



Making Sense of the Eddington Rail Proposals

The following notes are based on a presentation given to members of the Metropolitan Transport Forum at the Department of Infrastructure on 28th April.

Rationalisation of Lines

The objective is to operate the suburban lines as six groups rather than as 16 individual lines.

1. Werribee/Williamstown line to be through-routed with Frankston line via Flinders St and Southern Cross. Track works at Laverton will allow a new service terminating at Laverton running via Altona; Werribee services will run directly from Laverton to Newport. I can't recall what was proposed for the Sandringham line, but possibly it is seen as a branch of the Frankston line or through-routed to Williamstown.
2. Watergardens (Sydenham) line electrification to be extended to Sunbury, replacing three V/Line services/hour. This line to be connected to tunnel at Footscray thence to Caulfield (or possibly Oakleigh, via Chadstone) and terminating at Clayton.
3. Pakenham and Cranbourne line to run express from Clayton to Richmond and thence to City Loop.
4. Burnley group – no change.
5. Clifton Hill group – no change (but there is capacity for extension from Epping to South Morang).
6. Craigieburn/Upfield group – no change.

Long Haul - Short Haul Separation

Two examples of separating long haul services from short haul services were given: Pakenham-Clayton, and Werribee-Laverton. There is scope for similar service separation on the Frankston and Ringwood lines, but this wasn't discussed.

Laverton-Cheltenham would be a possible short haul service.

Separation of V/Line and Suburban Services

The objective is to have separate paths for V/Line services and suburban trains.

1. V/Line services from Geelong to be diverted to Sunshine via new Tarneit line from Werribee to Deer Park and then use the same tracks as Ballarat and Bendigo services to Southern Cross. Four tracks between Sunshine and Footscray will allow separation of V/Line and suburban services.

Ray Walford

TCPA Submission to Review of Victorian Transport Legislation

Last December the TCPA submitted its views to the Victorian government's review of transport legislation. The government's approach and broad objective of this process was set out in its discussion paper "Towards an integrated and sustainable transport future" (October 2007), which would set up an overarching Act – the *Transport Integration Act?* This Act would establish the organisations and roles that are legally responsible for the delivery of transport in Victoria." This strategy reflects a recommendation by VCEC in its 2006 report on transport congestion for integrating and commonising a set of objectives for governance of transport across all transport authorities in Victoria.

Transport System Objectives

Public stakeholders were asked whether the initial draft set of objectives reflect their expectations. In thinking about how objectives should be framed, input was sought regarding the particular aspects of objectives which are important to reflect in the legislation. Should these be framed in the legislation? And how?

The pre-emptive draft *objectives* set out by the government were:

1. An integrated and coordinated system
2. A safe and secure system
3. An efficient and reliable system
4. A system that provides value for money
5. A system that supports economic growth
6. An equitable, accessible and socially inclusive system
7. A healthy system
8. An environmentally sensitive system

Feedback was invited on the following *questions* about the proposed objectives:

- Are the proposed objectives sufficiently related to long-term issues?
- How might the objectives strengthen or weaken the integration of the transport system
- Do all of the proposed objectives have broad support from the community, and if not what aspects of the objectives are not well supported?
- Do any of the objectives impose unnecessary constraints on the transport system?
- To what extent are the objectives consistent with each other?
- Should these objectives apply to all bodies created under the transport legislation? Are there other transport bodies not created under the transport legislation that the objectives should also apply to?
- What other objectives should be considered and why?
- Are some objectives more important than others or are they equal in importance?

TCPA's response

Framing of objectives

Level of generality and time-frames

We believe that objectives for the transport

sector should be split between those to be embedded in the relevant legislation, and those that are not in the legislation but which the legislation specifically calls upon designated authorities to devise, adopt and publish.

There is obviously a need to balance control of delegated authorities with the need for flexibility of corporate goal-setting with the corporate authorities. As the strategic environment changes, so should longer term strategic goals.

Thus, the new Act should define in general but sufficiently succinct terms what are the *higher-level, broad objectives* for the transport sector and for those agencies and authorities legally responsible for their achievement. Such objectives should be of an enduring and transcendent validity and would be stable over the long term (10 to 50 years, or longer?). As the land-use matrix tends to be stable in the long-term (50 – 100 years before major changes occur to land-use subdivisions and buildings), so should the transport planning and infrastructure, e.g. creating and setting aside of transport route land corridors, something that was very effectively done in Melbourne town plans up to the 1960s.

Goals of a *shorter* time frame (one to three years) and of a more specific scope should be left to the responsible decision-making of authorities empowered under the new Act. Nevertheless, these smaller scale goals must define performance outcomes fully compliant with the broad objectives stated in the new Act. The responsibility of defining and achieving these “sub-Act” objectives should be clearly defined and allocated in the new Act.

Objectives need to distinguish between outcomes for the transport services and performance outcomes for the authorised transport agencies

The drafted objectives always refer to the transport “system”, implying the physical

artefact of the infrastructure and services that are tangible to the public stakeholders. There is also the need to identify the authorised and mandated authorities that are charged with responsibility of achieving these “system” objectives.

What about statements about government vision, mission and objectives for the transport sector?

Question: Could the government’s candidate objectives be better expressed in terms of:

- A **government vision** for transport (the “transport system”) defined and stated at or near the top of the Act, maybe as a preamble. The candidate objectives (plus additions – see below) in the DoI’s discussion paper could and should (with some re-phrasing) comprise this Vision statement
- A **mission statement** (statement of *purposes*) to be produced by each agency or corporation authorised under the new Act, and approved by the ministers for transport and planning. The mission statements should be consistent with the statement of vision for transport under the new Act. These organisational mission statements would not be part of the new Act but be mandated by it, and would be required to be publicly gazetted or attached by schedule to the Act. The Greater Vancouver Transportation Authority Act 1998 has a short statement of purposes.

A mission statement (or statement of purpose) is a brief description of a corporation’s fundamental purpose. A mission statement answers the question, “Why do we exist?” [Not simply due to an Act of Parliament!] The mission statement should articulate the organization's purpose(s) both for those in the

organization and for the public. A mission statement will “broadly describe an organization's present capabilities, customer focus, activities, and business makeup”. Every organisation should have a mission statement, both as a way of ensuring that everyone in the organization is “on the same page” and to serve as a baseline for effective business planning.

The difference between a mission statement and a vision statement is that a mission statement focuses on a corporation’s purpose while a vision statement focuses on a corporation’s (in this case, the entire transport service sector’s) desired future.

- A statement of the **broad objectives** for the transport sector, and for the authorised organisations (basically what the DoI’s current review phase is about)

Interestingly, the statement of Objects and Functions of the Department (in Part II Subdivision 1 Section 4 p.18) in the current Act could provide, with rewording, a reasonable (but obviously incomplete) starting point for such a generic mission statement for the overarching transport administrative authorities (DoI, etc).

The TCPA recommends that the candidate objectives could be retained and/or enhanced in a vision statement within the new Transport Act as follows:

1. An integrated and coordinated transport system and related sector of organisations
2. A safe and secure system, where people are not repelled by their fear of accident or crime
3. A reliable system whose planning and operation must seek maximum efficiency and effectiveness to the extent that this is consistent with other objectives.
4. A system that provides optimal value for

money

5. A system that meets the needs of the economy
6. A system that maximises social equity, fairness, accessibility and social inclusiveness to return the greatest possible good to the community
7. An active, healthy system that promotes people's health and well-being
8. A system that minimises environmental impact and unsustainable use of natural resources
9. *A system that fully supports planning strategies for sustainable land use, as defined by the relevant land planning statutes and governing policy*
10. *An accountable system and sector, which are transparent and open to public scrutiny and legal appeals.*

Objectives 9 and 10 are additional to the list in the DoI's Discussion Paper.

TCPA Submission to Garnaut Climate Change Review

What are the key barriers to the adoption of cost-effective and low-emissions mode use in the passenger transport sector?

1. Poor access to public transport from home in low density suburbs and country towns
2. Bus service hours of operation are too short and frequencies are too low
3. Public transport too slow for long journeys, and journeys circumferential to city centres
4. Overcrowding on some train and tram services, symptomatic of inadequate supply and a deterrent to increased demand.
5. Public transport route interchanging too difficult
6. Lack of safe and direct bicycle routes, and secure parking at rail stations.
7. Continuation of low-density urban design in growth areas is a barrier to sustainable public transport services and walking/cycling. In the absence of transport plans, new developments cannot plan for higher density nodes or corridors.
8. Circuitous street layouts not conducive to walking or cycling, and thus access to public transport
9. Facilities, jobs too dispersed, shopping centre

catchments too large for walking

10. Tax benefits that favour car driving over use of public transport for work- or business-related journeys

How might these be addressed effectively and efficiently by government policy?

11. Legislate for carefully researched national minimum passenger convenience standards for urban bus services (frequency, hours of operation, accessibility, intermodal connectivity), and subsidise them where warranted.
12. Improved inter-modal coordination and connections, and development of more major bus nodes, which will afford improved interchanges between bus and rail links and increase salience/visibility of bus services.
13. Provide federal government grants to the states for the purchase of additional suburban train rolling stock and for engineering works to eliminate rail network capacity constraints. Likewise, contribute to the funding of major infrastructure and rolling stock assets for other public transport modes
14. Hypothecate this funding of rail, bus and other transport modes to state governments implementing regulatory and licensing reforms that increase flexibility of bus route development and modification and the introduction of demand-responsive public transport such as flexibuses or continuous multi-hire bus-taxis in low-density suburbs and rural towns. This would inject some measure of competition between service providers. This would be in addition to some degree of competitive tendering for route services.
15. Also, insist that state and territory governments revise their transport regulatory laws to achieve improvements in governance and public scrutiny, starting with clear and unequivocal purposes/objectives that drive administrative activity towards the most sustainable and socially equitable outcomes.
16. Drive changes in the mechanisms of funding of road programs by linking funding to the introduction in major urban areas of general or "wide area" road pricing that would be the platform for congestion-related charging, carbon taxing, general freight non-passenger vehicle and car-use pricing (rather than tollway-specific), and replacement of fuel taxes and fixed charges like registration and insurances.
17. Provide federal government grants to local government for the construction of pedestrian and bicycle routes and road treatments.
18. Increase car and secure cycle parking at outer

suburban railway stations. In Melbourne, for example, parking stations could be built on industrial land in places such as Westall, Upfield and Aircraft (Laverton).

19. Give higher priority to the walking and cycling environment (footpaths, cycle lanes, traffic, road crossings). Suggested measures include reduced speed limits (40 km/hr in all residential and shopping streets) and traffic calming using driver self-regulation through the removal of traffic signals, stop signs, etc., as being implemented in Bendigo, for example.
20. All new greenfield residential developments to have a mandatory transport plan and planning requirements for higher densities around transport nodes and along major bus and rail corridors.
21. Investigate the scope for modifications to income tax rules for deductible expenses incurred in land subdivisions and building design and construction that provide greater deductibility offsets for urban developments that minimise carbon emissions during their establishment and throughout their occupation (operation?). Similarly, reward with favourable tax concessions those subdivision projects that install good quality public transport in advance of their completion. A 6-star energy use and emissions rating scales for these activities could be devised and referred to in federal income tax laws and regulations.
22. Introduce land tax levies to capture some of the property value increase created by public transport, as a source of its funding. For example, real estate agents in North Annandale in Sydney support light rail as a major attraction in the area. Property values could increase at least 10% if the light rail extended beyond Lilyfield. <http://www.smh.com.au/news/news/a-trip-on-the-light-fantastic/2008/03/28/1206207351999.html>

What policies would be suitable to address barriers to the uptake of more fuel-efficient passenger vehicles?

23. Eliminate perverse incentives to waste fuel (e.g. minimum km in vehicle leasing conditions, reduced import duty on 4-wheel drives).
24. Change federal income tax laws that provide incentives to use motor cars ahead of public transport for work- and business-related travel.
25. Remove restrictions on the import of low-powered electric bicycles
26. Apply the user-pays principle to private vehicle use through (a) congestion charges and road pricing (referred to above), (b) reduced registration fees, and (c) third party premiums paid through a petrol levy or road pricing.

How can land-use planning and the built environment be managed more effectively to lower reliance on high emission patterns of transport behaviour?

27. Facilitate the construction of low cost medium-density housing within walking distance of shops and social and medical facilities at suburban nodes that are on the rail network or principal bus routes. This would enable families to live with only one car, and give them the option of public transport to the CBD and other major activity centres or zones. Victoria's Transit Cities program is already doing this, but it needs to be accelerated and expanded.
28. Strengthen small neighbourhood shopping centres to reduce the need to drive to more distant retail centres. Encourage the development of mixed-use buildings with multi-storey housing and offices above shops.
29. End the expansion of large drive-in shopping malls that are not located on major rail or grade-separated public transport corridors, or else cannot practically be linked to such. Those (like Chadstone) that are already drawing customers from a wide geographical area should be transitioned into greater self-containment, by the construction of multi-storey apartment and office buildings within walking distance and a simultaneous reduction in parking and an increase in public transport service levels.
30. Re-develop major arterial roads within the existing metropolitan area and served by public transport as high-density mixed-use corridors (the Curitiba model).