

Thank you for the opportunity to make corrections to the transcript. This is the very first time we have ever done something like this. We prepared as much as possible, but there was some confusion on our side and made mistakes.

I hope that from all these detailed comments, our main messages can still be heard:

- The NSW Government option of supplying the future growth area through railing freight from Port-Botany to Moorebank, and then trucking the freight to the growth area is a half-baked solution, that has been poorly thought through
- From a society's point of view, a thorough study, should be considered on how best serve the new development – as shown on Page 5 of our tabled report.

We are more than happy to answer any question.

Kind regards

Narelle and Paul van den Bos

Correction to Page 6 – in the tabled report

The boxes with the words “Badgerys Creek” and its green star and pink arrow have been shifted. The same applies to Eastern Creek.

I wonder if the corrected version of Page 6 could be used instead – see attachment.

Comment on Narelle's opening statement

The report that Narelle tabled “Narelle and Paul van den Bos, Freight – and the (potential) role of Newcastle”, contained mostly maps and pictures.

In her opening statement, Narelle pointed to the images but made no reference to the page numbers. She used words along the lines of “on the next page”.

We think it would be helpful if the references to the page numbers could be made, and that would assist the reader in reconciling Narelle's words and images. We have inserted the page numbers in the margins.

Wrong statements

Note 1: on page 50: “**we give the indication that**”

Narelle is wrong in stating those words. It is the “NSW Freight and Ports Strategy” that gives that indication. Refer to Page 5. (*See Note 1 below for the book's history*).

On page 51, Narelle used the word “**growth**”, but she really meant to say “**size**”.

On Page 52

Paul said **20** million, but should it be **1** million

Paul said “**draft Western City District Plan**”, he meant to say “**Draft Broader Western Sydney Employment Area Structure Plan**”.

Paul said “There is a reference for it here, **where ever it is.**” The reference is on Page 19, under the image of the artist impression of Badgerys Creek (Southern) Intermodal.

Books

We have written two books:

Moorebank Intermodals, Key Assumptions Require Closer Scrutiny

http://lccit.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/Intermodals_Book_Web_V19.pdf

Moorebank Intermodal, Better Options

www.transportmodelling.com.au/Intermodal/MoorebankIntermodal_BetterOptions.pdf

On page 51, Narelle held up the wrong book.

We have added the correct book titles in the margins

Questions

Most of the questions that were asked of Paul, were technical in nature and it would have been better, if we had more time to answer them properly.

In the margins, we have added the words Note 1, Note 2, ... Note 9 and the Notes below, to help with understanding Paul's comments.

I strongly suspect that I in some cases, I did not answer the question fully.

Hopefully, this background does supply more information.

I hope that there are other questions that are asked of this work, because I like to help the committee in this inquiry.

Note 1 – table report

Narelle did not actually table the second book.

We wrote this second book for Craig Kelly MP. He used it in the cabinet meetings. We remember seeing his web site acknowledging this book in his speech in Parliament.

Note 2 – 85% consumption within Sydney

Page 41 shows the proportion of containers that are transported **to and from Port Botany**, to destinations outside Sydney. This data comes from the NSW Freight model, when it was freely available on the NSW Government web site. This is 2011 data.

- 7% crosses the Hawkesbury River
- 4% crosses the Nepean River
- 1% goes to the southern Highland and beyond
- 2% goes to Wollongong and the South Coast

Total about 14% is transported to destinations outside Sydney.

- Hence about 85% (rounded off for simplicity) of the containers remain in Sydney. This 85% percentage of containers remaining in Sydney would have changed slightly between 2011 and 2016, but probably not by a very large amount.
- The precise percentage depends on where the Sydney Boundary is drawn.

Pages 45 – 49 give an indication of the truck movements to and from the intermodals. The thickness of the line represents the traffic flow to and from the intermodal.

- By visual inspection, few trucks from the intermodals travel north.

Summary: About 85% of the containers are remain in Sydney and about 85% of the goods are consumed in Sydney.

Note 3 – Chullora + definitions of “western Sydney” + “inner west”

Page 40 shows the destinations of the Port Botany container trucks.

- The red vertical bars represent the “articulated trucks” (bogy + trailers).
- The Blue bars represent the “rigid trucks”, and
- The yellow bars represent the “white utes and vans”.

The height of the bars represents the number of trucks - 24-hour (2011).

This was extracted from the NSW Government Freight model data.

Image 1 in the attachment, shows the same data a Google Map background.

For clarity, the width of the bars has been reduced, and a different scale is used. Now the following observations can be made:

- Port Botany truck movements are to industrial areas. (On Google Maps, industrial areas are easily identified as the white areas on the map corresponding to the white roofs of warehouses).
- The Sydney Intermodals are marked with name and asterisk.
- This data is 2011 data, and therefore no information was available on the recently opened Enfield Intermodal.
- Google Maps highlight the words land use planners use:
 - “green fields” - shown on Google maps with the predominant green colour, and
 - “brown fields - shown on Google maps with the brown colour, for the existing developments.

Sydney’s future growth will be in the “green fields”.

- The Bankstown Industrial area will be served by the Enfield Intermodal.
- Moorebank is rather isolated from the existing market (Wetherill Park), and even further from the future market (“green fields”).

Image 2, in the attachment, summarises Pages 45 to 49.

It shows articulated truck movements from all the intermodals in Sydney (2011 data – 24-hour – articulated truck movements only).

The thickness of the lines represents the number of trucks.

- Note the thick lines from Port Botany, and the immediate surroundings of any intermodal, and how quickly the lines reduce in size.
- From a technical point of view, there is a limit to the thinness of the pen size and the truck volume it represents. If more detailed information is required it is best to turn to the appropriate Pages 45 to 49.

This image was meant not meant for publication, but rather part of a very early working document. Please ignore the legends, because they are wrong. This image is put here to provide a general idea of truck movements to and from all the intermodals.

Image 2 shows that trucks travel all over Sydney, but are generally concentrated around the intermodals.

Definitions

- Many people in the freight business refer to the catchment area of Chullora, Yennora and Villawood, as the “inner west”.
The inner west is now well established with respect to population growth. There will be some infill, rather than large developments.
- **Rail capacity:** Page 55 shows the locations of Sydney’s Intermodals, together with their capacities.
 - SIMTA engineers, have calculated the rail capacity – see bottom of the page.
 - In the right-hand-side of this image there is the Federal Government’s announcement about the increased rail capacity.
 - Page 7 shows that the next stage of the duplication will be through a mainly residential area.
Intermodal capacities far exceed the rail capacity.
That means whatever cannot be moved by rail has to be moved by truck.
See Note 9 on road capacity.
- “Western Sydney”, Page 5, shows the new developments
 - South West Growth Area = 300, 000 people (size of Canberra)
 - North West Growth Area = 200,000 people (size of Townsville)
Combined: 500,000 people
 - Draft Broader Western Sydney Employment Area Structure Plan expects that 1.5 million TEU will be required at Badgerys Creek and 0.5 million TEU is expected at Easter Creek.
Combined 2 million TEUs.
 - This is only slightly less than current Port Botany TEU movements.

More complete answer

The “inner west” is expected to be served by the existing intermodals and the new Enfield intermodal.

I have not seen any modelling for the future freight. However, I understand that Moorebank will supply 0.5 million TEUs to Eastern Creek, and 1.0 Million to Badgerys Creek. (Moorebank will have 1.55 million TEU capacity).

Since In the future of Baderys Creek and Eastern Creek required 2 million TEU’s, and 1.5 million TEUs come from Moorebank, then 0.5 million TEUs must come from the existing Intermodals.
It is possible that Chullora would contribute to those TEUs.

There was a clear misunderstanding by Paul when he was asked about the 1 mil TEU by the NSW Government representations, and my 2 million TEU.

With benefit of reading the complete transcript, but not having access to the latest NSW Government plans regarding Badgerys Creek and Eastern Creek Intermodals, or private companies developing St Marys, Paul likes to provide the following information.

Note 4 - demand 2 mil TEUs – supply 1 mil TEUs

See Page 5. Western Sydney contains the

- “South West Growth Area” – 300,000 people, about the size of Canberra, and
- “North West Growth Area: – 200,000 people the size of Townsville.

Combined growth areas: 500,000 people (about ½ the size of Brisbane).
Total including “infill” the population is expected to house the 2.2 million people (shown in the Yellow blob).

The TEU data comes from the Draft Broader Western Sydney Employment Area Structure Plan. The Plan states that Badgerys Creek (Southern Intermodal) requires 1.5 mil TEUs, and Eastern Creek Intermodal 0.5 million TEUs. Combined, the demand of 2 million TEUs in 20 years’ time.

This should be compared to the current 2.4 mil TEU at Port Botany. Unless this freight is delivered by rail, all the 2 mil TEUs will need to be trucks. This roughly equates to all of Port Botany’s truck movements.

When Ian Hunt, then CEO of MICL and his entourage were at our home, his technical people advised us that Moorebank Intermodal will supply 1 mil TEUs to Badgerys Creek and 0.5 mil TEUs to Wetherill Park (Moorebank will process 1.55 mil TEU).

We suspect that the NSW Government meant that 1 mil TEU would be supplied by Moorebank in 15 years’ time.

Note 5 – economic analysis

The Federal Department of Finance and Deregulation, Moorebank Intermodal Terminal Project, Detailed Business Case, 6 February 2012, was highly redacted.

Working backwards, the following conclusions can be made:

1. Moorebank Intermodal was assumed to exist and was already fully functional
2. The containers were being delivered by truck from Port Botany.

The economic analysis concentrated on making this operation more efficient – by shifting the truck movements on to rail. To achieve this, the only costs incurred were

- building of a rail bridge over the Georges River, and
- the widening of Moorebank Av in 2029/30.

See Page 54 – reference Page 19 in the Detailed Business Case.

Page 11 shows the Federal Government’s web page at that time – stating that the benefits that when those 3,300 trucks were shifted onto rail, there would be \$10 billion of economic benefits.

This conclusion is further reinforced, in the EIS released to the community for comment. That EIS, contained a statement referring to the local committee benefits, when the 3,300 trucks would also be removed from Moorebank Av.

Page 12 (from MICL EIS) shows that if Moorebank was opened, fewer trucks would start from Port Botany (green colour) and more trucks would start from Moorebank (red colour).

There is a green line between Port Botany and Moorebank (reduction of truck movements). If all the 3,300 trucks are transported by rail, the green line, between Port Botany, should be as thick as shown.

By visual inspection, the MICL plot, shown the green line between Port Botany and Moorebank is not as thick as width.

Importance of this fact:

Page 13 (Detailed Business Case) shows the allocation of the project benefits.
In this case, 73% of all the economic benefits as based on shifting the 3,300 trucks.

Challenging this fact:

We have tried every avenue to obtain the traffic counts that show that 3,300 trucks travel between Port Botany and Newcastle. The agencies we have contacted include the proponents, Liverpool Council, NSW Government, PAC (see Image 3 in the attached document) and Infrastructure Australia. As yet, this data has not yet been provided.

Cost of obtaining this data: trivial

Our argument is that this data is extremely cheap to obtain:

- one GoPro-type camera on Foreshore Rd in Botany and
- another camera on the Moorebank Av bridge over the M5.
- Collect just 1-day worth of data.

The analysis: first examine the inbound trucks and then the outbound trucks.

- The videos would be displayed on two separate screens.
- The two screens would be analysed with the time shifted, that is
 - A truck passing the Foreshore camera on the first screen, would pass the second camera a short time later on the second screen.

Conclusion: Those 3,300 trucks do not exist. Therefore, the economic analysis is invalid.

Why is not a single organisation prepared to invest a few 100 dollars to debunk us?

Does the community have a right to be cynical?

Note 6 – visit to Newcastle

Background to my response

Pages 45 – 49 show the truck movements from existing intermodals. (2011 data). Each of these images emphasises the depth of penetration of the truck movements associated with intermodals.

Page 43 shows a table of the truck movements from intermodals in Sydney. In order to obtain a magnitude of truck trips from a typical intermodal, the truck trips from each Intermodal have been factored to 1 million TEUs -- see the column "Factored to 1 Mil TEU"

- Note the low numbers for the Enfield Intermodal and SIMTA (Moorebank) intermodal. These numbers have been extracted from their EIS documents.

From visual observation, it is clear that for the Enfield and SIMTA figures, and additional "zero" (0) would put the numbers in line with the other figures.

Notes:

- Port Botany does not have any warehousing.
- Moorebank (SIMTA in this table) is planned to have vast amounts of warehousing.
 - The actual number (including the additional zero) could be significantly higher.

My response

The purpose of my visit to Newcastle, was to forewarn them and not to get caught out on the traffic as Enfield and Moorebank are experiencing.

The obvious solution is to built an industry park- intermodal outside Newcastle, and from there, rail the containers to the port.

Note 8 – long term rail planning

This image comes from the Draft Broader Western Sydney Employment Area Structure Plan.

Note 9 – road capacity

The Inquiry discussed rail capacity, I like to add a few additional thoughts about road capacity.

Refer to Page 37.

This is a “fundamental diagram” – in transportation and traffic engineering this curve has the same status as “rules” in mathematics, and “laws” of physics etc.

This is known as a Speed-flow curve.

- On the X axis: the traffic flow
- On the Y axis: the traffic speed
- There is a “maximum” flow – also known as capacity
- The green line shows the traffic flow, in what is known as “free flow” conditions. Average traffic speed is close to the sign posted speed.
- Once the “maximum flow” condition has been reached, and more traffic is added, the gaps between the vehicles become shorter, and drivers reduce their speed to maintain their “3-second” gaps.
 - The result is that both speed flow reduces.
 - This condition is known as the “forced flow” condition – shown in red.
 - In simple terms: there are too many cars on the road
- As more vehicles are added, both the flow and speed reduce even further, following the arrow.

Different modelling tools

Just as a carpenter has big hammers one and small hammers, a traffic engineer has different transport modelling packages.

A mesoscopic modelling software is used if the principles of the fundamental diagram need to be followed. Under heavy traffic flow conditions, the model will show that queues will restrict intersection flows and generally impede the network flow. When the network extremely congested, some traffic is not allowed to enter the network.

Strategic modelling software is used to examine potential issues in future scenarios. This is achieved by overwriting the “maximum flow” condition, by using the Brown curve.

It is tradition that all the links that exceed the maximum flow, as shown in red. The observer can see where the network work issues are expected to be – because of the red links.

Once the maximum flow is exceeded there is a difference between the modelled flow (brown curve) and the flow on the fundamental diagram (red curve).

Sadly, the NSW Government continues to use the strategic modelling software, rather than the mesoscopic modelling software.

This leads to unrealistic comments about the expected time savings and counter intuitive economic analyses. For example, when I was asked to review some West Connex modelling results, I observed volume capacity ratios (modelled flow / capacity) of 1.4, and 1.6 and higher. That means that the modelled flows were 40% higher than the maximum, 60% higher than the maximum etc. The same results can be expected if freight modelling is done.

PAUL van den BOS, Transport Modelling, sworn and examined

NARELLE van den BOS, Transport Modelling, sworn and examined

The CHAIR: I welcome Mr and Mrs van den Bos.

Mr van den BOS: My wife and I are residents of an area near Liverpool and we have had some interaction with the Moorebank intermodal. We would like to share our knowledge.

Mrs van den BOS: We live in Chipping Norton and we have our own transport modelling company.

The CHAIR: Do you wish to make a brief opening statement?

Mrs van den BOS: Yes, please. I have given you copies of our report and I will go through it. We have had our own transport modelling company for 29 years. The reason we are here is because we have done a lot of work with the Moorebank-Port Botany interaction and we have been quite appalled at some of the science that is being used to support that. We have received no payment for this work, which is done purely for the community and because we want to see the right thing done for the community.

(page 5) I will start with a diagram. The yellow blob represents the future population in Western Sydney, which is supposed to be the equivalent of two times the population of Brisbane, or about 2.2 million. As such, it will require about 2 million TEUs a year. The way that that can be serviced through our ports would be through Port Newcastle, Port Botany or Port Kembla. The solution that the Government provides, if you go to the next page, is to come to Port Botany. The boats come in, the TEUs are transferred to rail and that rail is supposedly going to Moorebank and then the TEUs will be transferred to trucks. Those trucks go from Moorebank to, presumably, Western Sydney and the areas where the freight is needed. There are problems with this. Even if the rail is duplicated completely, from what we can determine, it is not going to provide the capacity that is needed to take the rail from Port Botany to Moorebank. This is made clear on the bottom of that page of our tabled document. The SIMTA environmental impact statement [EIS] casts doubt on the rail capacity to serve Moorebank as well as the other intermodals. (page 7)

The CHAIR: Could you tell us what SIMTA is?

Mr van den BOS: SIMTA is the Sydney Intermodal Terminal Alliance—the intermodal company for Moorebank.

(page 8) **Mrs van den BOS:** Without a lot of government financial input, the rail is not going to be able to provide. We really come to the fore with the road infrastructure. The roads do not have the capacity to take the freight that is expected. The red on this map indicates an increase in traffic, and Moorebank is not equipped to take that traffic. To do that, we have written a book that has 34 intersections that would need upgrading in terms of being able to cope with the traffic. That has not been costed; we do not see that costing and we do not see the costing that we need for rail. On the following page, in red, according to the New South Wales Government's ports and freight strategy, we give the indication that the road infrastructure is not going to cope. That is a very costly exercise for the Government that has not been determined. We would like to see the cost of improving the rail infrastructure and the road infrastructure to take all this freight from Port Botany. Note 1

Also, when the cost-benefit analysis was done, it was done incorrectly. They assumed that 3,300 trucks would come off the road and freight would go by rail, but that is absolutely incorrect. It is a shame because when they did this cost-benefit analysis, 73 per cent of their benefits are supposed to come from taking trucks off the road, putting freight on rail and taking it to Moorebank. (page 11) That is absolutely not correct. When the cost-benefit analysis was originally done, they said there would be \$10 million in benefits, but that is actually not correct. (page 12)

(page 14) In the future, at least the freight coming into Port Botany that is needed for the north of Sydney could be taken by the Port of Newcastle. Why is that not being taken by the Port of Newcastle? Also, the freight in the future going to the north of Sydney could also be taken by the Port of Newcastle. (page 15) When the Port Botany TEU cap was taken off, when Port Botany was sold, we give the amount of freight that was coming through. If you add Port Kembla and Newcastle to that, you find that the black line in our report shows where the freight is. We also give the prediction for the future, which is twice that. (page 16) We have no detailed account of how they are going to supply the capacity in the freight, in the rail and the road to take care of this extra freight. Here you can see that two-thirds of our freight goes by road and one-third goes by rail. That is a shame. We should perhaps be increasing that. (page 17)

(page 19) Just to sum up here, if you look there has been a little bit of an indication of a broadbrush way of getting freight to the west of Sydney. As our Government suggests, it is supposed to come through Port Botany. The work done on that has been appalling. We do not have a lot of the sums that we need to do this correctly. To do a proper comparison, we are advocating, as members of the community and taxpayers, that a proper comparison be done

UNCORRECTED

using the costs of increasing the rail capacity and the road capacity to go through the Moorebank way; a proper costing from Port Newcastle, perhaps taking in down to the growth centre at the back of Sydney, which is two times the growth of Brisbane; and a proper costing coming up from Port Kembla, including all of those things that have not been done—including a proper business case being done. That comparison then should be looked at, doing the best for the community and the best for the dollar that the taxpayer has. That is basically what I wanted to say.

The CHAIR: That was very lucid and very good—particularly for old engineers like me, who like pictures. Before we proceed to questions, have you been given the opportunity or have you been able to take the opportunity to present your findings to anybody in government?

Mrs van den BOS: Very early on in 2014, we produced this book, *Moorebank Intermodal*. ~~There are better options~~, and it showed how it has been built close to housing and how it has been built without regard for transport, and all of those things. We sent it to 80 decision-makers at the time. I have spoken to 30 presentations, including Karen Jones, who was the director for planning. We have spoken to Craig Kelly and to a number of politicians. We have presented at Planning Assessment Commission [PAC] meetings. We have been to Alan Jones. We have tried many, many avenues. It just seems to be not recognised. Even in the PAC meetings, they will go, "Oh, wow. We didn't realise that." But then it still goes ahead. They still keep doing it. They do not seem to have the energy to look at it closely and understand what we are saying and say, "Look, the studies need to be done fully. We can't just half-bake this stuff."

For Paul and I, this is voluntary. The book shows 34 intersections that are recognised not by us but by Bankstown, Campbelltown and Liverpool local governments and the New South Wales Government to show intersections that are having issues in Moorebank already. With the extra traffic, they are just taking the traffic from Port Botany and saying, "We'll put it on Moorebank, and Moorebank is going to cope." No. We have presented this. This book has been tabled and nothing seems to be done about it. We would like to see costings. We would like to see what it is going to cost to fix up Hoxton Park Road, what it is going to cost to fix up the Hume Highway, and what it is going to cost to get the trucks onto the M5 without causing accidents. At the moment it is like *Fawlty Towers*. It is absolutely hysterical. I just find it very, very sad for the public.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: I just want to ask about a couple of the figures. You have a figure in here on page 22: "Since 85 per cent of all freight is consumed in Sydney ...". Where do you get that figure from?

Mr van den BOS: Page 22?

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: Yes, underneath the "high expected growth". It is on page 22 and it is the third-last sentence.

Mr van den BOS: This is my interpretation from this graph, which is on page 23. It comes from a report entitled "First Things First" produced by Infrastructure NSW. In particular I am looking at page 38 of that report. What I have done with that is actually rank or sorted the icons into two groups—one that belongs to demographics and the other one to the others. In the demographics part, which is the top part, we are looking at housing stock, roads, hospital beds and public transport. When we look at the average of that, it seems like population is growing at about 30 per cent. That is just the average—hospital beds, housing and all that sort of stuff. When we look at the last icon, for whatever reason, Port Botany's containers will increase tenfold. We accept that all of the containers, or 85 per cent.

Mrs van den BOS: That is 300 per cent.

Mr van den BOS: We accept that the containers are consumed, if you like, in Sydney. So if the population grows 30 per cent and the containers grow 300 per cent, that basically means that we must consume 10 times what we do now.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: I was more wondering where you came up with the 85 per cent.

Mr van den BOS: The 85 per cent is a given statistic of all the containers that arrive at Port Botany and are consumed in Sydney.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: And that is an assumption, that figure, is it?

Mr van den BOS: Well, it is a stated fact, and you hear it in every report.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: With the Chullora line, when you talk about the duplication of the line to Chullora—is that right—the Enfield holding yard?

Mrs van den BOS: We accept that is part of the line.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: I am not looking at a picture. I am just talking about that line.

UNCORRECTED

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Key assumption
assumptions
require
deeper
scrutiny

moorebank
intermodal,
better
options

Note 1

Note 2

Mrs van den BOS: Okay.

Mr van den BOS: Yes.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: You are not expecting them the Chullora facility to take fewer containers than it is already taking. Is that the assumption?

Mr van den BOS: There are two things. That question has two parts. If you turn to page 55, which looks a bit like what I am showing you, what happens here is, when I did this picture I looked around and went through the websites and all the stuff, and worked out how many TEUs were coming in or being processed at each of these intermodals. That gives you a total of what was done at that point.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: And when was that point? At what point in time?

Mr van den BOS: It would have been a couple of years ago. The last statement up there you can see, which my wife was alluding to, is a statement from the Sydney Intermodal Terminal Alliance [SIMTA] environmental impact statement [EIS].

Mrs van den BOS: This was when it was two intermodals. It is now joined.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: What I am getting to is that it works on the principle that you take Yennora, Chullora, Enfield and those holding ones in there, and they are servicing the western suburbs region. The intermodal at Moorebank essentially would be for the south-west region, which is where a lot of the growth is coming because of Badgerys Creek. That would be fair enough to say?

Mr van den BOS: That is what this diagram says.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: Yes.

The CHAIR: That is on what page?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: It is on page 55.

Mr van den BOS: In fact, 45 per cent of all the containers that arrive at Port Botany end up in what we call Wetherill Park—45 per cent.

Mrs van den BOS: Our argument now though is there is another intermodal planned at Badgerys Creek, where the airport will come in.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: Yes. Your figures project that there will be two million in 20 years?

Mr van den BOS: Yes.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: That is for greater Western Sydney area whereas the figure we had for Western Sydney this morning from the Government was one million over 15 years. How do you get from the—

Mr van den BOS: If there are 20 million in 15 years, that explains it.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: So that is a big jump in a five-year period from one million to two million.

Mr van den BOS: Yes, excellent. Thank you for that. If you go back to this diagram here, the two million that you arrive at—

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: What page number?

Mr van den BOS: That is page 5. We can see 1½ million TEUs from Badgerys Creek and half a million from Eastern Creek. Those figures come from the draft Western City District Plan. There is a reference for it here, wherever it is.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: So that is freight growth. I thought I saw a figure on population growth in here.

Mr van den BOS: The population growth basically is 2.2 million.

Mrs van den BOS: I am not sure that that is growth. The whole lot contains 2.2 million.

Mr van den BOS: The yellow line.

Mr van den BOS: There are some existing people in that area.

The CHAIR: So that is absolute at the end.

Mrs van den BOS: Yes.

UNCORRECTED

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Note 3

Note 4
continued

NOTE 4

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: And that is the growth area?

Mr van den BOS: Yes.

The CHAIR: I will now move to Ms Faehrmann.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: Thank you for your presentation. Page 11 of your document—and I am sorry you had to skip through the presentation so quickly at the beginning; it would have been good to have more detail because there is a lot here—

Mrs van den BOS: This is always the way; it is five minutes and it is science.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: You mentioned that the 3,500 truck figure was incorrect. Could you expand on that?

Mrs van den BOS: Yes. If you have a look at the next page, this is produced from one of the Moorebank Intermodal Company Limited [MICL] reports, which is again the intermodal, and the green indicates a reduction in traffic when Moorebank goes into place, and the red indicates an increase in traffic. You can see if you follow the green line from Port Botany to Moorebank it starts to dwindle out when it gets to Moorebank and it is not very thick. If there were 3,300 trucks coming off the road—and this is to scale—it would look like the green line underneath; that would be 3,300 trucks, but this comes out of their report, it is that very thin little line there.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: They are not saying it because the trucks get rid of their goods closer to the terminal—I am just guessing at what they would argue.

Mrs van den BOS: No.

Mr van den BOS: No. The logic purely is that at the moment for the green line the containers come to Port Botany and they get shipped. You can see the green line going. In their new option we rail it to Moorebank and the same trucks now start from Moorebank.

Mrs van den BOS: So now they are picking up from Moorebank rather than here, but that is actually not what happens.

Mr van den BOS: The economic argument is that at the moment the containers come and land in Port Botany, they get trucked 3,300 to Moorebank and then they get trucked again.

Mrs van den BOS: They are assuming it is already happening but it is not. The infrastructure is not there for these trucks to suddenly arrive here and take the freight where it needs to be.

Mr van den BOS: The assumption is that Moorebank already operates and already 3,300 trucks are being driven to it. We can see if we turn to page 54 that the cost of implementing Moorebank is a bridge over the railway, a bridge over the Georges River and upgrading Moorebank Avenue in 15 years from now.

Notes 5

Mrs van den BOS: Actually it has to be done now.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: I understand you visited Newcastle to argue against the creation of an intermodal terminal. What do you consider to be the preferred transport modes for a container terminal in Newcastle?

Mr van den BOS: Obviously rail. There is not a single traffic transportation engineer that would argue against it. We would all argue let us go and put containers on rail, but there is always a proponent that is just basically difficult to get on rail. So now we have to have possibly an intermodal terminal somewhere.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: I am not sure whether you sat through today's hearing but the government witnesses said that there would be hundreds if not thousands of truck movements per day in Newcastle if the container terminal went ahead.

The CHAIR: It is 2,700 to 5,000.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: It is 2,700 to 5,000 in that Newcastle city area. Have you done any modelling or do you have any comments on that?

Mr van den BOS: Yes. When Sydney Intermodal Terminal Alliance [SIMTA] first came up they used the same number, and how did they arrive at that number? If you divide one million by 365 days.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: And one million is the figure for the TEUs?

Mrs van den BOS: Yes.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: By 365 days?

UNCORRECTED

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Note 6

Mr van den BOS: Yes. That is how that number was arrived by SIMTA and by MICL.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: Do you have confirmation of that or did you deduce that from your—

Mr van den BOS: Just working backwards. I have worked in this field for 30 years; I have got some idea what goes on.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: You also highlighted towards the end of your presentation about a suggested freight rail bypass of Sydney. I understand there has not been any comprehensive study of this by the Government. Is that correct?

Mr van den BOS: That is correct.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: What do you see are the advantages if the Government did do something like that?

Mr van den BOS: We heard the previous speaker talk about long-term plans. When we build infrastructure we think about existing road and rail structure and when was that constructed. So if you build new stuff it is going to last 100 years, plus or minus a bit. So for us to invest in something that is going to last 100 years it is worthwhile investing a bit of thought and money into getting this right. That is why we tend to look at an economic analysis over a longer period. We should not produce this crap that has been produced before. I think if we did it properly we would as a society make long-term investments that have long-term benefits.

Mrs van den BOS: This book has the 34 intersections.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: Can you say what that book is?

Mrs van den BOS: It is one that we produced for Craig Kelly.

Mr van den BOS: Craig Kelly asked us to produce this report.

Mrs van den BOS: And it shows 34 intersections that need work around the Moorebank area.

The CHAIR: Could you just clarify the name of the book or its title?

Mr van den BOS: It is called Moorebank Intermodal Better Options. It contains an awful lot of material.

Mrs van den BOS: It is a literature review basically. Our thing is that the cost of actually fixing these up properly, if you add all of that up, plus the cost of fixing the rail properly, add all of that up, possibly billions of dollars. It may be cheaper to make a good, decent rail from Newcastle to the growth area and that would be infinitely useful then for Sydney and a better use of government resources. If they could just study all three and do them without bias, do them exactly how they should be and give us a good presentation of that, that would be wonderful.

The CHAIR: I will now move over to the Government.

The Hon. TREVOR KHAN: It would seem that if we are talking about Newcastle to Sydney—I take it that you are looking at costing—it would be the development of a new line from—

Mrs van den BOS: Ideally that would work.

The Hon. TREVOR KHAN: I am not being in any way dismissive, but a new line from Sydney to Newcastle.

Mr van den BOS: I am not too sure about this.

Mrs van den BOS: Lower down. Maybe Wyong. I do not know, but it needs to be studied. Certainly Port Kembla is an option.

Mr van den BOS: Just like Newcastle is an option.

Mrs van den BOS: And there is only a billion dollars or something left in the cost of doing that, and that is an option to the back of Sydney, which sounds good.

The Hon. TREVOR KHAN: We are running a little short on time, and I know that is always a bugbear, but do I take it also that if you were doing this properly what you be looking at costing is separating out freight from passenger.

Mr van den BOS: Absolutely.

The Hon. TREVOR KHAN: Because trying to run them on the same line is a disaster.

Mr van den BOS: Totally.

UNCORRECTED

note 7

The Hon. TREVOR KHAN: I think the current position is that on a shared line passenger gets priority because of timetables and the like, so you are constantly shunting freight essentially sideways or stopping it from operating.

Mrs van den BOS: And this is the issue with duplicating the line; it is not totally duplicated as yet, a lot of it is passing lanes and trying to manage passengers as well as freight. It may be that if you think about your money properly you might be able to put two lines in in terms of getting a passenger line as well as a freight line; it might not be that much dearer. So that could be a better option.

The Hon. TREVOR KHAN: I am not an economist so I do not know, but if you are going to increase the freight load from Newcastle one of the things is that you have to separate out the passenger from the freight.

Mr van den BOS: Yes.

The Hon. TREVOR KHAN: I think we would all agree, however, not an inexpensive task in itself.

Mrs van den BOS: Compared to doing anything in Sydney. The WestConnex is a huge amount of money.

The Hon. TREVOR KHAN: Big money.

Mrs van den BOS: Yes, big money.

The Hon. SCOT MacDONALD: I am trying to understand what we were told by earlier witnesses that 650 metre trains were not a problem. We took evidence from the Port of Newcastle that the desirable length for efficiency and productivity is 1.5 kilometres. Can you explain the limitations you were alluding to in Moorebank? Can you expand on that a bit?

Mr van den BOS: Yes. There are a number of sites. The issue is Moorebank was chosen because it has this capacity for long trains but they are only going to be used for interstate trains, not the ones from Port Botany. As I understand it from my reading of all the stuff—I am a transport person with great speciality in roads, but not so much in rail but I do speak with people who are specialists in rail—the constraints are at Port Botany rather than at Moorebank.

The Hon. SCOT MacDONALD: So we are stuck with 650 metre trains. The future will continue to be 650 metre trains?

Mr van den BOS: Yes, but there is greater efficiency having longer trains.

The Hon. SCOT MacDONALD: If I understand your argument, there is not enough rail capacity out to Moorebank so, therefore, you will have more trucks on the road?

Mr van den BOS: That is part of it. The table that is shown on page 17 shows a graph basically. The top picture shows all the containers coming in by ship and then we can see the two lines. The red line represents the trucks and the green line represents the rail. You can see here just by the sheer numbers, just by looking at it, that we are going to shift probably twice as many containers by truck than by rail.

The Hon. SCOT MacDONALD: So we hit rail capacity at 2025 or so, roughly?

Mr van den BOS: At the moment we have the rail capacity at 1 million TEUs which is one of the government documents that I have in one of these things. By duplicating it part of the way we might actually increase it a bit more.

The CHAIR: Your submission No. 4 and what you have provided today is very detailed and it contains a lot of interesting stuff. I suspect therefore that there will be quite a number of questions from members who will need to take time to absorb this. I do not want to put pressure on you but those questions will be sent to you by the secretariat and we would like answers by 11 February which I know does not give you a lot of time and you are doing this on a voluntary basis. But there are several issues that will probably need clarification. Thank you very much for agreeing to come and see us. We will be in touch with you.

Mrs van den BOS: We absolutely appreciate your time and we would love questions.

(The witnesses withdrew)

PAUL van den BOS, Transport Modelling, sworn and examined

NARELLE van den BOS, Transport Modelling, sworn and examined

The CHAIR: I welcome Mr and Mrs van den Bos.

Mr van den BOS: My wife and I are residents of an area near Liverpool and we have had some interaction with the Moorebank intermodal. We would like to share our knowledge.

Mrs van den BOS: We live in Chipping Norton and we have our own transport modelling company.

The CHAIR: Do you wish to make a brief opening statement?

Mrs van den BOS: Yes, please. I have given you copies of our report and I will go through it. We have had our own transport modelling company for 29 years. The reason we are here is because we have done a lot of work with the Moorebank-Port Botany interaction and we have been quite appalled at some of the science that is being used to support that. We have received no payment for this work, which is done purely for the community and because we want to see the right thing done for the community.

(page 5) I will start with a diagram. The yellow blob represents the future population in Western Sydney, which is supposed to be the equivalent of two times the population of Brisbane, or about 2.2 million. As such, it will require about 2 million TEUs a year. The way that that can be serviced through our ports would be through Port Newcastle, Port Botany or Port Kembla. The solution that the Government provides, if you go to the next page, is to come to Port Botany. The boats come in, the TEUs are transferred to rail and that rail is supposedly going to Moorebank and then the TEUs will be transferred to trucks. Those trucks go from Moorebank to, presumably, Western Sydney and the areas where the freight is needed. There are problems with this. Even if the rail is duplicated completely, from what we can determine, it is not going to provide the capacity that is needed to take the rail from Port Botany to Moorebank. This is made clear on the bottom of that page of our tabled document. The SIMTA environmental impact statement [EIS] casts doubt on the rail capacity to serve Moorebank as well as the other intermodals. (page 7)

The CHAIR: Could you tell us what SIMTA is?

Mr van den BOS: SIMTA is the Sydney Intermodal Terminal Alliance—the intermodal company for Moorebank.

(page 8) **Mrs van den BOS:** Without a lot of government financial input, the rail is not going to be able to provide. We really come to the fore with the road infrastructure. The roads do not have the capacity to take the freight that is expected. The red on this map indicates an increase in traffic, and Moorebank is not equipped to take that traffic. To do that, we have written a book that has 34 intersections that would need upgrading in terms of being able to cope with the traffic. That has not been costed; we do not see that costing and we do not see the costing that we need for rail. On the following page, in red, according to the New South Wales Government's ports and freight strategy, we give the indication that the road infrastructure is not going to cope. That is a very costly exercise for the Government that has not been determined. We would like to see the cost of improving the rail infrastructure and the road infrastructure to take all this freight from Port Botany. Note 1

Also, when the cost-benefit analysis was done, it was done incorrectly. They assumed that 3,300 trucks would come off the road and freight would go by rail, but that is absolutely incorrect. It is a shame because when they did this cost-benefit analysis, 73 per cent of their benefits are supposed to come from taking trucks off the road, putting freight on rail and taking it to Moorebank. (page 11) That is absolutely not correct. When the cost-benefit analysis was originally done, they said there would be \$10 million in benefits, but that is actually not correct. (page 12)

(page 14) In the future, at least the freight coming into Port Botany that is needed for the north of Sydney could be taken by the Port of Newcastle. Why is that not being taken by the Port of Newcastle? Also, the freight in the future going to the north of Sydney could also be taken by the Port of Newcastle. (page 15) When the Port Botany TEU cap was taken off, when Port Botany was sold, we give the amount of freight that was coming through. If you add Port Kembla and Newcastle to that, you find that the black line in our report shows where the freight is. We also give the prediction for the future, which is twice that. We have no detailed account of how they are going to supply the capacity in the freight, in the rail and the road to take care of this extra freight. (page 17) Here you can see that two-thirds of our freight goes by road and one-third goes by rail. That is a shame. We should perhaps be increasing that.

(page 19) Just to sum up here, if you look there has been a little bit of an indication of a broadbrush way of getting freight to the west of Sydney. As our Government suggests, it is supposed to come through Port Botany. The work done on that has been appalling. We do not have a lot of the sums that we need to do this correctly. To do a proper comparison, we are advocating, as members of the community and taxpayers, that a proper comparison be done

UNCORRECTED

using the costs of increasing the rail capacity and the road capacity to go through the Moorebank way; a proper costing from Port Newcastle, perhaps taking in down to the growth centre at the back of Sydney, which is two times the growth of Brisbane; and a proper costing coming up from Port Kembla, including all of those things that have not been done—including a proper business case being done. That comparison then should be looked at, doing the best for the community and the best for the dollar that the taxpayer has. That is basically what I wanted to say.

The CHAIR: That was very lucid and very good—particularly for old engineers like me, who like pictures. Before we proceed to questions, have you been given the opportunity or have you been able to take the opportunity to present your findings to anybody in government?

Mrs van den BOS: Very early on in 2014, we produced this book, *Moorebank Intermodal*. ~~There are better options~~, and it showed how it has been built close to housing and how it has been built without regard for transport, and all of those things. We sent it to 80 decision-makers at the time. I have spoken to 30 presentations, including Karen Jones, who was the director for planning. We have spoken to Craig Kelly and to a number of politicians. We have presented at Planning Assessment Commission [PAC] meetings. We have been to Alan Jones. We have tried many, many avenues. It just seems to be not recognised. Even in the PAC meetings, they will go, "Oh, wow. We didn't realise that." But then it still goes ahead. They still keep doing it. They do not seem to have the energy to look at it closely and understand what we are saying and say, "Look, the studies need to be done fully. We can't just half-bake this stuff."

For Paul and I, this is voluntary. The book shows 34 intersections that are recognised not by us but by Bankstown, Campbelltown and Liverpool local governments and the New South Wales Government to show intersections that are having issues in Moorebank already. With the extra traffic, they are just taking the traffic from Port Botany and saying, "We'll put it on Moorebank, and Moorebank is going to cope." No. We have presented this. This book has been tabled and nothing seems to be done about it. We would like to see costings. We would like to see what it is going to cost to fix up Hoxton Park Road, what it is going to cost to fix up the Hume Highway, and what it is going to cost to get the trucks onto the M5 without causing accidents. At the moment it is like *Fawlty Towers*. It is absolutely hysterical. I just find it very, very sad for the public.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: I just want to ask about a couple of the figures. You have a figure in here on page 22: "Since 85 per cent of all freight is consumed in Sydney ...". Where do you get that figure from?

Mr van den BOS: Page 22?

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: Yes, underneath the "high expected growth". It is on page 22 and it is the third-last sentence.

Mr van den BOS: This is my interpretation from this graph, which is on page 23. It comes from a report entitled "First Things First" produced by Infrastructure NSW. In particular I am looking at page 38 of that report. What I have done with that is actually rank or sorted the icons into two groups—one that belongs to demographics and the other one to the others. In the demographics part, which is the top part, we are looking at housing stock, roads, hospital beds and public transport. When we look at the average of that, it seems like population is growing at about 30 per cent. That is just the average—hospital beds, housing and all that sort of stuff. When we look at the last icon, for whatever reason, Port Botany's containers will increase tenfold. We accept that all of the containers, or 85 per cent.

Mrs van den BOS: That is 300 per cent.

Mr van den BOS: We accept that the containers are consumed, if you like, in Sydney. So if the population grows 30 per cent and the containers grow 300 per cent, that basically means that we must consume 10 times what we do now.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: I was more wondering where you came up with the 85 per cent.

Mr van den BOS: The 85 per cent is a given statistic of all the containers that arrive at Port Botany and are consumed in Sydney.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: And that is an assumption, that figure, is it?

Mr van den BOS: Well, it is a stated fact, and you hear it in every report.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: With the Chullora line, when you talk about the duplication of the line to Chullora—is that right—the Enfield holding yard?

Mrs van den BOS: We accept that is part of the line.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: I am not looking at a picture. I am just talking about that line.

UNCORRECTED

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Key assumption
assumptions
require
deeper
scrutiny

moorebank
intermodal,
better
options

Note 1

Note 2

Mrs van den BOS: Okay.

Mr van den BOS: Yes.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: You are not expecting them the Chullora facility to take fewer containers than it is already taking. Is that the assumption?

Mr van den BOS: There are two things. That question has two parts. If you turn to page 55, which looks a bit like what I am showing you, what happens here is, when I did this picture I looked around and went through the websites and all the stuff, and worked out how many TEUs were coming in or being processed at each of these intermodals. That gives you a total of what was done at that point.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: And when was that point? At what point in time?

Mr van den BOS: It would have been a couple of years ago. The last statement up there you can see, which my wife was alluding to, is a statement from the Sydney Intermodal Terminal Alliance [SIMTA] environmental impact statement [EIS].

Mrs van den BOS: This was when it was two intermodals. It is now joined.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: What I am getting to is that it works on the principle that you take Yennora, Chullora, Enfield and those holding ones in there, and they are servicing the western suburbs region. The intermodal at Moorebank essentially would be for the south-west region, which is where a lot of the growth is coming because of Badgerys Creek. That would be fair enough to say?

Mr van den BOS: That is what this diagram says.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: Yes.

The CHAIR: That is on what page?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: It is on page 55.

Mr van den BOS: In fact, 45 per cent of all the containers that arrive at Port Botany end up in what we call Wetherill Park—45 per cent.

Mrs van den BOS: Our argument now though is there is another intermodal planned at Badgerys Creek, where the airport will come in.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: Yes. Your figures project that there will be two million in 20 years?

Mr van den BOS: Yes.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: That is for greater Western Sydney area whereas the figure we had for Western Sydney this morning from the Government was one million over 15 years. How do you get from the—

Mr van den BOS: If there are 20 million in 15 years, that explains it.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: So that is a big jump in a five-year period from one million to two million.

Mr van den BOS: Yes, excellent. Thank you for that. If you go back to this diagram here, the two million that you arrive at—

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: What page number?

Mr van den BOS: That is page 5. We can see 1½ million TEUs from Badgerys Creek and half a million from Eastern Creek. Those figures come from the draft Western City District Plan. There is a reference for it here, wherever it is.

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: So that is freight growth. I thought I saw a figure on population growth in here.

Mr van den BOS: The population growth basically is 2.2 million.

Mrs van den BOS: I am not sure that that is growth. The whole lot contains 2.2 million.

Mr van den BOS: The yellow line.

Mr van den BOS: There are some existing people in that area.

The CHAIR: So that is absolute at the end.

Mrs van den BOS: Yes.

UNCORRECTED

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Note 3

Note 4
continued

NOTE 4

The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ: And that is the growth area?

Mr van den BOS: Yes.

The CHAIR: I will now move to Ms Faehrmann.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: Thank you for your presentation. Page 11 of your document—and I am sorry you had to skip through the presentation so quickly at the beginning; it would have been good to have more detail because there is a lot here—

Mrs van den BOS: This is always the way; it is five minutes and it is science.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: You mentioned that the 3,500 truck figure was incorrect. Could you expand on that?

Mrs van den BOS: Yes. If you have a look at the next page, this is produced from one of the Moorebank Intermodal Company Limited [MICL] reports, which is again the intermodal, and the green indicates a reduction in traffic when Moorebank goes into place, and the red indicates an increase in traffic. You can see if you follow the green line from Port Botany to Moorebank it starts to dwindle out when it gets to Moorebank and it is not very thick. If there were 3,300 trucks coming off the road—and this is to scale—it would look like the green line underneath; that would be 3,300 trucks, but this comes out of their report, it is that very thin little line there.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: They are not saying it because the trucks get rid of their goods closer to the terminal—I am just guessing at what they would argue.

Mrs van den BOS: No.

Mr van den BOS: No. The logic purely is that at the moment for the green line the containers come to Port Botany and they get shipped. You can see the green line going. In their new option we rail it to Moorebank and the same trucks now start from Moorebank.

Mrs van den BOS: So now they are picking up from Moorebank rather than here, but that is actually not what happens.

Mr van den BOS: The economic argument is that at the moment the containers come and land in Port Botany, they get trucked 3,300 to Moorebank and then they get trucked again.

Mrs van den BOS: They are assuming it is already happening but it is not. The infrastructure is not there for these trucks to suddenly arrive here and take the freight where it needs to be.

Mr van den BOS: The assumption is that Moorebank already operates and already 3,300 trucks are being driven to it. We can see if we turn to page 54 that the cost of implementing Moorebank is a bridge over the railway, a bridge over the Georges River and upgrading Moorebank Avenue in 15 years from now.

Notes 5

Mrs van den BOS: Actually it has to be done now.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: I understand you visited Newcastle to argue against the creation of an intermodal terminal. What do you consider to be the preferred transport modes for a container terminal in Newcastle?

Mr van den BOS: Obviously rail. There is not a single traffic transportation engineer that would argue against it. We would all argue let us go and put containers on rail, but there is always a proponent that is just basically difficult to get on rail. So now we have to have possibly an intermodal terminal somewhere.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: I am not sure whether you sat through today's hearing but the government witnesses said that there would be hundreds if not thousands of truck movements per day in Newcastle if the container terminal went ahead.

The CHAIR: It is 2,700 to 5,000.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: It is 2,700 to 5,000 in that Newcastle city area. Have you done any modelling or do you have any comments on that?

Mr van den BOS: Yes. When Sydney Intermodal Terminal Alliance [SIMTA] first came up they used the same number, and how did they arrive at that number? If you divide one million by 365 days.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: And one million is the figure for the TEUs?

Mrs van den BOS: Yes.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: By 365 days?

UNCORRECTED

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Note 6

Mr van den BOS: Yes. That is how that number was arrived by SIMTA and by MICL.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: Do you have confirmation of that or did you deduce that from your—

Mr van den BOS: Just working backwards. I have worked in this field for 30 years; I have got some idea what goes on.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: You also highlighted towards the end of your presentation about a suggested freight rail bypass of Sydney. I understand there has not been any comprehensive study of this by the Government. Is that correct?

Mr van den BOS: That is correct.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: What do you see are the advantages if the Government did do something like that?

Mr van den BOS: We heard the previous speaker talk about long-term plans. When we build infrastructure we think about existing road and rail structure and when was that constructed. So if you build new stuff it is going to last 100 years, plus or minus a bit. So for us to invest in something that is going to last 100 years it is worthwhile investing a bit of thought and money into getting this right. That is why we tend to look at an economic analysis over a longer period. We should not produce this crap that has been produced before. I think if we did it properly we would as a society make long-term investments that have long-term benefits.

Mrs van den BOS: This book has the 34 intersections.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: Can you say what that book is?

Mrs van den BOS: It is one that we produced for Craig Kelly.

Mr van den BOS: Craig Kelly asked us to produce this report.

Mrs van den BOS: And it shows 34 intersections that need work around the Moorebank area.

The CHAIR: Could you just clarify the name of the book or its title?

Mr van den BOS: It is called Moorebank Intermodal Better Options. It contains an awful lot of material.

Mrs van den BOS: It is a literature review basically. Our thing is that the cost of actually fixing these up properly, if you add all of that up, plus the cost of fixing the rail properly, add all of that up, possibly billions of dollars. It may be cheaper to make a good, decent rail from Newcastle to the growth area and that would be infinitely useful then for Sydney and a better use of government resources. If they could just study all three and do them without bias, do them exactly how they should be and give us a good presentation of that, that would be wonderful.

The CHAIR: I will now move over to the Government.

The Hon. TREVOR KHAN: It would seem that if we are talking about Newcastle to Sydney—I take it that you are looking at costing—it would be the development of a new line from—

Mrs van den BOS: Ideally that would work.

The Hon. TREVOR KHAN: I am not being in any way dismissive, but a new line from Sydney to Newcastle.

Mr van den BOS: I am not too sure about this.

Mrs van den BOS: Lower down. Maybe Wyong. I do not know, but it needs to be studied. Certainly Port Kembla is an option.

Mr van den BOS: Just like Newcastle is an option.

Mrs van den BOS: And there is only a billion dollars or something left in the cost of doing that, and that is an option to the back of Sydney, which sounds good.

The Hon. TREVOR KHAN: We are running a little short on time, and I know that is always a bugbear, but do I take it also that if you were doing this properly what you be looking at costing is separating out freight from passenger.

Mr van den BOS: Absolutely.

The Hon. TREVOR KHAN: Because trying to run them on the same line is a disaster.

Mr van den BOS: Totally.

UNCORRECTED

note 7

The Hon. TREVOR KHAN: I think the current position is that on a shared line passenger gets priority because of timetables and the like, so you are constantly shunting freight essentially sideways or stopping it from operating.

Mrs van den BOS: And this is the issue with duplicating the line; it is not totally duplicated as yet, a lot of it is passing lanes and trying to manage passengers as well as freight. It may be that if you think about your money properly you might be able to put two lines in in terms of getting a passenger line as well as a freight line; it might not be that much dearer. So that could be a better option.

The Hon. TREVOR KHAN: I am not an economist so I do not know, but if you are going to increase the freight load from Newcastle one of the things is that you have to separate out the passenger from the freight.

Mr van den BOS: Yes.

The Hon. TREVOR KHAN: I think we would all agree, however, not an inexpensive task in itself.

Mrs van den BOS: Compared to doing anything in Sydney. The WestConnex is a huge amount of money.

The Hon. TREVOR KHAN: Big money.

Mrs van den BOS: Yes, big money.

The Hon. SCOT MacDONALD: I am trying to understand what we were told by earlier witnesses that 650 metre trains were not a problem. We took evidence from the Port of Newcastle that the desirable length for efficiency and productivity is 1.5 kilometres. Can you explain the limitations you were alluding to in Moorebank? Can you expand on that a bit?

Mr van den BOS: Yes. There are a number of sites. The issue is Moorebank was chosen because it has this capacity for long trains but they are only going to be used for interstate trains, not the ones from Port Botany. As I understand it from my reading of all the stuff—I am a transport person with great speciality in roads, but not so much in rail but I do speak with people who are specialists in rail—the constraints are at Port Botany rather than at Moorebank.

The Hon. SCOT MacDONALD: So we are stuck with 650 metre trains. The future will continue to be 650 metre trains?

Mr van den BOS: Yes, but there is greater efficiency having longer trains.

The Hon. SCOT MacDONALD: If I understand your argument, there is not enough rail capacity out to Moorebank so, therefore, you will have more trucks on the road?

Mr van den BOS: That is part of it. The table that is shown on page 17 shows a graph basically. The top picture shows all the containers coming in by ship and then we can see the two lines. The red line represents the trucks and the green line represents the rail. You can see here just by the sheer numbers, just by looking at it, that we are going to shift probably twice as many containers by truck than by rail.

The Hon. SCOT MacDONALD: So we hit rail capacity at 2025 or so, roughly?

Mr van den BOS: At the moment we have the rail capacity at 1 million TEUs which is one of the government documents that I have in one of these things. By duplicating it part of the way we might actually increase it a bit more.

The CHAIR: Your submission No. 4 and what you have provided today is very detailed and it contains a lot of interesting stuff. I suspect therefore that there will be quite a number of questions from members who will need to take time to absorb this. I do not want to put pressure on you but those questions will be sent to you by the secretariat and we would like answers by 11 February which I know does not give you a lot of time and you are doing this on a voluntary basis. But there are several issues that will probably need clarification. Thank you very much for agreeing to come and see us. We will be in touch with you.

Mrs van den BOS: We absolutely appreciate your time and we would love questions.

(The witnesses withdrew)