradies there or the school buses there, all of those elements for them, I presume a toll road cost would actually be tax deductible. You might find some people love to use a toll road and others would choose with time on their hands to go the old-fashioned way around the mountain.

PUBLIC

Ms HOWLETT - It certainly still makes them cost-negative though.

Ms OGILVIE - As a good Tasmanian I believe that the federal government should tip in. They have the infrastructure money and we are being treated a little bit like the poor cousins. If you look at the work being done in Victoria, which is federal- and state government-funded, and in Queensland. I prefer that we keep our ownership of things in the public sector. Public-private partnerships, where your toll roads come in, lead to outcomes that are not necessarily the best, such as not being able to get a train from Melbourne airport to the city. So those kinds of decisions probably may not even be repeated, if they were designing those systems again.

Mr VALENTINE - You were talking about improved multilevel parking; I was not sure exactly where you were thinking about this.

Ms OGILVIE - What we have been trying to do, and I have been chatting to people - I know this is in your electorate, so we can have a good discussion.

Mr VALENTINE - For the whole of Tasmania.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, that is right. There is block of land owned by the state Government - I do not want to say storage lot - but it is used by the police for cars.

Mr VALENTINE - Where they used to keep their maritime assets.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes and now it is used for cars. That area could be used and repurposed for a multilevel or any sort of car parking. I do not think there is any real reason they need to have that facility in the middle of North Hobart.

Mr VALENTINE - The reason I ask is that some would say providing more facilities for cars will simply push the real problem further out.

Ms SIEJKA - Make it more attractive for drivers.

Mr VALENTINE - Yes, make it more attractive for drivers, increase the car traffic and cause more congestion. A couple of the submissions we have received point this out. Instead of providing greater infrastructure, doubling a road to a four-lane rather than a two-lane might cope with the traffic today, but tomorrow it simply becomes more congested. Do you think that argument holds water and basically encouraging people? Doesn't congestion encourage people to try to find an alternative public transport option?

Ms OGILVIE - I only have my personal views and obviously I am not a traffic engineer.

Mr VALENTINE - I can appreciate that.

Ms OGILVIE - But 80 per cent of people drive a car. Now, the proportion of men and women both working in a family is almost as high as 80 per cent. You cannot run a family, drop kids off at school and get all of that done without driving a car. A proportion of people will have to use their car. I often have a giggle when I hear someone say I saw them driving and there was one person in that car. I always respond by saying if they are like me, they got up at 6 a.m., got three kids ready for school - primary school kids - dropped them each off and by the time I was

PUBLIC

getting to my job at 8 a.m., having done a few hours work already, there was only me in the car. So again, we need to be data-driven with this; we need to ask our customers and our road users what they actually want and then try to balance that with those other elements. It is imperative for us to provide infrastructure, including road upgrades and more parking. If we do this right, particularly, on Sandy Bay Road around the university - which is a difficult area - we will actually alleviate the traffic problems right down through Taroona and make it also safer for the cyclists. We cannot do this work until we have the data and we need the data. In order to get the data, we need to ask people what the problem is. That is why I have come up with the conclusion of saying we actually need this single point of contact so we can gather the information about what people actually want and need.

Mr VALENTINE - There is some of that going on at the moment with the cameras - numberplate recognition software looking at through traffic versus those who simply just come into the city.

Ms OGILVIE - I think that not providing proper roads and parking does nothing other than frustrate people.

Mr VALENTINE - You do not think there is an argument for looking at better ways to get kids to school? As you were saying, you have three and you take them and drop them off.

Ms OGILVIE - That would be great.

Mr VALENTINE - If there were an alternative, would you use it?

Ms OGILVIE - Of course, yes, absolutely. Whatever we can do to alleviate the need to drive a car, but let us not maroon people at home - and we do have some problems in Kingston where people feel a bit marooned, particularly older folks who are worried about taking to the roads. So we want choices. If I had the choice to put my primary school-aged child on a little Canadian-style school bus where the teacher turns up and off they go with their packed lunch, fantastic, that is one trip I do not have to make. It shortens the number of trips I have to do and that is less traffic on the roads - but it's complex, obviously. We want the traffic engineers to design the solutions.

Mr VALENTINE - The other observation about tunnels and flyovers in Brisbane is that they've got a heck of a lot of people there - they've got over 1 million in Brisbane. Is it likely to work in terms of the funding available to us? Could that work or not?

Ms OGILVIE - I have given that some thought too, and it's a little bit like the arguments around the size of the Houses of parliament. The solutions you need are not necessarily linked only to the number of people you have. To run a proper football team, you need the right number of people regardless of whether you are a small town or a big town. It's a little bit like a road and traffic network. You need it working properly in harmony to be able to get people where they need to go on time.

Hobart is doing nothing other than growing at the moment. We've seen an increase in migration that's been quite enormous. We know that people are living further out and working all over the place so the amount of cross-traffic is large, but I take your point. As far as mounting an argument for the feds to kick in some dollars, we would need to have a pretty loud and squeaky voice at the table.

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - You are talking about the ferry system, and that would be good to have a trial.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, it would be great, wouldn't it?

Mr VALENTINE - Do you have any opinion on the sorts of services that need to exist at those terminals or roads?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, I know some of them are in poor shape because they haven't been used for this purpose before or it's been allowed to fall away. I guess we'd need to at least put in some all-weather capabilities for people standing on a windy dock in the rain or whatever it happened to be. There is all that stuff around ticketing as well. You might need to work with an entity like Mona. The access to the boats could be sorted. The ticketing systems are tricky - that's a Metro thing, I think.

Mr VALENTINE - What about our other services like childcare centres and supermarkets for shopping and those sorts of things to keep out the cars, as a mum as you are?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, absolutely.

Mr VALENTINE - If you were going to use that mode of transport, what would convince you to use the ferry?

Ms OGILVIE - As long as I didn't have to do the weekly shopping on my ferry run, I'd be very happy.

As a mum, when I do the shopping it's a major event; it's a lot of food for a family of five. I'm cooking three meals a day. It's a big deal, so I have to take the car or get it delivered. If it's delivered, it's an extra cost so I choose not to do that. We do it ourselves. It's very old-fashioned.

It might suit a lot of people who perhaps don't have that responsibility. They can take their ferry, get enough supplies for that night's dinner and breakfast perhaps.

I see the model you are thinking about could be really quite nice and - let's face it, the kid thing is just a phase of life as well, so that's only a certain proportion of people who are in the zone that I'm discussing. I see that in the not-too-distant future I'll have more freedom as well, and then I might choose to ride my bike at that stage.

Mr VALENTINE - Do you see older people wanting to catch ferry services more than younger people, maybe?

Ms OGILVIE - No. I think we need to flip it around. Maybe people who have caring responsibilities would find it harder to use ferry services and bus services as their primary mode of transport - that cohort. But I think we can deal with diversity. Part of the frustration I have with this whole debate is that we all think about how it works for me, but we actually have a huge spectrum of transport needs.

Mr VALENTINE - For sure. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR - You probably need to go, don't you?

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - I do. Thank you all, it's nice to see you. Good luck.

CHAIR - Thank you for your submission and your time.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Mr TONY DENNE WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Welcome to the Legislative Council Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion. All the evidence today in this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege but outside of the hearing you are not afforded that courtesy. A copy of the witness information is available if you have not read it. The evidence is being recorded and will be available. By way of introduction, I will give you the opportunity first to talk about your submission. If there is anything you would like to have heard in camera, please ask us about that. If you could give us your short introduction, we can go on with questions. We have half an hour for your time today. It is also being broadcast.

Mr DENNE - Happy with all of that. Beyond what I have put in my submission, I am a fifth-generation Tasmanian. I was employed by Hydro Tasmania for 40 years, starting off as an engineering cadet, and worked my way through to being in charge as principal engineer for civil assets within the Hydro. That included all the strategic assets such as the catchments, dams, storages, intakes, canals, pipelines, power stations and then roads and canals, and also tunnels. As part of that inventory I was responsible for over 600 kilometres of road within Hydro's network brief and that ranged from major highways through to tracks. I was also responsible for looking after 50 kilometres of tunnels, both lined and unlined, within the Hydro's portfolio.

Mr VALENTINE - Sorry, what distance?

Mr DENNE - Over 50 kilometres. A lot of little diversion tunnels set up for getting around the dam sites all those years ago are still in use, but not practice, fortunately, for water. Generally, ones like Poatina headrace tunnel; you have Liapootah headrace tunnel, which is a concrete-lined tunnel not dissimilar to the proposals in here for road tunnels, and also we've got a number of unlined tunnels such as Lemonthyme and King River headrace tunnels, but essentially that is my past. Why I am here today, just to finish that, is that I was involved in the 30-year asset management plan for Hydro, which is to review all the criticality of civil assets and put them into a ranking, if you like, so they can be addressed for condition and performance throughout their lifetime. That's really my background.

I did nurture, having been a cadet myself, engineering students, who then went on to become graduates and then doctorate students - over 20 of those - so I see that as one of my major contributions to the engineering profession. I'd just like to point out too that I have been doing a number of presentations with both Bob Cotgrove and Don Challen. We have spoken to Jeremy Rockliff, Kim Evans and Gary Swain in the Department of State Growth. We have spoken to the RACT, the Secretary of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, Mr Baker, and a number of others. Also, this proposal I have put forward, which is an engineering solution to Hobart's traffic congestion, is being appraised for State Growth by its consultants, GHD. I met with them about three weeks ago to outline some of the detail that sits behind that proposal.

Generally, to sum it all up, specifically this proposal is to address Hobart's traffic congestion with an engineering solution. It's targeted to the Macquarie Street and Davey Street gridlock or bottlenecks that they pose. It's essentially to try to link the three arterials of the Southern Outlet, the Tasman Highway and the Brooker Highway so there is a non-stop traffic flow between those three elements. It is also there to accommodate the growth currently occurring and that which will occur in the future in those southern and eastern regions.

PUBLIC

It also ties in with the Jan Gehl report, which essentially said that they would like to free-up the dockside CBD area, particularly for a more pedestrian-friendly operation.

Essentially, that is my summary of where I have been, where I've come from and what this proposal is all about.

CHAIR - Thank you, Tony. The Wilbur Smith proposal of the Southern Outlet-Brooker Highway flyovers: properties were acquired for that in the 1960s. I don't know whether the properties are still in -

Mr DENNE - I believe they've been disposed of. Rob's probably got a better handle on those. They were generally heading up Harrington and Melville streets and then they were going to come down Burnett Street, as I understand it. That's why Burnett Street just near Campbell Street is a lot wider than you'd think for just a normal suburban route.

I've tried to pick up some of those key features in this proposal for integrating with the current traffic flows and also not to have any great number of acquisitions for putting this on the ground. It is the least disruption to the current situation as possible.

CHAIR - That is why with tunnelling you have less land acquisition.

Mr DENNE - Yes, that and also there are some areas that look like they were set aside by the old department of Main Roads or Roads and Transport. You can actually see those on the hill above the Burnett Street-Brooker Highway area. There's an area that's undeveloped on the northern side of the Glebe, for instance.

In South Hobart, there's an area just above the Hobart Rivulet, near Males Sand where Elboden Street meets Macquarie Street. There's a gap on the hillside there which is undeveloped so the only houses that I see that have to be acquired would be some on the northern side of the Hill Street grocery in Macquarie Street on the far side which are fairly run down.

CHAIR - This is for a tunnel?

Mr DENNE - Yes, access to the tunnel predominantly, Robert. You would have to have some acquisitions close to the Campbell Street Primary School, not the school itself but on the other side at the back of the car yards where I think DJ Motors are there together with Performance Automobiles.

CHAIR - Perhaps, the old bikies' headquarters might have to go too.

Mr DENNE - I would try to keep that to a minimum.

Mr VALENTINE - That's already gone. They're putting in new units on that site.

Mr DENNE - I've noticed that. The old bars are down, Rob.

CHAIR - With the tunnelling, I noticed you did say what you thought the geology was there. Was it sandstone?

PUBLIC

Mr DENNE - The first part I suspect is in sandstone but normally if you went through a formal design - and I have included that investigation and design in the costs for the proposal - you would go through and you would drill, say, every 100 metres or so.

CHAIR - There was never any drilling done that you know?

Mr DENNE - I haven't been able to find out. I have spoken to a lot of the engineers who were involved in it and even some of those who currently hold some of the design proposals for intersections and the like. There are a lot more of them, as you can imagine, but I have only taken the surface geology, which is what we always used to do in the Hydro. You would just take that as a first cut, then you get the geologists in and you might do a seismic thing or we did in the Hydro for out of town. In town you would not be blowing up people's backyards, I hope. Certainly, drilling is what you would look at to totally confirm that is what you have underneath you. I have taken the features on the northern side of the Hobart Rivulet - there is a lot of sandstone cliffs there. I used to go to St Virgil's so I know there is an old sandstone cutting on the footy oval there. My mother and father used to play tennis at St Mary's which is also sandstone. As you go across to the other side of the Brooker Highway, you have dolerite where the Hobart City Council depot is located on the pathway up the hillside there. I am assuming with those, that is what you would be looking at.

For a tunnel boring machine, one of my former colleagues, who is a tunnelling guru and engineer, has provided me with all of the cost analysis on that side of it. He said it was not a problem to go through dolerite. Sandstone is like going through butter. As far as dolerite goes, it is slower but you recover a lot of the material, which then becomes the road base for the tunnels and also for any other infrastructure that may be considered around Hobart.

CHAIR - You would not need any stopping up probably in dolerite either.

Mr DENNE - It is mandatory that you put a line around it, unfortunately. If you go to the Sydney tunnels just out near Parramatta, the new ones that have just been opened, they are all concrete-lined. It is just a safety feature so that if you do have a rock fall - in the Hydro, just harking back to that, we used to have emergency tunnel sets so we could run those in and shore up and clean it out, but you cannot afford to have those situations in a tunnel.

CHAIR - As you said tunnelling is expensive and everywhere else in Australia every tunnel has a toll to it, I think.

Mr DENNE - If it does not have one, it is soon to have one. I think the Melbourne one is the next to come on line and I think Brisbane is stage 2. I think they all have tolls on them, yes. Interesting enough, they reviewed some of the costs for the Queensland tunnels in particular, and for stage 1, they had some Europeans quote on the cost for the second half and their numbers came in at half the initial cost. So there is a lot of variation in cost, if you like.

I have used the one that I asked Channel Tunnel expert Nigel Sugden to give me some indication for. I have all of those numbers sitting in behind the proposal, and they are the ones I have used. They include things like ventilation, lighting pump out stations for groundwater ingress, all of the other services like powerlines, which can be accommodated in the invert of the tunnel.

PUBLIC

Ms HOWLETT - A supplementary to that before my question. What is the costing for tunnelling?

Mr DENNE - It is roughly \$125 000 dollars per metre and if you look in the submission I put in, I think it is page 15 -

Ms HOWLETT - And that costing would change if it were sandstone or dolerite?

Mr DENNE - Not really, because it is a timewise thing. Essentially these are quite short tunnels in the Australian landscape and internationally there are tunnels everywhere. It may be slightly more expensive but on average - for instance, in dolerite, you would not expect as many areas of rock, rubble, boulders and alluvial-type material as you would perhaps in sandstone areas. Where you have a change of geology between sandstone and dolerite, there is obviously a fault line and that is generally where the creeks and groundwater run.

Ms HOWLETT - Given the population projections in Tasmania, how do you think all levels of government can work together to ensure an increase in our existing population aligns with current infrastructure capacity and congestion?

Mr DENNE - I think that is one of the main drivers for me being here to put forward an idea, a proposal. All levels of government will have to work together, but it is more a strategic-type thing. In the past these roles were carried out by Roads and Transport with a view, and they still do it, I think. I am not privy to how their processes are, but harking back to the Hydro we had our 30-year plan. I suspect they have a 10- or a 20-year plan, something like that. If that is the case, all these elements, such as ferries, light rail, clearways, tunnelling and all the rest, should be integrated into the strategic plan. The costs associated with it would be balanced against current local government funding, federal grants and things of that nature to support it.

As, no doubt, Don Challen and his group will say later in the week, there could be a case for putting in a toll, or a congestion tax overall, for Hobart so that if you want to go into the city centre, to park your car, for example, you might have to pay a nominal congestion tax. That is not inconceivable. It is not a cheap solution.

Ms SIEJKA - Just looking at the section about further congestion easing, in particular the Mornington bypass. There has been talk about a road. It is the same sort of route.

I was curious, looking at some of these options, why in those cases, a tunnel was a better proposal in your view rather than just improving the roads - the Mornington bypass one.

Mr DENNE - I don't think they are exclusive. I think when you look at, or hear on the radio about, the traffic coming in from Sorell and Midway Point, there is a strong argument to say that a lot of that traffic, rather than putting it onto the Tasman Bridge and then sending it south or north, the northern people could well bypass the Mornington overpass, Flagstaff Gully Road, which then comes out and joins the East Derwent Highway, then onto the Bowen Bridge.

The Bowen Bridge is very much underutilised. You really want to get the best 'bang for buck', excuse the term, but essentially to get a good use of your strategic assets like bridges. They are not cheap to build, and in essence, this proposal is a lot cheaper than the Bowen Bridge, the Tasman Bridge and the Southern Outlet, which cost a bomb.

PUBLIC

It will perform the same sort of thing: to move people away from the old, tired current routes for commercial, heavy transport and private use vehicles.

Ms WEBB - Just to clarify these further congestion-easing suggestions. They are not tunnels, are they? They are road solutions?

Mr DENNE - They are roads that I stuck on the end of something I have been thinking of. If you look at the way the harbour is used at the moment, Macquarie No. 2, where they stockpile all the logs. Rather than running those through town, I could see that if you were able to get up through the Regatta Grounds onto McVilly Drive, you could then get back onto a bypass and take them further north if you want to, or south to that area.

Ms SIEJKA - That airport roundabout I find interesting as well, because it has been such a blocked area.

Mr DENNE - I was always taught that it is cheaper to go over with your main road, and go under with your secondary roads.

If you look at a lot of the north-west: coming from Burnie or Devonport, you peel off and go underneath that particular link road into Launceston, you head back to Perth and south -

that is a far better solution, say, than the new intersection - I don't want to be critical - near Bunnings at Glenorchy, which has all these lights, so you have to wait your turn.

You are better off going over the top. When I ran some quick numbers, I think it is a bit cheaper, or about the same order of cost - about \$50 million for that roundabout, using an overpass.

Ms SIEJKA - Using up different space as well. A lot of the time our proposals are about additional width, aren't they?

Mr DENNE - I don't see that as necessary. You don't have to encroach on the orchards or the golf course in that proposal. Just fly over the top. I could see a similar solution for the Midway Point nexus -

Ms SIEJKA - I will have to talk to you about the Mornington roundabout another time.

Mr DENNE - I was going to ask where you all came from, and what you -

Ms SIEJKA - I know that is one of the key blockages in that space, and that traffic has increased something like 40 per cent in the decade. But what you do with that is a tricky one.

CHAIR - Tony, do you know if there was ever any work done on a tunnel under the Derwent River, or is it too deep?

Mr DENNE - On the western side it is really deep. That is an interesting point. When they built the Tasman Bridge, finished in 1969 - I am sure you would have been around?

CHAIR - I wasn't very old, but I was about.

PUBLIC

Mr DENNE - They did all the geological investigation and they got almost to where the old lift span used to be on the Western Shore, but they didn't complete it. When they finally came to build the bridge, they found it was about five times deeper there, so that is why they had a temporary bailey bridge section there for a very long time. They were doing all the piling and everything underneath to put in that pier group that supported the last section of roadworks near Government House.

Ms SIEJKA - Does your theory about going over and under apply to bridges as well? I am just thinking of the Tasman Bridge, which will reach its [end of?] lifetime at some time.

Mr DENNE - Its projected capacity is 75 000 vehicles a day.

Ms SIEJKA - I'm just thinking whether you would have another layer. What are your thoughts on that?

Mr DENNE - Well, I used to think about this a bit. It was not in my provenance and I had plenty of other things to think about, but I always thought you could run something underneath it, but that compromises shipping, so there are a few things to go, and that is essentially why they built the Bowen Bridge. There were other ideas of tunnels or augmenting. They actually put a 'nip-on clip-on', as it was called, on the Tasman Bridge, if you remember back in those days. They had a box section they bolted on the side, and that allowed them to put an extra laneway.

Ms SIEJKA - We do think all these things are in the medium term, but I guess even longer term we do need to consider those things as well.

Mr DENNE - I understand the Tasman Bridge also has a number of structural issues, so whether it can take a greater load is arguable. I am not in a position to say that, but if you could make better use of the roads around the bridge and [inaudible] them so you can get traffic to those localised areas without having to travel through the CBD, that is the ultimate solution, and that is essentially what my proposal is about.

CHAIR - On sections of the Bowen Bridge, when it was being built, I worked on the drilling part of it, and six-metre cords came out unbroken in some places. It was very solid.

Ms WEBB - With the tunnels you have proposed, what is their lifespan as an engineering solution, and when would we need to think about the next engineering solution?

Mr DENNE - Well, again it depends on growth, but from an engineering standpoint, any concrete structure would have a minimum life of 50 years. We might never know their maximum life, because if you build them right they will still be going after 200 years, like the Roman aqueducts and all the rest. We could talk for hours, but a minimum of 50 years would see that particular structure stand up. Generally, it relates to concrete strength, so to overcome that you make your concrete stronger. Instead of 25 megapascal concrete, you might put in 50 and make it stronger, so it will last; it does not fret on the edges and dust up.

Ms WEBB - I was thinking not so much of physical lifespan, but more in terms of a solution to our traffic congestion, and when we might then have to contemplate another significant engineering solution because we have hit another situation like we are in now, where we have increased congestion and then we need to do the next iteration. Do you have a sense of that?

PUBLIC

Mr DENNE - This is going to take a while to implement. I was going to say in closing that it really needs to be integrated with all the other things, like light rail, the ferry proposals. The stuff that you can implement quickly will need to be done, because you can do this in two stages. You can do it from Southern Outlet to the Brooker, and then from the Brooker across to the Tasman Bridge, but it takes time, and in that intervening period you are going to have a lot of ructions from commuters, as you currently are now.

It is going to get progressively worse, and I do not think you are going to turn people away from their social habits of using the car here in Hobart, to using bikes or walking or using public transport, to the sorts of figures that you will need to sustain people's desire to move around Hobart and Greater Hobart with the current solution.

As a solution, it is longer term. It can carry up to 192 000 vehicles a day. Currently the Bridgewater Bridge is about 30 000 vehicles a day, the Tasman Bridge is about 70,000 vehicles a day, so you are looking at decades of capacity.

Ms WEBB - What is coming in now?

Mr DENNE - That figure is not available. That is one of the things that is missing from the congestion study, but if you look at the traffic that goes out of the city in the afternoons, I think it is of the order of about 24 000 to 25 000 vehicles a day. That's an interesting statistic actually, because that is 82 per cent of the number of vehicles coming in from the Brooker Highway and the Tasman Highway, and also you've got Campbell Street and Barrack Street. All those, if you take a number down near Grand Chancellor and compare it to the number at the Southern Outlet, it's about 82 per cent so 82 per cent of the traffic coming into Davey Street, in this instance, it's 82 per cent of that number at the top end of the Outlet so that is quite a significant number. That is probably one of the reasons why of an evening it doesn't take much for Davey Street to choke up - I could show you photos but you have seen them in *The Mercury*. It's very frustrating.

Ms WEBB - I have been sitting in the middle of them.

There is one other thing I wondered about, and it's something I am interested to hear about from a range of people we have talked to. Given that there is already such an active conversation in this space and a lot of activity through different mechanisms, could you suggest to us what you think this inquiry should best contemplate as a contribution into that space and those active conversations? What should we do or think about to add best value from our inquiry?

Mr DENNE - If I can use what we did in the Hydro as an example of a yardstick, you need a strategic plan. If you can energise people into putting in those short-term, medium-term and then longer term plans and then add the detail to each of those, I think that will then become an achievable solution to traffic congestion for Hobart. But it needs to be properly framed; it needs to have all of the detail in it - which you are garnering from all of the submissions, I presume - and then essentially, at the end of it all, someone has to sit down - normally State Growth does that - and analyse it to say 'This is what we need to have; this meets the needs of these communities or these people within our society'. In the longer term, you can have a solution that is going to cover all of those ideas - and it needs to be a rolling one. When we did the Hydro one, that's a rolling 30-year plan and it's distilled back to a 10-year plan and then an annual plan. You need to keep rolling it forward so as populations move and people's habits also change, you need to follow those so that you've actually got an active, viable plan. I would think this committee could perhaps highlight the fact that there is a need for a strategic plan.

PUBLIC

Ms WEBB - And advocate for that.

Mr DENNE - And it needs to be in the shorter, medium- and longer term.

Ms SIEJKA - Just as a follow-up on that sort of planning -

CHAIR - We are getting close to time, and Rob is already on his -

Ms SIEJKA - Sorry, it's just that a couple of times we have heard that some people would like a greater strategic oversight or authority. I wondered, in your experience and history, whether there was anything key that you thought at that oversight level would need to be shifted at the moment to improve.

Mr DENNE - With respect, I am always in favour of having bureaucrats looking at something which you are at arm's length with a political solution, otherwise we'd end up with gold-plated roads in people's electorates all the time. I would see that currently not having an overarching crowd but making State Growth - which is what it says, State Growth - have the responsibility of driving that plan and looking to getting the inputs and support to make it happen. That would then sign off and it's the reason you are here looking at all these different inputs, not just reacting but being proactive about it all.

Ms HOWLETT - Just quickly, the Bowen Bridge usage: could you tell me the figures on the daily traffic?

Mr DENNE - I haven't got those. State Growth should have them; I'd suggest someone like Gary Swain or Martin Blake, who is one of their planners. There are not that many engineers around unfortunately in these groups, and I don't want to sound sort of -

Ms SIEJKA - It's generally underutilised.

CHAIR - You are a threatened species.

Mr DENNE - Not anymore; I've been retired for 11 years.

CHAIR - That's right, but you are still a species - retired or otherwise.

Mr VALENTINE - \$1.45 billion is a heck of a lot of money.

Mr DENNE - Over 10 years, though.

Mr VALENTINE - Yes. The problem seems to be an 8 per cent problem, so take away the school traffic and it flows quite well. So one might argue that this is a very big sledgehammer to crack a nut. Some would say that in providing more infrastructure for the cars simply exacerbates the problem into the future. Do you see how that can be the case, that indeed providing for greater traffic simply exacerbates the future congestion? Whereas possibly, as one of the submissions suggests, concentrating on smaller issues like kids being dropped off at school and those sorts of things might be a more economic way of going. Do you have a comment on that?

PUBLIC

Mr DENNE - If you really look at the last three to five years of traffic growth and extrapolate that for another three to five years growth, it means that the time we used to have traffic jams three to five years ago, which is around the time this report was projected, was only a short period in the morning and then in the evening. That tallies with what you said about schoolkids being dropped off and picked up again. Give that another three to five years and it's more visible now that those periods of heavy traffic load are extending in the mornings and in the evenings. Give it another five years and you will actually meet what the GHD thing said: you actually have a volume greater than the capacity of the roads. As the traffic speed slows and gets down to zero, you either get people off the road - so that's why the fifth lane on the Southern Outlet is no good at all, you need to get rid of the bottlenecks to keep the existing traffic moving and away from the city centre. Traffic modes may well change. People will go to electric vehicles and the like -

Mr VALENTINE - Might even have jet packs, Tony, and we won't need roads at all, just got a problem in the sky.

Mr DENNE - I've heard that said. Everyone has to live in the CBD then. If you don't want to be a university student, that's not a long-term future. You still have to go on your holidays. They found in America that a lot of the millennials who grew up saying we don't need cars and that we'll get around on bikes, at some stage they have to go on their holidays or they have to go and visit relatives who are outside. They say we'll just lease a car or get an Uber, but it doesn't really work out that way. Statistically it has been proven that that's not quite the way it works.

Another point is they are doing a traffic study in Melbourne for the tunnels and the like. Peter Seamer, who wants to get people off the roads, found that even by doubling the number of people who use public transport in Melbourne, which is highly geared to rail and bus and the like, was actually going to have a worse effect. There would still be more vehicles on the road than those traffic reductions would provide. It is on the ABC listen app; he spoke to Philip Clark a while back.

Mr VALENTINE - Peter?

Mr DENNE - Peter Seamer.

Mr VALENTINE - Some would say that if you have congestion, you will force people onto public transport simply because they can't handle their car in all that in a timely manner.

Mr DENNE - Just as a footnote on Peter Seamer, he advocates having residential business nodes outside the CBD so that you make people, their place of work and where they go to congregate outside of the CBD so that you don't have everyone wanting to go through the same spot all the time to get to wherever they are at.

For instance, he would see Cambridge Park or something in the northern suburbs or down at Kingston having greater development which would draw people to those areas and take them off the need to go through. He's an advocate of decentralisation and roads still figure in his solution to that problem. He is probably erring on the side of the people you just mentioned who would get away from cars and traffic and walk everywhere and get Ubers and that. You would need to have a huge increase in the number of Ubers for a start. Electric vehicles, when they come, people will go for smaller size and more of them.

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - We'll follow that up.

CHAIR - Thank you, Tony, and thank you for your submission. It certainly was interesting reading.

Mr DENNE - I hope so.

CHAIR - It was, I know it was commented to me that it was very good. Thank you for your time to come along today to the committee. We really appreciate it.

Mr DENNE - I wish you well on the rest of the submission period.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Mr SHANE DEWSBERY, PRESIDENT, AND **Mr GEOFF LEWIS**, GENERAL MANAGER, TASMANIAN BUS ASSOCIATION WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Welcome to the public hearing on the Legislative Council's Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion. All evidence taken in this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege. I remind you that any comment you make outside of the hearing may not be afforded that privilege. A copy of the witness information is there for you if you want to read that to make you aware of the process. The evidence today is being broadcast and the evidence you present will be recorded and the *Hansard* version will be published on the committee website when it becomes available.

By way of introduction I advise that the procedure we intend to follow today is as follows, firstly you will be provided with an opportunity to speak to your submission, then questions from the committee. If there is something that you feel needs to be in camera, just ask and we will see how we can facilitate that for you.

Mr DEWSBERY - Thank you very much. As I said, my name is Shane. I am the president of the Tasmanian Bus Association and my colleague is Geoff Lewis, who is the general manager of our association. I am also the managing director of Tassielink Transit, which is a bus operation that delivers services into the urban areas. Our association is the peak body for the bus and coach transport industry in Tasmania which looks after members who are school bus operators, or who operate tour and charter and general access services; it also includes Metro Tasmania.

You will see from our submission that as an industry, we believe we have a vital role to play in Tasmania as far as both short- and long-term solutions to traffic congestion, issues with connectivity from our regional centres into the urban centres and connecting services within and around Tasmania. We have a very wide range of topics that we mentioned in our submission, from providing solutions for healthy, active lives to providing connectivity for very special needs and also providing social benefits to those who are isolated and transport disadvantaged.

It is not just about transport for us; it is about providing services and looking after our communities. That is where we stand at the moment.

Mr VALENTINE - On page 2 of your submission, you talk about the creation of a transport advisory panel. What do you see the membership as being on that particular group?

Mr DEWSBERY - We have raised this topic for some years now. Geoff and I have been in the industry for many years and we have seen a lot of discussions about what we are going to do regarding transport, bus network and public transport. We think that we need an advisory panel or a group that can bring all that together to get the messages from all the inquiries that we have had and consultants' work, work out what the federal government's role is, state government, local government, stakeholders and bring it all together, all forms of transport, not just buses but active transport, bikes and maybe ferries. What do we do with the rail corridor? What do we do right across Tasmania? It is not just about the urban areas. We need to bring all that together and make recommendations to policy and to help drive that policy.

We're at a stage now that we're a little bit behind what we need in Tasmania so we need a bit of injection. We think that if we had a body like this, it could contribute to ensure that we

PUBLIC

continue with the strategy; everyone agrees on a strategy, and if anyone disagrees, we deal with it, but continue to move on.

Mr VALENTINE - How do you see that strategy being developed? Do you see that being developed prior to a group like this coming together or do you see it being developed in conjunction with a group like this?

Mr DEWSBERY - We've seen a lot of work being done and what the needs are for Tasmania. We've seen strategies being done and we've seen committees being formed and we've got those reports. Maybe this committee or this advisory group with mixed stakeholders can sit down and go through the latest information we've received and come up with some hardcore policies.

I think there is enough information out there now that we can start to look at the future of what we need, both short-term and long-term.

Mr LEWIS - I think one of the things at the moment is that all individual groups are pedalling their own bicycles. As Shane said, if we get all the groups together with a strategy to go forward, to make the policy, you will get something out of it. At the moment - let us take the light rail, we've had the light rail corridor; we agree, as we said in our policy, keep it, but make it work in the future. It's not perhaps viable at the moment, but in the future, but you need somebody - when is that time due for that to happen? That is where this group would be able to go to government and say, 'We see in the future that should be up and running, whatever, in the time down the track'.

Mr VALENTINE - Have you had an opportunity to look at the trackless trams and do you have an opinion? You mentioned using alternative technology and intelligent transport systems, so have you had a chance to look into that and what's your opinion?

Mr DEWSBERY - With the trackless trams, it really is a really good-looking bus on wheels. There are many different types of examples in the world. Australia is pretty well advanced as far as what we are building, as far as the buses are concerned. We're modern, we have a lot of technology in it and we have Australian body builders and bus manufacturers. When we are looking at the needs of Tasmania, we can go to them and say, 'This is what we need'. We need a really good, efficient chassis on a nice design body. Some of those are coming into the state now, but what you want [is called] a 'trackless tram' and what you call a bus.

At the end of the day a trackless tram provides the same sort of service as a bus. It's flexible, it's modern, it has to be attractive to the customer, but at the end of the day it still provides the same services. It can start a culture where people can catch passenger transport. It is that culture that we need, so if it looks pretty and it does wonderful things, we might get more and more people interested in the product we can deliver, and it might be more attractive for the wider community and not just students or commuters.

Mr VALENTINE - My last question or my last lead-in, just with respect to data, is: do you survey your passengers across the board very often just to find out your demographics? I suppose the individual bus drivers would know their demographics, but getting a broader picture as to how to build more effective services for your passengers rather than just putting on services that you hope they take on?

PUBLIC

Mr DEWSBERY - It's a good question because the data we get is normally from passengers who use our network. What we don't know is why people don't use our services. While our customers might say, 'We want services at this time of the day' or 'We want this type of bus', for those who for some reason don't catch us, we struggle to get that data.

Mr VALENTINE - I understand that and that is a third-party exercise. But for those who do use your services, do you have a regular survey?

Mr DEWSBERY - We allow a feedback component through the websites normally. Other companies would do it differently, no doubt. They might do it by written responses and technology nowadays with social media certainly gives feedback pretty quickly.

CHAIR - Okay.

Mr LEWIS - One of the things in that at the moment is that we do not know the pattern. Shane can survey the people he brings into Hobart but where do they go then? Do they jump on Metro or do they go to work? At least now with the integrated ticketing between Tassielink and Metro, we can track those people, whereas with the other services coming in, we cannot.

Mr VALENTINE - So you can get origin and destination, or just origin?

Mr LEWIS - Just origin at the moment, unfortunately.

Mr VALENTINE - That is a bit of an issue, isn't it?

Mr LEWIS - There is a new proposal to look at a different ticketing system and one of the thoughts on that is tap-on, tap-off so you can.

Mr VALENTINE - Like the Oyster card, which does that.

Mr LEWIS - Yes.

Mr VALENTINE - Thank you.

Ms WEBB - I have two to pick up on each of the things Rob has already covered, but I will just ask a bit more if that is all right.

Going back to that idea of an advisory panel, and we have heard a bit about a lack of potential coordinating function, which what you are talking about would bring the pieces together, would do that good evidence-based strategic thinking and planning and then perhaps coordinate implementation. Do you see that there is, perhaps, a gap of that sort within government or bureaucracy in terms of a senior responsibility and point of contact around public transport and/or transport more broadly? Is your experience that this gap would be there?

Mr DEWSBERY - Are you talking about the role of coordinating the transport services or more of the strategic?

Ms WEBB - Probably both those things. We heard from another group earlier that we have no, say, a minister for public transport, or somebody with a very senior responsibility who is the go-to person in the bureaucracy who sits behind the minister, who would be that identifiable

PUBLIC

person who might coordinate or bring together those things. I am wondering if that is something you would see as a gap as well?

Mr DEWSBERY - I think the discussion needs to be: what is the role of the bureaucracy in providing passenger transport in Tasmania and what role is for someone else for the strategic part? Do you have the strategists and the policymakers also implementing it or is that separated? That is a question that needs to be asked.

We see the bureaucracy as managing the passenger transport network and also any other forms of transport, but it also looks at the infrastructure we run in. What do we really need to provide our service? Also, what is the community response to some of the surveys we get? Are we addressing the needs of our customers? We know our customers, but where does it go from there?

Ms WEBB - So in terms of that advisory panel concept you are advocating, where does that sit to articulate into the government and/or the bureaucracy in the space we see?

Mr LEWIS - We would see that going into the minister.

Ms WEBB - Right, directly into the minister. To pick up on the second thing Rob asked about trackless trams and snazzy buses, I am interested that in your submission you talk about the Northern Rail Corridor and the opportunity there not to go with tracked vehicles but to go with trackless options. I gather that is to better integrate beyond that - get all the same benefits that corridor concept has but have flexibility. Could you talk a bit more about how that might be a better integrating option?

Mr DEWSBERY - With the corridor, we have to work out what it is going to bring us customers. We think that if we look at trackless trams to start with, well, the cost is significantly less but also using those vehicles to go on and do other things, so once we come into Hobart, we can go off over to the Tasman Bridge, we can go to the Outlet, we can go down into Kingston and provide other services, not just that one A to B along a tracked corridor. Then we can see, as we slowly build the culture and patronage of that corridor, well, we may look at other sources of vehicles if need be. But to start with, if the road is there or if the clearway is there, we can start trackless trams very, very soon. We can put buses on it straightaway.

Ms WEBB - Has that work been done somewhere to model what it would take to have that northern corridor become ready to take a workable system?

Mr DEWSBERY - There are a lot of bus rapid transport systems around Australia and around the world. Queensland is probably one of the better examples of what busways do and the benefits that come from busways.

Mr VALENTINE - The O-Bahn in Adelaide?

Mr DEWSBERY - The O-Bahn, yes, that's on a different type of track, but certainly the busways in Queensland are a good example.

Ms WEBB - But we haven't had someone draw up a proposal that modelled what it would cost, how it would work, what the timeline would be yet?

PUBLIC

Mr DEWSBERY - Not here, no.

Ms WEBB - That's fine, I just wanted to check how far down the track you were with that thinking.

Mr DEWSBERY - No. We did engage Professor Stanley and he came in and had a look at it. It's just an overview of some of the benefits and non-benefits of what we would do with that corridor. We've taken that on board for whatever we do as far as our policy thinking.

Ms WEBB - Have you been advocating for that option, for that corridor, with the current government and with current stakeholders who have an interest in that space?

Mr DEWSBERY - We believe the best model that suits the corridor to start with, whether that is buses or whether it is trackless trams, we would support that, but it needs to be cost-efficient. We need to think about where our money is going and the benefits we are going to get for it. We have a big bus system out there and it provides a massive service. That, in itself, needs to be funded along with other forms of transport. We just have to put it all together and work out what we are going to get for it.

Mr LEWIS - I think we have to remember that only fixes one of the corridors. There are two others that are perhaps are worse than that one.

Ms HOWLETT - Sorry, out of curiosity, what states are currently using trackless trams?

Mr DEWSBERY - I don't say we can call them trackless trams anywhere else; they would be modern buses.

Ms HOWLETT - Are they capable of carrying freight?

Mr DEWSBERY - Freight or luggage? Freight as in boxes?

Ms HOWLETT - Small, yes.

Mr DEWSBERY - Most buses have some sort of freight capacity if someone was coming on with bags.

Ms HOWLETT - So just like a bus.

Mr DEWSBERY - Yes.

Mr VALENTINE - I think they are a lot longer than buses, aren't they?

Mr DEWSBERY - Yes, they're articulated.

Mr VALENTINE - They are sort of multiple carriage, articulated single driver, multiple carriages, less cost.

Mr DEWSBERY - Yes, that's right.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - I know outside of school areas, what would be the age? Would you have an idea of the age groups that use buses? Is it the younger people, the older people or a mixture?

Mr DEWSBERY - I think there is a mixture. It depends where you are talking about. Some of the local outside communities, it may be the teenage population that uses it a lot and the elderly who have no other option. They might not have a second car. Certainly, in regional areas, kids do depend on bus services. In the urban area you would probably want to talk to Metro about that one.

CHAIR - I was more particularly interested in the outer areas.

Mr DEWSBERY - In the outer areas there is a mixture right across the board. Mostly a lot of it is teenagers going to social activities and then you have a certain segment of commuters. There're impacts to the commuters, like fares and competing against the car - the market that doesn't have much of a choice, well, that is certainly a main customer of ours as far as bus customers are concerned.

CHAIR - One thing that has come up during the hearing is if somebody from out in the country comes into Hobart on a bus, if they work at Glenorchy, for instance, they have to get from here to Glenorchy.

Mr DEWSBERY - There is a lot of work being done on that. As Geoff said, we've been looking at integrated ticketing, or common ticketing, which allows them to use that card all the way through the journey. The other part of that we've been discussing is things like journey planners and the information going out to our customers.

We have just introduced an integrated network in the south as far as timetables and bus operators, and we've seen a positive response from our customers. That means that if you are looking at going from A to B and there are several different operators running through that corridor it's all on the one timetable. You might use one particular company to come into Hobart and another particular company to go out. The journey planner then will connect those services, especially to Metro, which provides a lot of the urban services, allowing that easy transition from one bus to another.

Then we have to think about not only ticketing, we have to think about information, we have to think about infrastructure to do so.

CHAIR - Bicycles have come up in discussions. Do you carry bicycles?

Mr DEWSBERY - I suppose different operators look at the design of their bus to suit the market. Someone like ourselves: we build our buses to cater for putting bikes underneath our buses. It is a balance sometimes. The latest buses we got last month allow several bikes to go in underneath the carriage of a low-floor bus. We ask that people ring and say they have a bike to put on the bus.

CHAIR - Is there any cost?

Mr DEWSBERY - Yes, we charge for the longer distance ones. There is a fee to do that.

Mr VALENTINE - How big a fee?

PUBLIC

Mr DEWSBERY - It's about \$10.

CHAIR - That's for a longer distance?

Mr DEWSBERY - Yes, it's for a big bike, mostly, say, to go from here to Bicheno. It's a topic that has been considered by operators about how to cater for bikes. Of course we try to encourage active transport, but where does that fit into our bus designs, capacity, where we go, how do we carry the bikes, our obligations, our safety? There is a lot to consider.

Mr LEWIS - Just picking up on fees, the fares on buses, particularly coming from regional areas, are expensive. There have been a lot of people saying it should be free. We don't support the free theory, but maybe to get more people on, there should be a holistic look at fares to see if it can be a reasonable price to travel a reasonable distance. At the moment it is expensive.

Ms WEBB - Can I check in on that and get you to talk a bit more about why you don't support a free option as potentially a temporary incentive offered to help people change the habit?

Mr LEWIS - I think everything should have a value. If it hasn't a value, you don't treat it with any value. There was a study done in Victoria years ago which found that free fares were going to do nothing because people will think it's going to be a crappy service if it's free.

Mr DEWSBERY - If the product is right and it has a value to it, it's entitled to have some sort of fare placed on it. What that fare is, is another discussion. If people are buying something, they expect to get something in return. If it's free, what do they expect in return?

Ms WEBB - A service, I suppose. It's a different conceptualisation potentially of that service of transport that it doesn't have to pay for itself as such. Even now, we wouldn't have a system that really pays for itself; it's a subsidised system already.

Mr DEWSBERY - Yes, it is.

Ms WEBB - Really, the question is how much are we subsidising it. I guess that option is that we could subsidise it entirely, but you are suggesting from your point of view that is not the best option necessarily or the ideal option.

Mr DEWSBERY - If you are going to invest in bus services, you invest into making them reliable, servicing the people for their requirements and making sure they are going to get from A to B safely and then you work out where the fare structure sits in that.

Mr LEWIS - I think coming to buses, when your studies are on congestion, we are part of that short-term solution if you can get more people on buses. At the moment, a bus sits in the same traffic as a car, so there is no incentive to get on a bus even if you are paying a fare. If you had the clearway, you had priority on lights and those sorts of things and integrated ticketing down the track, it would be attractive for people to get on buses.

Mr VALENTINE - Do you think standardised fees are a possibility, regardless of the operator?

Mr LEWIS - Well, they are now.

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - They are?

Mr LEWIS - Yes.

Mr VALENTINE - If somebody is travelling 20 kilometres on a bus from Launceston to Hobart, say, going to one of the smaller towns on the way as opposed to going down the west coast, it would be a standard fare?

Mr DEWSBERY - Certainly the fares around the urban fringes and the outer urban zone are consistently the same. The longer distance ones are isolated. They are also fares that should be reviewed in conjunction with delivery of the service.

Mr VALENTINE - Obviously the number of people travelling on those buses might vary widely.

Mr DEWSBERY - Definitely, if there were a more competitive fare structure and depending on what services you look at, the ones coming in around the urban centres would need to be reliable. At the moment we struggle to be reliable and our passengers require us to turn up when we tell them we are going to turn up, not be stuck in traffic three blocks away or we can't get to the bus stop and there is no information to tell them we can't get there and they lose faith in us.

Mr VALENTINE - You mention in point 2 of your summary -

Increased public passenger transport services, including better services for tourism.

Do you see the two going hand in hand, and how is that addressing congestion? I am just wondering, you say, 'To meet future demands action is needed in the following areas'. Does it make it more profitable if you can use a bus for commuter traffic and then turn around and use it for tourism services? Is that what the idea is there?

Mr DEWSBERY - It was about having a contribution from the tourism market that comes to Tasmania that needs to get to some of the iconic places around Tasmania. Whether it is going in an urban area if they don't need to hire a car, that is one good thing, but it is also about promoting the rest of Tasmania and access for getting there. It's just another tool we promote Tasmania with. We say we believe tourism should come into it because we give the opportunity of another form of transport.

Mr VALENTINE - Okay, I was just wondering whether it was in relation to congestion.

CHAIR - Any closing comments you want to make?

Mr LEWIS - I have a couple of closing comments. One of the problems with getting people into the city is the bus mall. At the moment you have a certain number of stops and you have so many buses coming in, there is a time frame that bus has got to be on and off; loading people and unloading people can be a bit slow so the bus behind it is held up so therefore that goes to a chain so you are then held up getting to the next stop. There needs to be something done towards that as part of the infrastructure. Better infrastructure will get more people on buses.

PUBLIC

Mr DEWSBERY - I just think there is some low-hanging fruit that we can get our hands on. We can make a change very quickly if we address some of those things. It is not rocket science - they are very simple things if we put our heads together and think about how we are going to improve and make a quick impact on congestion in Hobart. It won't take much. Our industry has a great foundation ready to do things straightaway. Give us the framework to work within and we're up and running tomorrow.

Ms HOWLETT - What is the low-hanging fruit?

Mr DEWSBERY - Just things like giving us clearways. When we make decisions, think about the impact it has on us and our bus network. When we're closing roads or having something done, we need to consider the repercussions. Every time we close a road, what do we do to our customers' reliability? What do we do with the sort-term interchanges? If we want to get more and more people there, what are we doing about the information we're getting out to our customers? Real-time information, integrated ticketing, whether it's the marketing, culture change - if you don't catch buses, what do you really know about them? What do we need to do to get everybody to know about what other services are being delivered? Some of that basic stuff we can get out and get done pretty quickly, and I think that could change the perception of our bus network.

Mr LEWIS - As we know, we only have to get 8 per cent.

CHAIR - Thanks very much for your submission and thanks for making your time available today to come before the committee. We really appreciate it.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Mr GERRY WHITE, PUBLIC OFFICER, CIRCULAR ECONOMY HUON, WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Welcome, Gerry, to the public hearing of the Legislative Council Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion.

I will let you know that the committee hearings are being broadcast today. I make you aware of that. All the evidence in the hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege, but I remind you any comments made outside the hearing may not be afforded such a privilege. A copy of the witness information statement is there available for you. The evidence you present is being recorded and the *Hansard* version will be published on the committee website when it becomes available.

The procedure for the day: we have a half hour together, so if you would like to make a short presentation regarding your submission, then we will have members from the committee ask questions of you. If there is anything you really think you need to put in camera, just let us know and we will organise that for you.

Mr WHITE - Thank you. I do not think so.

It seems as though it has been a very successful call for submissions. I looked on the website and you have over 50, so how have you coped with all that information, I do not know.

CHAIR - Forty-eight or 49, I think.

Mr WHITE - Lots of attachments from the Government. Some interesting stuff there.

As to the reasons I am here, I am part of a group called Circular Economy Huon, as its public officer. Really the submission we have put in is based on 'circular economy' principles. Those principles are about keeping goods and services within the economy for as long as possible. Often it is linked to waste, and that is okay, but it is about designing products and services that stay within the economy for as long as possible.

This is based on two things. One is that we are using resources on the planet too quickly, and particularly within Australia. When we look at maximising goods and services within the economy, and then we look at transport, we see that there are a couple of areas particularly of wastage. One is that within private car transport, there are so many vehicles that travel at 20 per cent occupancy, or 25 per cent or 50 per cent. Where there is one person in a ute, that is 50 per cent, or one person in a five-seater car. That is an area we have been concerned with for a couple of years - in fact since we were formed, which was about two years ago.

The other area is looking at the vehicles themselves. Within Tasmania, the majority have internal combustion engines - ICE vehicles as they are nicknamed - and the emissions from these are quite considerable. In the submission we talked about this and said that for passenger cars within Tasmania, that is the equivalent of 1 million tons of CO₂ going into the atmosphere.

It is on that sort of basis that we put the submission together, and we started thinking about what could work in the future using existing resources and building on the existing system - not

PUBLIC

requiring more but making better use of it. Really that is the basis of what we are talking about with a rideshare or car-pooling system.

Since I wrote the submission, I have put some more thinking into it. It has not changed, I still support what I said, but in addition I did some figures on the Southern Outlet. I do not know whether other people have done that in terms of flows on the Southern Outlet, and the implications that has for congestion.

CHAIR - We have had a lot of figures put before us.

Mr WHITE - I am sure you have. I am not pushing them onto you, but I am happy to share what I prepared.

CHAIR - You can table that document if you want to.

Mr WHITE - I made a few copies. Shall I leave these with you?

CHAIR - Yes, you can table them.

Mr WHITE - It is certainly interesting when you start looking at figures for transport - the amount of information that does exist.

What I was trying to do was look at the way in which the Huon Valley impacts on congestion in Hobart. What I did was to look at the Geocounts website, which you are probably familiar with, which is a wealth of information about the counting that happens within Tasmania, and building up the picture.

The first table is about the Huon Valley, looking from the furthest southern point of Hastings and Southport, up to the Huon Highway in Kingston, which is the end of the highway. From 2010 to 2019, there has been an increase of 1600 vehicle movements a day, or thereabouts.

CHAIR - I would have thought it would have been a lot more than that.

Mr WHITE - I am using the facts that State Roads -

CHAIR - I am not disputing your figures. It is my own personal opinion that it would have been a lot more than that.

Mr WHITE - It is quite interesting. These magic eyes that exist somewhere that count.

The Channel is slightly different in that it is a slightly bigger increase.

Mr VALENTINE - Except for Hastings.

Mr WHITE - It is interesting. If you look at Hastings and Southport for Huon, the expression of reasonable development, or lack of it, declines in regional areas.

Ms SIEJKA - Possibly the fires and things.

PUBLIC

Mr WHITE - Yes, it could be. I cannot remember. It is 2019 or the nearest, so it may have been a 2018 figure, but it is an indication as to economic activity and where people are living.

I wanted to put the figures for the Huon and the Channel, and you can see they are straightforward. When it comes to the Southern Outlet, if you combine the flows from the Kingston bypass, which is sort of the Channel plus Kingston population, and add that to the Huon Highway, which is mainly coming up from the Huon, you can see that the combined count at Mt Nelson is 38 000 vehicle movements, and 37 000 before you come out of the Southern Outlet.

It gives an indication of the rate at which the Huon Valley is impacting on it. It is difficult to separate the Channel from Kingston, but it sheds a bit of light on where people are coming from. That was one thing I did.

The second thing I did was to look at vehicle occupancy, to get a better take on that. Here is another sheet on vehicle occupancy.

In terms of vehicle occupancy, a mixture of information exists. It is quite important in terms of the submission we make to increase the occupancy in cars. There is a survey underway that will have some further details at the end of this month.

There is a lack of information about the Huon Valley, because it is not considered to be part of Greater Hobart, so that is not an area of study which you may be aware of.

There are a range of things in there that talk about the data in terms of occupancy, and I contrast it with some of the work that has been done overseas in terms of high-occupancy vehicles and high-occupancy lanes. As an example, in Leeds, Bristol and Madrid, it is quite interesting to see that where high-occupancy vehicles and lanes have been built into the system, they are reducing congestion in cities.

It is virtually impossible to say what the direct impact would be within Hobart, but if we were to increase the number of people in a car, statistically, by half a body, that would have an impact on many thousands of cars coming into the city. That is the argument I am putting and it has been shown by evidence.

CHAIR - It has been raised several times. When I used to travel to Hobart years ago, four of us used to travel together in a car but it can't work for everyone because they are in different areas and different starting times.

Mr WHITE - Yes.

CHAIR - Jerry, with your carpooling, you say you need to encourage people to use carpooling. How would you propose to do that?

Mr WHITE - I think it has to be done in a businesslike way. I have had conversations with the person who set up Carpool Tasmania, which wasn't successful. It was an example of one where a lot of enthusiasm was put in, but there wasn't a lot of impetus and there wasn't much finance behind it. It was one lady who tried to get it up and running. The important thing is it needs proper research and the technology has moved on. There are mobility apps that weren't available then.

PUBLIC

It is a question of looking at what is happening elsewhere and putting together a business case and a practical case. There are all sorts of questions that people come up with - the proverbial, what about insurance? If you look at the example I quoted in the submission of Liftshare UK, where 600 000 people are involved, they have dealt with those issues. What about young people? What about people who have special needs? Again, that will have been dealt with so I think that is why it needs a case to be put together.

One needs to put together a project team and it is a three-stage process: its investigation first and then it is the pilot program, which then gets evaluated before hopefully rolling out more generally. I am suggesting the pilot program would be for south of Hobart and then run into other areas. The sorts of people who should be involved, and I have said in the submission, are people who are integral to transport, not just well-wishers and community groups that would like it to happen. I see the RACT as potentially central to that. The three councils in the area, which are Hobart, Kingborough and Huon Valley Council, need to be involved, and also State Growth.

Ms SIEJKA - One of the examples you had was the Northern Rivers Carpool and you said it was supported by government. Is it the sort of buy-in coordination-type support that you are talking about? Do you know if that one was resourcing support as well?

Mr WHITE - I think it was initially.

Ms SIEJKA - Yes, and you would think it would be needed?

Mr WHITE - It needs a sum of money to get it up and running.

Ms WEBB - For those first two stages, right?

Mr WHITE - For the first two stages. But compared to most traffic options, if you are talking about a development program for six months with one project officer plus a board of people who would be contributing their time as part of their work, what figure would you put on that - \$60 000 or \$70 000?

Ms SIEJKA - Yes.

Mr WHITE - To pay somebody to do that, plus on costs, for six months. It is important that you sell the thing properly.

Ms SIEJKA - I guess if there's an app as well that is another cost or just the developmental stage to get going?

Mr WHITE - My feeling is, and it is interesting talking to one of the councillors in the Huon Valley - he was told that he would be welcome to have the app for one rideshare organisation, which is great because things have been developed. We don't have to develop an app. I think there might be some tinkering to make it particularly suitable for Tasmania, but I don't think we are talking about development costs. It could be there for \$100 000, that sort of thing.

Ms WEBB - Have you surveyed the community down there to see what appetite there might be in that area?

PUBLIC

Mr WHITE - It is interesting. We've run a number of events down there and transport is always an option and a number of people have said they would like to carpool or rideshare but we haven't gone out and asked them. One of the problems is that you need a product before you ask.

Ms WEBB - People need to see what it is you are asking them about?

Mr WHITE - It is like when iPad was first produced, people did not know what an iPad was going to be used for. Apple had some resources to market it, but I think we need to come up with a product and it is something we can put to the community and get the backing. The way it has been successful in other places is that you work within existing frameworks to begin with. You don't just go to the populace in general but you go to people who are working in groups.

Within the Huon Valley, for instance, or the Channel, you'd be looking at who's working in education. Who might be willing to share cars in education or health or who's working at the university and so on? That was probably the way it worked for you, Robert, when you were sharing cars.

CHAIR - We worked at all different places, but it was roughly the same.

Ms SIEJKA - Culturally, I think it was more acceptable, wasn't it?

Ms WEBB - That could all be a part of that first stage of investigation, I would assume? Can I also ask: have you thought about how it might fit alongside or even articulate with other kinds of services that are already operating on a model that might involve shared rides? Say community transport services that might pick up a range of people from that area down the Huon to bring them up for appointments in the city. That has a particular funding model that relates to aged care and that sort of thing, but there would be some replication potentially around concept. Have you talked to other services of that sort?

Mr WHITE - Well, involved in the group we've got people who drive for community transport and I see it as pretty complementary, actually.

Ms WEBB - That's why I'm asking you about it.

Mr WHITE - I see the things meshing into each other reasonably well in the same way that the previous speaker was talking about bus services. It might be that you have - we are talking about congestion so the issue is transport from Hobart but intraregional stuff could link in with bus services to facilitate that as well.

Ms WEBB - You might even have something to offer those other services in terms of a coordinating technology that might amplify what they're able to do.

Mr WHITE - That would be great.

Mr VALENTINE - Just a question on the stats. Can you just explain - it's called Seoaccounts.com and State Growth, so these are basically generated by state departments?

Mr WHITE - I don't know whether it's a private company, but I've been in contact with State Growth and it's been extremely helpful. An officer there put me on to Seoaccounts.

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - So they use them, State Growth uses them?

Mr WHITE - They use them.

Mr VALENTINE - I just wanted to verify its provenance, if I can put it that way.

Mr WHITE - Yes.

CHAIR - Park and ride, Gerry? You haven't touched on that in your submission, I don't think. Has that come up in your -?

Mr WHITE - Absolutely. We're great supporters of public transport and park and ride, and active transport. What we wanted to do in this submission was to talk specifically about ride share and getting that up. We thought there would be other people who would address that. There are two other things that we're interested in - and I mentioned it in the submission - public transport is one and we've got somebody working on that at the moment and talking about it.

The other thing is changing from ICE vehicles to EVs - electric vehicles - and we can see potential for that and we're taking some action on it.

Mr VALENTINE - Do you see this rideshare linking in with park and ride services? For instance, if it's the Huon and you know there's park and ride at Kingston that you are sharing to Kingston and then it goes on a general service to Hobart?

Mr WHITE - Yes, yes. It would mean that cars don't need to come into the centre of town but they can go to an area where they can park, hopefully for free, and that the park and ride would be pretty readily available and then they travel in by public transport from there.

Ms HOWLETT - In relation to electric vehicles, Gerry, how many charging stations do you currently have in the Huon Valley?

Mr WHITE - There is a paucity of them, and that's why we are running a seminar on electrical vehicle recharging on 19 November. We have a range of people, including the Tasmanian Climate Change Office, coming down to talk about what's there.

Ms HOWLETT - How many do you currently have?

Mr WHITE - I think there are four or five.

Ms HOWLETT - Spread out, geographically?

Mr WHITE - Yes, but the whole thing is pathetic in terms of setting up a service. Is it Shenzhen that has 42 000 recharging points in China? I'm not suggesting the Huon Valley needs that number, but what we are suggesting is that it would be nice for the new tourism journeys drives that are being developed at the moment to facilitate electric vehicles and the hire of electric vehicles. When somebody pulls into an Airbnb or a hotel and spends the night, they'd plug their vehicle in. That's the idea but we are not there yet.

Ms HOWLETT - I am not sure if Avis has any in their rental car fleet.

PUBLIC

Ms SIEJKA - Probably hybrids.

Mr WHITE - We have invited them along as well, so it'll be interesting to see who comes.

CHAIR - Gerry, do you have any closing comments you want to make?

Mr WHITE - We are very keen on getting this scheme up. We don't think it's going to work unless there is a bit of an injection of cash. We will continue, as we have done, setting up meetings with the RACT and Huon Valley Council and ourselves to talk about the proposal. We want it to happen, but it has to be something that also has a bit of buy-in, although it's low money in a transport sense.

CHAIR - Thank you, Gerry, for your submission and for making yourself available to come up today. We appreciate that. Have a safe trip back home God's country.

Mr WHITE - No biases around the table here.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Mr MICHAEL JAMES HANGAN, PRESIDENT, NORTHERN SUBURBS RAIL, WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Thank you, Michael, and welcome to the Legislative Council Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion. I am just letting you know that we are being broadcast today and all evidence at the hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege, but any comments made outside the parliament may not be afforded that privilege. A copy of the information for witnesses is available to you. The evidence you present is being recorded and the *Hansard* version will be available on the committee website later on. If there is anything you want to mention in camera, please let us know. If you would like to give an overview of your submission, we will come to you with questions.

Mr HANGAN - For a bit of background, the Hobart Northern Suburbs Rail Action Group was formed in 2010. I'm the second president of the group. We thank you very much for the opportunity to talk today about our submission.

The project presents an exciting opportunity for urban renewal and development in the major regions around Hobart. However, to date the project, it has been assessed with a rational passenger transport approach only, without considering the wider benefits for the land use around those possible stations and also the maintaining of the rail link between Hobart, Bridgewater and Brighton. We need to also think about the link back to the current working port of Hobart.

Maintaining that rail access to Hobart and down to the waterfront is also a tourist and heritage opportunity for trains to come back into Hobart, but also to increase public transport patronage along that corridor. We know that the Brooker Highway is only one of those corridors that are suffering in this day and age.

Also, despite the single-track mentality with which everyone seems to look at that line going out through there, it is possible to run a service on that line just by placing looping stations around certain points along the line. From the reports - and I will talk about this as we go through - that are sitting underneath here are all reports that have been done either by government agencies or other engineering firms.

Mr VALENTINE - How many?

Mr HANGAN - There are 18.

Mr VALENTINE - From what period of time?

Mr HANGAN - The first one was done in May 2009 and the most recent one was done in October 2016.

Mr VALENTINE - May 2009 to October 2016 and the number, did you say, was 18?

CHAIR - You said it was possible to run trains on the single line with just looping?

Mr HANGAN - Yes, just putting some strategically located loops so that the train would pull in and another can pass - passing bays. From what we have learnt in these reports, they can

PUBLIC

actually move around about 1000 people on each train in each direction every 12 minutes. That's in these reports so what I am saying is not nonfactual, it is all coming out of here.

The Rail Action Group has been an incorporated body since 2010 and its purpose is to facilitate the establishment of a passenger rail service as the centrepiece for passenger rail services throughout the northern suburbs of Hobart all the way out to Brighton.

Ms WEBB - It will be fascinating to have a look at some of those.

Mr HANGAN - I can actually leave this.

Ms WEBB - If they are available electronically, we can take links or whatever is easiest.

Mr HANGAN - You can have that folder if you want, I have a couple of copies sitting on my desk.

Ms WEBB - One of the ideas we have been asked to think about is that this corridor into the northern suburbs has all those benefits we know impact on housing and development along the line. Potentially that could be achieved with a trackless option using the same idea, but not being locked into a tracked option, which doesn't allow for flexibility and potentially to integrate with the other elements of public transport - bus elements - around it. Can you comment on whether there has been any comparative modelling and valuing of a tracked option which maintains the rail line, compared to a non-tracked option?

Mr HANGAN - There have been, but most of them have been overseas studies.

Ms WEBB - So none of these 18 has actually contemplated looking at those two options and comparing them for us to consider best options here?

Mr HANGAN - No.

Ms WEBB - Has your group had an inclination to put consideration to the comparative value of those two options?

Mr HANGAN - We are presently looking at the two options and we have had discussion amongst the group, but we are trying to make sure we are talking truth - we want to see some of the statistical information with regard to the two options. We've got this one, but -

Ms WEBB - You mentioned there might be some overseas similar jurisdictions that may be considered have comparative value. Do you see that there is anywhere to look, to gain some understanding which may be better value for us?

Mr HANGAN - I am unsure, sorry.

Ms WEBB - Okay, that is fine. Do these reports provide that sort of thorough cost-benefit analysis of this option, and is it consistent across those 18 reports over seven years?

Mr HANGAN - Most of the fact sheets we have produced, which are all available on our website, have come from these documents. All those costs have come out of these documents.

PUBLIC

We are saying that for 188 metres, the cost would be around about \$80 million for 15 kilometres of track.

We already know the track is there, but we have to rebuild some of the infrastructure around those tracks - stations, passing lanes and so forth.

Ms WEBB - Finally, you have been talking about this for a good while, and there has been a lot of community discussion and various official investigations about this. We are doing this inquiry now. What do you think we could best provide as an outcome from our inquiry to help action in your space?

Mr HANGAN - Currently, under the City Deal plan, \$25 million has been allocated to reactivating that northern corridor.

Ms WEBB - What does that mean?

Mr HANGAN - We are unsure as to what that actually means. Does that mean now another report has to be produced on the particular corridor we now have?

Ms WEBB - So it is not specified what the outcome of that reactivation \$25 million should produce?

Mr HANGAN - No.

Ms WEBB - How do you progress that then?

Mr HANGAN - We need to talk to the minister to find out from them.

We have been working predominantly with the Glenorchy and Hobart City councils, because it covers the majority of their areas. The Brighton mayor is quite keen for the line to continue all the way out there, but we also have these other issues where the new Bridgewater Bridge does not have rail on it, or does not have the facility for rail.

There are all these little stumbling blocks.

Ms WEBB - Which may be not such a factor if you weren't using track, which is interesting.

I will reiterate that question, because I diverted you in the middle of your answer: in terms of what this inquiry could provide to help propel action in your space, what would you like us to think about in that?

Mr HANGAN - A totally integrated service would be great. Rail could be one of those options, meeting with the other services that are currently provided.

We have a beautiful corridor that is ready to be used. It really is a no-brainer. We only have to find the dollars to sit behind it.

Ms WEBB - So throwing our support behind it in terms of advocacy?

Mr HANGAN - Would be good.

PUBLIC

Ms WEBB - Okay, thank you.

Ms HOWLETT - There is not enough money out there.

Mr VALENTINE - In terms of viability, in all of those reports, do they talk about the minimum number of people in the catchment that would be needed to make it viable?

Mr HANGAN - In one of our fact sheets we talked about patronage, and operating and maintenance costs going forward. We also talked about a fare structure, as to what sort of fares would be needed.

If it is based on the current bus fares, there could be an annual revenue of \$15.4 million against an annual profit of \$12.9 million but that's predicting around about 6 million trips along that line over a 12-month period.

Mr VALENTINE - I am wondering whether the independent studies in your collection, their compendium, shall I say -

Mr HANGAN - Probably not. I am not sure, to answer your question.

Mr VALENTINE - No. It's probably only around the 60 000 people-mark if you are taking into account Glenorchy, Brighton - that's if you can get to Brighton - and possibly the Derwent Valley. Would that be right?

Mr HANGAN - Possibly, yes.

Mr VALENTINE - Do you know roughly -?

Mr HANGAN - Yes, that's roughly the population.

Mr VALENTINE - Do you think that would be viable?

Mr HANGAN - Don't forget not everyone would just take one trip. If you're looking at multiple usages of the service, you've got multiple hits there as well. You multiply that out considerably.

Mr VALENTINE - Thank you.

Ms SIEJKA - Just on the trackless trams we talked about. I am looking at your submission: you talked about how buses get caught up in the same congestion. I presume that trackless trams potentially could do that if we moved them in more flexible ways. Are there other environmental benefits?

We talk about the fact that the tracks are already there and that people would like to move in that sort of way, but are there other benefits you see socially and economically that we perhaps haven't thought of in terms of having that train system there?

Mr HANGAN - It actually allows for higher density housing around those areas.

PUBLIC

Ms SIEJKA - It's on greater urban planning.

Mr HANGAN - Yes. It will actually reduce the emissions from cars by taking more cars off the road by having a rail service or an integrated service.

Ms SIEJKA - Environmentally that compares - or do you know how many cars we would need to take off the road to be winning in that capacity? It would be interesting.

Ms WEBB - It would be very interesting.

Ms SIEJKA - Yes.

Mr HANGAN - Can I take it on notice?

Ms SIEJKA - Yes. While you were speaking, I thought that would be something worth exploring because there would a point at which the capacity would flip to the other area and environmental considerations are important.

Mr HANGAN - By having rail you are also reducing the traffic congestion on those lines.

There's one developer at Austins Ferry who has a rail station on his site plan.

Ms SIEJKA - There's one in Bellerive, I think, too.

Mr HANGAN - He's selling the land with a possible future rail.

Ms SIEJKA - That would be interesting to know.

CHAIR - Anything else, Jane?

Ms HOWLETT - No. I was just curious - you mentioned density of housing on the line. Do you have any figures?

Mr HANGAN - No, but I believe that Glenorchy City Council is working on some of those, as is Hobart City Council as well. I am not aware of that information.

Ms SIEJKA - That impact has been seen in Victoria with a different population where they have built up around those central lines, haven't they?

Mr HANGAN - Yes.

Ms HOWLETT - That's natural growth.

Mr HANGAN - Yes.

CHAIR - The current line that is still the corridor there, what sort of condition is that in?

Mr HANGAN - If you drive along the Domain Highway, coming under the bridge that way there's lots of overgrown grass all over the line so it hasn't been maintained.

PUBLIC

Ms HOWLETT - I think you mean the sleepers et cetera, don't you?

Mr HANGAN - Yes.

Ms HOWLETT - What condition are they in?

Mr VALENTINE - He means the infrastructure.

CHAIR - Rob, you and I sat on the North East Rail.

Mr VALENTINE - No, I didn't.

CHAIR - No. Just you and me, Jane.

Ms HOWLETT - Yes, that's correct.

CHAIR - When the rail regulator report came in, it was pretty damning of the rail. He said it's not just the sleepers that you've got to look; it's the ballast, it's the under-wash, and each road crossing if it's passive or -

Mr HANGAN - It would all have to be reviewed to make sure it's up to -

CHAIR - Are any rail crossings still there?

Mr HANGAN - There are no active rail crossings.

CHAIR - All the infrastructure has been removed?

Mr HANGAN - All the lights and bells and all that have all gone.

Ms HOWLETT - Surely you must have looked at the sleepers and the infrastructure there in order to come up with an estimated price?

Mr HANGAN - We have walked along, yes. One of these reports talks about the cost of replacing the lines as well.

CHAIR - It was huge money we were talking there because there were two crossings, the minor crossing and the major crossing. The major crossing which you would have to have on this one, and it was talking about big money, wasn't it?

Mr HANGAN - There are a number of major crossings.

Ms HOWLETT - It was huge money. What is the estimated cost you have in your folder?

CHAIR - It is \$80 million to \$200 million, isn't it, depending on the route?

Mr HANGAN - Yes, that is right.

Ms HOWLETT - I like version 16.

PUBLIC

Ms SIEJKA - Then there is that chart in the submission that shows what you get for different, for comparable, money.

Ms HOWLETT - That is in metres?

Mr HANGAN - Three metres of the new Bridgewater Bridge would get this much of the train and 13 metres of the airport runway is a little bit more of the train.

CHAIR - Is there any bridge or bridge crossings on that line, coming in?

Mr HANGAN - No. There are level crossings. There is New Town Bridge over New Town Road.

Ms SIEJKA - One of the criticisms or questions that people I talk to often raise, is that while they may be in favour of the train, it obviously has a limited capacity in that the length of it is not huge.

What do you say to those sorts of comments? Could you potentially see this extending further?

Mr HANGAN - There is a line still going into Lutana. The track is still there.

Mr VALENTINE - The benching is still there, the track is partly not there.

Mr HANGAN - That is right. There is a corridor still available. We have had the same criticism, 'Oh, it is not going to Kingston' or 'It is not going to Clarence'.

Ms SIEJKA - You would have been very familiar with it, yes.

Mr HANGAN - We are saying, at least if we can get one area up and operating -

Ms SIEJKA - It is part of the solution.

Mr HANGAN - it is part of a solution, it is not the whole solution.

Ms SIEJKA - There is probably no one whole solution, unfortunately.

Mr HANGAN - That is why we are advocating for an integrated service, because it has to integrate. Integrate the trains with buses, trains with ferries, whatever. There has to be a total solution and this is only one part of it.

Mr VALENTINE - Michael, with respect to the revenue raised, is it realistic it will maintain the service into the future?

Quite clearly, 188 metres of northern suburbs rail for \$1 million and you might get the original establishment money, but maintaining it, the rail and the crossings and all those sorts of things, is it viable? Do those reports you have there show that it is viable?

Mr HANGAN - Yes, these reports show they are viable into the future.

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - On the projected passenger numbers?

Mr HANGAN - On the projected passenger numbers.

Mr VALENTINE - What sort of passenger numbers are we talking about again, on those figures? You did not mention that in your submission.

Ms HOWLETT - Yes, I did, 6 million trips a year.

Mr VALENTINE - Is it? Okay.

Ms WEBB - When that is being modelled, where does your modelling say the passengers are being drawn from? Are you taking people out of cars on what you have identified is that busiest thoroughfare into the city, the Brooker? What proportion are you taking from cars and therefore reducing that congestion there? What proportion might you be taking from existing public transport users, who are coming on public transport buses down the roads already, do you think, in that mix?

Mr HANGAN - Short answer, I do not have those figures.

Ms WEBB - Okay. Would that modelling have been done? There would be assumptions about that somewhere?

Mr HANGAN - There might be, yes. There may be something like that.

Ms SIEJKA - One of the things we have heard is about what percentage of people you need to shift their behaviour in order to alleviate -

Ms WEBB - I am wondering about what proportion of that are you assuming is a shift in modes from car to -

Ms SIEJKA - Or are people just excited about catching trains.

Ms WEBB - Same mode but other forms public transport.

Mr HANGAN - Can I will take that on notice as well?

Ms WEBB - Absolutely.

Mr HANGAN - I will answer those two questions for you.

Mr VALENTINE - If you take 365 days a year, 16 438 a day, but obviously weekends would not be as much. It could be about 18 000 a day.

Mr HANGAN - You could also then still have that tourist traffic going out to Mona and things like that as well.

Mr VALENTINE - Or out by boat and back by train, possibly.

PUBLIC

Ms HOWLETT - The \$80 to \$200 million for the replacement of infrastructure, how many kilometres of infrastructure is that, how is that broken down?

Mr HANGAN - Sorry, I can't answer the question.

Ms HOWLETT - Could you take that on notice?

Mr HANGAN - Yes. Could you repeat that?

Ms HOWLETT - You mentioned the \$80 million to \$200 million for the replacement of infrastructure.

Ms WEBB - That was the cost of putting the infrastructure in place for this to happen. I presume that variation, \$80 to \$200 million, is dependent on how far it goes.

Ms HOWLETT - That's what I just asked. What is the kilometre breakdown within that?

Ms WEBB - Presumably the \$1 million for 188 metres could be extrapolated out to get that figure.

Ms SIEJKA - The idea has been floating around for a while now; I remember doing a youth forum in about 2009 that Kristie attended and we talked about it at the time. Do you feel that the public support in the area has continued to grow?

Mr HANGAN - Yes. Our membership - and you use that term loosely because while you have people who pay their membership, there are also people who support it - is steadily growing. There are more and more people coming on board. I think *The Mercury's* figure the other day was 80 per cent of its readers supported it.

Mr VALENTINE - Of course that has to be balanced on what they know. Having supporters is one thing, but having supporters who know what the full costs are and what it might mean to the public purse might be a different thing.

Ms SIEJKA - Sometimes when people want something to happen, it doesn't happen - support does fluctuate sometimes.

Ms HOWLETT - If this happened to be a successful infrastructure project too, who would you propose to manage it?

Mr HANGAN - Probably not Metro, probably a state body, maybe a transport authority that takes on all those sorts of things.

Ms WEBB - To follow up on that, because I was about to ask the same question, you are advocating for an integrated service but you are saying it shouldn't be managed under the same public transport entity we have in place? There would have to be a lot of integration with the Metro service.

Mr HANGAN - There would have to be, but a transport body could be the manager.

Ms HOWLETT - So you are advocating for a transport advisory body/authority/panel?

PUBLIC

Ms SIEJKA - An authority that's larger than just for buses; you need overarching governance.

Mr HANGAN - That's right. If you're going to integrate, you are integrating possibly three services into one.

Ms WEBB - Just to clarify, to operate this service, if it was in place - I am wondering who is operating the service.

Mr HANGAN - I don't know who we get.

Ms WEBB - A state entity, a private entity?

Mr HANGAN - Probably a state entity.

Ms WEBB - But separate to Metro?

Mr HANGAN - Yes.

Mr VALENTINE - If Metro is integral to it, in other words, it might be that you have these various nodes along the track and they would be expected to provide bus services to those nodes, wouldn't it be sensible to have it integrated and run by them?

Mr HANGAN - That could be a possibility, but we'd have to make sure that the service is something they will continue to operate.

Ms HOWLETT - But you did mention not Metro?

Mr HANGAN - I did.

Ms WEBB - You might need to talk that through a little more with us.

Mr HANGAN - It's because we have had some pushback from Metro about rail. In any talks we have had with Metro in the past, it's been 'We're not rail - go away'.

Ms WEBB - Sure, but that isn't in the development of the idea phase of things. It's not their business as usual right now. However, once a decision has been made, a plan has been put in place, this has been actually developed, you then get to the point where someone operates it, at which time they could be directed to operate it and at which time, presumably, that -

Mr HANGAN - They could be directed to operate a ferry service as well, which their legislation has been changed to cover.

Ms WEBB - Other than the fact that so far they haven't wanted to play -

Mr HANGAN - They could.

Ms WEBB - They could.

PUBLIC

Mr HANGAN - There still needs to be some sort of overarching authority that looks at the whole integration.

Ms HOWLETT - Another layer of bureaucracy, isn't it?

Mr HANGAN - I know it is.

Ms WEBB - We have heard that from others too, today, so that's not an idea that doesn't seem to have legs in terms of people's interest in that coordinating function.

CHAIR - It's interesting. The comments I've had about the rail are that if a person gets on a bus at the back of Glenorchy and then comes down to the rail, they would stay on the bus to travel into Hobart; or if they get in their car, and most people I have spoken to about it have said they'd hop in their car and drive down there. Is there parking available?

Mr HANGAN - At the moment there is not, but that's some of the infrastructure cost that would need to be covered as well.

CHAIR - Is that covered in the infrastructure costs?

Mr HANGAN - Yes, it is.

CHAIR - Would that be acquisition of land or is there land there?

Mr HANGAN - If you look around some of the railway stations or the possible railway stations, there is land available.

Ms HOWLETT - But that's not covered in that \$80 million to \$200 million?

Mr HANGAN - I can't answer that question.

Ms HOWLETT - Because that's replacement of infrastructure.

CHAIR - Thank you, Michael, for your submission.

Mr HANGAN - Can I leave this one for you?

CHAIR - Do members want a copy?

Mr VALENTINE - Do you have a series of links that link to those?

Mr HANGAN - I've got them all as PDFs.

Mr VALENTINE - Electronically available?

Mr HANGAN - They are not on our website.

Mr VALENTINE - If you do not have links, it might be a bit difficult. If you can get links, send us one email with all the links.

Mr HANGAN - Yes, okay. I have a couple on my desk. I will send that in to you as well.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Thank you, Michael. Thank you for your time, we appreciate that.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.