



Annual General Meeting

6.00 pm, Wednesday 30th November 2005

Montague Hotel, 355 Park Street, South Melbourne

Guest speaker: Robert Maclellan

(Former Minister for Planning and Minister for Transport)

Solid Waste Containment Facility – TCPA Submission

TCPA are preparing a submission on the Environmental Effects Statement for the proposed solid waste containment facility (toxic waste dump) at Nowingi, in north west Victoria. Deadline is 18th November. Our submission is based on the following points:

Incompatible adjacent land-use

National Park and Hazardous Waste Storage Facility are incompatible adjacent land uses.

Such facilities should include a reasonable buffer (e.g. 10 km) from areas such as National Parks.

Violation of the Victorian Greenhouse Strategy

The transportation of hazardous waste from Melbourne and Geelong to Nowingi, a distance of approximately 500 kilometres, directly contradicts the current Victorian Greenhouse strategy.

The increased fuel use and emissions (from transport) contravene good sustainable planning principles.

Unnecessary Transportation Risk

Exposure to road crashes is directly proportional to the distance travelled.

The Nowingi site presents a real increased risk by an order of magnitude over current transport operations. The proposed site at Nowingi exposes

both motorists and communities to transport risks that are not necessary if an alternative site is selected within 100 km of Melbourne.

Net Benefit to Society has not been established

The fundamental planning principle of net benefit to the community has not been established in this proposal. This is largely due to the site's location. The environmental impact statement fails to demonstrate a clear net benefit over current waste management practices.

Increased transport costs as well as environmental risks associated illustrate that this proposal will have a net cost and many generations of Victorians will have to pay considerably for it over its life.

The government should not support projects that fail to demonstrate a clear net benefit to society. The onus is on the proponent to establish the rationale for a net benefit. This is clearly lacking in the Environmental Effects Statement.

Threatens Clean Agricultural Image

Especially for export orientated produce (e.g. Wine).

Traffic Congestion Inquiry

The TCPA will make a submission to the Victorian Competition and Efficiency Commission "Inquiry into managing transport congestion". We seek members' input to the TCPA submission: send to Oz Kayak, email ok.trc@rmit.edu.au The Issues Paper is accessible at:

[http://www.vcec.vic.gov.au/CA256EAF001C7B21/WebObj/IssuespaperManagingTransportCongestion/\\$File/Issues%20paper%20Managing%20Transport%20Congestion.pdf](http://www.vcec.vic.gov.au/CA256EAF001C7B21/WebObj/IssuespaperManagingTransportCongestion/$File/Issues%20paper%20Managing%20Transport%20Congestion.pdf)

We also encourage members to make individual submissions to the Commission:

Transport Congestion Inquiry,
Victorian Competition and Efficiency Commission,
GPO Box 4379 Melbourne Victoria 3002,

or email to: transport@vcec.vic.gov.au

p.t.o.

A Personal View on Congestion Costs

From the personal perspective of a professional engineer and planner with more than forty years of involvement in solving bottleneck issues, I see the concerns of congestion a little differently.

The issues paper avoids the word “value”. Particularly, there is no discussion on *the value of time*. However, there is discussion in the paper on *time as a measure of congestion*. There needs to be more discussion on how different sections of the community value time. The issues relating to the value of travel time spent in the logistics freight chain are very different to those delaying an emergency vehicle, or a walker on the way to work as part of a health program.

I doubt the wisdom, for infrastructure investment decision-making, of valuing the shortening of my commuter or leisure travel time in a vehicle at nearly \$10 per hour. However, I can see the rationale for estimating the benefit of shortening business trip and freight cartage time at close to \$30 per hour.

My focus is on one of the many congestion issues, road space. Freight, private and public transport vehicles are users of road network space. Road reserves have additional functions, but these are not at issue in this discussion.

Congestion is indicated by unit travel times varying throughout the day. There is the perception that because a journey takes twice as long over one period as over another there is congestion. The congestion is a negative attribute. It may only be a negative attribute because people are in a hurry. In a twenty-four hour time-budget cycle, is a five to ten minute travel-time reduction able to justify major capital investment?

The increase in people’s travel time could be handled by travelling at another time, although this may cut into leisure time.

Correspondence to me on the value of time as a quality of life issue is welcome.

H (Oz) Kayak
ok.trc@rmit.edu.au

WHY MELBOURNE WILL GET A DEEPER SHIPPING CHANNEL, OR DIE

[The views expressed in this article are those of the author, and do not necessarily represent the views of TCPA. Ed.]

In spite of the fact that our community in general, many individuals, small business and community organisations will suffer from the dredging of Port Philip Bay in the short-term, it will go ahead.

At no other time has the access of ships been more important to the health of the Victorian economy. Without certainty of access, the long-term investment both in business and in transport infrastructure will gradually diminish; and without that investment will go the

commerce and manufacturing that creates the wealth and jobs that provide the health, education and transport services that makes Melbourne so liveable.

The port of Melbourne plays host to two types of vessel: bulk carriers for low value commodities, including oil, chemicals, cement, timber and grain; and container ships that carry medium value goods, such as exported manufactures and agribusiness products, and imported consumer goods demanded by Victorian businesses and residents. These goods are transported by the biggest ships that regularly visit the port. It is primarily for these ships that the channel is being deepened.

World container shipping supplies ‘liner services’ to traders around the world, and is dominated by some twenty shipping groups. Between them, they control the services that connect everywhere to the rest of the world. Economy of scale, and fierce competition between them, ensures that ship size continues to grow as quickly as technological innovation supplies solutions to increasing length, beam and draft (depth). As one group builds a new class of vessel, another group leap-frogs to greater size and increasing economy to obtain the next (temporary) advantage. The ships that are displaced, (often with still more than half their useful lives intact) are ‘cascaded’ to the next level of shipping service.

Once, ship size was limited to the ports that their cargoes were destined for, but containerisation has enabled containers to be economically transported by a mix of sea, rail and road transport. This has resulted in the development of entirely new trading routes that by-pass earlier limitations. In the pursuit of cost savings and competition, ships have now grown too large to transit the Panama Canal, and vessels that can carry 6,000 to 8,000 20-foot containers have displaced those half their size to other routes. Ships that can carry 10,000 TEU¹ are now on order for delivery in 2007/2008.

The adoption of this strategy by the shipping industry has required the largest ‘hub’ ports (where containers change from one mode to another), to increase their channel depths to accommodate the deepest ships. However, it is placing pressure on many major and secondary ports to increase the depths of their port channels to maintain their place in the cascaded trading infrastructure. Melbourne is an example of this unfolding scenario.

This is not a new issue for Melbourne. The first Melbourne Harbour Trust was formed in 1877 to deepen the channel. The issue has continued ever since but while competition remains at the centre of commerce and business, *economics* will continue to compete with *ecosystems*. We cannot avoid the current deepening, but we should consider and plan carefully as ships continue to get deeper, wider and longer.

John Leavesley is a retired Master Mariner and lecturer in International Trade at RMIT. He has just completed a research degree in shipping and sea-ports. He is a member of the TCPA committee. Tel (03) 9570 5842 (h).

¹ The capacity of a container ship is measured in TEU (technical equivalent units).