

PUBLIC

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL SELECT COMMITTEE ON GREATER HOBART TRAFFIC CONGESTION MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 2, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART, ON WEDNESDAY 13 NOVEMBER 2019.

Mr TIMOTHY GARDNER, CHAIR, AND **Ms MEGAN MORSE**, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, METRO TASMANIA, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR (Mr Armstrong) - Good morning and welcome to the Legislative Council Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion. These hearings are being broadcast. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege. I remind you that any comments made outside may not be afforded that privilege. A copy of the information for witnesses statement is there for you to have. The evidence you present is being recorded by Hansard and it will be published on the committee website when Hansard makes that available. By way of introduction, I advise the procedure we intend to follow today is to let you give a 10-minute overview of your submission and then committee members will ask questions. If there is anything that you wanted to bring to the committee in camera, we can facilitate that for you.

Mr GARDNER - Thank you, Chair. My name is Tim Gardner. I am the Chairman of the Board of Metro Tasmania. I will start by giving you a brief overview. First, thank you for the opportunity to present our evidence to the committee this morning.

Metro connects people with work, education and training, health, retail and services, loved ones and their community. In 2018-19 we did this over 8.5 million times, increasing patronage for a sixth consecutive year by consolidating network upgrades and focusing on customer service to improve the reliability of our services. Buses provide the most flexible, cost-effective method of making our cities more liveable and less congested. Metro successfully encouraged more full fare-paying adult passengers to use public transport by enhancing reliability, focusing on customer service and consolidating network upgrades.

Metro is one of 158 bus operators in Tasmania operating services under contract with the Department of State Growth and the primary urban provider in Hobart. In recent years, the department has assumed a more active role not only as a purchaser of services but also as a system manager in the transition to a more integrated statewide public transport network. Contracts and networks designed by the Department of State Growth are informed by a series of planning principles and a government-designed, economic-demand model that supports allocation of bus services based on need and likely patronage.

Metro delivers the services it is contracted to provide. The decision to procure new bus services or vary existing bus services is governed by the Passenger Transport Services Act 2011.

The International Association of Public Transport identifies that public transport costs the community less, needs less urban space, is less energy-intensive, pollutes less, is safer, improves accessibility to jobs and offers mobility for all.

One bus has the capacity to take 60 cars off the road, and we fully endorse the pursuit of measures such as clearways, bus lanes and priority lights to make buses a compelling alternative to the private car and offer a true commuter incentive. Hobart can reduce congestion and deliver

PUBLIC

better mobility by prioritising the movement of public transport over single-occupant vehicles and best enabling the exchange of people, goods and services, not the simple movement of cars.

Mr VALENTINE - Given your remit, and you just mentioned that you provide services based on need and patronage, with all the different solutions being put forward, like ferries and light rail, how flexible can Metro be in being able to fit in with some of those models? I imagine with light rail, you would have nodes and would provide services to the nodes, or if it was services to the ferries rather than providing an end-to-end service by bus. How flexible can you be and what are your constraints to meeting some of those challenges?

Mr GARDNER - First, the important piece is integration. We are complete supporters of public transport, period. A critical piece is full integration across whatever mode and between whatever nodes. That comes back to the customer experience and customers' ability to shift between modes without having to buy other tickets, and having those timetables integrated.

In terms of Metro's constraints, as per my opening points, we are fundamentally constrained by our contract obligations. Our contracts define exactly where and when we will run, what vehicles we will have on the road and the timetables by which we will operate. It is a decision in relation to the contracts we provide that then shapes the way we can operate on the ground. Buses are ultimately an extremely flexible tool because you can redirect them and take them wherever that demand lies; it's just a matter of a decision being made at a government level about where it would like and where it deems the priority to apply those resources.

Mr VALENTINE - Yesterday we heard from a number of mayors, Dean Winter from Kingborough being one, saying that State Growth determines where the buses go, and that's a fair comment to make. Fair enough. The other aspect is whether you have the capacity to meet the peak demand. I think it was Doug Chipman from Clarence who said that even if we provided free services in peak hours, Metro couldn't cope. Is that the case?

Mr GARDNER - Some statements of fact around what goes on in Hobart: we have very short peaks in the morning and afternoon, where on many of our key routes we operate full on route and we operate at or close to capacity. Simply to throw more resources at those very short peaks is a very inefficient way of dealing with that solution. You end up with a lot of capacity sitting around in between those peaks, a very underutilised investment in those assets.

From our point of view, it would be much more beneficial and a much more effective use of resources to do all the things we can to spread demand off those peaks, provide pricing incentives and service incentives to get people to shift behaviour and spread those loads so we can get better utilisation. At the same time, the big thing everyone is telling us, the big driver for our customers, is service reliability. The challenge in the peak, if you throw more buses in the peak, is that you are just throwing more vehicles on the road at a time when it's already congested. Unless we deal with a suite of issues and matters, there is no direct value in throwing more resources at those times if we are not dealing with the underlying issues of being able to move buses more efficiently and effectively through those peak periods - that is, through bus prioritisation, bus lanes, light jumps et cetera to allow us to move those vehicles. It's a combination of that and incentives to spread behaviour and to get people on buses earlier and later and across the day.

Mr VALENTINE - My last question, before others are going to ask questions, is: how important are models like park and ride in achieving what you see as a viable service, and where would you suggest they be placed if they were to happen? I know in some sense you already have

PUBLIC

one at Springfield, but where else? How important are they or would they be if they were in place in meeting peak demand?

Mr GARDNER - If you look at the way our network is designed, fundamentally with mass transit we are seeking to move as many people as frequently as possible on the key corridors - be that moving from Kingston into Hobart, moving from Glenorchy into the city or moving from the Eastern Shore on the Tasman Highway into the city. It makes logical sense that you would locate that opportunity to park and ride on those key corridors to get into the city, to get as many people onto those services and give them as much opportunity as possible to get onto those services.

Mr VALENTINE - Have you done an analysis as to where they would most optimally be placed? Have you gone into that at all?

Ms MORSE - In most instances Metro actually isn't the provider of park and ride facilities. Many of them are owned and managed by local government. You have identified Springfield as the one site which we do own and provide for Metro passengers, but the majority of that infrastructure is actually provided by local government. I understand there is some work underway as part of the Hobart Transport Vision being facilitated by State Growth with local government in relation to park and ride. It reinforces Mr Gardner's earlier point that all the infrastructure that supports passenger transport, from interchanges through to things like park and ride, is part of the decision-making process for intending passengers.

Increasingly, we are also getting a very strong message from the cycling community about the ability to ride and ride, and to be able to safely store a bike, which might be their mode of choice to get to the mainline services. As Mr Gardner described, it is not just passenger vehicles, but also cyclists who we would love to see better accommodated through park and ride.

Mr VALENTINE - I can understand that the spaces involved with park and ride might be local government's responsibility, but you have the data, so I am wondering whether you can say where they would be best placed, as opposed to saying, 'You tell us where'. You have the data, so have you not analysed that side of it?

Ms MORSE - We do have the data, we are a very data-rich business, and we are a generous partner in terms of providing access to that data. It does tend to be the growth corridor that is under quite active analysis at the moment, and certainly, in terms of our network, that is the Kingston side as the urban boundary extends further beyond the Kingston centre. Similarly, the northern suburbs are a real engine for our network, and there are time savings for communities further out in the Granton and Brighton corridors with people being able to access a more frequent service by having driven to access that corridor.

Mr VALENTINE - What about the Eastern Shore? Sorell?

Ms MORSE - Metro does not service Sorell, but the same principles could be expected to apply for the urban boundary on the eastern shore.

Mr VALENTINE - Thank you.

CHAIR - Could I have a follow-up on the bicycle bit? Some people might ride their bike to the bus stop, hop on the bus, and then need their bike to finish their journey to where they work, in South Hobart or wherever. Does Metro accommodate bicycles on their buses? Are they

PUBLIC

looking at it, because there are so many more people now using bicycles as a means of transport, either at the beginning or at the end of their journey?

Ms MORSE - Metro does not currently carry bikes on board. There are a range of health and safety considerations for our staff, for other motorists, for the cyclists themselves, and for our other passengers. It is slightly complicated under the Heavy Vehicle National Law and Regulations in terms of it affecting the length of our vehicles, and therefore the streets we are able to operate on.

Our focus, in supporting cyclists who would like to use our services for part of their journey, is very much geared towards that ride and ride model.

Ms SIEJKA - Just on what you were saying about peak times, and how you can better service that sort of demand? There seems to be, from what we have heard, two sides to getting people off the road and into buses.

One of the things we heard about yesterday was about behaviour change, so in terms of attracting more people - I am not sure how to phrase this- you have people who are not bus users currently who might consider it. Do you think spreading the bus timetable is going to assist in attracting more people, or is it purely going to help service the people who are already using the buses?

Mr GARDNER - Yes, it does make sense. Do we attract new patrons, is what you are asking through that?

Ms SIEJKA - Obviously we want more people off the roads.

Mr GARDNER - To run through the order of things in what really matters to people and how we get behaviour shift. The very clear feedback in our research, and research nationally and internationally, suggests that service reliability is the most important factor in getting people to utilise public transport.

The challenge we have at the moment is that our buses just sit in traffic with all the other vehicles. It is very hard.

Ms SIEJKA - Not a great incentive to shift.

Mr GARDNER - It is not a great incentive to shift. A pricing mechanism - for example, free transport - in itself is not going to deal with that issue. We have to deal with a number of issues.

If we could be in a position where we have the infrastructure that allows buses free movement and priority flow through traffic, then we are confident, and our patrons can be confident, that they will arrive at their destination at the scheduled time.

Ms SIEJKA - You expect there might be people, because of the frustration of waiting, if they went half an hour earlier, and if you had that flexibility for those other infrastructure things, it might improve, or attract more as well?

Mr GARDNER - Absolutely, all these bits come together. So, the other piece is if we can provide some pricing incentives for people off-peak. We have already done some work on this.

PUBLIC

Over the past four years, we have run a 'Free Before 7' initiative with the support of Department of State Growth. We have seen some data, an average 14 per cent increase in people choosing to travel prior to 7 o'clock, to take up that opportunity.

It is a bit like, when you have limited capacity, and you have a restaurant on a Saturday night, you don't make it cheap. You don't discount it. You discount it on Tuesday night. That is exactly the same principle we need to be thinking of, in terms of simple economics.

Ms WEBB - That increase of 14 per cent when you offered free travel before 7 a.m., was that in people who already use buses? Do you know what percentage may have been new travellers?

Mr GARDNER - My understanding, and I will refer to Ms Morse, but I believe it was largely a movement -

Ms WEBB - Did you just take 14 per cent out of your peak-hour regular users, or did you add users?

Mr GARDNER - Largely movement of the patrons we have.

Ms MORSE - In relation to that initiative, and the notion of attracting new passengers. I think the strongest case we can point to is our growth in Hobart since the implementation of our new Hobart network in January 2016.

We have had sustained year-on-year growth in patronage since that network was introduced. The strongest growth sector for that network has been in full-fare paying adults, and we have consistently been in double-figure growths. A more than 10 per cent growth year on year, in terms of our full-fare paying adults.

I think that, as Mr Gardner has highlighted, we were able to provide better frequencies, so people have more options in terms of how they plan their day, and how they plan the activities they want to undertake across the day.

In terms of reliability, what we were able to do as part of that network was to re-time our services. We also made many bus services more direct, to reduce travel time where we could. Obviously, nobody wants to be on a bus longer than the equivalent car journey might have taken, notwithstanding that it is a communal experience.

Again, I guess we are finding that network very tested by the significant year-on-year growth in congestion across that subsequent four years.

I think the evidence arising from our Hobart Network Review points to our ability to attract and maintain a relationship with full-fare paying adult passengers, who are obviously key to managing congestion.

CHAIR - You only offer free travel before 7 a.m. There is nothing after 7 p.m.?

Mr GARDNER - It is a trial. It is just for a limited period of time, every year, coinciding with the return to school in February. We run it for four weeks.

PUBLIC

Ms MORSE - The ongoing fare incentive we provide off-peak is actually during the day. We offer an off-peak fare during the middle of the day and during weekends, but at present we do not have an early morning or evening fare rate.

Ms SIEJKA - The only other area I wanted to explore was to do with attracting particular cohorts of people to be regular bus users: younger people and older people.

Younger people, because if their families are not satisfied with the service, the parents tend to drive more.

Older people, because they are often reluctant at particular times of the day, either for safety or their flexibility or their agility and physical needs.

What particular things have you been doing at Metro to accommodate and attract those particular groups?

Mr GARDNER - There are three particular groups there in terms of the full-fare paying adults, and then the concession travellers split into older concessions and students. What our data is actually showing, as Megan has just outlined, is that we've got growth in adult full-fare paying and we've also seen growth in the older concession group as well. The area that has been particularly challenging nationally over the last decade plus is students. Nationally, there is a declining trend in student use of buses. More parents are driving their kids around and you can see how that impacts, school holidays - traffic dies off.

Metro has been doing a range of things, particularly working directly with schools around encouraging teaching, getting the younger cohort - younger primary school kids - comfortable with getting on to the bus and getting familiar. I name up Taroona High and Taroona Primary as being excellent -

Ms WEBB - I thought of it just this week -

Ms SIEJKA - Having worked with young people I know that a big barrier for some of them, particularly in that next suburb out from the CBD or the further you get out, is often an anxiety or concern about buses. Are there other areas you're doing that sort of work in? It is Taroona I'm aware of, but there are a lot of areas where that work could be explored.

Mr GARDNER - Absolutely. A lot of it goes to the appetite of the schools to actually take this on. We're actively working all the time in this space. This is a really important piece for us and we would really like to see this grow.

The other element of that is we've been running marketing campaigns around 'Just Take the Bus'. It was about little kids having fun getting on and enjoying the bus ride coming through to older kids - you don't need a driver licence, just catch the bus, it's fine. It's easier for your family and more independence. That's trying to pull that cohort through and that's ongoing work.

As I said, we are working against a national trend here. This is not a local issue and the irony of it is that while there is a safety concern, often this is actually a very safe way to travel. Safer than travelling in a car. We continue to prosecute on every front that we can.

Ms SIEJKA - Thank you.

PUBLIC

Ms MORSE - I think the other cohort we probably acknowledge in that life stage is the work we've been able to do with the University of Tasmania. Its residential accommodation patterns are changing. It has a lot more students accommodated in the CBD and the university continues to be a very important partner for us. It is a great example of an organisation that has been willing to use the levers available to it in relation to parking, the availability of parking, the cost of parking, the availability of end-of-journey facilities for cyclists. It's pulled a whole range of those levers to shift the travel patterns of its students. We've seen enormous growth in the utilisation of Metro services by university students. We have had great returns from a very targeted small investment for very impactful promotions we've been able to partner with the university to establish travel patterns for students moving into their accommodation.

Ms SIEJKA - Just finally on seniors, I know that you don't have a full rollout of disability-friendly, age-friendly fleet yet. Do you target your services where you think an older cohort would need that service more? How does that work with the fleet?

Mr GARDNER - In terms of those specific -

Ms SIEJKA - Yes, I know that in my electorate, in particular, and I am sure in others, that seniors are often reluctant getting on and off the bus. Is some of the fleet ready for that sort of support and are other buses yet to reach that level?

Mr GARDNER - At the moment, we are in the process of an accelerated fleet upgrade. There are 100 new buses under construction in Wynyard for Bustech in Elphinstone which will make us disability-access compliant once we have those. We have another 18 months to get the last 50 of those buses and once they come in, we will be completely 100 per cent compliant.

Mr VALENTINE - How many buses were there?

Mr GARDNER - We have 100 being built at the moment and we've just received the fifty-second of the 100.

Ms MORSE - They will be fully low-floor by early 2021 and obviously that opens up opportunities for a range of Tasmanians who have access challenges, whether that is older Tasmanians, whether it's younger families. There's a range of people who will find it easier to use our services if they're confident that every time a bus pulls up, it will be a low-floor vehicle so we're very excited about reaching that milestone.

Ms WEBB - Rob, I'm probably going to cover it, so can I have a crack and then you come back. It's probably about UTAS to CBD, I imagine.

Mr VALENTINE - That's what I was going to ask, but now you go.

Ms WEBB - You talked about having a relationship with the university and that being fruitful. Clearly, the university has a plan in place to transition into the CBD across the next 10 years, and we will talk to it later today about that in relation to this issue of traffic congestion.

Have you been actively engaged in strategically planning that move with the university at this point in time?

PUBLIC

Ms MORSE - We have. I think its plans are still at a fairly preliminary level. They're still in very active consultation with a wide range of stakeholders, including Metro. As you've identified, it is a long-term plan; it doesn't see them vacating the Sandy Bay campus and they will still have a range of services operating through them. So, we will continue to provide, I imagine, quite significant levels of service to assist university staff and students in moving between their campuses.

Ms WEBB - Given that they've had a first pass report - as they've described it - done on traffic impact, from that do you have a clear picture of what impact that move will have on your Metro services and in what way you may need to respond to that?

Ms MORSE - Again, consistent with it being a first pass, it might be premature to say that we're absolutely clear on that. It's certainly an initiative we're monitoring very closely and, again, they're a partner we work very well with. They openly share information and we will continue to liaise effectively with them in preparing for that.

Ms WEBB - On that data matter, you mentioned you share your data. Is it open source? Is it publicly available?

Ms MORSE - It's not currently, no. Our timetable information is very readily available but obviously there is a range of privacy concerns in relation to our passenger data.

Ms WEBB - In terms of numbers?

Ms MORSE - It's disaggregated information and it's available on request, but it is not completely open source.

Ms WEBB - There is nowhere stakeholders in the community could access information about the usage of your services?

Ms MORSE - It would be by request rather than open source at this point.

Mr GARDNER - Other than what we publish in the annual report.

Ms MORSE - The public domain.

Ms WEBB - One of the areas I wanted to ask about: you've been marketing to drive growth, you've had growth in recent years, quite successfully. When has that growth occurred? What periods of the day have you seen that growth happen in your services?

Ms MORSE - It's really right across the day.

Ms WEBB - Is it an even growth across the day?

Ms MORSE - It's not even but it is right across the day and it's right across the week.

Ms WEBB - What percentage of the growth is in peak times?

Ms MORSE - I would have to take that question on notice.

PUBLIC

Ms WEBB - It's pretty interesting for us to know that so it would be great if you could provide that information. Given, if you could just profile across, say, the last five years you've been experiencing that growth, what proportion of that has been occurring at the peak times at either end of the day?

I absolutely accept what you say about the need to increase reliability by those measures that help buses move more quickly. It's a great proposal. Other measures, like spreading peak demand, are only going to do so much. Everything we hear has been about encouraging more use of public transport.

It will happen in peak times and that's why I would like to see where the growth has been to date. It would be a successful tick for us to see further growth of people using the service in peak times, regardless of how much you might try to spread it, it's going to happen if we do well with this issue. Given that, are you at capacity now and given that you are marketing for growth, you have experienced growth, a successful outcome for congestion would be to get more people on your buses during peak times, what is your plan to increase capacity going forward?

Mr GARDNER - We have to work very closely with our customer, our buying agency, the Department of State Growth. Effectively, it's through its modelling and work about demand and need that then informs us as to the investments that have to be made in buses and the routes.

As Megan indicated, we have a lot of data. We share that data very actively and we work very closely with the Department of State Growth.

Ms WEBB - With that then, State Growth has not mapped out for you - because you are directed by its decision-making - an increase in bus capacity to accommodate a successful outcome of getting more people on your buses during peak time?

Mr GARDNER - That is a work in progress right now. It is a current piece of work so Megan's team, our team, is working very closely with the Hobart Transport Vision team, which works within the Department of State Growth, looking at the challenge around meeting the growing capacity. How do we resource this? For example, if the government invests in a fifth lane on the Southern Outlet, well, there is no good just doing that without putting more capacity onto it, so it is a very active discussion at the moment.

Ms WEBB - At any given time is there a current strategic plan about what that looks like going forward, the plan to increase capacity? Given, of course, that it would be updated on a regular basis and also probably in response to new initiatives, is there a documented strategic plan we could be aware of about what is the plan to increase capacity in Metro?

Mr GARDNER - Ultimately, Meg, that is a question for the Department of State Growth.

Ms WEBB - And we will put it to them too, but from your side, that is not something you could point us to at this time?

Mr GARDNER - No, we are working very actively with them to build that, and to map it out and provide all the support and data we can, but ultimately it is their direction.

Ms WEBB - One thing I wondered is, in terms of your proposals about helping buses move more readily through traffic, which all sounds like very positive and not difficult to implement

PUBLIC

solutions, have you measured, say with current use, what difference that would make to your reliability? I think our understanding is your reliability sits about 87 per cent. Have you actually modelled, were these things to be put in place, what you could expect to see in terms of an improvement in reliability on current conditions or is that not really available that modelling?

Mr GARDNER - We have a clear understanding of where the pinch points exist and where we are losing time in the network. Out of that, we have identified a list of priority initiatives to effectively prioritise bus flow, which we have shared with the Department of State Growth and with local government, around the works that would make a difference in terms of us improving our on-time running.

Ms WEBB - I accept that, and they sound like sensible and likely to be effective measures, but I am just wondering whether there is a quantified element to that?

Ms MORSE - I guess I would add that we have certainly modelled what those potential time savings look like. I think we would highlight that the network is dynamic so it is not necessarily an absolute single answer. The other thing I would highlight to the committee is that we have over 1600 bus movements a day in Hobart; we operate about 1650 services a week day in Hobart at the moment.

Savings of literally seconds are very significant to us over the course of the day. Saving a minute or two here and there adds up dramatically because of the volume of movements we manage. The impact at those locations would be significant, in the same way that a delay here can have a very big ripple effect in the network because it is so highly interconnected. Staying on time somewhere can avert those delays occurring. Our reliability is seasonal. We struggle more for time at the back-to-school peak than we do at any other time of the year. So the impact of savings at that time of the year would also be heightened, were they to be realised. It is not an absolute number but the saving potential is absolutely there.

Ms HOWLETT - Thanks, Chair, my question has been answered.

CHAIR - I am just interested in your relationship with local government. You say in your submission -

Regrettably, Metro understands that local governments have not been as responsive. Due to objections from business owners, proposals to remove parking spaces have been rejected, and proposals including allocating dedicated road space ...

Would you like to elaborate on that? We have had correspondence from local government where they have said they have actually done work in those areas for you.

Mr GARDNER - First, I would say that over the long haul and across the broad spread we have very good relationship with local government. We have to work with 18 local government areas across the state so that is quite an ongoing task to do that. Our comments related specifically to the Greater Hobart area, and were relevant to a couple of specific pieces of work that were completed. The Hobart traffic congestion was the report, 'Hobart Traffic Analysis', which was undertaken by the Department of State Growth in 2016. It had a number of specific recommendations in it, a number of which were rejected by the City of Hobart, largely on the basis of the impact on business frontage.

PUBLIC

The other report is the 'Main Road Transit Corridor Plan', which was undertaken and developed in 2012. It made recommendations and proposed a number of changes to the flow through Main Road and that specifically had impact on parking around bus stop location and design and bus prioritisation at lights. Again, those proposals were fairly roundly rejected by council on the basis of the impact on businesses through that main corridor, despite the fact that evidence from research locally, nationally and globally strongly points to the fact that economic growth - and economic activity - is driven by connectivity and movement of people, not car parking. The people who catch public transport and use public transport stay longer in the precincts that they travel to and they spend more. That is what we were specifically referencing.

CHAIR - On the bus mall in Hobart, with Metro growing, its clients are growing at a fair percentage. What do you see the future of the bus mall? Do you see that is going to be adequate in the future or do you believe it will have to be moved to another site?

Mr GARDNER - Clearly, with the growth projections and the amount of traffic and movement and population in and around Hobart and the redevelopment of central Hobart, if you take into consideration Macquarie Point, there needs to be further consideration about how buses move, how people interchange in central Hobart and through Macquarie Point, and the way that links together. That could be quite considerably reconfigured.

CHAIR - Do you see Macquarie Point as a bus centre?

Mr GARDNER - Certainly, Macquarie Point is integral to the flow of buses. There is still a need for an interchange within the CBD. So, it is not about shifting out to Macquarie Point but Macquarie Point is integral and it creates a real opportunity to redesign the flow of the public transport movement through the city. It is important for us that we seek to be actively engaged at all times in the future development of bus interchange in the city, be it the movement through Macquarie Point and then interchange into the city.

Mr VALENTINE - Just on that, you are talking interchange with third party services as well? At the moment that does not happen in the city effectively, does it?

Mr GARDNER - Yes, it does.

Mr VALENTINE - Whereabouts?

Mr GARDNER - In the city at the moment, a number of bus operators run into that interchange. We are only one of probably four.

Ms MORSE - Certainly with the changes to southern bus services which took effect in January of this year.

Mr VALENTINE - Sorry, I wasn't aware of that.

Ms MORSE - They provide for greater interoperability of operators and services. Where Metro was effectively the sole of the central interchange up until January, we now share that space quite actively with O'Driscolls and Tassielink.

Mr VALENTINE - The likes of Tassielink and Redline?

PUBLIC

Ms MORSE - Correct. Certainly in that space, given we have vacated some stops in the interchange over the last two years to accommodate building, we have been very stretched. The Government is completing a substantial and significant piece of work of looking for a future trajectory for a transit centre. That location has provided interchange for public transport in Hobart for a significant period; it was the key interchange location for trolley buses and for trams. We certainly see our footprint in the centre of the CBD as enormously significant to our business and our passengers, but we appreciate that as passenger transport grows, the adequacy of that footprint is likely to be challenged. Our future trajectory will be welcomed by our business.

Ms WEBB - I just wanted to zero in a little bit more and come back to that issue of your capacity, knowing that it's not your decision what your capacity is and that decision is held elsewhere, for information that you can provide. How much has your capacity increased, say, over the past five years in number of buses and therefore ability to carry people?

Mr GARDNER - In the past five years? Megan?

Ms MORSE - It hasn't increased at all. We are operating a fleet that hasn't changed in size for a number of years.

Ms WEBB - Your fleet number hasn't changed for five years across the time you have been growing in double digits? And you have been able to accommodate some of that growth through the routes and the timetables, that sort of thing; however, you haven't been given greater capacity? Looking ahead, is there any planned increase to your capacity across the next five years on current financing of your service?

Ms MORSE - As we sit here today, there isn't a locked-in plan. Certainly, as Tim has described, we are advocating for identifying areas in our network where we are currently experiencing capacity constraint and what the future pathway for that looks like. Whether that is around higher capacity vehicles, additional vehicles, additional services, there are obviously a range of ways you can introduce more capacity.

Ms WEBB - But at a certain point, without more buses, you are going to be constrained as to what you can accommodate in terms of growth.

Ms MORSE - In particular times of the day and in particular locations.

Ms WEBB - On that, because you mentioned earlier that there are issues around servicing a fleet that can meet demand at peak times but then sits potentially idle in other parts, surely that scenario is a given in a public transport system?

Ms MORSE - It's a structural element of our business.

Ms WEBB - From other jurisdictions and all over, we would say that's a given, that in order to meet peak demand, you will have idle capacity at other times. So that's not something we would consider to be unusual or particularly problematic in planning going forward.

Mr GARDNER - It's the nature of the business. We can't argue with that, but it is about extent and at the end of the day, we have limited capital. The government has limited capital to apply; we have to apply it in the smartest way we can, and we have to pull every lever we can to

PUBLIC

get the best use of those assets. To just keep squeezing stuff into peak, we can do it. The buses can be bought. If we can get prioritisation, we can keep moving. It's an important part of it, but we constantly have to look also at everything we can do, including user behaviour and driving changes so we are not just increasing this capital investment into these two short periods of the day.

CHAIR - What percentage of your fleet would be idle during the off-peak?

Ms MORSE - I'd have to come back to you with an exact number, but certainly it would be a 30 to 40 percent reduction in vehicle utilisation during the middle of the day, in comparison to the morning or the afternoon, acknowledging that our afternoon peak is longer. School finishes earlier than work does, so our evening peak is extended. In the period between about 9.30 a.m. and about 2.30 p.m. we have significantly fewer vehicles in service than we do during the morning and afternoon.

Mr VALENTINE - There are two issues. People talk all the time about Metro putting on smaller buses to cover greater areas. Can you address that issue? I worked with Metro for four years and I know what the answer is likely to be, but I just want you to put on the record the issue of smaller buses versus larger buses and some of the complications with that.

Mr GARDNER - Two fundamental things: mass transit works on concentrating services on high-priority routes at high frequency. When you look at the cost of operating the vehicles, 70 per cent of that is labour, so it becomes the more you decrease the capacity of each vehicle, the more inefficient that becomes and the higher the cost per person on that bus. There are various modes of transport for people moving around in our business, which is a mass transit business. The value for our customers is derived from getting an optimum larger size that we can move through those busier corridors and those main routes as frequently as possible.

Mr VALENTINE - The other aspect was the 100 buses that are being built. Do they have capacity to carry bikes as well, perhaps vertically stored in the luggage area?

Mr GARDNER - No, there is nothing designed at the moment for bikes on buses. Ultimately, I think it would be great if we could accommodate that, in principle, but as Megan outlined earlier there are so many hurdles in relation to bus design, workplace safety -

Ms SIEJKA - On the mainland, there are public transport options that do that, though.

Mr GARDNER - I understand they do exist; they don't exist here.

Ms SIEJKA - There must be learnings from interstate as well.

Mr VALENTINE - I am thinking about this; you obviously have spaces for wheelchairs, but not every bus is going to be carrying a wheelchair. If it's possible, couldn't that space, if it's not being taken up by wheelchairs, for instance, be used for vertical storage of bicycles? There may not be a large impost in creating that opportunity.

MR GARDNER - There maybe ways of dealing with that, Rob, but it's not currently in the design of our vehicles.

PUBLIC

Ms WEBB - Given the role of this inquiry, and there is so much talk going on in other spaces around this topic, what would you like to see best delivered from this inquiry that might support your efforts going forward?

Mr GARDNER - I think the most important thing for our business, from feedback from our customers, is the service reliability - getting to places on time is the most important thing. We would seek support from this committee prioritising expenditure at a state and local government level on bus prioritisation.

CHAIR - Any closing comments?

Mr GARDNER - No, it's all good.

CHAIR - Thanks very much for making yourself available today and we appreciate your submission.

Mr GARDNER - Thank you for the opportunity.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Mr DAVID ALLINGHAM, MANAGER DEVELOPMENT SERVICES, BRIGHTON COUNCIL, WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Thank you, David, and welcome to the hearings here today;, the information for the witness statement is there if you want to read that. All evidence taken in this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege, but outside of the parliament you might not be afforded that privilege. The evidence is being recorded and we are being broadcast. If there is any evidence you would like to give in camera, we could accommodate that for you. I will let you give a short overview and the committee can ask questions. We have allocated 30 minutes for you today.

Mr ALLINGHAM - I am from Brighton Council. I am the manager of development services in the planning department. We are looking at a Brighton context here. Brighton is one of the key growth areas for Greater Hobart - it is estimated we will have another 5700 people in Brighton by 2042. There is a significant amount of growth there. It is an area that is heavily reliant on cars at the moment, due to low density, and a lot of social housing as well. As I pointed out, 82 per cent of the people who work in Brighton actually commute to Glenorchy and Hobart to work. I do not have the figures of how many of those are in a private car or public transport.

Ms SIEJKA - I know you are doing your overview, but do you know how much of the Brighton community is employed? What is that workforce overall?

Ms HOWLETT - Municipality, not Brighton community.

Ms SIEJKA - Yes, sorry, yes.

Mr ALLINGHAM - It varies between the suburbs. In the Bridgewater and Gagebrook area you have unemployment rates of 35 per cent.

Ms SIEJKA - No overall number?

Mr ALLINGHAM - Not off the top of my head, sorry. We are obviously looking to the future as far as growth and greenfield development, and are transitioning into the Tasmanian Planning Scheme at the moment. What we have learned from that is there was not a lot of strategy behind it, and we think there is a need for an urgent review of the Southern Tasmanian Regional Land Use Strategy. The last version was done in 2012. Tasmania - and Hobart - was a very different place in 2012. It has boomed since then, and the traffic congestion issues have become more serious.

Mr VALENTINE - In 2011, I think, and then they did a slight review.

Mr ALLINGHAM - What we would be looking at is where people are going to settle across greater Hobart in future, employment nodes,] how people are going to move around and what infrastructure is needed for that. We think that is critical.

As we move to the Tasmanian Planning Scheme, we currently have density provisions in the general residential zone - which is a zone that is used most widely - that encourages greater, higher densities around public transport nodes, open space, commercial areas and such. That has gone from the Tasmanian Planning Scheme framework, and there is nothing in there about the need to actually engage with public transport operators.

PUBLIC

For example, in Victoria, Public Transport Victoria is a referral authority, and if you have more than 50 lots in a subdivision, you have to refer to them. There is also a requirement that all new lots - or 90 per cent of them - need to be within 400 metres of public transport stock and greenfield developments. We do not have anything like that in Tasmania.

I have also put in some other ideas. Light rail could really transform the Brighton area. We have done a Brighton structure plan that looks at the area of Old Main Road in Bridgewater, where the new McDonald's is, which is a bit desolate at the moment. In the structure plan the consultants did a sketch of what that place could look like as a mixed-use, medium-density development if public transport stopped running there. We also have the Brighton industrial hub, which is obviously going to be a big employer in the future, on that rail - and there is also potential for a stop in Brighton not too far from the town centre. I think at the very least that corridor needs to be protected, but any new plan for utilising that corridor needs to include Brighton, if not now, then in the future as a future stage.

Things like trialling ferries on the Derwent may or may not work, but are really important. Bicycle networks, planning for people rather than cars first - something like the 'streets code' in the planning scheme - would be very useful.

One of the other things I've put in our submission is the need for a public transport map that actually takes in all of Greater Hobart, so that people can easily understand how to get around the whole of Greater Hobart, rather than get to your bus stop and having a single route.

I remember from my studies that if you can't put it on one map, it doesn't work. That was what we were told.

Mr VALENTINE - Why, because people give up trying to understand it?

Mr ALLINGHAM - Yes, but I think it is also when the actual design hasn't been properly thought out so it's all integrated - with a few ideas around disincentives and things like that, and parking, which is probably outside Brighton's area.

Ms HOWLETT - Yesterday the mayors of Glenorchy, Hobart and Kingborough mentioned that they wanted changes to the existing Bridgewater Bridge, rather than building a new bridge. Considering, as you mentioned, we have one of the fastest growing municipalities in the state, how important is a new bridge for commuters and transport operators?

Mr ALLINGHAM - I think a new bridge to replace the Bridgewater Bridge is probably necessary. It is coming to the end of its life, and there are faulty parts on the bridge, so it will need to be done anyway. It will need to be designed so that the rail corridor is still included, and it probably needs to become dual lane as well.

Mr VALENTINE - Sorry, do you mean four lanes?

Mr ALLINGHAM - Yes, and with greater consideration for pedestrians and cyclists to be able to use it as well.

CHAIR - Does the new bridge have pedestrian access and a cycle lane?

PUBLIC

Mr ALLINGHAM - We are not 100 per cent sure what the design is at the moment.

Ms HOWLETT - They are still in consultation.

Mr ALLINGHAM - Yes, we were consulted on it many years ago, but we have not seen any plan. Based on the feedback they had from Infrastructure Australia and other places, there is another movement to do some more design. We are getting inquiries that they are looking at doing the bore holes, to do the geotech. It is obviously a big part of the final design, so we would expect some changes and hopefully be consulted.

Ms HOWLETT - I spent a lot of time in the electorate in Brighton and Bagdad et cetera, and the community definitely is in favour, as I am, of a new Bridgewater bridge.

Mr ALLINGHAM - Yes, absolutely.

Ms HOWLETT - And especially transport operators as well.

Mr ALLINGHAM - Yes, that is one of the things we get - 'When is the new bridge coming?'

Ms WEBB - I will pick up on one bit to clarify, too, because the mayors from yesterday aren't here to clarify themselves. My understanding was that those mayors were not so much opposed to a new bridge; they were interested in a new bridge that best fitted the variety of needs - including, as you've just talked about, the need to preserve a rail corridor across it. They pointed to the Infrastructure Australia report that provided a range of options that might meet different needs. Have you looked at that Infrastructure Australia report, and does Brighton Council have a view on its findings?

Mr ALLINGHAM - No, we haven't looked at it in any detail. We are waiting for the next round of consultation. We understand there is probably going to be a redesign. We think that the Bridgewater Bridge is necessary, but the design could be tweaked to be a better bang for your buck.

Ms WEBB - I think that is the phrase the Mayor of Glenorchy used yesterday.

Ms HOWLETT - From the notes I have, it was making changes to the existing bridge, not building a new one, from the mayor's comments yesterday.

Mr VALENTINE - Just with respect to the comment on the planning scheme, you are saying that certain aspects will be lost when the new statewide planning scheme comes into play? Can't you put up a local provision schedule to accommodate the issue you are talking about, so you do get to keep some decision-making?

Mr ALLINGHAM - It's a tricky one. My understanding is that to move away from the zones we have been provided under the State Planning Provisions - SPPs - and to put in extra standards that haven't been addressed under that is unlikely to be well received. These are the standards that have been given for these zones, and just don't touch these zones.

Mr VALENTINE - I was under the impression that councils could put forward Local Provision Schedules, if they were concerned enough about certain aspects of the scheme. They

PUBLIC

could actually put in LPSs that would preserve some of those aspects you are currently working with.

I guess that is a discussion for another day, if you are saying you don't think that is the case.

Mr ALLINGHAM - I mean, we can obviously master-plan larger areas and put in different things. My experience, we did one. There is an area between Old Beach and Gagebrook called Tivoli Green, where we have put forward lots down to 300 square metres around an open space area, and we did that on top of the general residential zone.

That was a two-and-a-half-year battle with legal submissions and things like that. It is harder than possibly it should be.

Mr VALENTINE - I know the council is keen on having rail out to its municipality, and I can fully understand that, as another transport option, but have you done any surveying of your own community with regard to who might use rail?

Mr ALLINGHAM - We have surveyed the community in Brighton when we did our structure planning work. There was definitely some enthusiasm for being able to use a rail system if it was there.

Mr VALENTINE - Great numbers, or small numbers of people?

Mr ALLINGHAM - Unfortunately it's not a very engaged community when it comes to these larger, high-level things. It is always hard to engage with those things.

The best responses we got were when we stood out the front of the supermarket and asked people about certain aspects, and that is when things like the Bridgewater Bridge came up. Rail was important, but more frequent buses among the suburbs was probably the most frequent one that came up.

Ms SIEJKA - In your overview, you mentioned that for the other jurisdictions in their planning frameworks there is a requirement that new developments in some areas need to be within 400 metres of public transport. Is that correct?

Mr ALLINGHAM - Yes, that's right.

Ms SIEJKA - Can you talk a bit more about that, just in terms of a planning perspective? What that might mean in Brighton or other areas? I don't mind if it is really general. I am just curious about it.

Mr ALLINGHAM - Under the Victorian Planning Scheme, for instance, they have requirements that say if you are building a new development with 50 lots or greater, 90 per cent of those lots need to be within 400 metres of a bus stop.

Ms SIEJKA - How much, sorry? What number of houses did you say need to be within that?

Mr ALLINGHAM - Sorry, 90 per cent of all houses. Also, what they have is a mechanism to refer that development through to the public transport operator so they are aware of the need to

PUBLIC

extend their network. They provide comments on things like the location of bus stops and how roads should be designed to accommodate buses and things like that. We don't have that mechanism. We can do it but there is no requirement for us to do it.

Ms SIEJKA - With Brighton growing, there would be a number of areas that would be some way from bus stops to an extent, like all regional areas.

Mr VALENTINE - I think it's considered to be a walkable distance, 400 metres.

Mr ALLINGHAM - Yes. Last week, Kingborough Council organised the meeting between Metro, the Department of State Growth, all the councils and the planning policy units to discuss how we better engage with Metro and public transport planning. Actually, it was really interesting to get a better understanding of, I guess, Metro's resourcing, which seemed very under-resourced, and the disconnect between them and the Department of State Growth. It was quite jaw dropping how disconnected everyone was in the planning sphere when it came to planning for future growth.

Ms HOWLETT - David, you mentioned in your submission the retrofit of the Tasman Bridge and Bowen Bridge for improved pedestrian and cycle access. I am just curious how many people in your municipality, or what percentage, do you think would actually utilise the Bowen Bridge?

Mr ALLINGHAM - At a pedestrian and cycle -?

Ms HOWLETT - No, in a car form.

Mr ALLINGHAM - I would not have the stats, but it would be a lot. It would probably be over 50 per cent. It is the logical way to go if you're travelling to Glenorchy from Bridgewater, Old Beach, Gagebrook and Herdsmans Cove; otherwise you are going back the other way.

CHAIR - Anybody going to Incat or anywhere like that?

Ms SIEJKA - Nyrstar.

Mr ALLINGHAM - So it is an easy journey into Glenorchy; you have the new interchange there, which makes it easier as well.

Mr VALENTINE - I am interested to know: the freight hub is a big thing for Brighton and a very positive thing for a lot of people moving freight, but it does put a lot of trucks onto the Brooker going into Hobart. Has there been any discussion about the impact of those trucks that are actually going south on your municipality? Do you have a position on whether that freight ought to be going by rail because of its impact on congestion in Hobart itself?

Quite clearly, the number of truck movements has an impact, and they are not always outside peak periods. Have you had any discussion on that from your council's perspective?

Mr ALLINGHAM - Not a huge amount, no.

Mr VALENTINE - How it impacts your residents?

PUBLIC

Mr ALLINGHAM - No, the trucks very much stick to the major freight corridors. I guess early on quite a lot of trucks were using the service stations in Brighton, but they have now established a couple of those out in the industrial estates so that is not an issue, but they generally are sticking to the - .

Mr VALENTINE - So noise is not a great factor with engine braking and all those sorts of things?

Mr ALLINGHAM - No, not that we are getting feedback.

Mr VALENTINE - No, that is fair enough. Okay. Thanks for that.

CHAIR - I would just like to touch on your submission where you refer to a ferry from Bridgewater or Brighton to Hobart. It sounds like a good idea to me because you are in protected waters if you are coming from Blackmans Bay or South Arm or somewhere where you are in more open waters, whereas in the Derwent you are pretty well protected.

Mr VALENTINE - It can be rough.

CHAIR - Not as rough as Storm Bay or even coming out of the Kingston-Blackmans Bay area. Has anybody ever done any work on that? Has it ever been - ?

MR ALLINGHAM - As in whether it is likely to stack up?

CHAIR - Yes.

Mr ALLINGHAM - No, I do not think so. We have redone a jetty in Old Beach and when we designed it, we made it so - I think the option was put forward by Incat with those little ferries - so it could accommodate something like that. As far as whether it would actually work financially, we have not done any work on that.

Ms HOWLETT - Something that Madeleine Ogilvie commented in her submission also yesterday about trialling ferries up and down the Derwent.

CHAIR - You have a good number of people up there who travel into Hobart and, as I said, it is reasonably protected waters.

Ms WEBB - It would need to be a reasonably priced service given the demographic of the community as well.

CHAIR - Because of your traffic issues coming in, I thought, yes.

Mr VALENTINE - You need a good origin-destination survey, I expect, where people are actually travelling to. Quite clearly, if they are travelling to Glenorchy, they are not going to catch a ferry, they are going to catch a bus.

CHAIR - That's right. Thank you, David for your time today and for your submission. We have another few days of hearings.

Mr ALLINGHAM - Thank you very much.

PUBLIC

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Mr ROB JOHN NOLAN WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Welcome to the public hearing of the Legislative Council Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion. We are being broadcast today. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege, but outside of the parliament that privilege may not be afforded. A copy of the information for witnesses statement is there for you to read. The evidence you present is being recorded and the *Hansard* version will be available on our website at a later date. By way of introduction, the procedure we will follow today is to let you speak to your submission and then the members can ask questions. We have allowed 30 minutes for today's hearing. If there is anything you would like to put to us in camera, please let us know.

Mr NOLAN - Chair and select committee members, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you here to today and particularly the opportunity to provide a submission. I appear as a person not representing any particular group or organisation. I do have a short statement I will read.

In the context of this inquiry, traffic congestion is a wicked problem that I contend by definition is a problem that cannot be fixed or 'congestion-busted' except for perhaps short-term measures. The problem is social and cultural more than technical, and is difficult or impossible to fix because of:

- incomplete or contradictory knowledge - and the submissions you have received are probably evidence of contrary knowledge
- the number of people and opinions involved in the issue around travel and traffic, which is also evident in the submissions received
- the large economic burden if we are to make major infrastructure changes - and there is reference to the perennial Hobart western bypass or tunnel or northside freeway et cetera, and there has been reference to a cost of \$1.5 billion in Tony Denne's solution
- the interrelated nature of these problems with other problems; I contend this is the major required understanding for the select committee.

That is the sense of what I describe, or people have described, as the wicked problem. Of course, you know all that because otherwise, if solutions to traffic congestion were readily found, there would not be a need for this inquiry.

My submission raises 14 interrelated principles that cut across the select committee's terms of reference, and which I invite the committee to examine and test the veracity of the principles through your deliberations.

My primary point in the 14 principles is not to view active travel - walking, cycling and public transport - only through the lens of reducing congestion. Much more needs to be done to provide safe and attractive travel options in our communities - that is, our communities across the metropolitan area, particularly those who currently rely on others for their transport requirements. Those who rely on others for their transport requirements are a significant proportion of the population, perhaps the major proportion of the population. In my submission I refer to the

PUBLIC

young, the elderly, the disadvantaged, the poor, and so it goes. On my estimate, probably greater than 50 per cent of the population rely on someone else for their travel needs. That may be a partner, a parent or grandparent, public transport, taxi et cetera. We have a big cohort of people who are perhaps not drivers but depend upon finding some way to satisfy their travel needs.

Along the way, active travel can assist in ameliorating traffic congestion and contribute to a more liveable and resilient city. Liveability and resilience can lead to improved wellbeing and health outcomes - I think those matters have been well documented - and better handle shocks from such things as fuel price hikes or rationing. I think it's pretty evident that we in Australia don't have a big margin of fuel stocks so fuel price hikes and rationing is probably ever present. Liveability and resilience can also reduce the urban heat island effect and respond to more extreme weather events from climate change.

There are some questions or challenges relating to improving travel: how much is travel the constraining factor in accessing jobs for those on low incomes? Are the poorest people in the community only able to find housing in locations most poorly serviced for active travel, and should the working poor household need two or more cars to access jobs and services? I think the Metro submission referred to some \$14 000 as the annual cost to run two cars.

As cities grow, congestion is inevitable for certain times of the day and in certain places. As a question, what do we want? There are examples around where I'd suggest the traffic congestion has been busted. We had the fortune of visiting Fairbanks in Alaska - a different place, different environment and everything else, but it certainly appeared to be a parking lot looking for a city. Los Angeles and similar places are now looking to improve and provide public transport. I think it's the universal request of those communities now.

Take the main roads of Hobart. For much of the day, except if there is a crash, the roads carry relatively light traffic. As I said in my initial submission, my statements are essentially from observation and what I have learnt along the way in my career.

Also, congestion can lead to changed travel behaviour. That's something that, in a sense, sorts itself out if the supporting structures are there to allow that to be sorted out. That's where I start talking about active travel. Congestion can lead to changed travel behaviour and a reshuffle of the urban land use and development, particularly in how the community responds to the benefits from investment in public infrastructure, both social and physical.

A key point I want to make is that successful cities have comprehensive infrastructure for active travel. Interestingly, the general public view appears to be that arguments for increased use and supply of public transport is mostly heard in the context of congestion. Public surveys support better public transport, but for everyone else. Public transport is about travel equity. The last major Metro transport study, I believe, was the Derwent Regional Transportation Study - DRTS - in 1979. That study put the argument that public transport was mainly for schoolkids and the elderly - perhaps not much has changed - and the supply of public transport at peak times was an avoidable cost. Hopefully, we now have a better view of funding of public transport, or we will certainly in the future.

When it comes to land use, the better the road system, the more dispersed land use, which adds to the traffic congestion. It is becoming increasingly difficult to avoid separate trips to purchase different items. If you now want to find stationery, there's Officeworks and probably not

PUBLIC

much else. Similarly, for anything of a building nature, you need to go to Glenorchy or Derwent Park. Each place is separate, each place has its own parking in front, and so it goes.

We are seeing, for instance, Spotlight moving out of the city to Glenorchy. Personally, my wife now will have to go to the Glenorchy rather than the CBD and miss out on the opportunities that gather from going to the CBD and doing many trips at the same time.

Those sorts of things are how we respond and how the community and how businesses respond to the traffic and the opportunities provided.

There we have street edge parking becoming the dominant feature in the streetscape and each service being accessed involves a vehicle movement. To access a lot of businesses and opportunities now, particularly if you're not driving a car, you have to venture across a large car park just to get to the business and that's not always an overly pleasant but maybe a minor inconvenience in your day.

Those urban areas that consolidate and aggregate parking - the Hobart CBD, central Glenorchy, Bellerive - provide a much better opportunity to access a number of things at the same time rather than doing all these separate trips, each one adding to the congestion.

Looking at active travel, there are too many examples of walking and bike riding space being pinched for car travel, while the provision for walking or bike riding can't be shoehorned into the road reservation. One of my principal sayings is that there are multiple demands on road reservations and perhaps more could be shared than we currently do.

As I said in my submission, I did some work for the Heart Foundation, which is on the corner of Murray and Brisbane streets. The corner of Murray and Brisbane streets essentially is cut off. For some reason, the people walking into the CBD congregate on that corner which has the least amount of space. You have schoolkids going up to St Mary's, you have kids walking across there and so on but because of corner rounding - that corner is not a very pleasant space to be in.

Ms SIEJKA - Sorry, that was Murray and Brisbane streets?

Mr NOLAN - Yes. That's not atypical where we've made it more difficult to walk and if not, ride.

We are still developing streets in new subdivisions with little or no footpaths, maybe only on one side of the road. Footpaths that are too narrow to walk alongside whoever you're walking with, to push a pram, to walk the dog. We are losing laneways and shortcuts and so on. We're eating into and reducing the travel opportunities for a whole range of active travel.

We have traffic signs, poles and other paraphernalia that have been placed in the walking space. Most of your traffic signs and your poles and parking meters - they're not there anymore, I don't think - and so it goes. They are always in your walking space, not your roadway, obviously, and where footpaths and most that are exempt are available for bike riding too. That space is becoming even more critical and congested and contested by people walking, riding et cetera. That's a whole lot of new issues that are good to see but it also means] we are not being equitable in terms of how we allocate space, particularly in more urban areas.

Turning to the journey to school trips, for which there exist many issues, some issues relate to perceived or real unsafe walking and riding spaces to out-of-area travel to preferred schools.

PUBLIC

I am not sure whether it has been mentioned in your inquiry, but I believe the new Port Sorell Primary School, in terms of its location, made provision for cycling, so that many more kids would be cycling and walking. In the initial stages, there was under-provision of bike racks and so on at the school.

I caught a bit of an ABC interview, via computer, of a lady driving from Kingston. If I understand it correctly, it was along the lines of she is caught up in the traffic. She has to get to work and the kids to school. She can't enrol her kids at local schools because they won't take the entry to the school before 8.30 a.m.

Ms SIEJKA - Yes, I did see that.

Mr NOLAN - I found that really quite fascinating. Well, it was pretty horrible. If the preference is for your local schools - and there is a lot going for that - and you can't take up that opportunity because of that difficulty between managing getting to work and not being able to drop the kids earlier than might otherwise be the case.

Mr VALENTINE - Called responsibility, I think.

Mr NOLAN - Thank you.

I will make the statement, I suppose more of a question: are we to see funds for major road construction diverted from schools and hospitals to reduce traffic congestion caused by the journey to school? That arises from the experience that during school holidays there doesn't seem to be a traffic problem. I don't know what happens there. Everyone goes on holidays or in fact the 5 per cent, 20 per cent or whatever percent of the problem is, in fact, related to the journey to school.

Ms SIEJKA - It can be quite extreme though. I know there is a school on the Eastern Shore where the school doesn't allow the kids to walk because they have to get to the other side of a highway. So, walking and riding is considered too dangerous. Real extremes of those sorts of planning.

Mr NOLAN - So often you will find that there aren't the footpaths because of that.

Our kids went to Tarooma High. They weren't allowed to ride. I don't know what the situation is now.

Mr VALENTINE - They weren't allowed to ride?

Mr NOLAN - That was a few years ago now. I don't know what the situation is now. It was really quite a number of years ago.

I can't remember it all. It was not encouraged.

I would like to make the case that, for instance, we have a good, modern bus service. All the arguments seem to be on the bus service. But often the problem is not the bus service, per se, it is what might be referred to 'the last mile' or getting to the bus stop.

PUBLIC

There may not be a footpath to do that; no safe environment for that to happen. Our footpaths are often hard up against the kerb, so there is no barrier, what we used to call a nature strip, to provide that bit of separation.

These sorts of things, I put to you, contribute to the congestion we are experiencing. When looking at traffic congestion, congestion of itself can't be divorced from factors that create the congestion. The response to congestion will determine what we want the city to become.

Mr Chair, it can be readily seen that there are interrelated issues of travel, land use and social, cultural and income factors underlying Hobart's traffic congestion. Ideally, this select committee has the evidence and capacity to articulate these factors, and the necessary responses to improve travel accessibility across the metropolitan area.

I thank you for allowing me that time to provide that statement.

Ms WEBB - Thanks a lot for that. I really liked the focus in your submission around travel equity. It was something that came up a couple of times yesterday.

On that, and picking up on the point you made around public transport and the treatment of that as essential infrastructure, as opposed to a subsidised arrangement. Could you talk a little bit more about that? Perhaps describe how we might treat our public transport system differently if we were to have a different mindset?

Mr NOLAN - Blimey.

Ms WEBB - Too many elements?

Mr NOLAN - I am trying to piece together all of that.

Ms WEBB - Just expand on that idea a little bit.

Mr NOLAN - My construct here is that if more people use public transport, it does not necessarily solve the congestion problem, because it just provides space for other people to drive, so there is that aspect.

There is the aspect about the journey, and the ability to get to the bus stops. I was driving down the Channel Highway past the intersection of Howden Road, and there was a lady in a concrete bunker waiting for a bus. I do not know how long she had been waiting, but there were no footpaths to get to this concrete bunker of a bus stop, the rain was pouring down, and I thought 'My goodness, why would anyone travel by public transport if they had a choice?' Often there is no choice.

The issue of subsidy is an interesting one. Most of the argument is about how much subsidy should there be for public transport, and can we afford that subsidy and so on. But is there an alternative case, along the line which says that the more that people use public transport - and if that defers major road infrastructure requirements - then in fact people using public transport are in fact subsidising the -

Ms WEBB - The road users.

PUBLIC

Mr NOLAN - The road users. The cost of me driving here was not reflected in anything. The cost to me if I caught the bus here would be an upfront payment.

The costs of maintaining a road system in terms of police, ambulances and all that goes with managing traffic, and the number of people who work on that are not reflected in me really driving - but if I were catching a bus, it perhaps would be more so, because I would have to actually front up with the coins.

I am not sure whether I have answered your question, but it starts to expose some of the thinking I am putting to you.

Ms WEBB - Absolutely. I am interested in that idea of public transport as essential infrastructure, rather than subsidised. We sort of expect it to be able to pay for itself somehow, but why would we, if we were actually considering the full range of benefits derived from providing an excellent public transport system? I was looking at your comment and thinking along those lines myself.

The other question I want to put to you is - and there has been so much conversation about this, for a very long time - what do you see as the biggest barriers for actually progressing effective action on this issue, for us to think about as a committee?

Mr NOLAN - I had some thoughts along the lines of what the committee might like to suggest, and I may just read them out.

I think there needs to be a vision statement of what we are really after, and whether that vision statement can get to what might be the aspiration of what we want, and to change the paradigm around travel. That vision, that aspiration, should be reflected in a state policy under State Policies and Projects Act. There are the coming Tasmanian planning policies. They are a vehicle for starting to do some of this stuff, but Tasmanian planning policies will only apply to planning schemes and regional and [inaudible] strategies, whereas state policy binds the state and state agencies as well as councils in what they do, more so than what they direct other people to do.

Councils approving planning permit applications and so on is one aspect, but what the council does itself, or the state agency does itself, is a state policy; it provides a vehicle for doing that.

Ms WEBB - There is an accountability to it, isn't there?

Mr NOLAN - Congestion has been on the agenda for a long time. It must have been on the agenda before 1964, when they did the Wilbur Smith transportation study. What did Wilbur Smith do? He offered solutions to the congestion that, in essence, were not implemented. It was around 1985 when the 1964 transportation study required all these works to be in place. We have come to 2019 and the sky has not fallen in yet, so congestion has been with us for a long time.

I think there is some sense of a paradigm shift in the community already. A preference for some, anyway - maybe the cashed-up latte sippers in Salamanca - the much maligned who live close to the city, particularly where that provides a desirable environment for millennials and so on. I believe we are seeing less take-up of driver licences by young adults. How do we respond

PUBLIC

to independent travel needs for the ageing population? That is that vision the aspirational statement that needs to address.

In strategic terms, update the original strategy and get some more work around there, and also registry, the State Planning Provisions review for parking, introduce a street code review, ensure regulation of housing is appropriate at a greater density - those sorts of things are where one can go.

There are also matters around active travel and the inquiry deliverables; I do not whether we have got time to go through those.

Mr VALENTINE - I would like to come back to the premise of some of your arguments. For instance, we thought adding a two-lane highway to the current highway leading to the airport and Midway Point: would you suggest that by doing that you are simply encouraging more cars to use that space, and you end up pushing the congestion thing further out?

Rather than building the two-lane extra highway, it would be better off trying to encourage people to use public transport?

I read what you are saying here, and I wonder whether that is part of your premise. I know Andrew Holmes, who will be here later today, is basically suggesting the same thing. If we increase the infrastructure, the cars will come, but without the congestion happening, you do not get the opportunity to make those paradigm shifts.

Mr NOLAN - In some ways it would be fantastic not to have congestion. Sometimes it would be fantastic to be able to drive wherever you want without being constrained. I think that is an unrealistic premise to start to work to; it is good that we have the roads that we have.

How can we make better use of that rather than duplicating it and adding to it? Other technologies that would enable you to get to the airport quickly, for instance, might be a better solution than duplicating that highway. It comes down to what we can afford, and what is the best outcome in terms of increasing mobility for our population.

Mr VALENTINE - I guess the premise is that by creating the infrastructure, to actually accommodate more cars, it actually gets the cars to the city quicker and therefore the congestion happens quicker rather than over a longer period of time.

Mr NOLAN - I haven't seen anything which contests the view that adding more travel space doesn't increase the use of that space. That new infrastructure gets taken up very quickly so you are always chasing your tail.

Mr VALENTINE - And that's what you were saying about the buses, about getting people onto buses simply creates more space for other cars to fill.

Mr NOLAN - People just move into that space and if nothing else, my theory would be that you might reduce the peak of the congestion but you would still have the congestion because people would maximise the opportunity to reduce the amount of time involved. So, they won't leave earlier, they won't take alternative routes, they won't take some of the alternative choices.

PUBLIC

At the same time, I am saying we can do a lot more to improve the travel options for those who don't drive for a whole lot of the reasons I mentioned.

Mr VALENTINE - Adding extra highways may not necessarily be the best way as a society for us to move. Would you say that?

Mr NOLAN - Yes, that's my principal point. Those other options need to be explored before we put a lot of money into that heavier infrastructure. As I also said, how much of the state budget, or whatever budget it is, do we take out of schools and hospitals to deal with congestion that might be principally involved or created by kids getting to school?

To appreciate what those options are and get a better appreciation of the factors relating to travel and how one might improve the alternatives, you might have a better debate about whether that infrastructure is required or not.

Mr VALENTINE - It comes down to what sort of quality of life you are trying to build for the community at the end of the day?

Mr NOLAN - My submission is - let's not just talk about the CBD. We have communities across the metropolitan area and within those communities the liveability can be improved through better arrangements for active travel.

CHAIR - Thank you, Rob. Thank you for your submission and thank you for your time today. We appreciate you giving up your time today and your submission.

Mr NOLAN - Thank you, Chair, and I look forward to the recommendations from your inquiry.

Mr VALENTINE - It's truly a wicked problem though, isn't it?

Mr NOLAN - I wasn't sure whether to use that comment or not, but then I thought it, yes, because it is as I said - if it wasn't and it could be solved, you wouldn't need this inquiry.

Mr VALENTINE - Yes, that's right.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Mr TIM RUTHERFORD, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SOUTHERN FUTURES, AND **Mr JASON BYRNE**, ACTING DEAN, SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF TASMANIA WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Thank you. I will just let you know we are being broadcast today and if there is anything in your submission you would like to have in a closed session, we can accommodate that for you.

Welcome to the committee today on Greater Hobart traffic congestion. All evidence in this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege but you might not receive that privilege outside of the parliament. A copy of the information witness statement is there for you. The evidence you present is being recorded and the *Hansard* version will be later available on our website.

By way of introduction, we let you give an overview on your submission first - a 10-minute overview or roundabout, and then the committee will ask questions. We are looking for information specifically related to the terms of reference.

Mr RUTHERFORD - Thank you very much. By way of introduction, my role at the university is Executive Director of the Southern Campus Transformation so I am actually heading up the move from the Sandy Bay campus into the city. I am responsible for that. I will let Jason introduce himself in terms of his specific responsibilities.

Mr BYRNE - I am Professor of Human Geography and Planning at the University of Tasmania and currently acting head of the School of Technology, Environments and Design.

CHAIR - Thank you. Would you like to speak to your submission?

Mr RUTHERFORD - In terms of the submission, we welcome the opportunity, first and foremost, to make this submission. The move of the university from the Sandy Bay campus into the Hobart CBD is a significant move in terms of the number of people who will be moving into the Hobart CBD for work, study and accommodation over the next 10 to 15 years. It is something we are incredibly concerned about, not only for our staff and students, but also for the wider community and what we can do and the contributions we can also make in terms of how we deal with traffic congestion across the Hobart CBD.

A significant number of factors influence the congestion we currently see, both in terms of the infrastructure currently available but also the traffic choices or the transport choices that people make every day and the influence that then has on congestion. I think it is fair to say that the work we have done in terms of the university and looking at the choices our staff make - for example, at the Sandy Bay campus 75 per cent of our staff choose to drive to work every day. When we look at that in the Hobart CBD, it actually reduces to 50 per cent. Currently, we are also putting into place a significant number of measures in to actually provide choices for staff and for students to move away from reliance on motor vehicles as their primary mode of transportation.

The analysis we have done in terms of the impact of our move into the Hobart CBD is that because of removal of transport, and particularly car trips across the Hobart CBD, the move on the current volume is marginal - it is one or two minutes in peak periods.

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - Sorry, did I hear right? You have 75 per cent of staff who now drive to Sandy Bay. When you move to Hobart, it will be 50 per cent.

Mr RUTHERFORD - Of our staff in the city, so currently a third of our staff are based in the Hobart CBD today. Of the staff based in the Hobart CBD, only half chose to drive. So, with the transition into the Hobart CBD, we are expecting a significant reduction in the number of people choosing to drive because of the other transportation links that currently exist which are better for the Hobart CBD than for Sandy Bay.

Mr VALENTINE - Sorry, can I just get that statistic again? I know I just asked it. Are we talking about total university staff in the south, 75 per cent drive to work or 75 per cent of the staff working in Sandy Bay drive to work?

Mr RUTHERFORD - It is 75 per cent of the staff at Sandy Bay.

Mr VALENTINE - Right. At the present, staff in the Hobart CBD is 50 per cent.

Mr RUTHERFORD - Correct.

Mr VALENTINE - But when you move more to the CBD, that stays the same? I am just trying to get a before and after figure.

Mr RUTHERFORD - The easiest explanation for that is if we look at what happened as staff have moved into the Hobart CBD from the Sandy Bay campus for a number of our faculties over previous years. Those staff who chose to drive, at that time, to Sandy Bay chose alternative transport methods to get into the Hobart CBD.

Mr VALENTINE - Statistics?

Mr RUTHERFORD - It is statistics; I absolutely get it.

Ms WEBB - Effectively, you are expecting that one in three of the staff currently at Sandy Bay who will shift to the city will shift away from car to another form of transport?

Mr RUTHERFORD - Based on our current data. We are also putting in place a number of measures to reduce that even further if possible, and we will be putting those measures in place ahead of the move into the Hobart CBD.

That is starting to work more with public transport, but looking for more active transport methods for our staff as well.

Ms WEBB - We have derailed you from your opening statement, so I'm sure we will come back to pick up on those measures and talk about them more.

CHAIR - What the number of staff do you have at Sandy Bay?

Mr RUTHERFORD - That we currently have at Sandy Bay? We have 3000 staff out at Sandy Bay.

CHAIR - And in Hobart?

PUBLIC

Mr RUTHERFORD - We have 1200.

The things we are keen to see as a university - following on from my earlier statements and the questions that have been asked - are: continued investment in public transport, continued investment in active transport links across the city to deal with that congestion, and a number of other actions that support changes in behaviour of how people choose to get to and from the CBD. That's about creating networks and market signals in how that actually works in the Hobart CBD.

There are a number of challenges that we have in the public transport network, the practicality of how those networks operate on a day-to-day basis, and the ability of people to access them. I will let Jason comment a little bit more on that.

Mr BYRNE - Part of the university's strategy is based on global understanding of people's travel behaviour. When we look to other cities internationally that are a similar size to Hobart, with similar topography and similar climate, we see a higher level of investment in public transport. Wellington, New Zealand, for example, is a really good analogue city. It has bus, train and ferry options available in public transport. We can look at other analogue cities around the world, and see similar trends. The university is very keen to activate the capability and capacity that we have, both in staff and students, to take public transport.

Recently we have done a travel behaviour survey at the university. That travel behaviour survey gave us some really interesting numbers. This is not just about the fact that people own a car or have access to a car. What we can see is when public transport is available, people will often choose to use it. For example, of those students attending the Hobart CBD facilities of the university, 32 percent own a vehicle or have regular access to a vehicle. Three-quarters of those chose to use public transport instead of using their vehicle. There are indicators that behaviour change is viable and with the right investment and the right stimulus, we can achieve some significant changes in what we would call mode share - people, for example, choosing to walk, cycle or use public transport instead of a car.

Ms WEBB - What proportion of those students live in the CBD or immediate areas?

Mr BYRNE - That's a great question. I don't have that data available, I'm sorry.

Ms WEBB - Naturally they wouldn't use their car if they are just two blocks away, but they have their car for other purposes elsewhere.

Mr BYRNE - We have data that shows a lot of our students don't live immediately around the facilities. Many do, but also a fair proportion live further away from the university.

Ms SIEJKA - Student living has spread out further with costs as well. Everyone used to live nearby and now they are further away.

Mr RUTHERFORD - One of the things we are doing as a university is investing significantly in student accommodation. People would be aware of the student apartments that have been put up in the Hobart CBD. That's about developing mid-density accommodation through the Hobart CBD where people are in proximity to where they work, live and play, and that's actually reducing materially the use of cars as a proxy for congestion within the Hobart CBD. Less than 10 per cent of the people who live in those apartments have motor vehicles.

PUBLIC

Ms WEBB - Primarily, they are international students at the present time.

Mr RUTHERFORD - No, it is a mix.

Ms HOWLETT - Can I ask how many apartments you have?

Mr RUTHERFORD - Probably a better way to look at it would be beds rather than apartments. We have 450 beds on the corner of Elizabeth Street and Melville Street; there are another 440 currently going in on the opposite corner on Melville Street, and we have plans for another 450 to go into the city as well.

Ms HOWLETT - Are the current 450 that are there fully occupied?

Mr RUTHERFORD - Yes.

CHAIR - When you said Wellington, they have a three ways of travel - bus, ferry and train?

Mr RUTHERFORD - Yes.

Ms WEBB - Not just the variety of modes of travel, but we talked about investment in similar jurisdictions. Tasmania's investment in public transport - I believe this is still current - is the lowest per capita of any jurisdiction in our country. Is that something you looked at too, the level of investment when you considered our -

Mr BYRNE - Sorry, I don't have that data to hand, but we have amongst the highest levels of car dependence in Australia. We are extremely car-dependent. Our levels of public transport use have declined substantially post-World War II.

Mr RUTHERFORD - I will answer that - yes, we have the lowest rate of investment.

Ms WEBB - Significantly, compared to other states per capita.

Mr RUTHERFORD - Yes, materially different.

Ms HOWLETT - How many students do you have in total in the Hobart-Sandy Bay campus?

Mr RUTHERFORD - In Sandy Bay alone we will have 12 000 students.

Ms HOWLETT - And Hobart?

Mr RUTHERFORD - In Hobart we have 15 000 who attend on a day in, day out basis.

Mr BYRNE - If I may just add a little bit of detail from our travel survey, of the students attending the Hobart facilities, 71 per cent travelled by a sustainable mode. When we look at international students, it's 82 per cent of international students who opt for a sustainable mode of travel.

Ms HOWLETT - If I'm right, 12 000 students in Sandy Bay and 15 000 students in Hobart?

PUBLIC

Ms SIEJKA - Some would go across Hobart.

Mr RUTHERFORD - Yes. A number of students will go across both campuses at the moment. If we look at roughly, we will end up with about 15 000 students in the city.

CHAIR - Do you want to continue or have you finished your summary?

Mr RUTHERFORD - Given where we are at, I think the best use of the time is to answer the questions that you have.

Ms WEBB - I would like to talk a little bit more with you about the measures you are planning to put in place to help students and staff move away from their car use when they come into the CBD, what those measures are and what time frames you have in mind for them taking effect.

Mr RUTHERFORD - There are a number of those measures. We've already worked very closely with Metro around changing some of the bus routes and timetabling where we know there has been latent demand. That has been proven in the work that we've done with Metro in terms of the utilisation of those bus routes within those time frames.

Ms WEBB - Latent demand in the sense that they're not being currently used but could be used?

Mr RUTHERFORD - Yes.

Ms WEBB - Outside of peak times?

Mr RUTHERFORD - Yes. People who would have used that mode of transport had it been available, and that's what we've proven. We have done that work with Metro and there have been changes that Metro has made to its bus routes and the timetabling of those bus routes where we have high utilisation, and we will continue to do that.

Also, because we know where our staff live, as we move into the city we will be proactively working with staff around the other modes of transport available to them - what do these look like, and what are the economics of them as we make that transition into the city.

We are also undertaking a number of other actions to encourage staff to use other transport methods. One of those, which we are in mid-process, is offering ebike leasing for our staff. That is something no other employer in this state currently offers.

CHAIR - Leasing them?

Mr RUTHERFORD - Leasing, so it is different to bike share. This is one of the key things. People think this is a bike share scheme, but it is actually your bike. It is the same as leasing a car, but you lease a bike, and there are a number of benefits available for the user, and also for the employer. With ebikes, there has been an ATO ruling that no fringe benefits tax is payable, whereas FBT is payable on cars.

Ms HOWLETT - Do they have the option to purchase at the end of the lease?

PUBLIC

Mr RUTHERFORD - They do.

CHAIR - That is to staff? Not to students?

Mr RUTHERFORD - It is a salary sacrifice. It is a lease, in the same way as you would lease a motor vehicle, so it needs to be done through an employer to get the tax benefits for it.

Ms SIEJKA - That is a really interesting measure. Have you just begun that?

Mr RUTHERFORD - Yes, we are in the process of working through negotiations with the provider of that.

Ms WEBB - We will get to see how that goes in terms of uptake. Other than that, which is a lovely tangible example, the rest appears to be around information provision and encouragement, in terms of the measures to help people change behaviour?

Mr RUTHERFORD - Yes.

Prof. BYRNE - We might also add that the university has end-of-trip facilities available - bicycle racks, for example, which enable uptake, secure bicycle storage facilities, lockers, showers, change rooms and places for storing clothes.

Mr RUTHERFORD - As we move into the Hobart CBD campus, they will be materially expanded, in terms of both the quality and the availability of those end-of-trip facilities.

Ms WEBB - Of the one in three you expect to change their mode of transport away from cars -

Mr RUTHERFORD - We are hoping for more than one in three.

Ms WEBB - You are projecting, based on what you know from your staff in the CBD already, that 1000 out of the 3000 are going to make the move. What do you think the proportion will be who will take up public transport and active transport?

Mr RUTHERFORD - Of those staff who have already made the move into the city, that is actually the difference. Where they have moved to is public transport and active transport.

Ms WEBB - What I am asking is what proportion of each. I want to know what the impact is going to be on our bus system, and what the impact is going to be on our cycling and walking system, so we get a picture of what will be needed in each of those spaces, and what the flow-on effect would be.

Mr RUTHERFORD - I'll get Mr Byrne to look at the exact numbers.

Mr VALENTINE - What is this document again?

Prof. BYRNE - It is the University of Tasmania Travel Behaviour Survey for 2019. We have been conducting these travel behaviour surveys since 2013.

PUBLIC

Mr RUTHERFORD - I want to make sure I give you the right numbers. When we look at the use of those other methods in Sandy Bay - that is for students, not staff - for active transport methods, we have about 40 per cent who will use active transport methods, and 10 per cent who are using public transport.

Ms WEBB - Okay, we did not quite get to it, and it may be one you do not have the figure for, or could provide later, but what I am looking for is, of the 1000 staff that you expect to shift from cars to a different form of transport when you move them into the CBD to work, what proportion do you expect to be using buses, public transport as they shift? What proportion do you expect to shift to active transport?

Mr RUTHERFORD - On that basis, on what we have seen we would expect 20 per cent to move to public transport, and 80 per cent are moving to active transport. Based on what we have seen.

Ms WEBB - Of the staff who are already there in the CBD?

MR RUTHERFORD - Yes.

Ms WEBB - Of the 2000 staff who will be shifting their workplace into the CBD and who will remain car users, based on your current understanding of behaviour, for those 2000 cars, what proportion of car parking space will you be providing in your facilities to accommodate that, and what proportion of those 2000 cars will have to be accommodated other than in car parking provided by you?

Mr RUTHERFORD - We currently have 1100 car parks at Sandy Bay. We are in discussions through our planning process, and we still have to complete our master planning for the campus as to what we expect the car parking provision to be across the Hobart CBD. Our going-in position is that we would be expect to be providing parking for fewer cars, based on the usage we are projecting we would see, so we will see a decrease in the 1100 car parks that are actually provided.

Please understand that this is all very rough, and all subject to master planning, working with council, and also what is economic. We are roughly expecting that we will be providing circa 600 to 700 car parks in the city.

Ms WEBB - So the 2000 or so staff who come to work in the CBD will still be driving their cars in, based on what you are imagining. You will be providing parking for 600 to 700, approximately, so we would expect the other 1300 or so to have to park either in other parking facilities in the CBD or in surrounding areas?

Mr RUTHERFORD - What we will actually be looking to do is transition the majority of them, as much as we can, to other methods of transport. That is what I was saying earlier. Where we are for the city at the moment is 50 per cent. We actually want to see an improvement on that number, which we have seen year on year for our staff in there.

Ms WEBB - Have you got a modelled target?

PUBLIC

Mr RUTHERFORD -Not currently, because that is part of the process we have to go through with our master planning when we move into the city, and that is through working with Hobart City Council and working with State Growth on its transport modelling as well.

Prof. BYRNE - Can I also add that many of our staff journeys tend to be quite dispersed; their residential origins are different to student origins. This means that in a public transport network that does not provide sufficient coverage, it will be challenging to shift some of that load share, so the university submission, with some of this shift, is also contingent upon improving the public transport system.

Ms WEBB - How is that discussion going with the state government? You are probably already talking with Metro about some routes and things, but it is actually not their decision, it is State Growth's decision in terms of their capacity and their timetabling.

Mr RUTHERFORD - We have commenced conversations with the Department of State Growth around the modelling, both for transport and for traffic movements, but also then for public transport as well. We have just commenced those.

Ms WEBB - There are no commitments made yet, then, from that side?

Mr RUTHERFORD - Not yet.

Mr VALENTINE - I just want to clarify that statistic. That 1100 car spaces. Were they just staff car parks or were they -?

Mr RUTHERFORD - That's total car parking on Sandy Bay.

Mr VALENTINE - That changes the nature of your question, I think.

Ms WEBB - No, it doesn't actually, because we are still talking about the quantum of cars that will be coming in to the CBD driven by a staff member, which we still, based on current figures, expect to be 2000 of the 3000 who are shifting.

It doesn't matter how many parks they have now because they are parking in and around the campus in Sandy Bay.

Mr VALENTINE - For the record, the 1100 is for staff and students.

Ms WEBB - That's down at Sandy Bay.

Mr VALENTINE - I just want to clarify that.

Ms WEBB - In the city they are going to be provided, in rough figures, 600 to 700. So potentially, you have 1300 or so there who have to either use existing car parking facilities or park in and around the city.

Mr VALENTINE - Or find a different way of getting to work.

Ms WEBB - That is what you are talking about encouraging.

PUBLIC

Prof. BYRNE - Some of the options available to us include adopting some behaviour change practices we have seen in other employers around Australia, which have been highly successful.

For example, carpooling arrangements, incentivising carpooling, having flexible start and end times so that we are missing some of the peak congestion times on roads, and encouraging people to think about things like leasing ebikes. The first mile and last mile conundrum, we call it, which is the proximity to public transport stops.

If it is outside of walking distance, which is usually factored at about a 400-metre radius around the public transport stop, for healthy people. If it is outside that distance, people are less inclined to take public transport. Part of it is incentivising, giving options, for example, bicycle storage facilities near park and ride.

Ms HOWLETT - In relation to how you were saying they are successfully carpooling at other universities across Australia, are they utilising an app, an in-house app?

Mr RUTHERFORD - Yes. What we have seen in other cities around the world, not universities, is that there is a range of ridesharing tools and methods, where people can actually connect and enter into ridesharing arrangements with someone else who lives close to them who is going to the same place, effectively. We haven't seen that here in Hobart.

Ms HOWLETT - Do you know where they are doing that really well?

Mr RUTHERFORD - There is a whole range of places. I would like to come back and clarify where they are doing it on like-size cities, rather than for the big cities. But big cities that currently do it are the places you would expect. There is New York, Los Angeles, London. Those cities are all doing it really well. The technology is well and truly there. It is about us using and accessing that technology and getting people to make those links, and the decisions around how they are choosing to get to and from another location.

Mr VALENTINE - What about Otago in New Zealand? Do it figure in all of this?

Mr RUTHERFORD - Otago, I'm not aware whether they do it. Otago is a little bit smaller than Hobart. It is definitely a university city. It is a very good university city. I can't comment one way or the other on that specific point.

Prof. BYRNE - Some of the other cities we are looking at are analogues for Hobart and might help us better understand the options that are available. These include Halifax, Canada, which has a population of round about 430 000. We could look to slightly larger cities than that, mid-size cities like Copenhagen in Denmark where there are very well advanced measures in place to ensure people walk and cycle and use public transport.

We could also be looking at cities that are considerably colder than us, but round about the same population size, like Reykjavik, for example. They are switching to some of these innovative new technologies, like hydrogen-powered buses. They have load shares that are different to ours.

Mr VALENTINE - I was interested to know whether you are getting good entrée into the Hobart City Deal, being bought into the Chamber?

PUBLIC

Mr RUTHERFORD - Yes, we're on the reference group for the Hobart City Deal.

Mr VALENTINE - It is an interesting submission that you're making to us and some of the initiatives certainly look very interesting.

Mr RUTHERFORD - Yes. There's been some initial interest from both Hobart City Council and State Growth in terms of the things we are looking at. The ebike leasing is an easy example of that where they're interested in being able to leverage off what we're doing in those areas.

Mr VALENTINE - You were mentioning one-way streets as being an issue. Do you think that might be something or do you know that is definitely a problem?

Mr RUTHERFORD - It is always a sensitive one in Hobart when you start talking about one-way streets. When we look at the cities around the world that went to one-way streets at the same time as Hobart did in the post-war period -

Ms SIEJKA - Which city? Can you name any?

Mr RUTHERFORD - I will list them: Vancouver, Minneapolis, Louisville and Oklahoma City. They have all moved away from one-way streets. They've done that from a traffic perspective and also a social and economic perspective, and understanding the differences between those.

From a transport perspective, what they found was that it actually limited entrance and exit from a CBD because it limited the number of roads that people could travel on, the options. We've seen this in Hobart where it doesn't take much to happen in one street for everything to then back up because there's no other option.

Mr VALENTINE - It increases the options.

Mr RUTHERFORD - Yes. What it does is increases options.

On the social and economic front, those cities that have seen the activation of streets which were one-way streets have seen a significant uplift in the activation. Businesses are going into those streets and are providing people with more options and they're more likely to use them in a two-way fashion than when they were on a one-way street. It's not just a matter of congestion, it's a matter of social and economic activation as well.

Mr VALENTINE - Thanks for that.

CHAIR - Just on that, you are saying the one-way streets like Hobart has - Argyle, Campbell, Murray, Harrington et cetera -

Mr RUTHERFORD - Every street.

CHAIR - Are you talking about all those one-way streets or just the main arterials like Macquarie and Davey streets coming in or going out? Are they moving away from all those one-way streets or just the -?

PUBLIC

Mr RUTHERFORD - There's a mix for those other cities. If we use those as examples, they've done a mix. Some of them have done it for all streets and some of them have done it for a mix of those streets. I am not going to sit here and say that everybody's done it for every street. In all of those cities, the majority of the one-way streets that they had, they no longer have but a couple of those cities have kept some of them.

Mr VALENTINE - In those cities, and I don't know closely you've looked at them, what's being suggested in one of the submissions - the Bicycle Network I think it is - that there be this grid of bicycle access routes. Clearly, one-way streets may be an advantage in terms of putting in a cycleway but if it becomes two-way that may actually reduce the opportunity. Do you know how they've handled that when it comes to cycle access?

Mr RUTHERFORD - There's a whole range of things that come into the decision-making process at that point in time. That's around the width of the street - and when I talk about width I'm not talking about how many traffic lanes there are - but it's from edge of building to edge of building. So, decisions then about how wide are the footpaths? Do we provide on-street parking, do we provide on-street parking on both sides of the road? These are the decisions that go into what do we want the city to look like and how do we want people to get around the city. These are trade-offs.

Ms WEBB - A separated cycle way would generally just remove parking from one side of the street, it wouldn't impinge on the lanes available necessarily.

Mr VALENTINE - I understand all that; we have certainly seen separated cycleways.

Mr RUTHERFORD - That's what we have seen in other parts of the world and we have seen it in Australia as well.

Ms WEBB - You talked in your opening statements about the fact that the university is interested in the contribution it can make with this move. I would like to shift us into hearing a bit about beyond the things we have talked about so far, which is really about what you are doing to ameliorate the impact you are going to have, and there are still a lot of unknowns around even that amelioration effect. What do you see as being a contribution you can make to actually improving things in the city, not just for ameliorating the impact you are going to have but delivering a better city, a better functioning of transport and a better lifestyle for the people who live there? I think that's what the people of Hobart will be looking for and to hear from you in regards to this move.

Mr RUTHERFORD - We don't disagree with any of that. The university, as part of the move into the city - and I will caveat this - still has to go through a master planning process and working with the City of Hobart and the Department of State Growth. We've been very clear in our conversations that we are happy to support capital works programs that contribute to the city and we will look for opportunities to do that. We are in progress around what that can look like, but we have been very clear that it is our wish and our intent to do that.

Ms WEBB - In terms of transport, noting in your report attached to your submission, it talked about the opportunity to explore road network impact and improvement opportunities so that capital works could include amenities in terms of the road network within the CBD.

Mr RUTHERFORD - In terms of capital works for what?

PUBLIC

Ms WEBB - Perhaps things like the separated cycleway network that is proposed. Is that something the university might contribute to, for example?

Mr RUTHERFORD - Yes, absolutely.

Ms WEBB - Could we expect that the move into the CBD by the university will deliver a better public transport system to the greater community within the CBD than just the people who are being shifted?

Prof. BYRNE - One of the important contributions that the university has to make is its outstanding access to best practice internationally, to knowledge generation, and to educating students in alternative ways of city-making and city-building. Some of our proposed changes we are hoping to leverage by the move downtown go way beyond just capital works improvement. For example, we would like to leverage our considerable knowledge of health to consider how we might improve active transport in Greater Hobart, not just the CBD, to foster higher levels of walking and cycling.

We know, for example, that the very high level of car dependence we have at the moment in Greater Hobart is associated with social isolation and loneliness and with various ranges of morbidity, from other places in the world that we have seen that have similarly high levels of car dependence - higher rates of diabetes, cardiovascular disease, certain types of cancer, for example. The university has a commitment and an intent to improve the lives of Tasmanians by fostering active transport to improve healthy living.

Ms WEBB - That's great and that knowledge base you are providing there as a resource is an excellent and valuable thing. However, I'm interested to hear about how you intend to leverage your influence. Typically, it's not necessarily a lack of knowledge about what would be a good thing to do and a helpful, healthy and economically viable thing to do, it's actually a lack of political will and a decision being made. How will you leverage to make sure that good decisions are made to deliver the outcomes you want to deliver?

Mr RUTHERFORD - As I mentioned earlier, we have commenced discussions with the Department of State Growth, which is responsible for the public transport network, about what the future of public transport in Hobart looks like, what we can do to support that and encourage activation in appropriate ways, and what that public transport network looks like. That's a range of options rather than just putting more big buses on the road.

Ms WEBB - Yes, although we haven't had any new big buses, as we heard this morning, for the last five years and there's none planned for the next five, so it would be great if we could get a few of those on the road too.

Ms HOWLETT - We have 52.

Ms SIEJKA - The capacity won't change; they're replacing.

Prof. BYRNE - They're replacing the existing ones.

Some of the conversations we've been having at the moment are about how we might begin to shift the public transport network towards being carbon neutral. There are electric buses available in China, for example, that are off-the-shelf solutions. There are also electric buses in other parts

PUBLIC

of the world and so our conversations are with the government about how we might begin to foster uptake of those kinds of alternative vehicles.

The benefit for Greater Hobart means reduced levels of particulates, lower levels of asthma and lower levels of volatile organic compounds, if you can begin to shift those kinds of vehicles as well.

Mr RUTHERFORD - We've been encouraged by the trial of the autonomous electric bus that is currently being undertaken in Hobart as well. They're the options we want to continue to encourage and support as we move into the city.

CHAIR - We are just about out of time. Do you have any more questions, Rob?

Mr VALENTINE - No. It's been very useful. You've clearly covered a lot of ground.

Prof. BYRNE - Is there a chance of adding one last point for you to consider?

CHAIR - Yes.

Prof. BYRNE - We are growing our capacity to undertake partnerships with state and local governments and private enterprise in city building and city planning. We have a growing capability in that area. One of the key things the university is keen to do is take a closer look at what the settlement strategy is for Hobart. In our highly car-dependent city many people in the outlying suburbs of Greater Hobart have no choice other than to use their cars. In many cases it's a choice between paying the mortgage or paying for fuel. That's really unacceptable, from many different points of view, so we are working with the Planning Institute, with the RACT and with state and local governments to consider how we might, for example, enable park and ride facilities in outlying Hobart, and how we might encourage mixed-use development around those facilities so that we give people alternative options rather than just being highly car-dependent.

Mr VALENTINE - Very good.

CHAIR - Thank you for your submission. It was very comprehensive. Thank you for taking the time to appear here today. We very much appreciate it.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Mr PAT SYNGE, PUBLIC OFFICER, HUON VALLEY RESIDENTS AND RATEPAYERS ASSOCIATION, WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR - I inform you that we are being broadcast live today. I welcome you to the Select Committee on Great Hobart Traffic Congestion. All the evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege, but outside of the parliament you are probably not afforded such privilege. A copy of the witness information statement is available there for you. The evidence you present is being recorded and the *Hansard* version will be published on the committee website when it becomes available.

By way of introduction, I advise that first you will give a brief overview of your submission, then the committee will ask questions. We are seeking information specifically related to the terms of reference. If there is something that you would want to put to us in camera, we can facilitate that for you. We've allowed 30 minutes for today.

Mr SYNGE - This was a joint submission from members of the Huon Valley Residents and Ratepayers Association and, as you see, we have covered quite a number of different issues in it and made a number of suggestions. I don't know if I can cover them all in detail and I don't suppose you would really want me to. You all have copies.

CHAIR - We have your copy.

Mr SYNGE - The points we wanted to make, and I am no expert at all - this is a joint submission so I am interpreting what other people suggested. The thing that seem obvious to us was that we should try to reduce traffic where possible. Many people are reliant on private transport. I heard your earlier witness mention park and ride. That is one solution, as would rideshare.

Many people consider the vehicle a sacred space, a private space that they enjoy, and often it provides a degree of escape as well on their way to work where they can think quietly about what they are doing. It is also an expensive way to travel, especially when you also have to pay for parking. A lot of people find a lot of their income goes on travel when they have to travel a long way and pay expensive parking and they would quite enjoy sharing their vehicle if they knew who they were sharing it with. That has been a big failing in previous apps for ridesharing in that they were fairly random. There was no feedback or mechanism for feedback and most of them didn't operate on a smart phone. We think there is a lot of scope for improving apps for rideshare so that like and like, for instance, people at the university, might get together with other people at the university, or mechanisms for leaving feedback -

CHAIR - We have just heard from the university and that is happening.

Mr SYNGE - That is good. Mechanisms for leaving feedback about the driver and the passengers, a bit like on Airbnb and Uber and things like, that so that people have an idea who they are likely to be picking up and making the whole thing more flexible. There is a lot of potential for that, especially if it were seriously marketed, if money were put in to it. Off the top of my head, I suggest that a couple of hundred thousand dollars would go a long way towards marketing it and getting something like that off the ground and that for every car shared, it would reduce congestion significantly.

PUBLIC

So, rideshare, peak periods - and I just came into town now at about 11 a.m., it took me five minutes from Mt Nelson, where the 80-kilometre limit started, to the post office. I stopped at a couple of lights but there was no real congestion at all. Congestion seems to be just at the peak periods so a bit of staggering - government departments allowing for more flexitime, allowing more people to come in late and leave early would go a long way. We see during the school holidays congestion goes down significantly. I don't know what the studies show about the reduction in traffic, but I suspect it is not enormous but the congestion goes down hugely. No doubt there have been traffic studies that indicate what the difference is.

Mr VALENTINE - Some would say about 8 per cent or 10 per cent.

Mr SYNGE - But the congestion is considerably less than the 8 per cent or 10 per cent would indicate it might be, I suggest. Parking on the main arterial roads - we have two lanes or at least 1.5 lanes, let's say a lane and a cycle lane that are used by parking on sections of Macquarie and Davey streets all day. At least during the peak periods, if that was eliminated and possibly all the time -

CHAIR - Some of it has been.

Mr SYNGE - Some of it has been, but the thing is you get bottlenecks if it isn't all eliminated and if you have a transit lane they work very well. Transit lanes at T2, T3, T4, depending what one chooses, that only allow people with two passengers, or three passengers to use the transit lanes. People see them zapping past and they think, 'Wow, I am stuck in the traffic, alone in my car. These people are zapping past me, not held up at all because they have a passenger'. They think, 'Well, there is a ridesharing app. If I had a passenger I would get into town twice as fast'.

There are all these incentives for reducing traffic and also possibly offering other incentives, like cheap parking for people who come into town with three-up in the car, offering cheap or subsidised parking.

Decentralisation - that is another thing quite a few people said, partly because it has the advantage of maybe creating work down in our area. If some government departments were not centred in Hobart and were moved out to the regions that would reduce commuting. A lot of people commute up from Huonville and now we have the [inaudible] expanding enormously and a lot of the people moving in are commuting back and forth. The more roads we build, all it really does is make commuting more attractive - we build bigger, faster roads, more people commute, which is self-defeating in the end. Build it and they will come is the thing that happens.

One thing that isn't in our submission came in late from the suggestions from our members and I think it is quite relevant. The Southern Outlet which is, at various times of day, one of the busiest roads in the state has a fixed speed limit of 100 kilometres, regardless of the conditions, whereas going out to the airport you have a variable speed limit depending on traffic conditions and weather conditions. With a 100-kilometre limit from Kingston to Mount Nelson some people seem to think if it is 100 kilometres, they should be allowed to do 100 kilometres and they will attempt to do it.

Quite often in winter it is wet and you have everybody sensibly driving along at 80 kilometres and you have people weaving in and out and inevitably you have a minor collision and suddenly the road is blocked. It can be blocked for a long time. That would be a simple thing to have a variable speed limit on that road so that when the conditions are not good it comes down to

PUBLIC

90 or 80 or 70 if it is really bad. It could cut down on those serious congestion issues that occur quite frequently, particularly in winter, when it is dark and wet. That would be cheap and easy because one has to take into account the practicalities of it.

The most contentious suggestion was a congestion charge. We have a [inaudible] from [inaudible] the congestion tax because that would make it absolutely impossible. We pay for parking in the street, we pay to use a portion of the street to position our car and everybody accepts that, but when you talk about using a portion of that same street for driving a car, actually more of the street because you have to allow more space between cars when you are driving, people are up in arms about it understandably, but it does work. Of course, you can have exemptions for a lot of people, tradespeople who have to take a vehicle, disabled people, obviously. A lot of exemptions can be built in - you can have exemptions for people who have three in the car but for the average commuter who is driving a relatively large vehicle with one person, if they were to pay \$10 for the privilege of doing so during the peak hours, it might make them think twice.

You could have a variable scale so that the more people in the vehicle, the less they pay or even no charge if there were four and up. It would be a brave government that introduced that but it has been done in many countries; it was done in London and it was very contentious at the time, controversial. People hated it and now they accept it 100 per cent and it made a huge difference. In Melbourne we pay to use the toll roads, if it wasn't for the toll roads and the fact that we pay for them, Melbourne would be impossible.

CHAIR - All of Eastern States have toll roads - Sydney, Brisbane.

Mr SYNGE - Exactly, and there's no real difference between a toll road and a congestion charge. In practical terms, it is just that it was introduced as a toll road, and so people have never had an option to object to it, whereas here you would be changing it, which people would object to. It would be a brave government, but it would work, especially if all the money taken from it provided other services like public transport, subsidised public transport, better buses.

And so on to better buses. People who take the bus find themselves at the bus stop, in the rain, waiting for the bus, and they start wondering, 'I wonder if I just missed it.'

CHAIR - It has been raised in many submissions.

Mr SYNGE - 'I wonder if I just missed it.' If they could just take out their phone and look at it, and say 'Oh, it's just five minutes up the road', it would make a big difference to the usage of buses. That's cheap. Uber has it. It's not difficult. With GPS, every phone locates you, so the technology is there. The bus just has to have a GPS monitor. That would make a difference to usage.

Free wi-fi on the buses: that would encourage kids going to school, and a lot of other people. If you could start working on your emails and things while you are on the bus on your way into town. You are coming in from Bridgewater or Kingston, and dropped your car off, or you have come up from the south and have dropped your car off to satellite car park. You get on the bus; there are frequent buses, every 10 minutes. You can sit in your car in the warmth and you have wi-fi while you are waiting for the bus, and you have wi-fi when you get on the bus. You could possibly get half an hour's work done before you arrive at work. In fact, you could possibly arrive half an hour later on the understanding that you do it, depending on employer flexibility.

PUBLIC

Many employers are becoming more flexible for various reasons. Both my children have the flexibility to work one or two days at home, and their employers just trust them to get the job done. They're not breathing down their neck. More and more, people just have to show the results of their work and they have much more flexibility.

What else do we talk about - active travel. It's good for the health if people walk a bit and cycle a bit. It always used to be considered that Hobart was too hilly for cycling, but that is becoming a thing of the past with electric-assist on bicycles or total electric bicycles. It is a bit chilly in Hobart, but in fact when you are cycling, it is not often chilly. In many places the heat is more a problem for cycling. You arrive at work sweaty and hot and there are no facilities for having a shower, whereas here, even if you are cycling actively, often as not you won't get sweaty or hot.

Hobart is actually quite dry, compared with most cities in Australia.

Mr VALENTINE - Second driest.

Mr SYNGE - Second driest. That isn't a major factor. If we had somewhere you could safely put your bike - preferably under cover, and secure with CCTV, bike parking shelters - that would help, and of course bike lanes. I know we have some.

CHAIR - I am just looking at the time. We have questions to come.

Mr SYNGE - Okay, questions.

CHAIR - No, you keep going.

Mr SYNGE - I am pretty well through. Newer, bigger, faster roads: as I said earlier, build them and they will come - and they do work, they do help. I use the Kingston bypass quite frequently when I am coming to town. I come up from Cygnet over Nicholls Rivulet and use the Kingston bypass, and it has made a great difference, and it has made a difference to Kingston.

But when you start talking about a Hobart bypass, wow. With 75 per cent of the traffic terminating in the city centre, you are only going to get 25 per cent of the traffic using the bypass, and half of that goes over the Eastern Shore, and half of it goes north, so maybe 12 per cent would be using it.

We touched on self-driving cars. I don't think they will be here in the next decade, but people are beginning to suggest there will be fewer and fewer cars on earth. Again, when my kids were growing up, all the young people down there bought cars as soon as they could. The first thing they did was buy a car as soon as they had a licence, or even before they had a licence. Now they are not. My children haven't bought cars. They spend most of their time working on keyboards. Lifestyles do change. I certainly had a car absolutely, as soon as I could get one; I think I was 13 years old.

It is not the same obsession as it was. It is not the same key to freedom and independence as it was. Things are changing. I think that many people are choosing to live in the city centres, but maybe you have some questions.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - I just wanted to touch on the incentives of getting people to rideshare. I do not know whether you have done any work on it. We heard from the university on that. How do you think that could be progressed, particularly in the regional areas, from Sorrell down to the Huon and Kingborough and Brighton and New Norfolk way? I think your organisation or the Circular Economy may have done some work on it at one stage.

Mr SYNGE - We certainly have not done any work on it, perhaps Circular Economy has; have they talked to you yet?

CHAIR - Yes, they have.

Mr SYNGE - I am not a tech expert, but I would think of something like an Uber app, where you are a member, where you have a profile, other members have profiles, and you can look at the kind of person, and also where they are going and when they are going. It has to be offered on a smartphone, because that is the only logical way. It has to have feedback, and, of course, it has to cover the whole state. It cannot be one for the Huon and one for Sorrell and one for New Norfolk. It has to cover the whole state.

CHAIR - You could cover say, for instance, Cygnet, and where they could pick up on the way.

Mr SYNGE - It would be silly to develop an app for each place, but you would put in your locality - Cygnet - and it would show the closest people who are willing to share, and you scroll through them, and you think, 'Yeah, they are going to Kingston, that suits me, or they are going to Hobart at the right time.'

CHAIR - One thing that has come out of it is people's workplaces, when they work in different areas, with different start and finish times. That is the hard part.

Mr SYNGE - Absolutely. It is not going to work for everybody, and a lot of people would not want to anyway.

CHAIR - Three people and you have taken three cars off the road.

Mr SYNGE - Exactly. It is a cheap, simple way of getting cars off the road. It will not work for everybody, and some people would not have a bar of it. Fair enough.

CHAIR - Parking is getting harder in the city, and it is getting expensive, as you said, so that is something.

Ms HOWLETT - How many members do you have in your group?

Mr SYNGE - I think we have about 20 actual signed-up financial members at the moment, but people do not join nowadays - they join your Facebook page and think they are a member, but actually when the financial year comes around, they sign up again. On our mailing list to former members we must have about 100.

Ms HOWLETT - How many would have contributed to this?

PUBLIC

Mr SYNGE - I think there were about 10 submissions, different ideas. But quite often I will send out an email for suggestions about something and not get one response, so this was quite good. It showed that people were concerned.

CHAIR - It was an issue.

Mr SYNGE - A lot of people from the Huon Valley are working in Hobart.

CHAIR - When I worked in Hobart years ago, four of us bought a car between us and we travelled in it and we shared the expenses.

Ms SIEJKA - That is what my mum did at uni.

CHAIR - It worked really well because we could work in the same sort of area.

Mr SYNGE - And you were probably mates anyway.

CHAIR - It worked really well, and know people who still do that. I do not think they buy a car between them, but communication is the big thing.

Ms HOWLETT - Communicating.

Mr SYNGE - It does work on Facebook, as well on the local community Facebook.

CHAIR - That is the thing with Facebook, it does give them an avenue.

Mr SYNGE - But it is not as well worked out, it is very random. Someone will post who goes there all the time, but if you have it on your phone travel app and 'boom, boom, boom', you can see I have to use my own car, or there is someone just around the corner who is about to leave.

Mr VALENTINE - I have one question in regard to the occupants in the cars and the types of vehicles you were talking about and being zapped with something I suppose. How would you manage it? How would you administer the system that looked at the cars that were allowed to travel on that T4 or T3 system?

Mr SYNGE - The camera does that. They've got cameras that can see you with your phone down on your lap now - beware. They've just introduced them into New South Wales. They can see how many people are in the car - and don't buy an inflatable dummy, it doesn't work.

When they introduced them in Sydney, initially back in the 1980s, that's what people were doing, they had inflatable passengers.

Mr VALENTINE - I appreciate that, but I just wanted to get on the record as to how it actually happens. It's all by camera.

Mr SYNGE - It's all by camera, automatically. You just have the appropriate program coded correctly and it will do it. It'll charge you and it'll fine you if you are in the transit lane by yourself. The technology is all there. Other people have done it. We would not be reinventing the wheel at all.

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - Would you be putting that in where there are very few options for people to take, if they didn't have an option but to go down that particular street given their destination?

Mr SYNGE - You always have an option in the transit lane. We'd only be monitoring people in the transit lane and you would only have maybe a few transit lanes in Macquarie and Davey streets, the Southern Outlet - the main arteries. You'd only put the transit lanes there. It might be a section of the Brooker Highway or it.

CHAIR - Where it's appropriate.

Mr SYNGE - Yes.

Mr VALENTINE - We are talking about something that is viable, not something that's pie in the sky.

Mr SYNGE - No, no. It works in many cities. Sydney has had it since the 1980s. I remember straying into the odd transit lane. They didn't have the good technology in those days.

Mr VALENTINE - It would have been a policeman on a motorbike probably.

Mr SYNGE - That kind of thing, yes. The technology is definitely up to speed now. As I say, in New South Wales they are introducing cameras that can detect your mobile phone on your lap.

CHAIR - The other thing that has come up through our submissions, and I am not too sure whether you touched on it, is the park and ride facilities. It's been raised in nearly every submission.

Mr SYNGE - It makes a lot of sense.

CHAIR - It does. If there was a park and ride facility situated in the Huon Valley, possibly at Huonville, for people from Cygnet, Geeveston and Dover to access -

Mr SYNGE - In a sense we do. There's a car park next to the bus stop.

CHAIR - Yes, but I mean we only have a limited bus service. Then that could also pick up in the Kingston area if there was one. That's been raised and I think it holds a lot of merit. Have you discussed park and ride?

Mr SYNGE - We've certainly discussed it. Ideally, you have express buses so that when you park, you get on the bus and there are no stops on the way, so you have a satellite park like in Huonville and that bus goes straight to the CBD. It doesn't stop anywhere on the way so people are getting there faster than they would in their own car.

CHAIR - That's what you want.

Mr SYNGE - That's really what you want. You'd have maybe a couple of stops in Kingston out at the Fork in the Road and maybe one somewhere else.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - I reckon you'd fill a bus up from Huonville to Kingston pretty quickly.

Mr SYNGE - Yes, that's right. But you have to offer an option that is probably as fast and comfortable as your own car, with the added advantage of being cheaper and having wi-fi.

CHAIR - That's the cost of it at the moment.

Mr SYNGE - The cost of it's too expensive. There's no real incentive for taking the bus. It's slower. It goes all down Ranelagh and Kingston and takes an hour and a quarter or something.

Ms HOWLETT - It was interesting too, yesterday we heard that 35 per cent of the traffic on the Southern Outlet originates from the Huon Valley. I thought that was an interesting statistic.

CHAIR - It doesn't surprise me, travelling the road rather regularly, the amount of traffic that is coming up there.

Mr SYNGE - There's a lot coming up from the Channel as well - a lot of commuters down the Channel, Margate and Snug and so on and even further south. People commute up from Kettering.

CHAIR - It's the service they need, like you said, to be able to get through to Hobart as quickly as what they can in their car.

Mr SYNGE - As quickly as they can, yes. If you can arrive at the Fork in the Road at the end of Kingston, you are coming up from, say, Kettering, you sit there in your car for five minutes and you have wi-fi because it is streamed straight there. You are checking your emails and things like that. The bus turns up and on you get and it drops you off in the centre of town.

Another other thing we touched on was having a transport hub, ideally somewhere like, it would seem, Macquarie Point, then you could have ferries, light rail, buses, taxis all concentrated in the one area, under cover, attractive, modern, somewhere where you can get off your bus and grab an Uber or a taxi and go to work if you are 10 minutes away if it's too far to walk.

Mr VALENTINE - To explore that issue again with people down your way, if you live at Ranelagh and you don't own a car, what's your option?

Mr SYNGE - Sorry?

Mr VALENTINE - If you live at Ranelagh and you don't own a car, you really rely on the bus going to you rather than you going to the bus. How do you see that being resolved?

Mr SYNGE - Again, that could be a ride share options, where other people such as your neighbours are going to the bus or someone else in town.

Mr VALENTINE - Again, that is handled by the app?

Mr SYNGE - It could perfectly well be handled by the rideshare app, but the truth is that most people who live in out-of-the-way places do have cars. They may not want to use them all the time for going long distances, but families have two or three cars. There are very few people,

PUBLIC

except maybe the elderly and the very young who don't have cars nowadays if they live out of town. In the inner city, yes, for sure, there are many options and many opportunities for not owning a car.

CHAIR - Thank you for your submission and thanks for making your time available today.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

STACEY PENNICOTT, EXECUTIVE GENERAL MANAGER, RACT, WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Welcome to the hearings of the Legislative Council Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion. All the evidence taken in this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege but I will remind you that outside of parliament that privilege is not afforded. A copy of the witness information statement is there for you if you need to look at that. The evidence you present is being recorded and the *Hansard* version will be published on the committee website when that becomes available. By way of introduction, I advise that the procedure we intend to follow today is that you can speak to your submission first off, followed by members of the committee asking questions. If there is anything you want to bring before us in camera, we can facilitate that for you. If you would like to speak to your submission, we have 30 minutes.

Ms PENNICOTT - Thank you. Last year, the RACT decided to take the lead in determining a future vision to address the issue of traffic congestion and the wider question around infrastructure and mobility needs for the Greater Hobart area. Through that process, we undertook a significant amount of stakeholder engagement which went across not only our own 190 000-plus members but also across a wide group of government and community groups to understand exactly the issues impacting on traffic in particular, but also the greater mobility needs of the area in an effort to determine a longer term plan to address the issue.

Through that process, we undertook a significant amount of public engagement, addressed quite a number of issues outside the issue of just cars on roads. We took a holistic approach through that process to look at the way that people move in and around the city, that being the Greater Hobart area, not just the CBD.

That process took over six months and the outcome was a 30-year vision that we costed and presented to the wider public in April this year. That vision has been, I guess, endorsed by stakeholders but to this point we have not actually seen action to take the steps to implement.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Ms PENNICOTT - Would you like me to talk through what is in the vision?

Ms WEBB - You do not have to repeat it for us because we have read it, but if there are things you want to point us to.

CHAIR - Or any particular issues.

Ms PENNICOTT - I think the key outcome really was that this is not an issue for just one area of the city. It is a government issue but it is also an issue that is much wider than that. It has tentacles into public transport, private providers, active transport. There are significant planning issues that came out. Probably the key issue in terms of addressing the wider mobility problem is that the planning behind that doesn't necessarily lead itself to fixing the congestion issue.

The issue isn't just around how we get cars off roads or how we build around that. It is also about taking a holistic view about how people live their lives. That is probably the key issue that came, time and again, from the people we spoke to - whatever the answer is, it needs to address

PUBLIC

how people want to live their lives. That is where they live, but also how they move around the city and the things that they do along the way.

It is not just a case of hopping in a vehicle and driving to and from work. It is a much wider issue around where they do their shopping, where the schools are, their hours of work. It is a very holistic view that needs to be taken rather than just building a piece of infrastructure or putting a bus onto a road.

It is really taking that holistic view of how people live their lives. How do we make a whole ecosystem that enables people to do what they need? How can we offer answers that address those needs from a cost point of view as well as making sure we are doing that in the right places at the right times, and meeting the right needs?

Ms SIEJKA - Noting that you have said it is not just infrastructure, the need for strategic investment in infrastructure has been a theme that we have had, not just the last couple of days, but also in the submissions. We can see that your vision touches on that, along with all the other issues.

I noted that RACT, I think it was you, said that action not vision was needed in the Government's 30-year infrastructure strategy. I am just keen to know what actions, projects, time frames you would like to see to reduce congestion.

Ms PENNICOTT - We believe there is an immediate need to look at how we actually get people into public and active transport, and what they look like. That is not just a case of getting people onto buses. It is a case of changing the culture, and to change culture you need to meet people's needs.

Having spoken with people across the Greater Hobart area, the current options do not meet people's needs. They are the wrong timetables, or the wrong cost, or in the wrong places, or the wrong mode of transport.

The actual answer we would be looking for will address that. First, how do we get people to have the type of mobility they need? And when we talk mobility, we are not just talking using their cars. There are a lot of people who would like not to use their car, but they don't have an alternate option, or if the alternate option is there, it is too expensive or not available at the time or does not suit their needs.

We would like to see programs that would get people out of their cars and into using different modes of transport that then take more vehicles off the road. Those people who really do need to use their vehicle can use it without being in that congestion.

Ms SIEJKA - Very much looking at infrastructure in a bit more of a holistic manner, rather than -

Ms PENNICOTT - That's right. We are saying it might be buses; it might trackless trams. We certainly support ferries and the use of our beautiful waterways as well. When we are talking about options of infrastructure, it is more than just building a new road.

We are looking at other ways to get people around that actually take people off, particularly the Macquarie and Davey street couplet that is just at capacity. Unless we get more vehicles off,

PUBLIC

there really isn't an infrastructure fix for that which is going to address what we need in the long term.

Ms SIEJKA - Another issue those appearing before the inquiry have mentioned is that they would like to see greater oversight and coordination for our strategies that we have when it comes to transport, like an authority. Most frequently people have raised a need for a public transport authority. What are your thoughts on that, or is that something you have considered at any point? Do you think it is a gap?

Ms PENNICOTT - I think the reason the RACT had to create a vision is that nobody else was doing a vision that was for 30 years, and addressed more than just infrastructure or more than public transport. While maybe there is a need for a public transport authority, and I wouldn't speak to yes or no on that, what I would say is that the way that all the authorities interconnect is the vital piece.

There are a lot of strategies and a lot of visions. None of them actually comes together in a coordinated agreed way forward, and for more than just a three- or five-year period. The bigger infrastructure costs and projects are going to take 10, 15, 20 years - if you are talking about a Tasman bridge, it is longer.

You need all of those pieces to come together. Rather than one focus on public transport, then another focus on infrastructure over here and then one on planning over here, what we should be looking for is that they all come together to create an overall strategy and they will all be working towards the same thing.

Ms SIEJKA - Are you aware of other jurisdictions integrating all those multimodal things well? It would be good to know if in your network, there are things you have come across.

Ms PENNICOTT - I think all cities growing like Hobart are having growing pains and takes very courageous decisions to make a difference. I wouldn't point out a particular city, but there are cities we looked at through our process that are likeminded, with similar topography to that in Hobart, with the same sort of growing pains that we could look to. There are some cities in America and some in New Zealand that have similar issues and how they've addressed them has been quite courageous in that they don't just look at building their way out.

Ms SIEJKA - Thank you.

Mr VALENTINE - When you were doing this work, were you frustrated by the lack of data available at any point? Is there a set of data you think needs to be collected to better round out the whole picture, or not?

Ms PENNICOTT - I think it's getting a better picture of how people actually go about their business day to day. We went out and collected some of those data ourselves. We asked people about how they travel and where they travel. There is one piece of data that will tell you where people come into the city but they don't tell you why and it's that piece that's the missing link. Some of the data we collected were really about some of the things I mentioned before - cost and access. Also, the number one thing people do, according to our data, shopping on their way home from work - having to stop somewhere and getting the groceries before they go home to look after their families or whatever it is.

PUBLIC

Ms SIEJKA - We heard a bit about that earlier and planning more broadly, and how are more like warehouses now.

Ms PENNICOTT - You can get statistics on where cars move, but the reason and the understanding behind that is quite important. Similarly, how people like to travel, pedestrians, active transport - there is not a lot of data on what people would do if things were different. The modelling of that would be very important.

Mr VALENTINE - Do you think there is a need for government to engage in collecting data now for future decision-making?

Ms PENNICOTT - I think we should be data-led, absolutely; collecting that data, not just point to point, but understanding the reasons behind that would be vital because you want to build or put in place items that are going to meet people's needs so you need to understand what those needs are, not just now but into the future. That's the key bit: we don't know everything right now, we don't know the technology that's coming, but that's also a key piece. If we are smart about building things that allow for technology changes and what people might need into the future, all that information we really need now before we invest too heavily.

CHAIR - I find it fascinating on page 2 of the mobility vision document you provided, where it says -

Our aim is to achieve a shift in traveller behaviour from private vehicle transport to public and active transport options in the first 10 years of the vision.

That's interesting for an organisation that's car-based, but you are obviously looking at the overall comfort of people travelling through their daily life as opposed to their use of cars.

Ms PENNICOTT - As all businesses change, RACT must look at the way in which people are changing. We believe in the future it won't just be about cars, it's about that word 'mobility' - we move around in different ways - and the way we can help our members, who are not just people who hop into a vehicle, they are also cyclists and pedestrians and they like to catch ferries and all those things. If we can make their lives better through doing this work, we are actually achieving our aim. We are a membership organisation and it's to make our members' lives easier. That was our thinking behind it rather than a business decision about whether you are in a vehicle or not.

Ms WEBB - My question picks up on that a little bit. On page 3 of the vision document, where it maps out years 1 to 5, years 6 to 10 and so on, with some indicative costing, I note that you have the focus in that first 10 years about shifting people's modes with the view that if you can get that 4 per cent shift from 16 to 20 per cent, you are on track to keep going with that, but if you don't achieve that, then you shift to major infrastructure. In that first 10 years, indicative costs only add up to \$95 million across the 10-year period, which seems like peanuts - \$10 million per year. Are you providing to the public domain a breakdown of what you are anticipating that would fund?

Ms PENNICOTT - The information around the \$95 million is really to look at the active transport changes and to do the first five years of that. It would be a future cost as you look into each piece of the five-year periods as additional costs on top of that. To do some of the quick wins to get the 4 per cent off the road -

PUBLIC

Ms WEBB - That's what I am trying to get to, whether you are making available or could make available more detail about what you could get delivered to shift some of that modal behaviour within that funding. Is it separated cycleways - how many separated cycleways and what length? How much subsidy to public transport? How many more buses or whatever it might be? What trackless trams or whatever? I would like to understand because it seems like a very modest amount of money to deliver a 4 per cent change. Are you sharing that information about the breakdown used to approximate that cost?

Ms PENNICOTT - We don't have it in the vision, we do have it behind that, which is what went off to be modelled to come up with the costing so we haven't made it available publicly. Certainly it does have a full detail of those types of things behind it.

Ms WEBB - And you have an evidence base that says those particular actions could be expected to deliver that 4 per cent shift?

Ms PENNICOTT - The evidence behind is how we created the actual items we wanted that then went into the costing model.

Ms WEBB - Part of the issue and something that this inquiry is going to have to turn its mind to is, of course, that there is a very broad agreement on a laundry list of things that could be done. The question is what could be done because there is a really harmonious understanding out there about that. The question is: what should be done and what could best be done? That decision about how to deploy limited funding is really important. If there is information you have that you could provide that helps to inform in terms of shifting modes and getting people onto public transport, is it subsidising cost? Is it x number of more buses? Is it smoothing with lights and throughways - or is it all of those things together or none of them? I think that's the dilemma more than anything, not imagining what could be done, it's figuring out where best to spend the money.

Ms PENNICOTT - That was the dilemma we had in developing a 30-year vision. It would be very easy for us as a motoring organisation to say 'Build more roads' but we believe we are best to put the money into the items that might get the 4 per cent change first and start to fully plan out those big infrastructure pieces to fully cost-size and plan for those. We think doing the public transport and active transport changes would allow us time to fully understand what the scope of the rest of the work might be. We are not saying that you wouldn't do that work, but certainly getting that shift will ensure that through the growth period we have time make the right decisions for the next stages.

Ms WEBB - I'm just interested in what your evidence base is that says these changes x , y and z in active transport will deliver 4 per cent. Do you feel confident, because it is not there to share, that you had a clear evidence base said spending on x , y and z would deliver that 4 per cent?

Ms PENNICOTT - Yes, we have the details below that say these are the actual items that will deliver that. It was delivered through assistance with an expert panel and then validated externally as well. The evidence is there that if we put this in, it will take a culture shift and some of that is not around just building it and people will come. There will be things like: do you actually allow public transport to be free or how do you incentivise people to take up those initiatives? All of that is in that initial costing piece.

PUBLIC

Ms WEBB - Was that something you contemplated advocating for, free public transport?

Ms PENNICOTT - We believe it needs to be looked at. To get people onto public transport, you cannot just put it there. I think the key is actually a change in culture for people in the greater Hobart area, and probably Tasmania more widely, to actually have a look at those other options, because in the past they have not met the needs of people. If they do not meet them, there is a perception that they never will, even if we change up what we are doing now. We need to tell people about it and have those incentives in place, otherwise people just will not make the change anyway.

Ms WEBB - Do you think there is a changing culture, too, from the government side of it? This is something we have discussed at another hearing, regarding public transport as essential public infrastructure, rather than a cost-effective business that has to pay for itself. Is that a culture shift that needs to occur from the other side?

Ms PENNICOTT - We would absolutely say that is the case.

CHAIR - Just reading here, it says that if we cannot afford a light rail system along the old rail line to the northern suburbs, then a flexible bus-only route along the same line should be considered. That really interests me. It would be a quick service, because you have got no traffic. Could you just elaborate on that a little bit? Would buses just come in of a morning - 1, 10, 15 buses or something - and then go back out at night?

Ms PENNICOTT - Trackless trams are sort of the idea around that. There is a significant cost in building the infrastructure around rail transport, whereas with trackless trams, if you get it wrong you can actually change the route or alternatively not run the service. The ability to get it up and running, cost-wise -

CHAIR - Is this referring to trackless trams, or is this just a Metro bus service on the rail corridor?

Ms PENNICOTT - It is more around trackless trams, which really are a type of bus.

Ms SIEJKA - A trackless tram is a bus, essentially.

Ms PENNICOTT - Yes.

Mr VALENTINE - It is an extended bus.

Ms WEBB - A snazzy bus, I think we called it yesterday.

Ms WEBB - Do you feel it could integrate better with the existing public bus transport network?

Ms PENNICOTT - I think we really need to look outside of just 'a Metro bus is the answer'. Whether it is a trackless tram or other similar options that are available, we should be looking at those. Obviously, our vision is a 30-year vision, so how do we actually bring in autonomous buses and things like that to do the last miles, such as park and ride, where you might not be able to get the parking exactly where people want to get onto a ferry or a bus or a trackless tram. How

PUBLIC

do you have other options available so people can actually still get to where they need to get to and make it easier for them?

CHAIR - It has been raised with me through general discussions about line-marking. When you looked at reducing the 4 per cent of traffic, did you look into the line-marking of streets in different areas and things like that? People have said to me, if they change the line-marking in this area, did that ever come across your table?

Ms PENNICOTT - There was a piece of work done a number of years ago by the state government which had a number of quick wins in it, which looked at things like line-marking, putting in the clearways they have put in now, changing traffic lights, putting overpasses in where people now cross roads, things like that.

We have taken the assumption that those things will be done, and we have called on that outside of the vision strategy, to say those 'quick win' items should just should get done as a priority because they will give us a bit more time to put in the other items we need and take a little bit of those growing pains away. There are some very simple quick-win, cost-effective things previously identified by the government that we think should be put in, and then things that have been put in, such as the clearways.

CHAIR - By the government.

Mr VALENTINE - I am just following up on the idea of trackless trams that you were suggesting on that corridor. Wouldn't it be the case that might end up 'cruelling the pitch'? For instance, using that corridor for freight into the future, and/or tourism rail and those sorts of things. We would have to take those sorts of things into account, wouldn't we?

Ms PENNICOTT - Absolutely, and we are not actually advocating that it is the right route. I think the work needs to be done. If we are looking at a settlement strategy, which is in our vision, the settlement strategy should tell us the right corridor for building the infrastructure around it.

It might be the case that something like a trackless tram might go from the northern suburbs through New Town and down through Elizabeth Street, or something like that might be a better option for a trackless tram, but having that settlement strategy and actually planning around that is the key to working out the right location for where that might be.

Mr VALENTINE - I am not sure about the route system with trackless trams, in terms of whether they share the road with cars, or whether they have their own corridor. Are you aware of other places in the world where they are used, and what that might be in terms of how they are set up? Can you shed any light on that?

Ms PENNICOTT - I won't pretend to be an expert, but what I would say is that it would depend on the road itself. Certainly it needs a certain amount of space, and there would obviously be a whole heap of traffic considerations that need to be identified as you put the route in.

Mr VALENTINE - I think one of the advantages is that you have fewer drivers for a higher level of passenger numbers. Just wanted to see if you had any extra information on that.

PUBLIC

Ms WEBB - I'm going back to what I covered before, and see if I can come at it in a different way, around the costings.

Given that you do not have a breakdown of what those specific projects might be within your indicative costing, with that indicative costing for the first one to five years, which is the \$64 million - which is primarily directed towards shifting to public transport and to active transport, and improving land use planning - can you give a breakdown or a proportion of where the funding would go into those efforts? Without talking about the projects that you are pointing to. This proportion of the \$64 million into promoting and facilitating public transport, and this proportion into active transport.

Ms PENNICOTT - I am going to apologise and say I do not have that with me now. We do have it available, but I don't have it with me to be able to present to you today.

Ms WEBB - If it is something that you feel you could share with us, and provide to us later, would you mind doing that?

Ms PENNICOTT - Absolutely.

Ms WEBB - It would be of interest to see where your thinking was. It gives us the sense of where you are weighting that effort, and where the cost weights are in those efforts.

Ms PENNICOTT - We could certainly make it available, so you can understand the assumptions we made around where that goes.

Ms WEBB - This is something I am asking many of the people who appear for us in the committee. This is really great visioning work you have taken the lead on, and you are right. You stepped into a void. Although many conversations happen about this topic in lots of different ways, they are a little bit disjointed.

Given we are another effort into that space with this inquiry, what do you think we should be aiming to contribute to progress things here?

In your submission you talked about your continuing advocacy. What can this inquiry process do to help progress action in this space?

Ms PENNICOTT - It would be great to see the systems in place that would allow it to. At the moment, as we talked around the fact that you have different areas doing different things and each one can tweak the area they are at, but there is no holistic view to fixing the problems.

Mr VALENTINE - Framework.

Ms PENNICOTT - It is the framework around how we actually can address the planning, the social. The traffic comes into it, and the congestion, but the answer to fixing the problem is actually wider than that.

What that framework looks like that brings all the parties together, who have competing interests, but somehow come together to progress something as a combined group, so that everyone is heading in the same direction rather than saying they are, which is one thing, and that there is a framework or ability to actually make that happen.

PUBLIC

Mr VALENTINE - Just on that. Are you part of the Hobart City Deal conversation?

Ms PENNICOTT - No, we are not.

Mr VALENTINE - Have you requested to be part of it, given the amount of work you have done and obviously the opportunity to add some real input?

Ms PENNICOTT - We have spoken with each of the parties through our stakeholder. They are well aware that we are not a party to the actual agreement.

Mr VALENTINE - Do you feel that they are going to be able to produce something effective in terms of the framework you mentioned earlier?

Ms PENNICOTT - From what I have seen in the City Deal, I am not sure that framework will be the thing addressed. We can already see there are still different opinions on what should have been in and out of the City Deal. That goes to the point that I am making: unless we have a framework in which everybody is heading in the same direction, even when we are signed up to an agreement, we are still not in agreement for the longer term.

Mr VALENTINE - Do you see it as being more politically driven at the moment as opposed to strategically, in terms of a functional aspect?

Ms PENNICOTT - I would say that the RACT stepped into this void and created a 30-year vision so there were no political implications to it.

Mr VALENTINE - So it is a truly independent helicopter view, if you like, and members of the public are having a real input and opportunity to have their say?

Ms PENNICOTT - That is right, spot on.

CHAIR - I think that's it, Stacey. Thank you very much.

Ms PENNICOTT - Thank you very much for having me.

CHAIR - Thank you for your submission and for making yourself available to come before the committee today.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

PUBLIC

Mr ANDREW HOLMES, WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Welcome to the Legislative Council Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion. The committee hearing is being broadcast today and if there is anything you feel you want to put in camera, we can facilitate that for you. All evidence taken at the hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege. I remind you that any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. A copy of information for the witness is available, and the evidence is being recorded by Hansard and will be published on our website when it becomes available. By way of introduction, we ask for an overview of your submission and then there will be questions from the committee.

Mr HOLMES - Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. I am Andrew Holmes, a master of planning and civil engineering graduate from the University of Tasmania. I have a keen interest in transport planning. I will briefly highlight the key points made in my submission.

The increasing traffic on major highways, as noted by various state government reports, is beginning to create problems throughout Hobart. My submission, backed by reputable references, notes the issues and impacts caused by increasing motor vehicle congestion to Greater Hobart, its residents and its visitors. This includes worsening physical and mental health outcomes from being stuck in vehicles for longer, worsening pollution from the oldest average vehicles in the country, as well as congestion making the Metro bus network unappealing due to inconsistent delays.

My submission highlights two of many potential causes of congestion in Greater Hobart. First, it explains my belief that the First Home Owner Grant favours the construction of dwellings on the urban fringe. This means the state Government is incentivising people of working age to live a considerable distance from where they work. Effectively this boils down to a grant to increase urban congestion.

The second cause is the ongoing continual spend on road infrastructure that has not appeared to improve traffic outcomes, in contrast to the low expenditure to encourage public and active transport use and to improve service, frequency and reliability.

I highlight the disconnection between land use planning and transport planning in the south of the state and provide examples where this has done better.

These examples have made proven inroads to improving land use and transport integration. I highlight how there is no apparent desire to improve Metro's bus infrastructure in the inner and outer suburbs, which impacts desirability of the network.

I then explain my initiatives to beat traffic congestion. In summary, I propose that Greater Hobart residents of all ages, ability and income deserve the opportunity to get around the city on improved public and active transport networks.

Outdated solutions, like building roads, expensive tunnels or widening existing roads will not get us out of this problem. For the most part, it is these supposed solutions that got us into this mess and now we are paying for them.

PUBLIC

So that is modernised Greater Hobart. Modern cities around the world are recognising the damage that car-focused infrastructure has caused and are beginning to invest in protected bike lanes, bus and transit corridors, and light rail networks. Converting car parking requirements in the planning scheme for minimum to maximum requirements is a relatively simple change but would have a significant and positive effect over the long term.

In summary, Greater Hobart is at an exciting juncture. The problem of congestion is growing but the potential solutions have never been greater. I would love my commute in five years to be a bike ride to a light rail station which takes me into the city, from which I walk with pedestrian priority to my workplace. While making Greater Hobart a healthy and active place to live, we have the capacity to become an active world leader active in transport - a public transport-focused city, a people-focused city, not a car one.

Mr VALENTINE - Thanks for that and thank you for putting in your submission. I found it fascinating to read. There were certain things that made me sit up and think. On the second page of your submission, about the fourth paragraph down -

At a community level, growing congestion has been found to cause social impacts including heightened anger and stress ...

It is interesting the way you have brought out the health impacts of living further out. I have always thought it created more traffic, but it actually does have a detrimental effect. Some might say, though, that if you living out there and using public transport, you are still sitting in a vehicle and not doing a lot of activity.

Mr HOLMES - You're not.

Mr VALENTINE - Do you want to comment on that? If we went to a public transport model for those living further out.

Mr HOLMES - What I'm looking at is potentially using the northern suburbs corridor to slow down urban sprawl. We are trying to reduce people moving further and further out.

Mr VALENTINE - Create greater infill.

Mr HOLMES - And better use our existing assets - our parks, our roads, our NBN lines. We don't have to duplicate that. We don't have to duplicate water services and that sort of thing.

In terms of your question about sitting in a bus. Studies have been undertaken on what you can do on public transport. In a car, you can't really do much because you are focused on driving. On a bus, you can do a little bit more. You can be on your phone, and you can take that time to chill out, but it still might stop-start a bit infrequently. On a train, as there is less stopping and starting, you can actually get some work done, if you are that way inclined, or you can look out the window, at the views. Especially in Hobart, there would be great views.

Mr VALENTINE - I was interested in reading your thesis on building extra capacity in roads. Basically, it increases traffic. People make decisions to buy a car because they know they can get to point x more easily, whereas in a congested environment, as we have at the moment, it gives the opportunity to think about how we can revision our future when it comes to the way we live.

PUBLIC

Do you want to comment a bit further on that, that tension between congestion and the opportunities that it provides versus the money spent on major infrastructure to alleviate congestion?

Mr HOLMES - The opportunities that congestion provides?

Mr VALENTINE - Yes, I mean if you didn't have the congestion, we wouldn't have the opportunity to promote a healthier lifestyle, for instance. That's what you seem to be saying.

Mr HOLMES - Yes, that's not quite what I was trying to get across, but maybe -

Mr VALENTINE - It's a fact though, isn't it? If you don't have congestion, you are not going to think about how society might change.

Mr HOLMES - Maybe the change has already occurred. Maybe it might be looking at a Copenhagen sort of concept. I know that's a complete world away, with completely different characteristics to Hobart, but we might have had a mode share of 10 per cent active transport. Or, if traffic congestion was an issue in the 1960s before they took the tram network out, there were comparatively more people catching public transport then.

Mr VALENTINE - That was probably because of the lack of availability or affordability of cars back then.

Mr HOLMES - But also potentially where people were living as well. I believe that the car has made the outer suburbs more accessible, which has changed where people live. People are then focused on that we probably need more parking in the city, so there is an oversupply of car parking as required in the planning scheme because it looks at providing more car use growth. We assume there are going to be more and more cars and more and more population, so we over cater for car use and due to that being more accessible, therefore there is more accessibility in the CBD and people can drive there. More people are taking the option of buying a cheaper block of land on the fringe and driving in because there is a car parking spot waiting there for them. That's why I look at the car parking requirements in the planning scheme, which I am not familiar with and when they were last revised, but I know in the new planning scheme I don't believe they have been revised from the average across all the councils. That is, requiring two-bedroom dwellings to have two parking spaces.

Mr VALENTINE - Time to rethink that model, you say?

Mr HOLMES - I think that if you are going to have a two-car garage, people are going to fill it; people are then going to use their car, but we probably don't need that. If we change it from requiring two or more to two or less, that's a simple change from a minimum to a maximum limit. That's just a change of a few letters in the words 'minimum' and 'maximum' in the planning scheme. We can then make it developer or, I suppose, market-driven: people can say, 'Actually, I don't want a house with two car-parking spots or garage; I actually don't want a garage at all', and there is choice in that, whereas at the moment there is no choice because the councils require that.

Ms HOWLETT - Just on that point, I noticed in RACT's strategic 30-year vision it was 1.5 cars now per household and it was going to increase to two on average.

PUBLIC

Mr HOLMES - I haven't been fully across their plan, but that wouldn't surprise me at all. As the planning scheme requires two car parking spaces per house, people are more likely to fill those.

Mr VALENTINE - When you were doing your work, did you find that the available data was wanting?

Mr HOLMES - Definitely.

Mr VALENTINE - What sort of data were you looking for that you couldn't find that would have helped in your analysis?

Mr HOLMES - I will talk about car parking because that was my recent thesis. It would be good to find out the occupancy rate of on-street and off-street car parking to determine how well they are being used. The City of Hobart could probably do on-street parking with its sensors [census?] now, but it's the off-street parking we probably just don't have any idea about. Are the car parks, right now, at 60 per cent full, are they 50 per cent full or are they 100 per cent full? I don't think there are any numbers out there; I wouldn't be able to tell you that.

Mr VALENTINE - Private enterprise might have it because private enterprise provides the commuter parking whereas the city council provides shopper parking, for the most part.

Mr HOLMES - Yes, sure. I know there are about 6000 car parking spaces off-street in the Hobart CBD and that's equivalent to four cricket grounds of area.

Mr VALENTINE - Is that including private enterprise carparks, like Kings car park.

CHAIR - That's in the CBD, is it?

Mr HOLMES - That's in the CBD and in the Hobart draft transport strategy.

CHAIR - That was car parks and off-street parking?

Mr HOLMES - Yes, car parks and off-street parking, not on-street parking, about 6900 spaces within the CBD, which is equivalent to four cricket grounds of space.

Mr VALENTINE - I notice you talk about 80 per cent of cars stopping in Hobart as opposed to 20 per cent passing through. Did you find it difficult to get figures on that because the origin-destination surveys may not have been quite as effective as the numberplate reading beasts that are going on at the moment?

Mr HOLMES - Sure. I think the last origin-destination survey might have been in 2010, but I'm not 100 per cent sure of that. Then there were also figures that came out of a few government reports recently. Hopefully, with the cameras that went up two weeks ago for the tunnel study, they would be able to provide that.

Mr VALENTINE - It would get a more accurate figure.

Mr HOLMES - More accurate. What was the study earlier in the year about origin and destination, requesting where people were going? We filled out a survey and they dropped one

PUBLIC

off at my house. It was asking what did all your trips encompass and where were you going. I can't remember what that's called.

Mr VALENTINE - It's just that some have suggested that the 80 per cent might be an overestimate because people drop kids off at school and then continue a journey, and that might be confusing the destination aspect.

Mr HOLMES - It may be but I would say that comes back down to a land use problem.

CHAIR - One of your recommendations is to implement bus priority measures and bus lanes on priority bus routes in the short term - short term, until all these other measures take effect?

Mr HOLMES - No, sorry. By 'short term' I mean do it first, within four years - we could do it tomorrow. All we'd really need is a tin of red paint and to write 'bus lane' on the road. There are whole lot of issues that would fall out from that, but that's a quick win. We wouldn't be building anything there, we'd be putting up lights with B on them.

CHAIR - You would be actually affecting cars. If you take a bus lane in Macquarie or Davey streets, you are then cutting back a lane for normal vehicles.

Mr HOLMES - I'd be looking at taking a parking lane first.

Mr VALENTINE - Taking parking out. Is that what you mean?

Mr HOLMES - Yes, correct. On one of the sides, this side, of Macquarie Street.

CHAIR - On the southern side. On the bay side?

Mr HOLMES - Yes, that's where the bus tops are along Macquarie Street. I catch the bus from my workplace to Sandy Bay where I live. A bus lane would be great because that would show people sitting in cars - and yes, you'd take car capacity out, but you'd increase the bus capacity. There are a lot of vacant seats on the bus.

Ms HOWLETT - That's interesting. What time do you catch the bus?

Mr HOLMES - I walk from Sandy Bay into the city and I catch the bus about 8.50 a.m. to Rosny Park and then in the afternoon I catch the 4.58 p.m. bus from Rosny Park directly to Sandy Bay.

Ms HOWLETT - Is that full?

Mr HOLMES - No, it's not full.

Ms SIEJKA - You are going against the tide.

Mr HOLMES - I am going against the tide and it's not full.

CHAIR - It was interesting last night when I left here and I was driving home up Davey Street, there were buses pulled up - and I wasn't sure whether it was outside the Barracks or the

PUBLIC

block further back - the buses getting out into the traffic had the traffic backed down over Sandy Bay Road.

Mr HOLMES - Might need to look at changing where that spot is.

CHAIR - If it were a bus lane, it would not affect the other traffic - it would only affect the buses.

Mr HOLMES - That is correct. There would be a quick perception change with people sitting in their cars looking at a bus driving past quickly saying, 'Hang on, why aren't I sitting in that?'

CHAIR - Particularly if you had park and ride.

Mr HOLMES - In some places

Ms SIEJKA - Those outer lying areas.

Mr HOLMES - I think park and ride is still questionable because we are still spending money on car infrastructure with park and ride.

I am not an economist, but I feel that we should first focus on and improve the bus network and make it desirable.

CHAIR - Where I am coming at with park and ride is in regional areas - down the Huon where I am - where people still have to still have to drive to get to the bus.

Ms WEBB - You have to get to the bus.

CHAIR - Get to the bus, then on the bus ride through.

Mr HOLMES - I am definitely no expert in park and ride. That was just my opinion.

CHAIR - You are not going to take the car trip out of it all together.

Mr HOLMES - No, definitely not.

CHAIR - Park and ride has been one of the things mentioned in many submissions here. Particularly in the regional areas like Sorell, southern beaches, Tasman, New Norfolk.

Mr HOLMES - I am fortunate to live in Sandy Bay, so I am able to walk into town. I would not be one to use park and ride, so it was just a parting comment.

Mr VALENTINE - On page 2, towards the bottom of your submission -

Congestion can cause many impacts, socially, economically and environmentally. Although there is limited research completed within Greater Hobart, it is logical that the impacts and findings found elsewhere can be transferred to the Hobart context.

PUBLIC

Do you have other research you can actually point to that might be of use to us?

Mr HOLMES - I suppose I was speaking for the research above in the submission. We are talking about, in the fourth paragraph down -

At a community level, growing congestion has been found to cause social impacts including heightened anger and stress...

That was a Sydney reference.

Mr VALENTINE - Hennessy and Weisenthal.

Mr HOLMES - That was Sydney, yes. Then the reference later in that paragraph about sitting in vehicles was another mainland reference.

In the next paragraph we say pollution has been found to stunt lung capacity by 5 per cent. That was in London.

I suppose it was kind of covering the references in that chapter.

CHAIR - Andrew, I thank you for your submission. I do not know if you have anything you want to add.

Mr HOLMES - I suppose two things. One, I did not ask committee members if they would be interested in joining me on my morning commute, or afternoon commute, to see the walking impacts. Walking next to a major road and the congestion and the pollution. I suppose I can smell it when you are walking through there and it is not a pleasant thing. I invite the committee, if they want to sometime.

Ms HOWLETT - On that point, have you done any air quality checks?

Mr HOLMES - I have not personally, but I would love to see the boxes on the poles that are the base stations for the parking sensors. I would love to see an air quality sensor on those which sends data straight back to the Hobart City Council.

Ms SIEJKA - It might be something worth looking at.

CHAIR - The traffic survey to see where the traffic is going now at the moment. Is that the new ones you are talking about?

Mr HOLMES - No, I was talking about the inground sensors the Hobart City Council has put up. It has put up these white boxes on poles along the road.

Ms HOWLETT - Where are they?

Mr HOLMES - All across Macquarie and Davey streets and all up through the CBD. They would probably be a box this big sitting on a pole.

The last one was in my part 5, Any other matters incidental thereto. A lot of research has been undertaken, because I know how sensitive car parking is in the CBD. In terms of

PUBLIC

businessowners and the like a lot of research has been undertaken. One of these being in New York City looking at the economic benefits of sustainable streets, and in London there were also developments of parking in urban centres. I would just like to highlight the findings from the London study. I understand this is London, but the findings were that more parking does not necessarily mean greater commercial success. It found there was no such thing as free parking. The cost of developing and maintaining parking spaces and then enforcing proper use to ensure good traffic flow have to be borne by somebody. In the case of the local authority-operated parking on or off street, any costs are not covered by parking revenue falls to local taxpayers. They found shopkeepers consistently overestimate the share of customers coming in by car. They found car drivers spend more on a single trip, and walkers and bus users spend more over the week or the month. A good mix of shops, services and a quality environment are some of the most important factors in attracting visitors to town centres. There is very little evidence of the impacts of parking on the night-time economy and, finally, which is data-related, boroughs collect a lot of data and parking but there is less information available on town centre economic factors. These two resources show that car parking and economic activity were found not to be intertwined.

CHAIR - Thank you.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW

PUBLIC

Mr ROBERT COTGROVE, WAS CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WAS EXAMINED.

CHAIR - Thank you. Welcome to the Legislative Council Select Committee on Greater Hobart Traffic Congestion. If you would like to read the witness statement in front of you, please do so. The committee hearing is being broadcast today and if there is anything you want to bring to us in camera, we can facilitate that for you. All evidence taken in this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege and I remind you any comments made outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. A copy of the information for witness is there for you if you need it.

Mr COTGROVE - I have read through it.

CHAIR - The evidence you provide is being recorded and the *Hansard* version will be published on the committee website when it becomes available. By way of introduction we will ask you to give an overview of your submission and then we will have questions from the committee; we have more than half an hour.

Mr COTGROVE - I did prepare an opening statement.

CHAIR - I think we just received that on email.

MR COTGROVE - I hope you did. My main point is urban travel patterns reflect the culture in which the society is. If we go back to preindustrial times, people walked or they drove horses and cities were small and compact because it took time and effort to move over distances and so on.

Then we entered the industrial era. In the industrial era, we delivered mass forms of transport, particularly mechanical forms of transport - trains, trams and so on. I could include trackless trams and whatever - there is an extension of that. They were designed essentially for the industrial workforce. They ferried large groups of men to and from central workplaces, factories, office towers and so on. Very few women worked in those days. They worked until they got married. Even as late as 1960s, women in the Commonwealth Public Service, I believe, were dismissed if they got married or had children. The discrimination against women was quite strong. The duty of women in the industrial age was to stay home, look after the home and the family; they shopped and did daily little trips.

Progressively since World War II we have moved to what many writers, and I have quoted them in my submission, refer to as the post-industrial society. That is, a service-based economy where all of us work in some sort of service employment. The regular routine tasks in manufacturing and in all other sectors, agriculture and so on, are increasingly being done by machines. People serve other people. We have seen the growth of legal, medical health, education, finance, business - all these sectors have grown enormously. The other thing about the service economy is that it is gender-neutral, so women can and are doing those jobs just as efficiently as men could.

All the figures for Hobart I have cited in my submission are from the Census data so they are not based on hearsay or anything else. There has been an enormous growth in female employment. That main gap has been filled with women with dependant children. We now have mums and dads sharing work commitments with home and family responsibilities - picking Johnny up after school to take him to his ballet lessons, picking Matilda up to take her to her

PUBLIC

soccer training. People now live busy lives. There are still only 24 hours in a day. Most of that time is spent at home; we have to sleep, eat and do all those things. We have limited daylight hours to do things such as getting to work and then doing all the other activities that we need to during the day.

That is where the car comes in. The car has been designed for the post-industrial society. It was originally developed as a kind of luxury, recreational vehicle for families so they could get away from the city and visit the countryside. Increasingly, in the post-industrial society, it has been an urban vehicle. The reason for that is it can connect up spatially dispersed locations in highly critical time situations. If Johnny has to be picked up to go to the dentist and the appointment is at 4.30 p.m., he has to be there. Somebody has to pick him up from school and take him there, someone has to do the shopping on the way home and get home to cook the evening meal. Mums and dads and other people in society, whether they have children, lead busy lives and the only practical way for most people to do that is by car.

The reason public transport cannot do it is because public transport necessarily is governed by routes and it can only take you to points along the routes - stations and bus stops and so on. It can only take you at certain times. In other words, it is dependent on the timetable. It is intermittent and therefore it cannot connect up with spaciouly dispersed travel patterns.

I had a chance to look at and review all the submissions them all. Mine is the only submission that deals with the cultural aspects of urban travel. All the other submissions just deal with traffic; they just deal with vehicles. They talk about buses and how you can get 60 people on a bus -

Ms SIEJKA - The cultural aspect has come up as a theme from various people coming forward, the RACT in particular, but quite a few, which is interesting if it were not in the submissions.

MR COTGROVE - I was relating to the submissions as written.

Ms SIEJKA - Yes.

Mr COTGROVE - Another point I make is the role of public transport is increasingly being narrowed. It used to be general. People caught buses and did all sorts of things, but it being specialised to the role of taking commuters who work in the city and have simple activity patterns. In other words, they go to work, stay at work until it is time to go home again and then go home. They do not deal with these dispersed activities that most people face. That is a decreasing proportion of the workforce. More and more people are working non-centrally. More and more trips are made to non-central locations rather than central locations but public transport is fitted for a particular narrow set. It is not a general form of public transportation suitable for everybody.

If we think of people who cannot drive cars or people who for health reasons need to get to various appointments, we have community transport services available for them or they catch taxis. A number of elderly people catch taxis rather than use public transport because buses are heavy, there are crowds of youths at the back, or the driver is not very friendly or they find them intimidating.

Ms SIEJKA - Sometimes it is just the ability to get on the bus. I know the fleet is changing but that seems to have been an issue recently.

PUBLIC

Mr COTGROVE - Public transport and car travel essentially operate in separate markets. In 2014, the Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics, in Canberra, brought out an information sheet, No. 59 in my submission. It cites that the percentage of trips in the Greater Hobart area made by public transport is only 3.5 per cent, which is a very small proportion. The idea that making buses free or putting on ferries or building a light rail to the northern suburbs, improving public transport is going to have much effect on road traffic is a nonsense. It is not supported by the evidence.

I looked at figures from the Census and I compared Hobart to other capital cities. Fewer people use cars for the journey to work in Hobart than they do in cities like Adelaide and Perth. It is only in the megacities of Brisbane, Melbourne and Sydney. Melbourne and Sydney have populations close to 5 million while Brisbane's population is close to 3 million. To compare them with little old Hobart with fewer than a quarter of a million people is not a fair comparison.

Ms WEBB - We have heard from Metro this morning that its patronage has been growing in the double digits for a number of years now. How does that fit with you saying we cannot shift people's behaviour? They've done that not through adding more buses but through changing routes and changing the way they deploy the resource they have. We've had suggestions about all kinds of other ways we could choose to potentially increase the appealing factors of public transport and therefore drive greater use of public transport, but even without those factors, Metro is already growing in double digits each year. How does that fit with what you're saying? What are you saying is the upper limit that we could possibly expect to get to?

Mr COTGROVE - By public transport?

Ms WEBB - Yes, for public transport use.

Mr COTGROVE - If we compare ourselves with other cities, it's not very much. There is a graph I have shown in my submission that compares the mode split between cars and public transport over the last 40 years which is virtually unchanged - and that's across all Australian capital cities. During that time, let's get clear that the dominant paradigm in the profession, which is reflected in the vast majority of the submissions, is that we have to get people out of cars onto public transport and we have to redesign our cities into high density. They talk about urban sprawl, which is a derogatory term; I prefer to call it low-density settlement, and that's virtually unchanged, despite the fact that in that time governments have spent billions of dollars improving public transport.

Ms WEBB - I don't think our government has spent billions of dollars, just for the record.

Mr COTGROVE - Not only that, but also making car travel very difficult. We pay registration fees, we pay parking charges, we reduce the road space for cars for bike lanes and widened footpaths and things like that, so we are making it difficult. The figure the RACT might quote as double-digit growth -

Ms WEBB - Not the RACT, Metro Tasmania has reported to us that its growth has been in double digits every year for a number of years.

Mr COTGROVE - Metro, sorry. Well, double-digit growth on a very small base is not a very large increase.

PUBLIC

Ms WEBB - Sure, but we don't need a very large increase to make a tangible difference to congestion, which is one of the things we are hearing. No-one is advocating we should get everybody onto public transport; they are advocating that if we could shift a small proportion to public transport, that would make a tangible difference.

Mr COTGROVE - That's the RACT argument.

Ms WEBB - Given that the indication would be that we could shift a small proportion, are you saying that we couldn't shift a small proportion, say 4 per cent?

Mr COTGROVE - A small proportion isn't going to affect road traffic congestion effectively because the population of Hobart is growing.

Ms WEBB - What's the change in school holidays? It's less than 10 per cent that happens during school holidays when we see - magically - congestion is fixed, almost. So are you saying we shouldn't be contemplating those public transport and active transport solutions as part of a picture of solutions?

Mr COTGROVE - No, no, I'm not saying that. There is a need to improve public transport. I have written articles for *The Mercury*, many of them over the years, about ways of fixing public transport. One is to deregulate Metro. It's crazy. There is no evidence that bus services show the economies of scale that suggest a monopoly and in fact Metro would be much better if it were broken up and competition was allowed into the market so that people can compete for bus services, they can see a niche market and connect up with it.

Mr VALENTINE - How could that be? Metro has to service areas that private enterprise wouldn't take on. Is what you are suggesting feasible?

Mr COTGROVE - Well, it is. Take something like the North Hobart restaurant strip. That suffers from congestion, people can't get in there, the businesses are suffering and so on. Why shouldn't a group of businessmen in North Hobart run a shuttle bus service to areas - a lot of the people who eat up there come from Sandy Bay, South Hobart or other suburbs - run around and pick up passengers and clients, take them there and take them home afterwards? There are all sorts of solutions for these sorts of things.

Ms WEBB - Potentially we have already Uber fulfilling that function, to some extent. For people who can afford to pay for niche services like that, we already have other, technologically driven solutions such as Uber or ridesharing.

Mr COTGROVE - Uber has filled that gap because of public transport being so highly regulated.

Ms WEBB - We couldn't expect public transport to fill that particular gap to get people home from their dinner in North Hobart on a week night or whenever.

Mr COTGROVE - If we go back before the airline deregulation, all airlines were heavily regulated into cartels or into oligopolies of a few carriers. The argument was that if you deregulated the airline industry, it would form a giant monopoly because of economies of scale, the cost of aircraft, the cost of groundcrews and all the rest of it. It was tried in America in the

PUBLIC

1970s; they deregulated and the first thing that happened was that all the big iconic airlines - Pan Am and so on - collapsed. The growth of the airlines was in the small niche markets that came in, saw the opening and did it.

The same in Australia. Unfortunately, the Australian market is not large enough and because we are an archipelago of urban centres, a lot of the try-out companies, Compass and so on, failed. But there have been players that have stepped in that have taken up that slack, such as Tiger Air. The net result is that the threat of competition in a deregulated market drives down prices. Prices today in air travel are so much lower in real terms than they were prior to deregulation and, of course, the number of people flying is much greater; it's now a common experience.

The same thing applies to buses and public transport; not all public transport - trains obviously - require all the infrastructure and at a very high cost. Economically there are good reasons there are some monopoly industries and why other industries are competitive. It relies on the ratio of fixed cost to variable cost, and a degree of competition and so on.

Bob Hawke, the prime minister at the time when the airline pilots went on strike, described them as 'glorified bus drivers in the sky' - if you remember that famous quote. In other words, he was comparing them to bus companies, and yet here we are in Tasmania, with one single, publicly owned monopoly, Metro, that services just the four cities of Hobart, Launceston, Burnie and Devonport. It doesn't provide a service that accords with people.

Mr VALENTINE - To take this on a bit further, the fact they've got that task is due recognition that they are going to be servicing certain areas that require after-hours services with minimal numbers of people on those buses, otherwise people are going to be socially isolated. You're not going to get a private enterprise taking up those. If private enterprises don't take that up because simply there is not enough passenger numbers, who is going to do that task? Are you suggesting that Metro would still do that task and yet not be able to run the other services in order to make it possible for them to do that?

Mr COTGROVE - You have to give me an example. You mean somebody who lives at South Arm, for example?

Mr VALENTINE - Wherever the extremities are of Metro's operations, and I'm not sure where they are these days.

Ms HOWLETT - They do go to South Arm.

Mr VALENTINE - It's a fair way out, low numbers and wouldn't be commercially viable, but somebody has to service it.

Ms WEBB - Unless you are also servicing peak hour demands.

Mr VALENTINE - That's exactly right. One provides the other.

Mr COTGROVE - Where do you stop then? Do you provide buses to every place at all hours?

Ms WEBB - No, but I guess this is the fundamental thing. I think we're getting down a little rabbit hole here. We are making the assumption that public transport should be treated as a

PUBLIC

profit-driven business and somehow to be paying for itself, whereas that is probably not the way a lot of people suggest it needs to be regarded.

CHAIR - Rob, you were asking a question.

Mr VALENTINE - I was just trying to get a response from you with regard to that particular problem or issue. It is probably not on the money when it comes to talking about congestion so probably little off-topic, but I was interested in picking up on that statement.

Mr COTGROVE - I should say the advent of autonomous vehicles, whenever that might be I mean.

Mr VALENTINE - That will change the nature of things.

Mr COTGROVE - It will mean people who are, for example, disabled or people who for some reason cannot drive a car will be able to have the personal mobility other people have.

Mr VALENTINE - Some would say perhaps where we are at the moment with congestion actually provides us with an opportunity to have a paradigm shift as to how people get around - to be able to satisfy their needs through public transport offerings or through active transport and other ways. Some of our earlier submitters, Mr Andrew Holmes - I am not verballing him - the RACT and others were talking about those sorts of opportunities. Isn't that a good thing for us to be doing or not?

Mr COTGROVE - We have to be careful about social engineering and telling people what they should and should not do.

Mr VALENTINE - Wouldn't that be a good health outcome, for instance?

Mr COTGROVE - Most people when they go to bed at night put their head down on the pillow to sort of nod off and run through in their mind the sort of things they have to do tomorrow - 'Okay, I have to pick up such-and-such' or 'Must not forget to go and see my mother-in-law'. Incidentally, it is usually the mother who does all of those social and family ties, but that is changing. We run through our tasks and then work out how are we going to connect those things up and if any one of those trips requires a use of a car, there is no point in leaving the car at home, it has got to be with you during the day. We make linked trips. People know what they have to do; they are the best judges of what they need to do. The idea that somehow we can get in a trackless tram or have autonomous vehicles cruising up and down the street and people can click there and do that is a form of social engineering that has been in the planning profession for decades, probably ever since I have been involved in academia. We are making victims or we are blaming the victims of congestion. People suffer from congestion and we are blaming them for it.

Mr VALENTINE - Mind you, we do have congestion.

Mr COTGROVE - Yes, indeed we do.

Mr VALENTINE - We have to address it somehow; how do you see it going forward if we do not change?

Ms HOWLETT - It is the low-hanging fruit.

PUBLIC

Mr COTGROVE - The main problem for congestion in Hobart is that all the major arterial roads coming into Hobart - the Southern Outlet, the Brooker Avenue and the Tasman Highway - funnel traffic onto Macquarie and Davey streets. The cross-arterials often get neglected, but they are incredibly important, all the way from Antill Street which connects to Regent Street all the way down to Campbell Street. They all feed traffic onto Macquarie and Davey or they distribute traffic away from Macquarie and Davey. The whole of the city centre street system is really used for traffic conduits. It is really just using it for traffic either trying to get to some place in the CBD or, more importantly, trying to bypass it. It is interesting to look at the population figures. As I pointed out in my submission, if we look at the 1971 Census and compare it with the 2016 one, the most recent, in that almost-50 year period, 97.6 per cent of the growth of the Hobart urban area population occurred in the outer suburbs of Brighton, Kingborough, Clarence and Sorell. That is a pattern repeated throughout Australia. We now talk about 'exurbs' and all these forgotten people.

The reason for Hobart traffic congestion is that all traffic coming in from the regions that are in the expanding population areas of Hobart, whether they are trying to get to or bypass the CBD to get to other destinations, is funnelled onto that central street system. It is inevitable that there must be a western bypass to take the bypass traffic away from the city centre. By bypass, I mean traffic connecting the Southern Outlet, the Brooker Highway and the Tasman Highway. Those three major arterials have to be connected to allow that through traffic to bypass the city centre.

CHAIR - That was in a submission from Tony Denne.

Mr COTGROVE - Since I've been writing about this, Tony Denne has contacted me. He is a former project manager, engineer and a highly qualified man. He came up with what I considered to be a very workable solution. Unlike most people, I avoid prescribing engineering solutions. A lot of people fall into that trap, 'Do this, that and the other'. I avoid that. I point out the need; my expertise is in urban travel behaviour. I am an urban geographer, a transport economist. Tony Denne came up with what I think is a very workable solution that connects up those three major arterials.

Mr VALENTINE - There's \$1.6-billion price tag on that, isn't there?

Ms WEBB - It's \$1.4 billion.

Mr COTGROVE - I do not think it has been costed, but we can talk about it.

Mr VALENTINE - I am asking this question to hear your feedback; I am not stating that this is the way it is: wouldn't it be much more sensible to be encouraging active transport to overcome the congestion rather than spending \$1.4 billion on new infrastructure.

Mr COTGROVE - Let's talk about what we mean by active transport. Active transport is walking and cycling. A lot of people include public transport, including the Heart Foundation. It is appalling that the Heart Foundation should follow on from a three-part report published in *The Lancet* in Britain in 2016. They have picked it up everywhere. I know the lead authors of the report. They are purely of the paradigm that we have to get people out of cars and redesign our cities. They base public transport as being active transport on the fact that you have to walk to a bus stop or walk to a train station, as if that's the only exercise you do.

PUBLIC

If you are driving a car, you have time after work play golf or play cricket.

Mr VALENTINE - If you are not stuck in traffic.

Mr COTGROVE - If we can get rid of the traffic, flex your working time and so on. I have never seen anybody on a bus with a set of golf clubs or going to a cricket match.

Ms SIEJKA - That has been raised in the context of the provision on buses for carrying that sort of equipment, and bikes and so on.

Mr COTGROVE - Carrying bikes is a different matter. I play golf and nobody at the golf club comes by public transport. I used to play tennis on a Wednesday night. Nobody came by public transport.

I have a Bachelor of Dementia Care so I have a medical degree as well. I have seen no credible medical evidence, none whatsoever, in the published medical literature that says generally car drivers are less fit the public transport users. I would be very surprised if that were the case. People do sit around waiting for buses and trains, then they sit around on them. By the time they get home they are too tired to do anything else. They are not necessarily fitter than people who drive cars. It comes back to the obesity epidemic, which has a correlation between obesity and car ownership. So, okay, there must be a connection there. From all my studies, obesity is based on food input and not enough exercise and various things like that. It is all lifestyle. To say that people who catch buses or trains are less obese than people who drive cars is nonsense. There is no credible evidence for that.

CHAIR - Thank you very much.

Mr COTGROVE - I have been fairly passionate about it.

CHAIR - Thank you.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.