



HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

PORT RIVER EXPRESSWAY—STAGES 2 & 3

Constitution Room, Old Parliament House, Adelaide

Wednesday 1 June 2005 at 10.30 a.m.

(OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT)

PARLIAMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

MEMBERS:

Mr P. Caica MP (Presiding Member)
Mr M.K. Brindal MP
Ms V. Ciccarello MP
Mr T. Koutsantonis MP
Mr I.H. Venning MP

WITNESSES:

JON STEELE, Executive Director, and DAVID BARTLETT, Special Projects Coordinator, both of Transport SA, 33 Warwick Street, Walkerville 5081; and ROD HOOK, Executive Director, Office for Infrastructure Development, Level 12, Terrace Towers, North Terrace, Adelaide 5000, called and examined:

1 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Welcome and thank you for appearing before the Public Works Committee today. Before proceedings begin, please note that this hearing is a lawful function of parliament and as such warrants the same respect that parliament itself demands. Sections 28 and 31 of the Parliamentary Committees Act outline the privileges, immunity and powers of the committee.

In most instances, the hearing is open to the public. Evidence given will be recorded and made publicly available after witnesses have had an opportunity to check the transcript for accuracy. If you believe that there are any reasons of justifiable confidentiality, you may request the committee to hear part or all of your evidence in private or in camera. Before you commence your evidence, there are several matters the committee requires you to respond to for the record.

Firstly, please advise whether the proposition before the committee is exactly the same as the proposal submitted to and approved by cabinet. If it is not, then in what precise way does it differ? In particular, are there any errors or omissions in the submission that need to be drawn to the attention of committee members?

MR STEELE: It is the same as the submission that went to cabinet and there are no errors that we are aware of.

2 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Secondly, the committee requires you to make a quarterly report about the progress of the proposal. Each report must provide a full explanation and any variations in project costs, target time frames or design features. Please confirm that you understand and comply with this requirement?

MR STEELE: Yes, we do.

3 MR BRINDAL: Does that include the design features?

4 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Target time frames or design features.

5 MR BRINDAL: We have had evidence before this committee where they have changed design features in this department and not reported back.

6 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Thirdly, the committee requires that you advise at least eight weeks in advance when the work will be opened, dedicated, commissioned or handed over. It also requires you to invite committee members to attend any function arranged to mark that event. Please confirm that you understand and are prepared to comply with this requirement.

MR STEELE: I understand.

7 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Do you have any questions of the committee before we commence?

MR STEELE: No.

8 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Please introduce yourselves, including your titles, and then summarise your submission adding any further detail or facts which may be relevant. Members may then ask questions in order to clarify aspects of the submission or seek relevant additional information. Mr Steele?

MR STEELE: My name is Jon Steele. I am the Executive Director of Transport SA. Also with me is Rod Hook, who is the Executive Director of the Office for Infrastructure Development. Also present is David Bartlett, who is the senior project manager for stages 2 and 3 of the Port River Expressway. I apologise for the absence of the new Chief Executive of the Department of Transport, Energy and Infrastructure, Dr James Horne. It is only his third day in the job and he is tied up at a meeting with the minister. He sends his apologies to the committee. He expressed to me a desire to come to the next one of these hearings where we have a project coming before the committee, which we will do within the next month or so.

With your agreement, I will make some introductory remarks about the project itself and then hand over to Rod Hook to make a few comments about how the project fits overall within the government's strategies and plans for infrastructure within the state. Is that acceptable?

9 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: That is fine.

MR STEELE: After such a long planning and development phase for this unique project, I am very pleased to be here today to present this for your consideration, our submission for the design and construction of the road and rail bridges across the Port River and their associated road and rail connections. The road element of this project will continue the four-lane road link from Francis Street and across the Port River to connect with Victoria Road. This will not only reduce the inefficiencies in the transport system but will also assist the port area to realise its potential in terms of tourism, recreation and urban development by reducing the impact of heavy road transport traffic in the area. The rail element of the project will facilitate improvement in the efficiency of the interstate main line track from Dry Creek to Outer Harbor, which currently traverses residential areas.

The rail bridge and associated connections will reduce the rail distance by almost 4 kilometres, and will eliminate sharp curves and steep grades, resulting in significant savings in operating costs for rail operators. The proposed upgrade of the rail corridor along LeFevre Peninsula will increase track speed and improve safety along that line with the closure of a significant number of rail crossings.

The project incorporates high level opening bridges, which accommodate the vision for the Port's future, enabling the state's tourism industry to prosper and, at the same time, enhancing the new Port Quays port waterfront redevelopment, to maximise the potential of its waterfront holdings.

The Port River Expressway is one of the key elements in the government's overall strategy to improve international transport links, which will, in turn, reduce the future costs of trade and support future growth in exports such as grain, wine and motor vehicles. This important strategic road and rail transport initiative will ensure the efficient movement of goods and people, both within the state, interstate, and in fact the rest of the world. The Port River Expressway links the state's major port and rail terminals at the Port of Adelaide directly with the national highway to Perth and Darwin, via the Port Wakefield Road, and the national highway to Sydney and Melbourne.

The construction of the road and rail bridges will complement the government's significant investment in stage 1 of the project, which is expected to carry up to 55 000 vehicles per day by the year 2020. This submission is timely in view of other initiatives like the deepening of the Outer Harbor shipping channel, presented to this committee in recent times, with works commencing in May this year. In addition to complementing the port waterfront redevelopment, this project has an impact on the government's push to make South Australia the hub of Australia's defence industry and has significant benefits for the new Outer Harbor grain terminal and ship loader to be constructed at Berth 8. With those remarks, I will pass over to Rod Hook to make a few more comments of a broader nature.

MR HOOK: If I can comment briefly on just three aspects of the project. Firstly, as to the overall big picture nature of the proposal, we have come here in presentations in

previous weeks, and I have referred on those occasions about piecing together a jigsaw for the Outer Harbor area, and each time government officers have come here it has been putting another piece into that picture. The picture is one of a vibrant operating import-export hub of activity, and industry at Outer Harbor and the Port of Adelaide, and, can I say, Chair, that yesterday's announcements regarding the air warfare destroyer contract, together with today's submission to the committee on these bridges, makes it a pretty impressive picture for this state.

Clearly, we are focusing on reinforcing the operations of our major working port at Outer Harbor. That is where the deeper water is being created. That is where the major activity or port related activity will occur and that is where it is occurring today, and that is why this link in the transport corridor is so important. It is one part of the big picture and there is a whole series of other projects, million dollar projects, involved with Port River Expressway Stage 1, works on the corridor, linking with South Road, and we have discussed previously: linking with the Sturt Highway extension, and bringing the corridor across from Gawler, the deepening of the channel, the relocation of a grain terminal, building a grain wharf—all these are just part of this jigsaw that government has been piecing together now over several years.

The second aspect is that this development for the bridges has had a long history. Whilst the project has been talked about for some time, I guess delivery started in earnest some four years ago in 2001, and it started there with low level opening road and rail bridges, largely funded by the privates sector, delivered as a PPP off balance sheet. Over the past four years government officers have had to progressively work through the issues to get us to the stage where we are today, where we can give you a formal proposal on the design and on the funding of this particular aspect of the project. The first realisation was that it was not able to be delivered by the private sector as an off balance sheet transaction. Significant government funds were going to be required and those funds had to be sought.

The second issue was the understanding that the interaction of river traffic, and the expected growth in traffic on the road and rail bridges as this area developed, meant that it was not practicable to have bridges that opened on demand and have those bridges meet both the requirements of the users, the industry, and the requirements of those who were running vessels through Inner Harbor, and needed to have access to go under the bridges on regular occasions. So the decision was made then to go to high-level bridges, and that is to move them from the level that was being previously considered up to both bridges being 10 metres above mean sea level. There were then two outstanding matters to be resolved.

10 MR BRINDAL: Sorry; the submission says six and eight metres. Has that been changed?

MR HOOK: 10 metres above mean sea level. That is part of the history. That is where they started. From four and six, and then they went to six and eight, and now they are

both 10 metres above mean sea level. The two outstanding matters that then needed to be resolved were, one, the nature of the bridges, that is whether the bridges were fixed or opening, and the other issue being the imposition of a toll, both decisions having a major bearing on the financial negotiations necessary to get the funds in place to enable the project to proceed.

It was recently decided by the government not to toll the bridges, and that, I think, took recognition of the fact that the users of the bridges were probably not the main beneficiaries of the extra cost of the bridges being opening, and that there was already a contribution bridge users, in terms of industry, would be paying, to support the deepening of Outer Harbor and not wanting to add to that, and the major contributors to the costs would have been cars, anyway.

The second aspect decided by the government was to hold to their previous commitments to maximise the opportunities for Inner Harbor to be an active waterway, and therefore to retain the decision that the bridges will open. The third aspect, chair, if I can comment, is just briefly on the extraordinarily complex nature of the process that we have been through that gets us to this stage. Whilst construction work on Stage I of the Port River Expressway has been proceeding, government officers through this process have had to negotiate access arrangements, relocations, with industry and companies as substantial as Incitec Pivot and Adelaide Brighton Cement, to name just two, for this particular aspect of the project, but looking at bigger picture issues in the area, also negotiations and agreements with ABB grain, negotiations with Flinders Ports for relocating the location of the grain wharf, negotiations with Flinders Ports for channel deepening, the Port Adelaide Sailing Club and their relocation aspirations, the boat builders that are located in Inner Harbor, the fishing fleet, the tourism and the museum boats, and the tugs, all requiring separate negotiations on how they are housed under new arrangements, given both the construction of the bridges and the Port waterfront development. At the same time as that was proceeding, there was representations to Federal Government and negotiations on the Auslink funding agreement which required in term negotiations on the construction code that the Federal Government were imposing on the ability for Federal funds to be applied to this project. Negotiating with Australian Rail Track Corporation, their interest and access into the track.

So at the three levels of government also dealing with LMC and the new Port Quay developers and their interests in what is happening in the area, going into the process of having the development progressed by Infracorp as a public non-financial corporation as a vehicle to raise toll revenue, if that was part of the deal, and then going out of that arrangement now that the decision has been made not to collect the tolls, defining and redefining the product through the processes I have mentioned, dealing with the three bidders through that process, and getting prices adjusted as designs were refined, maintaining valid processes, dealing with probity requirements throughout that process, and getting to the stage where we are today. I do not normally do this in these presentations, chair, but I just think we should place on the public record the recognition of David Bartlett, and his team, in particular,

for the way that they have hung in there and got this project to the stage both in their detailed negotiations for this project. I also commend from my office Lino Di Lernia who has been a major factor in negotiating the bigger picture, and with your indulgence I mention that so that it is on the public record.

11 MR VENNING: Mr Presiding Member, are we able to address any members in the gallery here today?

12 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I understand that Mr Beilby is here, and we will try to accommodate, through this process, the ability to—

13 MR VENNING: Can we identify who is in the gallery?

14 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Get to the point, Ivan, what do you want to do?

15 MR VENNING: Identify who is there, and direct any questions we might have there.

16 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: These are the primary witnesses here. If, indeed, there are people from the department who are in addition to these three gentlemen, they will refer those questions to the people who may have the expertise to answer those questions that these gentlemen have not.

17 MR BRINDAL: And if we want other witnesses we can call them back on another day.

18 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: We could do that. Does any of the demolition work that is being undertaken today constitute part of the project, and, if so, why is it being commenced prior to this referral being considered by the Public Works Committee?

MR STEELE: I can answer that easily, Mr Presiding Member. There has been demolition work going on down there. For reasons of economies of scale, basically our demolition work and the LMC work that has to be done there has been combined. The LMC has actually been running a contract of demolition works down there. It is very hard to work out the dividing line between our project and their project, given that the road alignment, of course, passes through very big sheds, part of which will be remaining with LMC, part of which will be road alignment. So you cannot really define where the split is between the two. LMC has been running with that contract and, certainly, it is of benefit to us, but it is LMC's contract, and we have left that matter with them.

19 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I guess that has something to do with the jigsaw nature of the project that Mr Hook was talking about as well. Table 1 on page 4 shows that the traffic volume one Grand Junction Road and South Road will virtually double over the next 15

years without the expressway. Will the expressway handle all of this additional traffic, or will further roadworks be required?

MR STEELE: No. The expressway will handle all the additional traffic quite comfortably.

20 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Will traffic projections incorporate the additional traffic anticipated from the success in revitalising the Port waterfront and Port Adelaide centre, or is it based upon certain circumstances? What are the implications at any rate?

MR STEELE: No. Our modelling is always based on future traffic projections, as best you can make those projections, of course, but it has assumed a reasonable level of development on the peninsula itself and, of course, in the port area.

21 MS CICCARELLO: You mentioned the 55 000 movements earlier. In terms of yesterday's announcement, is they going to be an increased number of movements? Do you have any projections of how it will affect the project?

MR STEELE: As far as I am aware—and David will correct me if I am wrong—we have assumed development along the peninsula, not specifically associated with one industry, but assuming that the peninsula will be developed. Obviously, we do not know the detail. Given the fact it was only announced yesterday, we do not know what the detailed impact on traffic volumes will be. I can say that the facility we have there has the capacity to cater for that traffic flow.

22 MR BRINDAL: Would it be fair to assume, though, that, given that it is a \$6 billion project with 50 per cent of the work being contracted in other states and those units being modal, they will almost certainly come in by rail and with a number of ships in the time required. That could well mean increased traffic beyond your projections for the rail.

MR STEELE: It could do; yes.

MR BARTLETT: If I could add something to that: our traffic modelling looks at future horizons out to 20/20. It looks at issues like vacant land and its potential use, and the potential generators of traffic from that vacant land in addition to issues such as urban in-fill, the increase in the number of household trips, the increased urbanisation of that Inner Harbour area, and it projects all of that. The same sorts of issues have been taken into account with rail traffic. We have talked with ARTC, the Australian Railroad Group (ARG) and AVB Grain for their future projections and modelled that.

23 MR BRINDAL: I think the point the member for Norwood was making and that I am making is that yesterday the Premier announced effectively 3 000 jobs, which was

confirmed on radio this morning. There are probably 3 000 cars in Australian usage that will additionally be going to that peninsula. That is not modelling: that is reality.

MR BARTLETT: There are a couple of hundred hectares of vacant land, and we assume that that vacant land would be developed in some way over the next 20 years and generate trips and traffic.

24 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: It is just a benefit for us that it is going to be developed in the way it is.

MR HOOK: We would be happy to provide the corridor for 3 000 extra employees to access the site. The other point on the rail is that, when this started four years ago, there was an expectation of a limited number of rail movements, and the shifts in the project, in the nature of the bridges and in the height of the bridges was an understanding that rail movements will increase. With the moving of the grain terminal and the grain trains and the length of the grain trains, I think the comment is quite correct: there will be additional rail traffic to accommodate the Submarine Corporation project. That is a further reinforcement of this project.

25 MR BRINDAL: I am interested in the fact that in April 2003 the government formally announced that the two bridges would be opening and of sufficient height to minimise the number of openings for marine traffic, hence reducing delays to all road and rail traffic. You have already given testimony that projections are for 30 movements a day for trains alone, and that is assuming that there is not an increase over and above your projections. I do not think you will find the Liberal opposition is at all against these bridges, but what we want to test is value for money. In this whole submission we are getting, the government says we are getting opening bridges therefore we will have opening bridges.

We are very interested in examining why we should pay tens of millions of dollars more to have opening bridges that are going to do, as I read this and as my colleague reads it, three parts of nothing. I read here that you talk about the height of the *Falie* masts and the *One And All* masts, which would require opening bridges, but they are going to be moored north of the bridge. I am anxious to call the senior marine commander for the navy, because it is germane to previous evidence we have had that visiting vessels will come up there, yet your own submission says that, with 10 metres, the principal users now, which are the tourist boats in Inner Harbor, will pass under the bridge without it opening. I am actually very interested in why we need to spend tens of millions of dollars more on opening bridges that are not going to open for anything much.

MR STEELE: Basically, the government's decision to build opening bridges will maximise the return to government from the redevelopment of Inner Harbor, and Newport Quays has acknowledged that it considers opening bridges as a real asset to its development. Furthermore, it provides the government with the maximum flexibility in terms of the future

development of that area. Basically, it leaves the options open and, at the end of the day, the government decided that was the right way to go.

26 MR BRINDAL: Can you tell me what options it leaves open? What in the future is going to come in there that we need to spend all this money to bring in? In the long-term future, if we get some new advance in technology, we can pull down the bridges and build new ones; it has happened before. What can you foresee that we would need opening bridges for?

MR STEELE: Obviously if I could foresee future developments, I would be very smart. I can't foresee what will happen in the future. All I can say is that the government is determined to retain an active, vibrant waterway there, not to cut off its options, to allow Newport Quays to develop that area as they see fit to maximise the benefits, to maximise the returns to government from that development, and, as I said, to provide the maximum flexibility for whatever might occur in the future. I can't predict what might occur in the future but the government has decided that it considers that that this is a worth while investment.

27 MR BRINDAL: Mr Robert Gerard has the biggest private boat in South Australia. Are you aware what the height above mean sea level is of that boat?

MR STEELE: I have no idea.

28 MR BRINDAL: You don't know whether that boat will pass under the bridges or not and, if it will, I would suggest to you that, until everyone gets as wealthy as Mr Gerard, they will cope with an active waterway, apart from yachts, and I believe the yacht basin is going to be relocated because of LMC requirements to the north of the bridge, anyhow.

MR STEELE: That is correct.

29 MR BRINDAL: I think we need to bring in as additional witnesses somebody senior in the Darling Harbor project in Sydney because that project is an analogous project.

30 MR KOUTSANTONIS: We can bring Laurie Brereton over here to speak to you, if you like.

31 MR BRINDAL: I think we should. I think we should get someone over here who knows about Darling Harbor because it is an analogous development and it has a system whereby the monorail can open up to let stuff come in. I want to know what their evidence is. I think we should get someone from the museum sector down, either Port Dock museum, or Tim O'Loughlin or somebody, because I am not convinced that we are being sold anything other than a pup. Tens of millions of dollars for a bridge that no-one can tell us why it needs to open. I want the senior naval commander in here.

32 MR KOUTSANTONIS: I think it is a good idea to have the opening bridges. Why do they open vertically and not swivel? I have noticed in Europe that opening bridges, especially rail bridges, swivel, rather than open up. Is it more expensive to have a swivelling bridge?

MR STEELE: Dave has been intimately involved in this, so I will let him comment a bit further, but basically it depends on a couple of things. It depends on cost. You are right, they can go either way. They can either go up or they can swivel, or there are various other combinations. The trouble with a swivelling bridge is that you need a pier in the middle and, given the restricted width, I suspect that you might be struggling to get your navigation channel in. Do you want to comment further?

MR BARTLETT: There are various types. There is a bascule, which opens this way. The swivel, which is like the one in Darling Harbor, pivots on a centre and you get two opening spans, so you would have to have, in effect, 60 metres of opening span rather than the nominal 30. The other versions are lifting. It is largely up to the particular site. Generally for small spans, and this is a small span, the bascule or lifting-style bridge is the bridge to go for. We were open in our tender and all tender teams have experts from America who design these on an everyday basis, and they all came back with the same answer, that a lifting bridge was the best solution. It is a cost effective solution for the for the span and location.

33 MR KOUTSANTONIS: Can you give us an example of somewhere recently that a similar bridge has been built?

34 MR VENNING: A rail one.

MR BARTLETT: There are not many examples in Australia.

35 MR KOUTSANTONIS: In the world.

MR BARTLETT: I have records, but not with me, of lifting bridges that have been built in America. The American coast guard service looks after something like 620 opening bridges. The advisers that we had had been working on bascule and lifting bridges over the last three or four years.

36 MR BRINDAL: I thought you just said they were building them on a daily basis over there.

MR BARTLETT: Their job is designing, maintaining and constructing them on a daily basis. There are companies that specialise in that.

37 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: That was a reasonable question by Tom with respect specifically to rail bridges. Please take that question on notice, check your database and get back with us with respect to the specifics as they relate to rail bridges.

38 MR KOUTSANTONIS: Can you give us a comparison on tunnels, as opposed to bridges?

MR STEELE: There was some work done back in the early days. Bear in mind that there were value management workshops run back in, I think, the mid 90s, or early 90s, on this, and certainly all options were considered, including tunnels, excluding other locations. Dave, do you want to take that further?

MR BARTLETT: Approximately three times the cost for tunnels. The difficulty with tunnels is two-fold. One is the geo-technical sediments down at Port Adelaide, which means you have to found them relatively deep, and it is in an earthquake zone which adds complexity to the design. The other issue is rail grades, which have to be limited to about one in a hundred, and for a tunnel that is reasonably submerged below the bed of the river that brings a tunnel for rail probably of the order of three or four kilometres long, to get those grades.

39 MR KOUTSANTONIS: How long would it take for a bridge to open?

MR BARTLETT: Of the order of 60 seconds.

40 MR KOUTSANTONIS: 60 seconds?

MR BARTLETT: Yes.

41 MR KOUTSANTONIS: And to close, the same time?

MR BARTLETT: The same time.

42 MR KOUTSANTONIS: And once it is open what is the largest ship that you can get through it?

MR BARTLETT: Our design ship in the tender documents is an Anzac frigate, which is approximately four and a half thousand tonnes, 130 metres long.

43 MR KOUTSANTONIS: So would an air warfare destroyer be able to get into the Inner Harbor?

MR BARTLETT: I think they are significantly bigger; no, they won't.

44 MR BRINDAL: So why does the design tender call for an Anzac frigate when we have had evidence that the Anzac frigates will never be allowed to enter the Inner Harbor? Why use a naval ship when the navy won't go in there?

45 MR KOUTSANTONIS: Currently; after we win the war on terror they can come in.

46 MR BRINDAL: No; they will never be able to go in. They haven't been able to go in since Pearl Harbour.

47 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: There will be peace in our time, Mark.

MR BARTLETT: You have to pick some sort of design ship for these things. Obviously you have to limit the size of things, and it happened to be that. It doesn't matter whether it is an Anzac frigate or any boat of that sort of size. It was: what is a reasonable sized vessel to allow into the Inner Harbor, given the fact, of course, that you cannot have an unrestricted access to the Inner Harbor, because it is not big enough. So it just happened to be a reasonable sized vessel to allow in there.

48 MR BRINDAL: But generally wouldn't you pick a reasonable sized vessel that is likely to go in there, not a reasonable sized vessel that is unlikely to go in there?

MR STEELE: Whether it is a frigate, its dimensions and its weight are the critical thing.

49 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I have one further question—and I believe that we are going to be speaking to Mr Beilby later on, but one of the arguments he has put forward, Mr Steele, is that—and I will paraphrase here—when the project was first mooted the idea of bridges was most favourable because it was one of the cheaper, most cost effective options. We have now moved in time, to the extent that it may be argued that it is not the most cost effective option, and that the alternatives at that stage were not considered because of the cost effectiveness of the bridges at that stage, and that it may be argued that those cost options that were not considered at that time, because it was cheaper, could perhaps now be more cost effective alternatives today. Is that a reasonable assumption or not?

MR STEELE: No. If you look at the various options that were considered—and, as I said, there was a whole raft of options considered, including, for example, moving the bridges further downstream; the tunnels that we have talked about; and at one stage there was even talk of a flying fox being built. So there was a whole raft of options considered. What has happened over time, of course, is that the relative costs of all those options have changed, but the relative costs are still there, and, if you are looking at the cost effective solution, then the current option is still the most cost effective solution to the transport problem, and delivers the objectives. It is not only a matter of building something that is the cheapest; it is a matter of:

does it achieve the objectives that you have set for this project, anyway? The current solution has remained the best solution for this particular problem.

50 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I will further explore that later as well.

51 MR VENNING: Mr Chairman, this is probably the most important project to come before this committee in many, many years. I am very cognisant of the fact that this is the Public Works Committee, and we are here to make sure the government gets the best project at the best price and we are to be the eyes and ears of the people of South Australia. I want to be very careful, because I know have of the information in this document is not open for public scrutiny but I just cannot believe, when looking at the evidence and looking at this whole document, and I have read most of it, which is very extensive, that we could justify spending \$173.5 million extra over the top of a fixed bridge. That is over 30 years. That is the difference in operating a bridge like this. That is the difference in operating a bridge like this. I have visions and memories of what happened at the Adelaide oval light towers. I am very, very concerned, and I will congratulate the government for getting a lot of things right. They put the port in the right place. We are under way with the bridging. Thing are happening at long last, and this whole thing is very, very crucial to the future of South Australia, and so many industries use this, so it is critical that we make the right decision here.

Reading the document and looking at the evidence from all these organisations, the ARTC, SA Road Transport Association, Independent Truck Owners Association, ABB grain, Australian Wheat Board, South Australian Farmers Federation, SA Freight Council, the federal minister, and even the navy, all have expressed some concern about this being a lifting bridge. It is all to do with the Port Quays development and their yachts, all of which is still yet to materialise. My question is, and I know it is difficult, it is a decision to which is applicable decisions to build these lifting bridges. My question to you is, where in this document does it say—there is no recommendation here, in this document, whether you, as experts, and Mr Bartlett as the project coordinator, did you ever make a recommendation to government why it should be built?

MR STEELE: Obviously the discussions that any of us have had with our ministers is a matter for the government. We are not at liberty to say what discussions we have had with the minister, but obviously a lot of information has been placed before government in relation to this and I can only reiterate that on the balance of everything, the government has made a decision that it sees the opening bridges as the desired option and has made that decision.

52 MR VENNING: Why is there no recommendation here? All this work and there is no recommendation in here.

MR STEELE: There normally is not a recommendation certainly in any report I have brought to Public Works. What we have brought before Public Works is the project that the government has signed off on and proposes to implement.

53 MR VENNING: The previous government had a policy of lifting bridges too but nobody realised it was this sort of money, and nor did we realise that all these other organisations had a problem with it as well, including the navy, because they will not be going past this point. I think at a point in time we all have to be above politics and say this is a big project for South Australia, and really we have to turn back and say we got it wrong and this government should say it got it wrong.

MR HOOK: Can I just clarify. I thought the question might have referred to—did you say \$175 million?

54 MR VENNING: It is \$173.5 million over 30 years. That is with the operating costs added into it. I got that information from page 31.

MR HOOK: There is clearly an additional cost associated with the opening bridges, relative to fixed. Those costs are set out here. The additional component of the capital cost is something like \$45 million. The cost of the contract, the 10-year design, construct, maintain, operate, the cost penalty is something like \$65 million, and on page 30 it talks about a whole of life cost for the bridges, the comparison and the net present value analysis of the whole of life cost, there is a \$71.5 million cost penalty. That is on page 33.

55 MR VENNING: I took two figures, \$238 million. Sorry, the difference of building the actual bridge was \$96.5 million. I am looking at those three pages, pages 31, 32 and 33, I just put them altogether. My calculation is the bridge itself is going to cost \$238 million for the lifting bridge minus \$141.5 for a fixed bridge makes a difference of \$96.5 million. I added that \$77 million which is the extra cost over 30 years. That \$77 million was calculated taking \$90 million, deducting \$13 million for the cost of a fixed bridge left me \$77 million, so I have added them together and I have got \$173.5.

MR HOOK: The member is bringing together the 238 and the 141.5 is the difference between the capital plus the 10-year operating and maintenance cost of the bridges, so that difference there is already incorporating 10 years of operation and maintenance, which is part of the contract cost. It is the table on page 33 and there is nothing hidden. It is very clearly presented that a whole of like comparison of the bridge, when you take account of net present value of design, operating and maintenance, the department's development costs, all that is brought through, and it is shown in that table, there is a \$71.5 million cost difference between the two. Clearly, it is a cost difference. Clearly it is significant. The government has a choice. There are two options—turn it into fixed bridges or wear the additional cost and make them as opening bridges. The government's judgment was they did not want to close off any future option for the Inner Harbor to be an active waterway, and for some of the boats that

may be moored outside, to go back in on occasions, the government's judgment was that was the option they were to adopt. Our job is to present that information to you today.

56 MR VENNING: Really, the decision is not within this meeting. That is the sad part of it. Thank you for that clarification. It is on the record and I can certainly refer back to that. The biggest problem about this is that this bridge is the throat of industry in South Australia, and it is a mechanical device, and I do not trust any mechanical devices, any, whether they be aeroplanes or motor cars and things like this, and we have the instance of the light towers at the Adelaide Oval. We saw what happened there, that fiasco. If you cut this link the whole system stops, and we can think of all sorts of scenarios, Mr Chairman, of what can happen with a thing like this. What happens if we have an industrial dispute? They only have to lift the bridges and then go on strike and then where is everything else? What sort of leverage have those people got.

57 MR BRINDAL: That is true. We have opened up a lot of cans of worms here.

58 MR KOUTSANTONIS: I think John Howard is going to make striking illegal after 1 July.

59 MR VENNING: But John Howard does not go forever. He will go for a long time yet but he does not go forever. So I am just raising that point, Mr Chairman.

60 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Just so I understand your point, Ivan, because it is a question that I was going to look at earlier. You are talking about a worst case scenario—

61 MR VENNING: Yes, I know what you must do, because this is on the record. We can bring it out in 10 years time and quote it all back to you.

62 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: That is, what the impacts might be of that, that is has the worst case scenario as you have just talked about there been considered—

63 MR VENNING: Industrial dispute, it is a fantastic—a power failure. If they are up and they have a power failure.

64 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Yes, what are the implications on who pays. Is that right?

65 MR VENNING: That is right, and it could be deliberate power failure when they are up, because these things can be organised; they are up and you have a power failure, can they be got down without electricity? Is there an auxiliary power system to get them down? And what about security of a thing like this? This will become terrorist target number one in South Australia, particularly being a mechanical device. All these things need to be weighed up. Fixed bridges are pretty standard stuff. When you go into this heavy duty, not just

once but twice, Mr Chair, I certainly have a concern about that. Have all these things been brought into consideration? Was this discussed in a document like this, because this is a vital link, and even have you got a guarantee that it can not be used in a dispute to cause huge catastrophic problems.

MR STEELE: If I could just respond to those issues, firstly just to clarify, the bridges will, in fact, be operated from our Norwood traffic control centre, so it will all be done from there.

66 MR VENNING: Remotely.

MR STEELE: Yes, remotely, from the Norwood traffic control centre, exactly the same way as the Southern Expressway is reversed remotely from the Norwood traffic control centre. So that is how it will operate. In terms of backup, you are right and obviously it was an issue that had to be taken into account—what happens if we have a power failure? In effect, there are three systems that can be used for the bridges. Firstly, of course, there is the normal thing which is it works off normal power and everything is operating normally. If that fails, there will be emergency generators available in the case of power failure, and if the worst comes to the worst, as with the Birkenhead bridge at the present time, you can actually go out and lower it by hand.

67 MR VENNING: Gravity.

MR STEELE: Yes.

68 MR VENNING: I am going overseas in two weeks and have asked people in America and in Europe to show me these bridges. They can show me road bridges but nobody can show me a rail bridge, because the precision required is so much less obvious, as you cannot jump a half-inch gap as you can on a road bridge. I am looking forward to getting this information if we can look at one of these, because I am very concerned about it. When the builder builds this bridge, do we have a warranty with these people?

MR STEELE: Yes.

69 MR VENNING: Does the builder have a fund that we can fall back on if he gets a problem and just declares himself bankrupt or leaves? Is there a fund we can hold the contractors to to get us out of trouble?

MR BARTLETT: There is a guarantee of significance, and it is about 15 per cent of the contract initially, that the builder has to lodge with the government during the construction phase, and I think that gets down to 7.5 per cent during the maintenance phase. So, there is access to that fund. Actually, the contract is design, construct and maintain for 10

years, so the contractor has to design the opening bridge and its mechanisms etc., and he is responsible for those for 10 years.

70 MR VENNING: Can we have a look at the design of this bridge? Obviously they are not done yet: will they come back with a bridge design?

MR BARTLETT: We have some artists' impressions of what they may look like. That is the photomontage of the actual design that the contractors have come up with.

71 MR VENNING: These would be hydraulic?

MR BARTLETT: No, mechanical.

72 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: That is what I was thinking earlier, about blowing the bridges, in relation to the fire brigade getting in.

MR BARTLETT: There was considerable debate about hydraulics versus mechanical, and all the advice and tenderers came back with mechanical solutions.

73 MR VENNING: Should Newport Quays redevelopment contribute to some of this cost?

MR HOOK: Newport Quays has a deal with the government where it does actually contribute to the public purse for the land and the way that development proceeds. So, that contribution is already there and that goes back into the government's appropriation account. There has been no suggestion that there should be an additional contribution that goes towards the cost of the bridges. That is part of the government decision-making process.

74 MR VENNING: I am interested in what you said about tunnels earlier. Tunnels are the obvious solution to this, but when I did my checking for my coming visit there is new technology around for tunnels where they are fully floating, or they can put them on the bottom of the water. Have we done any extra work on tunnel technology? They can put them inside a cocoon that really does not need a base at all but floats. It is in the sand, but it does not have to be rigid any more, necessarily.

MR HOOK: Here again, one of the real difficulties with the tunnel is the grade that you need. If your bridge is 10 metres above mean sea level, you are roughly seven metres above the bank and your grade needs to go up to accommodate something like the seven metres. If you have a one in 100 grade on a rail line, that tells you how far back you need to go either side of the bridge. Once you go into a tunnel, however you construct it, whether or not you float it in—and one of the issues with tunnels is that you need to construct it with enough weight so it does not float of its own accord—you will need to go down below mean sea level. You need to go down to allow the passage of vessels over the top of you.

You then have to go down into the sub-base. You start with a bank height, then mean sea level, then the sub-base and then you have got to get the full height of the tunnel incorporated into the gradient, so it is something like 20 metres below the embankment to get the grade for a tunnel, and that would have you working out the grade either side for something like two kilometres each side to actually work the grade back up for a rail tunnel. It has a huge impact on the land either side of the project, including running the tunnel right up through the middle of the Adelaide Brighton Cement operations.

MR BARTLETT: One of the other issues is that ARTC is requesting double stack rail containers because that is the way the industry is going, which means in excess of seven metres clearance from rail height. So, by the time you have got your ballast, your rail, your seven-odd metre clearance, you are looking at eight metres plus and then you have your depth of structure below and up, and height-wise it is not an option.

75 MR KOUTSANTONIS: What is the lifespan of an opening bridge?

MR BARTLETT: The design life on the bridge is 100 years. Various components also have design lives that have to be factored into the design process.

76 MR KOUTSANTONIS: In terms of community consultation, there has been a lot of media about what local residents, local members of parliament and councillors have been saying about this project. Are they being consulted on the final design? Have they been briefed?

MR BARTLETT: Because we do not have a contract in place, this has been highly sensitive, and cabinet only saw them for the first time about 10 days ago. Part of our specification requires a community involvement plan, setting up of stakeholder groups at a community level and at an industry level, and we have the draft of that in our tender documents. The influences will be around the softer side of the structures—the lighting, the landscaping, perhaps the paving, not on the engineering, technical details and span. There is a requirement to consult with the community.

77 MR KOUTSANTONIS: The one thing that concerns me about this project is not that the bridges will be opening and the cost but it is the way that it is presented to us. Generally when we are given a project, whether it is a bridge or a school, we are given a look at the detail. Has this come to us a bit too early? You have included the entire project, including the bridges and the rail bridges in this, but we don't have a design. We don't know what it is going to look like. I even notice that the rail bridge, according to your map, is curved. I don't know anything about it.

MR STEELE: This is an issue that we will have to work through with the committee because it will happen on other projects. There is a trend to go for design and

construct contracts because, basically if you lump the package together, it leaves the constructor and the designer to work together to come up with the most cost-effective solution to whatever that project is. At the same time, we obviously need to come to this committee before we have signed a contract. We have to come to you with what we have at that point. We are obliged to come to you at that point before we have signed a contractor and before it starts work, but at the same time we cannot give you to the nth degree the detail. There is a lot of detail we can give you, we can give you spans, that it is a four-lane structure. I think there is a cross-section in here that broadly describes the parameters that we have required bidders to work within, which as I said, is the number of lanes, the height above sea level and those sort of things. It may mean that, with projects of this nature in the future, we need to work through with the committee at what stage should we be coming back to the committee again as the project is further developed once we have the contract in place.

78 MR KOUTSANTONIS: Why is the rail bridge curved?

MR STEELE: It is curved either end. The lifting span is straight.

79 MR KOUTSANTONIS: The maps just show it being curved.

MR STEELE: The lifting span has to be straight otherwise it would not work. You have a short length of straight and then you have the curves either side of that.

80 MR KOUTSANTONIS: Is it just one carriage at a time or is it a dual rail bridge?

MR STEELE: No, single lane.

81 MR KOUTSANTONIS: Single lane; okay.

MR HOOK: The issue of how we package contracts in government these days is much bigger than this project. Last week when I was here I talked about different contracting mechanisms. It will not just be for roads, but there will be an issue going forward with the more significant projects being packaged, contract-wise, other than through a traditional lump sum contracting process. Here we are talking about design and construct; in other instances, as it was in the Convention Centre, it could be an alliance contract or a relationship contract where you award the contract to the contractor before you have actually got into your design process and even sometimes before you have fixed your price. That is just part of packaging projects in different ways these days. It is an issue for when this committee looks at all these projects, and I mentioned that last week.

82 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: It is an issue on the basis that, until it is agreed, this committee operates under the provisions of the act that covers its operations. There are

certain things that I suspect might need to be revisited in the context of the different packaging arrangements that you were talking about.

MR HOOK: Coming back on successive occasions as well.

83 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Absolutely; that may well be. I accept that point. On the bridges, why do we need the two bridges? Why is it not that, and you may well have explained it when you talked to Tom, the rail component could have been incorporated into the single bridge?

MR STEELE: That would have been the ideal solution if you could do it. I think that all the bidders had a look at that and tried to come up with some way of doing it, and we had a look at it. Unfortunately, with the geometry of the situation, there is just no way that you can get the two bridges together so that you could double-stack them, if you like, one above the other or alongside each other. It is just a matter of the geometrics of the alignments as they come in. You just cannot get them to line up. As I say, if it could be done, I am sure that one of the bidders would have come up with that solution.

84 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Do you want to add to that Mr Bartlett?

MR BARTLETT: Perhaps we could show that on a plan. I know it is difficult for Hansard.

85 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: You can describe it provided you describe it as if you are telling a story that people reading it might understand, then you will have no problems.

MR BARTLETT: As Jon suggested, the alignments vary. We have Francis Street coming in from the south-east, but the rail line comes in from the north-east. On the opposite side we have to match in with both Victoria Road and the rail line that is parallel to Elder Road. To get those to come together, particularly with Elder Road being so close to the bank of the river, the curve on the railway line will then have to be extremely sharp. Our initial concepts had a lot tighter radius which then produced noise and speed issues for ARTC. To have them coincide—

86 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I understand that rail does not turn at right angles.

87 MR KOUTSANTONIS: Why can't you get the road to match the rail?

MR BARTLETT: We have Adelaide Brighton sitting in the middle here and a fully developed Victoria Road that is four lanes with wide median parking and which is a heavy load route whereas Elder Road is a smaller road with imperfect geometry and capacity.

88 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Delays will have an adverse impact on the LeFevre Peninsula transport corridor project and the commissioning of Berth 8 in the Outer Harbor grain terminal which we see on page 4 and, so, we do not necessarily need to turn to it. What are the timeframes for these other projects? How much leeway is there to achieve the completion of Stages 2 and 3? In other words, what is the cost effect of delayed reporting by the PWC?

MR STEELE: You mean delayed reporting at this early stage?

89 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Yes.

MR STEELE: Perhaps it is better for Rod to talk about the long-term impacts because he is across all these projects. Certainly, from our point of view, there is a significant issue in that we are locked into a price that is fixed for a certain period of time.

MR BARTLETT: To mid-August. We had a 364-day tender validity period which means we gave ourselves a year to decide who had this contract, and that is up in mid-August.

90 MR BRINDAL: So, just supplementing the Chairman's question: what you are saying is that you gave yourself 364 days of tender. Now we are in June, so you have conveniently come to us with only about two or three months to go.

MR BARTLETT: That is correct.

91 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Hang on a minute. I do not know whether that is—

MR BARTLETT: It is a valid statement.

92 MR BRINDAL: If this committee cannot decide in the next two or three months, what is the penalty—

93 MR KOUTSANTONIS: The next two or three hours.

94 MR BRINDAL: If the government wants to railroad this through.

95 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Mark, just ask the question.

96 MR BRINDAL: What is the penalty likely to be if it goes into October/November before a decision is made.

MR STEELE: In essence, we have to renegotiate with bidders for a new price.

97 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: It will not be cheaper, will it?

MR STEELE: It definitely will not be cheaper.

98 MR BRINDAL: Could you estimate? Just guess—is it 10 or 15 per cent?

MR STEELE: I do not know that I could guess. I do not know if David is prepared to have a guess.

99 MR BRINDAL: The point is, would it go up \$71 million?

MR STEELE: I doubt that it would go up \$71 million.

MR BARTLETT: We are in the process of dealing with one bidder, and we now have a non-competitive process, so, any delays now, cost. There is an expectation that decisions will be made and contracts let because this project is very resource hungry on the contractor side. There are designers from America, etc. who have to be scheduled to come as soon as we award a contract. Delays will impact on all those arrangements.

100 MR BRINDAL: What would happen if this committee made the decision to go to a non-opening bridge?

101 MR VENNING: Are we locked into it yet?

MR HOOK: No, we have to have your committee report to parliament before we can award the contract. So, the locking in comes after you have reported. Your committee's report to parliament is the process. Government's decision takes it beyond that time. In terms of timing with other projects, the dredging of Outer Harbor and the deepening of the channel will be complete by the end of this year or thereabouts. Stage one of the project is being completed later this year. ABB Grain has a deal with us to build their new grain terminal to coincide with the opening of these bridges, so it has an interest in the timing and how that progresses. We are already delayed in terms of the original projections because of the time that is has taken to work through the issues in getting the funding, and we now know when the funding is coming in. With any further delays, we would be negotiating extensions in a very unfavourable negotiating environment.

102 MR BRINDAL: I understand those aspects. I more meant that you have obviously scoped opening bridges and closing bridges. If the decision was made by the parliament to not approve the appropriation for opening bridges—so they have to be closing bridges—would you have to go back and start the whole tender process again? Would you prefer the tenderer had submitted a closing bridge thing so that—

103 MR KOUTSANTONIS: That is hypothetical. How are they to know what the government will decide after? You cannot appropriate money: only a minister can. The project could fall down—

104 MR BRINDAL: Only a parliament can appropriate money.

105 MR KOUTSANTONIS: No, it cannot; only a minister.

106 MR BRINDAL: If you know more than me. I am telling you that it is the parliament that appropriates the budget, not the minister.

107 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Mark, that was a hypothetical question.

108 MR BRINDAL: I really want to know if they can answer the question because if the parliament decides to reverse a decision of the government, it is fair to ask those experts that we have here what the possible consequences are.

MR STEELE: I guess I cannot give a categorical answer because, frankly, I would have to get some legal advice around that issue. I am fairly confident that we would be up for significant costs. We could be possibly up for litigation, and I suspect that we would have a real problem on our hands. Having taken three contractors to this stage, where the three bidders have spent significant sums of money to get to this point in time—for us to throw the process open again—we would run the real risk, I would think, of significant litigation.

109 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: The other point is that this is part of the jigsaw, using Mr Hook's terminology. As you have pointed out to the committee on numerous occasions, Ivan, we have an expressway that goes nowhere at the moment, and I think that you have always said that for the future well being of the port—

110 MR BRINDAL: That question should be taken on notice, though, because it is essential to my decision what we will do.

111 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Have a look at that question. I think you answered that, but treat it as a question on notice. If there is other additional information that you think can supplement the answer that you provided, please send it through to us.

One of the significant features of this project involves a great deal of public money, as we have discussed, and the need to get right, because it has, in your words, the potential to secure the future of our port, to revitalise Port Adelaide, to improve the amenity of the local community, to boost the state's economy and become the backbone for significant industrial development in the area. So it is crucial that we get it right. If we get it wrong, of course, the opposite would be true. Because of this very reason, the committee has taken a

great deal of interest in the correspondence it has received from Mr Beilby on behalf of the Port Adelaide Development Association.

Mr Beilby has put forward alternative routes for road and rail traffic that he believes could be more cheaply delivered, it would meet this project's objectives and would entirely avoid the need for additional bridges of any kind across the river. The committee has forwarded those ideas and suggestions to you previously, and we have received a response, but, just for the record, you might want to touch on that bearing in mind that we will, when we are finished with you as witnesses, call up Mr Beilby. Do you want to provide a response to that?

MR STEELE: Obviously, we have had approaches from Mr Beilby. We have received copies of his submissions, and we have had a serious look at them and treated them as serious options. David, in particular, has done quite a bit of work on that and I think it might be best if David summarises our views in terms of those particular proposals.

112 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: The committee is familiar with those proposals, but we would like to hear from Mr Bartlett.

MR BARTLETT: The project had multiple objective not only for transport but also for urban development the environment. Mr Beilby's proposal as submitted reopens the Gillman Shunting Yards and areas—

113 MR VENNING: Do we have that in our book?

MR BARTLETT: You do have a plan. Look at figure 7. There have been various proposals submitted, but the railway line, if all it through that area—

114 MR KOUTSANTONIS: What is St Vincent Street? Someone has blocked St Vincent Street. There is no entry into the bypass. Is that right?

MR BARTLETT: It is an extension. Yes; it appears that way from the plan as submitted

MR BEILBY: It has just blocked access onto St Vincent Street directly off the expressway.

115 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Mr Beilby, we are going to hear from you later on.

MR BARTLETT: The main issues are opening up and putting in significant increase in rail traffic, which we have heard before, very adjacent to the Rosewater residents, south of the red rail line. That rail line also needs to go up reasonably high to get back on to

the viaduct that currently goes over Commercial Road. It continues on through the Port Waterfront redevelopment land. One of the objectives is getting the rail traffic out of that Inner Harbor area. Currently the track is shared with TransAdelaide, and it is very close to the residents of Granville and Birkenhead on the other side. Therefore, there is increased rail noise and issues associated with rail traffic. The road traffic, as you can see, is very circuitous. It consists of quite a few other at-grade intersections, underpasses, or overpasses and has freight traffic, particularly the B-Doubles and road trains going a lot further distance and it really quite close to adjacent residences. For those reasons, and the costing some of those, and getting the approval and acceptance of the community to putt in a lot more traffic quite close to those residents would be extremely difficult.

116 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Do you want to add to that, Mr Steele, or are you happy with that response?

MR STEELE: Just to add to what David has said, basically our proposal is aimed at freeing up the port of Adelaide, freeing up the centre of the port, getting all the industrial traffic out away from Port Adelaide so the place can develop, and getting the heavy traffic and rail traffic away from residential areas. We believe that our proposal does that. Mr Beilby's proposal, unfortunately, does not achieve the objectives of the project as have been defined by government.

117 MR BRINDAL: Is there a similar plan for the rail corridor into the city, which goes very close to built-up residential areas in my own electorate and which has increased in movement dramatically in the last few years? I wonder where the equivalent plan is for my electors to be given serious consideration in their amenity. You seem to be doing very nicely by the electors down there and saying that we can't have increased rail traffic rattling past the residents, but it seems to be fine for all my electors. Is there an equivalent plan for my area?

MR HOOK: There are no plans currently for the rail corridor through the southern suburbs. There are issues heading down through South Road, which we have talked about, and there are other projects dealing with South Road traffic, but there are no plans for the rail corridor. From my personal perspective, I think there is a major issue for rail where it crosses Cross Road, and that needs to be looked at at some stage.

118 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: You mentioned that last week, too.

MR HOOK: The other point I would make on this is that the proposal for the rail on this alignment would cut completely across the government's signed agreement with Newport Quays for the Newport Quays development and would have major implications for the longevity of that agreement.

119 MR KOUTSANTONIS: Have you costed Mr Beilby's business proposal?

MR BARTLETT: No, we haven't in any detail.

120 MR BRINDAL: Mr Beilby's proposal would cost the government money in terms of the development of the inner port, would it?

MR HOOK: I am very confident that Newport Quays would be looking for compensation if there was rail wrapped around the site that has been offered to it as part of the Newport Quays agreement.

121 MR BRINDAL: This might be a question for the chairman. Earlier in Mr Steele's evidence, the member for Schubert asked Mr Steele what his department's recommendations were to his minister. Mr Steele basically politely refused to answer the question.

122 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Hang on a minute: it is a question directed at me, I guess in my role as chairperson. I think the response that was provided was that we have before us a project that has been ticked off by cabinet and discussions that might have occurred previously are not what we are dealing with. We are dealing with this project that is before us here and now.

123 MR BRINDAL: I would like your ruling on this matter. The committee has to consider this project in the best interests of the parliament and has to consider all evidence available to it, and the witnesses are here to serve the parliament, not the Executive Government. I think the member for Schubert's question as to what the Department of Transport's recommendations might have been to the Executive Government is absolutely germane to the parliament's work. If you rule that Mr Steele cannot answer that question, or Mr Steele refuses to answer that question, I think it is really important.

124 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I think that Mr Steele answered that question in the manner in which he saw fit within the context of the role and responsibility of this committee with respect to the act that guides those roles and responsibilities. That is that we deal with the projects before us, and that bit has been to cabinet and that bit is put before us, not what might happen or might have been or whatever the case might be. Ultimately it will be the parliament that will make determinations based on the report that we provide. You have asked the question again. I am assuming that the answer—

125 MR BRINDAL: No, I am asking you first. When a planning matter goes to council, and the planning matter is appealed to the ERD Court, the ERD Court calls in the council planners and asks the council planners for their recommendation to the council. That is taken into account. I cannot see that it is wrong for this committee to ask or for Mr Steele to be required to answer the question as to what was the recommendation of his department to the executive government.

126 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I am not ruling any questions out of order. I am suggesting that that question has already been asked and a response has been provided.

127 MR BRINDAL: I would like to ask it again, then.

128 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: You may ask the question again.

129 MR BRINDAL: Thank you.

MR STEELE: My response to that question is that we have provided information to the minister about this project. I might add—and this is sidestepping the question to a certain extent—that we need to bear in mind, as Rod has been through, that until a month ago this project was the responsibility of Infracorp, which was the organisation set up to be the owners of this project, if you like, because it was going to be a toll project. Transport SA was the project manager working for Infracorp, and therefore it was Infracorp which was reporting to the minister. It was not our place, it was not my place, to be making recommendations which should be coming from the owner of the project, which was Infracorp.

The one thing I can say is that I, as Executive Director of Transport SA, to the best of my recollection have made no specific recommendation to the minister on whether or not the bridges should be opening or fixed. What I have done, and what TSA has done, is provide information to Infracorp to allow it to assess the project.

130 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I have not been a cabinet minister and I know that Mark has, but it would seem that when policy is decided by the government of the day, as a public servant your responsibility would be to provide those, amongst other things, industrial or engineering solutions to the policy that has been determined.

MR STEELE: Clearly the policy is a government decision. All we can do as public servants is provide information, which we have done, and most of that information is in that report, the information that we provided to cabinet.

131 MR BRINDAL: There is no intention to blame them. The intention is to ask what the department thought about something.

132 MR KOUTSANTONIS: That is why we have elections.

133 MR BRINDAL: Mr Steele, you have partly answered the question. Until a month ago, it was the responsibility of Infracorp, on your testimony just then. Until a month ago it was assumed that the bridges would be tolled. I ask Mr Hook, given his long experience in government: would it not generally be a different order of policy decision of the government if the government considered that it was going to go down a tolled option and

therefore was going to get cost recovery from the project and a user-pays type system? Would that not generally sway a government, because in one way if you have opening bridges and there is cost recovery by tolls, it does not really matter what they cost because the people are going to pay for them? If, however, you then decide that you are going to have the same design parameters without tolling, you are bringing the cost direct back to government. Isn't that a pivotal decision which, in all your experience, could change a government's decision on whether to pay another \$70 million or not?

MR HOOK: The issue of tolling and the nature of the bridges were two—and I am happy to use your word—pivotal decisions government had to make on this project. The tolling issue was not straightforward in the first instance. With the projections of toll revenue and the additional cost involved to collect the revenue, I think the figures showed that for every \$2 of toll revenue collected, \$1 had to be spent in collecting it. So, even under the tolling regime there was substantial public sector costs—both commonwealth and state government—to fund the construction and operation of these bridges. There were then additional costs to collect the tolling revenue to reduce the overall long-term net effect on the government's consolidated account. The decision not to toll means that there is a different budget impact on government—not in the early years, because you are actually constructing a cheaper product—but it does mean that you do not get the revenue coming in in future years. Government clearly recognised all that when it made its decision to go with untolled, opening bridges.

134 MR BRINDAL: But, since that decision was made only a month ago, the government had locked itself into a decision about opening bridges. What I am saying to you is that in the beginning there were two pivotal factors—to toll or not to toll, and to open or not to open—and the two were interrelated. I put it to you that what has, in fact, happened is that the decision to open the bridges was made with a toll regime, then half of that regime was changed with the other half locked in. Is that a fair statement for me to make?

135 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Can I get an understanding from you, Mark, about the question you have asked there about how the toll and the opening bridges are interrelated. Why are they interrelated?

136 MR BRINDAL: Because when we were in cabinet and we talked about this (not that I talk about what went on in cabinet), the fact was that if it was a 'user pays' system then the government could be much more generous in its concept, because the people are paying—

137 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: So when you decided they would be opening bridges that was linked to a toll, was it?

138 MR BRINDAL: That was the understanding; it was the understanding of both governments until about a month ago.

MR HOOK: There was the understanding some four years ago that the bridges may have been funded off balance sheet by tolls with very minimal public sector input. That understanding has progressively gone over the last four years for reasons that I have canvassed previously. Cabinet made a decision on the opening/fixed bridge regime back somewhere around April 2003. I recall attending a public meeting (and there was a previous question about public consultation) and I think there were about 500 people present. The Deputy Premier spoke at that meeting and he announced very clearly then that they would continue to go with the government's previous commitment, and the former government's commitment, that these be opening bridges. He made a further announcement that one of the bridges would be called the Power Bridge, which caused me to wonder whether it was good value for my time being there, but that was part of the announcement at the time.

A month ago, when cabinet made its more recent decisions, it looked at the whole cash flow scenario and what government was going to pay under a tolling regime, and the difference in the government contribution under either scenario was not as great as was perhaps first imagined because of the anticipated toll revenue not being there to the extent it had been thought. There was a huge risk with it, because 70 per cent of it was to come from cars and you could have cars boycotting the bridges. So, again, there was a lot of risk on what we would collect. As I said before, we were spending \$1 for every \$2 that we collected. So taking the toll issue out of the equation was, I think, a relatively straightforward decision for government to make.

Regarding the second question, they were in a position where they could have said, 'We will now change our earlier decision on the bridges', and they would make a political judgment and would wear the consequences of that. They reviewed it and decided to continue with the position that these would be opening bridges, understanding their additional costs—

139 MR BRINDAL: And this is a month ago, you are talking about that?

MR HOOK: Yes. They made a call on it about April 2003 and they made another call on it recently and, for reasons we have explained before (and our role, as public servants, is to come here and present this as a government project), the government has said that they will be opening bridges. The consequences of that are set out before you in the submission.

140 MR BRINDAL: So your evidence to this committee is that as little as a month ago, with the full knowledge of the fact that they were not going to toll at that stage, the cabinet considered opening versus closing bridges and reaffirmed the decision that the bridges would remain opening, with all this information before it.

MR HOOK: All this information, because cabinet approves the presentation of this report, as it is before you today, to the committee.

141 MR BRINDAL: On the matter of opening bridges, one of you gave testimony that the area is subject to earthquakes, and I know that is right. The area is also subject to liquification, is it not? It is one of the areas in South Australia where the consequence—liquification, it is a process—because the ground there is very sandy, in the amplification of an earthquake, the sand vibrates and the structure tends to disappear. It sort of turns into quicksand. Can you confirm that, Mr Steele?

MR STEELE: Yes; in fact, we have had that issue with Stage 1 in the structuring of Stage 1.

142 MR BRINDAL: That means that the design solution, generally, is to tie together the structure top and bottom. Generally, if you are going to do it really well—I am not an engineer: I just know a little bit about it—you have your piers going downwards and then, ideally, to mitigate earthquake consequences, you would tie from one pier to the other pier across the gap. Is that part of your design?

MR STEELE: No; in fact, and Dave might like to follow this up, I do not know whether considerations have been given yet by the designers to this issue, but I can say that we had exactly the same design issue on Stage 1, particularly with the eastern road bridge, which the committee saw several weeks ago. You may recall that we talked then about the measures that were taken to basically relieve the pore pressure to avoid that very issue that you are talking about of liquification. The solution adopted on Stage 1 was to actually bore a series of holes which were then backfilled with gravel. That means that when you get that shock, your pore pressure is released instantaneously because it has somewhere to go into those series of bore holes. Whether a similar proposal is being put forward in this case, I do not know. Dave, do you—

143 MR BRINDAL: Do you acknowledge that something will have to be done?

MR BARTLETT: It will, and that is a design criteria, and with opening bridges it is obviously a significant criteria. The preferred recommended tenderer has made a decision to go for longer structures rather than put the approaching battens to the bridge onto the approaching battens so we got a variety of solutions. Some had ground improvements as per Jon's suggestions. The recommended tenderer felt that he was the better value for money. The rail bridge, in particular, is of the order of 700 metres long, because it goes from a position of about 2.5 metres high up over the bridge and back to 2.5 metres high to accommodate the earthquake loading. Much of that earthquake loading is taken out in very stiff piles and piers so that the earthquake does not have the impact.

144 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I have no further questions in the interests that we get ample opportunity. Basically, Mark and Ivan would ask the rest of the questions. I am extremely interested, and it does not relate to the earthquake aspect, but rather to what Mark said and what was said earlier. The committee is very interested in this project, as you would

be aware, and, indeed, all that is going to happen on the LeFevre Peninsula. Given what Mr Hook said earlier about the way in which projects are packaged, the committee will have a discussion after this, and amongst other things, about a way by which the reporting mechanisms between the project and this committee can be brought together so that, when more finite detail is available with respect to the specifics that Mark has asked, and that Ivan might ask of a technical nature that you cannot give precise answers to, we will need you to come back during that stage. I will alert you to the fact that is what we will discuss afterwards. I suspect that will be the scenario.

145 MR BRINDAL: So, you are going to somehow ameliorate the problem beneath the bridge in terms of earthquakes, but the current theory seems to be that, to actually minimise a structure in terms of earthquakes, you tie the structure, not only below but above. What they do now is create a box and the box is tied together in all of its particulars so that, in an earthquake, the box tends to rotate, it might crack, but it will not crumble.

146 MR BRINDAL: What I put to you is that, because of the very nature of an opening bridge, whatever you do down the bottom is not tied at the top because the bridge opens. Therefore, the structure is open at the top. Therefore, in an earthquake zone, you increase the risk for that structure simply because it is an opening bridge. Whereas, if it is a fixed bridge, your spans and all the equipment is tied across the width of the piers and river, and it would conform. This does not conform to those sort of defined parameters, does it? It cannot.

MR BARTLETT: You obviously cannot have a fixed opening span, but all the approach spans are fixed, and they will be tied together in big boxes. We have trappers or little boxes that will be put together and form the fixed section. The Bascal piers are extremely stiff; they have to be. The tolerances on the rail are 1½ millilitres—vertically and horizontally. They have to be very stiff, and the deflection criteria is to be met by the designers. Wind load is another issue. Impact load of ships—all these are taken into account in the design process.

147 MR BRINDAL: This is a simple question. You could do that and still have a fixed bridge. You could still have those Bascal piers so rigid with a fixed bridge. Is it not a fact that a fixed bridge would be safer in an earthquake zone than an opening bridge? You could design a safer fixed bridge than an opening bridge. Is that a correct and fair statement?

148 MR VENNING: That is a political question.

149 MR BRINDAL: No it is not; it is a design question.

MR BARTLETT: There are design criteria, whether it is fixed or opening. The designer and the constructor has to meet those criteria.

150 MR BRINDAL: In an earthquake zone, would the safest design solution be a fixed bridge?

MR STEELE: Not necessarily. As David said, there are certain criteria that they have to meet, be it a fixed or opening bridge. Basically, you have to meet the criteria. If you do not meet the criteria for an earthquake zone, you have an unsafe bridge.

MR BARTLETT: The same would apply to, say, wind. Some areas are far windier than others. You have to design for certain deflections under wind load. If you are in a very, very windy area, you make different design decisions to make sure you meet those criteria.

151 MR VENNING: Lots of quick questions and quick answers, if possible. Are you going to leave the current rail track and road access through Port Adelaide?

MR HOOK: The current rail that is already there, the main track through Port Adelaide, is the TransAdelaide line and is used by TransAdelaide services. It is used to take the TransAdelaide service up the western side of LeFevre Peninsula. There is a section on part of the line, that is, the standard gauge line that goes from TransAdelaide line linking with the standard gauge line up the eastern side of the peninsula would be removed as part of this project.

152 MR VENNING: In other words, that could not be used. If this fails, you will not be able to use the line through Port Adelaide.

MR HOOK: You would not be able to use that section of the line that goes onto the standard gauge line. You would be able to use that line that heads up the western side of the peninsula. It is broad gauge; it is being made dual gauge.

153 MR VENNING: Do you have to remove that section of the line you just mentioned?

MR HOOK: It is part of the deal with Newport Quays.

MR BARTLETT: It cannot remain because the road bridge and road alignments cross that rail line. If you look at figure 3—

154 MR BRINDAL: Where are the passenger trains going to go? Do passenger trains go further down the peninsula?

MR HOOK: Passenger trains go over the viaduct, around the Inner Harbor and head up the western side of the peninsula on a broad gauge line, but it is in the process of being made dual gauge.

155 MR VENNING: Are there any passenger trains over this new bridge?

MR HOOK: No. This is for the freight trains only. Passenger services still service Port Adelaide and the residential areas.

156 MR VENNING: You said it has dual gauges on it. You have both gauges on it, haven't you?

MR HOOK: Yes, because it services the stone train, which is broad gauge.

157 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: That stone train currently goes over the viaduct on the existing track?

MR HOOK: Yes.

158 MR VENNING: Could you put a tram on this as well? Where would you put the trams?

159 MR BRINDAL: They are only going to North Adelaide, not Port Adelaide.

160 MR VENNING: I am thinking of the future.

MR STEELE: We are talking about a freight line here, which is totally separate from the TransAdelaide network.

MR HOOK: If there was a light rail service to the port, it would be considered as replacing the heavy rail line to the port, so it would be on that corridor. Then it would be an issue whether it serviced the port and you then radiate out through other means of transport or it gets extended around the port to the Outer Harbor area. They are all decisions that are well down the track.

161 MR VENNING: You said there are no passenger trains. What about pedestrian access across the bridge?

MR STEELE: Yes.

162 MR BRINDAL: Will you get that this time? You will not come back to us and say you dropped the submission because you decided you could do something better?

MR STEELE: At this stage we have no plans to drop it, I can assure you.

163 MR VENNING: You said that it takes about one minute to open the bridge. How long will it remain open?

MR HOOK: The intention is that the bridges would open for half an hour in the morning and half an hour in the evening.

164 MR VENNING: Even if there is no traffic wishing to go through?

MR STEELE: I expect that, if there is no traffic wishing to go through, that would be evident at Norwood and they would not be opened.

165 MR VENNING: So, could someone wishing to go out make an appointment and then it opens, otherwise no appointment and it would stay shut?

MR STEELE: Because we will be remotely controlling it, obviously there will be extensive CCTV coverage, so we will know exactly what is happening at the site. If there is no boat there, there is no reason to open the bridge.

166 MR VENNING: Looking at the evidence in the report, you are talking of opening twice, in the morning and in the evening. That is peak hour traffic time.

MR STEELE: No, it would be outside peak hours.

167 MR VENNING: You say that it would stay open for half an hour: that is a lot of traffic, especially if it is anywhere near peak hour.

MR STEELE: It would not be remaining open. You have a half-hour time slot, but it will not necessarily be open half an hour. Obviously, it only takes a few minutes for a boat to go through. If boats go through, then it closes again.

MR HOOK: The understanding is that it would be well publicised that these are the only two windows of opportunity to get access through the bridges, unless there was a major initiative, something being brought in, and there was an announcement of an opening at some other period. But the general publicity, the awareness for those who want to use the bridges, the scheduling of it on the rail corridor, which is a major issue, is that they would schedule around two half-hour opening opportunities per day.

168 MR KOUTSANTONIS: Who is liable if you hit the bridge when it is open? If an *Anzac* size ship went through and accidentally hit the side of the bridges, who is liable?

MR STEELE: The first point to make is that, as with all bridges where you have boat traffic going underneath, you do have extensive fendering to protect the bridge in case something runs into it. You actually have fendering that will protect the bridge structure so it

does not get knocked into the water. Having said that, I guess if someone runs into it, then we have the potential to put in a claim against them for damaging our bridge.

169 MR KOUTSANTONIS: They could not sue you for damaging their boat, could they?

MR STEELE: They could always try, but I don't think they would be successful.

170 MR VENNING: I would presume that the depth of water under this bridge would be greater than the mean of any of the river around it, so that a yacht or boat could not run aground under this bridge.

MR BARTLETT: No, the depth is round eight metres, but it is an excavated channel. It is pretty constant across the whole width. Certainly, the *Falio*, the *One and All* and the navy all have adequate depth.

171 MR VENNING: As long as it is not at the shallowest part of the river.

MR BARTLETT: No.

172 MR VENNING: I presume this bridge would be a counterweight design.

MR BARTLETT: Yes.

173 MR VENNING: Can we have a basic mechanical design plan of this bridge? I am thinking about noise, not only when it is down, but I think people at the Quays are going to get a surprise. This bridge, being a lifting bridge, is of lighter construction and will be a lot noisier than a cement bridge. I would say it would be a lot noisier in its down position. Have you taken the noise factor into consideration with the contractor, not just down but also when operating, when it is going up and down?

MR BARTLETT: Yes, there are extensive noise requirements in the documents and there is a clause that ensures that noise levels resulting from the opening and closing of the road and rail bridges do not exceed the limits specified in the table below at the edge of the Port River within the project site, and there are also requirements for road noise and rail noise. The tenderers have had to provide noise contours and they have had to provide mitigation effects against any noise that exceeds the limits.

174 MR VENNING: Have you considered the possibility of a derailment on the lifting bridge?

MR BARTLETT: There are rail derailleurs on both sides of the river. It would be easier to talk to the plan on that. We have worked extensively with ARTC and the rail

operators to ensure that all their requirements have been met. The rail line will be left in its standard position without rail traffic in a default line running rail up into the port flat yard. On the western side on Elder Road, adjacent to Stirling Street, there is a parallel derailer track that runs at ground level before the trains start climbing the grade over the rail bridge. We had a workshop probably 10 days ago with all the rail operators, rail stakeholders and ARTC explaining all this. There has to be a series of fail-safe processes put in place to actually engage the track to enter the bridge and disengage the derailer there, and to disengage the diversion onto the port flat track. A series of decisions has to be made by ARTC train control and our bridge control person who is opening the bridge to introduce trains on to that track.

175 MR VENNING: You would not put the derailer on the bridge?

MR BARTLETT: No.

176 MR BRINDAL: What is a derailer?

177 MR VENNING: Extra rails. It puts them back on to the rails.

MR BARTLETT: There are additional rails on the bridge to ensure that, if a derailment happens there, the trains are kept on the bridge.

178 MR VENNING: Can the rail bridge in an emergency be used as a road bridge?

MR BARTLETT: No.

179 MR VENNING: It would be mainly access on and off it but it could technically be driven on, couldn't it? There are two bridges and, if one fails, it would be nice to have a fall-back position.

MR HOOK: If the road bridge fails, you have a ready-made option which means you put cars around the causeway and they drive around the waterway.

180 MR KOUTSANTONIS: What about pedestrian access on the other bridges?

181 MR BRINDAL: I said that and we are not going to get it this time. They are not going to change the design parameters in the middle of the project.

182 MR VENNING: Are you able to tell us the name of the company that has won the contract and whether or not they are Australian?

MR STEELE: Not at this stage. The reason why we can't is that it has not gone to cabinet yet and until cabinet makes a decision—

183 MR VENNING: I appreciate the efforts of the departmental officers in coming to this committee and the report that they have given us. I also appreciate the notice that they took of us during the construction of the expressway. It is pleasing to see the unders and overs that are on there, and that idea came from this committee, or we had some input into it. I think we convinced the government that it was worthy of the extra expenditure. The process does work and I have enjoyed this reference today.

184 MR BRINDAL: Do you know whether there are any agreements with the Newport Quays development that would involve a penalty payment by the government if the bridges were not opening?

MR STEELE: None that I am aware of.

MR HOOK: I understand that it was not part of the agreement. We did note that the representative of Newport Quays did go public and wrote a letter advocating opening bridges. If it ever eventuated to a stage that there were fixed bridges and whether they would make a claim, we would not have known. Our appreciation is that there was nothing in the agreement that enabled them to claim that as a breach of the agreement.

185 MR BRINDAL: Have they communicated with you, what they see, the difference in the viability of their project if there were not opening bridges? In other words, how much revenue would they anticipate losing, and what would the economic cost be to the inner port if there were fixed bridges.

MR HOOK: I do not have that figure. I do not believe that it has been communicated to government. They have done all their planning on their development proposals—what is in the agreement—and I think that it is reasonable to assume (which probably goes back to your previous question) that they would base their projections on the public statements of government anyway. I guess that there are proposals to have moorings in the Inner Harbor. People who purchase those moorings and locate cruises there would be able, in the main, to have unimpeded access under the bridges if they were fixed. But it would mean that if you wanted to purchase one of those moorings, and to run a yacht, you would either not be able to proceed, which may have an impact on price—on market interest—or you would have to do so with a collapsible mast.

186 MR BRINDAL: Might it not also have an impact on price, Mr Hook, if they moor boats in there that have a requirement—say, a flying bridge that is more than 10 metres high—10 metres above sea-level is a three-storey house, and if you have something the size of a three-storey house sitting outside your beach front with views of the Inner Harbor, I do not think that it is going to give you much of a view, is it?

MR HOOK: Some of these can be masts. The height is usually on yachts with a mast that, probably, if it is moored, would not have its sail up. On cruisers you have issues

with radio masts and so on, and they would have to take that into account when they made their purchase.

187 MR BRINDAL: But the yacht basin that is currently in the Inner Harbor has been acquired by LMC, and will be relocated to the other side of the harbor.

MR HOOK: The Port Adelaide Sailing Club is being relocated on the other side of the bridges.

188 MR BRINDAL: And the main marinas are at the Royal Yacht Squadron and North Haven now, so there will be three sailing marinas outside the bridges, and the only provisions inside the bridges—one presumes—will be private berths that go with expensive waterfront real estate. Would that be correct?

MR HOOK: That and other vessels. The tourist vessels like the Port Princess and the Queen Adelaide will be able to have access under the bridges, and they are the groups that take the hour cruises out from Inner Harbor, so they would still be able to be accommodated.

189 MR BRINDAL: Without the bridges opening.

MR HOOK: Without the bridges opening, and that was part of the factor in working through this—that the bridges had to be higher so that that activity could continue unimpeded. There would be a major interest from people who buy in the Inner Harbor, if they buy a mooring, that they would be able to work or have a vessel that could work with the bridges. I think in many instances they will buy cruisers rather than yachts, if they choose to buy an Inner Harbor berth, but that will be a choice that they make. That means that they will not have the impediment of waiting for bridge opening spans. People who buy into a waterfront area are going to pick up the impact of waterfront activities and, if it is boats, it is flapping masts or flapping ropes—but people still seem to be very keen to purchase in those areas as we have seen down at Glenelg.

190 MR BRINDAL: I understand, but what I am trying to ascertain is that opening bridges will only cater for fixed type structure boats that exceed 10 metres above the water line—which makes them a 30-foot structure out of the water—which is not going to be too popular with the neighbours moored in the berth next door, or yachts. How much work have you done on what size yacht you need before you must have a fixed mast, because most yachts with aluminium masts can actually pivot their masts—and do—including some large racing yachts. What size yacht do you need before the design requirements of the yacht require it to be a fixed mast?

MR HOOK: I do not know that there is a fixed design requirement. I am not a sailing expert. My appreciation is that most people who run yachts probably feel as though

they have an inferior product if they have to incorporate a collapsible mast—that they would choose to do that. Any respectable yacht with a fixed mast will not go under the bridges without the bridges opening. With the opening bridge opportunity, people have a choice of buying into the Inner Harbor and running a yacht or bringing a yacht in from outside the river through the window of opportunity available for that, or you could bring in the *One and All* and *Falie*. If they are not sailing during any particular day, they could go into the harbour in that window of opportunity and they could moor there for the day. They could operate at Inner Harbor. They are more likely to then go out and position themselves outside the bridge. If they have an evening cruise to take off at 7 o'clock and come back at 10, they will go from their external berth. So I think the argument for opening bridges is it gives you opportunities, and it may be opportunities at some stage in the future where navy might be prepared to come in.

Their current position is not that they will not go in through opening bridges. It is that they will not go and tie up on wharfs that are part of a residential project. They want the secure wharf space and their current policy is that but whether they would go in for a particular event—

191 MR VENNING: They are locked in, are they not?

MR HOOK: They have not been too concerned about whether they were sitting behind an opening bridge. Their concern in security requirements is that they will not moor or tie up at a public berth where you cannot have the security clearance as a part of that.

192 MR BRINDAL: Your evidence is that in your opinion the navy is not concerned about going in beyond an opening bridge.

MR HOOK: That is my understanding of their position, but they are concerned about tying up at an unsecure wharf.

193 MR BRINDAL: We are talking about \$71 million here. \$71 million is so that people who buy expensive waterfront property can get not just any yachts in. I think you used the word 'respectable yachts', so \$71 million is for a few people owning expensive waterfront property bringing in respectable yachts and it is also against the time when the *Falie* or the *One and All* might want to come into the Inner Harbor, and when the Australian government changes its mind, or we decide to change it from a precinct, which is a vibrant living precinct where people are wandering everywhere, to a secure precinct that you can bring navy boats into, which is at complete variance with everything else we have, but they are the three reasons that you can give me, Mr Hook, why we should have opening bridges.

MR HOOK: I guess it is to have the flexibility. If you build a fixed bridge, it is a fixed bridge forever and a day and you do not have the option.

194 MR BRINDAL: No, for a hundred years, Mr Hook.

MR HOOK: You do not have the option to reactivate any sense of active waterway in the Inner Harbor, other than with vessels that would go under the fixed bridge. It is the government's choice and that is what they are in a position to decide, and their judgment was it was worth spending more money to have a flexibility.

195 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I think it is successive governments' choice, actually.

196 MR BRINDAL: Yes, and we have changed our mind. Why do we not have opening bridges, then, into West Lakes? It gives us flexibility.

MR HOOK: The fact that West Lakes is a locked waterway may well be the reason why the government's view is that they want to keep Inner Harbor as an active waterway. The fact is I might want a respectable yacht in West Lakes and I cannot get it under the bridge.

197 MR VENNING: On the same line. Obviously, the alternative to a very expensive solution can often be very simple and cheap. I am a bit of a yachty, and all masts are held on by three wires, and I cannot see any reason why an electric winch on the front wire would or could do this job. In the audience, Mr Chair, with your permission I would like to ask a question of the Vice Commodore of the Port Adelaide Sailing Club, Mr Alan Rice, whether this is a feasible alternative and does it happen anywhere else in Australia?

198 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Sorry, you want to ask a question?

199 MR VENNING: Yes.

200 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: No, we are going to get that opportunity afterwards, Ivan.

201 MR VENNING: No, I wanted it in the body of the—

202 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: It will be. We are going to have the gentlemen, when you have finished asking the questions here, we are having them up for a short period of time and you can pose that question directly instead of through an intermediary, all right. I have a question. I did not realise there were many yachts up in the Barossa Valley. When was it that you became a bit of a yachty? Mark, do you have any more questions?

203 MR BRINDAL: I want to be sure that you are going to give us some more stuff on the earthquake design, because I remember when we were dealing with one of the reservoirs which was an earthen reservoir. There were design parameters for that and it met those parameters, but that does not necessarily make it safe because one of the design

parameters was that residents should not be allowed to live below an earthen wall. So, I really want to be sure that you come back to us on the earthquake structure, because I cannot see any design parameter given for an opening bridge which would make it safe—as safe in an earthquake zone as if you had a solid construction bridge. Do you understand what I am asking? I want to be absolutely specific that we get an answer to that question.

MR STEELE: Mr Chairman, I am assuming that you will want us to come back at some stage when the design is a bit further formalised. Are you happy to have that response at that time, once we have some further—

204 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Providing we have the correct response; I mean, if you could do that now, because Mark is interested in it. Sorry—what I am saying is make sure that you can provide the details; we will be guided by you in respect of the details. If it is not inconvenient for you to provide it in the time frame Mark likes, which is probably yesterday, that would be good. Failing that we are going to work out when you come back, and I really do not have a problem with when we get it as long as we do get it.

MR STEELE: Could I suggest, then, that we straight away provide you with what we have actually specified they must do and then, further down the track, we will be able to come back to you and say, 'This is what they did to meet that specified requirement.'

205 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I think that is reasonable. Mark, are you happy with that?

206 MR BRINDAL: Yes. Given also that the development of Newport Quays seems in many ways integral to this process, how much are the two interdependent? How much is the decision to have opening bridges tied in with the Newport Quays development? How much is it just a decision of government based on infrastructure needs?

MR HOOK: I think the decision to have bridges has a big interrelationship with the Newport Quays development because it is taking the traffic out of the heart of Port Adelaide—particularly freight traffic, both road and rail—and it is creating the opportunity for a redevelopment of the waterfront land. The decision that they be opening, rather than fixed, bridges was not, as I understand it, a measure that was specified in any agreement or commitment between the government and Newport Quays, and I do not believe that would have been a factor in the government's decision—other than the fact that Newport Quays made public statements that they were encouraging the government to build opening bridges, whereas other interest groups were encouraging fixed bridges.

207 MR BRINDAL: Does the government have a profit share in Newport Quays (and I do not know this, that is why I am asking); is the government in any way a financial beneficiary from the Inner Harbor development?

MR HOOK: Yes; there is a very clear arrangement, that has been announced quite openly, that the government receives a share of the revenue from the project. It has been talked up publicly but I think it is something like \$100 million worth of revenue to government.

208 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: We have evidence on that, Mr Hook—you were not there at that stage.

209 MR BRINDAL: I am just trying to work it out. In my opinion, executive government is prepared to pay an additional \$71 million for something that does not make sense to me, and I am trying to work out why it might make sense to them. And if they are going to make \$100 million and they reckon it will go down to—

210 MS CICCARELLO: You were in government when you decided on the opening bridges, anyway.

211 MR BRINDAL: We weren't.

212 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: You decided that they were opening ridges, that is a fact.

213 MR BRINDAL: We did not know the price—

214 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: We can talk across the table for as long as we want. I want to try to wind up and pay due courtesy and respect to other people who wish to be heard.

215 MR VENNING: I have a couple of quick questions. Would you let us know fairly urgently where we can have a look at a lifting rail bridge—ideally in Australia but, if not, then overseas.

216 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: That question is on notice, I understand. We asked that earlier.

217 MR VENNING: It is fairly urgent.

MR BARTLETT: There is one in Tasmania.

218 MR VENNING: And this project has been cleared by cabinet?

MR STEELE: Yes.

219 MR VENNING: Was it ever cleared by caucus, Mr Chairman?

220 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I beg your pardon, Ivan. You have been on Public Works and other committees long enough to know that it would not be here if it had not been to cabinet, you know that. That is not a question: ask a question. I have been fairly liberal, and I will continue to be so.

221 MR VENNING: That's it.

222 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Thank you very much. We are going to have other witnesses for a short period of time and you are, of course, more than welcome to stay.

WITNESSES:

CHRISTOPHER BEILBY, VisionSA, 344A Main North Road, Blair Athol 5084; SHIRLEY McNAMARA, Proprietor, Tourist Information Distributors Australia, PO Box 38 Balhannah 5242; and ALAN RICE, proprietor, Alan Rice Marine Surveys, 12 Columbine Avenue, West Lakes Shore 5020, called and examined:

223 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Mr Beilby, you have been a witness before the committee previously, so you are aware of the provisions of the committee that you need to comply with. You heard earlier the statement that I read out. This is a continuation of that same hearing, so I do not think there is any need for me to read that again. You are fully aware of the provisions.

MR BEILBY: That is correct.

224 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Thank you for appearing before the committee today. I know that you have had some discussions with the secretary. Given your previous interactions with the committee, we believed as a committee that it was prudent for you to appear before the committee today. I want to reinforce the point that the committee is very familiar with the proposals you have provided over a period of time. We have forwarded those to Transport and other government departments for their response, and there has been an exchange of information between you and the committee on numerous occasions.

To that extent, it would be appreciated by the committee if you do not necessarily—and I choose my words carefully—rehash those previous proposals, because we are familiar with them, and that you reinforce the points you want to reinforce or any additional information that might arise from the reports that you have previously provided. Is that reasonable?

MR BEILBY: Yes. At this stage we are quite glad that you have allowed us to have an input and we would like to keep it as brief as possible.

225 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Please proceed with a brief overview of the matters you wish the committee to consider.

MR BEILBY: I represent a group of people who have been following this issue for approximately three years. Our original concerns came about relating to tourism issues but since then we have become aware of more and more issues that the Public Works Committee needs to be really careful that it fully understands. In the last week, we have become aware of rumours that indicate that the whole thing is perhaps too much of a done deal, and we would hate to see this committee put into a situation where it feels obligated to go along with what is before it.

I have been encouraged to see the vigorous questioning that has gone on this morning. I am a bit concerned with regard to how some things have been put to you, and I will give one example. In questioning what was presented this morning, you mentioned the option of tunnels. What was not perhaps well presented was the responses they gave to you that tied the road and rail to being in a tunnel. They correctly responded when they said it is too expensive to put rail in a tunnel. They didn't give you any detail about upgrading the rail access by non-bridge means and then just building a road tunnel under the river at the current location.

We have a lot of sources that provide us with information and a lot of them can't appear before you because they are public servants. We have to weight information that we receive. From multiple different sources we have been made aware of who the preferred tenderer is, and if you are quite happy we can write on a bit of paper and give it to you and, if it is correct, it should allow you to give more belief to another rumour that we provide you, and this rumour involves the fact that—

226 MR BRINDAL: You can tell us who you believe to be the successful tenderer.

MR BEILBY: It is at the beginning of the alphabet: it starts with an A. I do not know whether that is correct or not. I will get away from the hypotheticals. The point that I am getting to is that, from similar sources, we have been advised that a road tunnel costing was provided to Transport SA or whoever was running the process and the cost of the road tunnel—and I will use the words—was considerably less than the proposal that is being put up to you.

Right from the day these projects were announced, the local community sought a preference for a tunnel. For whatever reasons, they saw a tunnel as the best outcome for their aspirations for that area. Now, if indeed a road tunnel costing was put up, another part of that was encasing in concrete the rail line that would remain behind the LMC-Newport Quays land, so it is totally soundproof and unknown to the unit development. They were two elements if what we have been told is correct.

The committee I praise for the fact that they believe they should be able to fully assess what is the right thing, not just what is put before them. I think that we now firmly believe that there are still two options on the table apart from what Transport SA have put up to you. One of the questions that we have put directly to Transport SA was whether they costed our options, and they replied no. They have not debunked our options on a costings basis. I have a list, which I will give to you afterwards, of the people we have consulted with over three years and it is not only every one of the major stakeholders that Transport SA has listed. It is others who are not listed. We have Alan Rice here who is the vice commodore of the sailing club. He has lived in the area 60 years.

One of the problems that government has to deal with is that government departments are often limited to the people they can talk to, for whatever reasons. We have been totally free to talk to anyone where we have seen doubts or concerns. We have had

people talk to us in a way that they can't normally do if they are employed with the government and other things, quite often. People have to be careful what they say. But the people we have dealt with, and what has surprised us, is that they have quite often been the people at the very top of all these organisations. They have been managing directors, CEOs, whatever. Quite often what they have said to us as a best case outcome is not what they are being offered by the current project.

I will give one example, AusBulk. AusBulk is to build new grain silos at Outer Harbor. I have a cutting here that shows in a drought year their profit went from \$55 million to \$11 million. This year looks like a potential drought year. Originally we believed that the amount of money involved in building the silos for AusBulk at Outer Harbor was \$70 million. The Flinders Ports manager told us that it is now over \$100 million. If they could continue to use their current silos, with the river dredge back to there—and, certainly, there appears a need to upgrade the berth and some of their loader facilities—it could save them a significant portion of the \$100 million-plus that they are going to have to spend at Outer Harbor. Another benefit from that is that no grain or freight train has to go the 7 or 8 kilometres down the predominantly residential LeFevre Peninsula, which any person with any real estate background or even just basic commonsense can see is going to grow more as a prime residential area that could be of great benefit to South Australia's future employment and economy. So, keeping it brief, I think the committee needs to step back a bit. It concerns me to hear today that Transport SA has had these prices that has put you in the situation now where you only have a very small percentage of that 364-day window left. It is another situation where you are put under pressure.

You asked questions about what was behind knocking down the wharf sheds. Not only are they knocking down the wharf sheds, but they are only knocking down the ones where the bridge is going to go; they are not knocking down the ones where the bridge is not going to go. Our engineer is a volunteer member of aviation museum. The government has spent millions relocating it. It has already built the new workshop shed, and you can see that it is going to be the only building left standing in the next week where the bridge will go. I do not know how millions are involved in relocating that. Flinders Ports has put in a new grain berth—\$30 million we are told they spent. The decision to build the bridges has not been made yet. What happens if, for some reason, you see that the ports should be relocated to beside the current silos? There is \$30 million that has been spent, and you are put under pressure that you would be responsible for them losing \$30 million.

There are a lot of issues here—they are everywhere. The whole port at Outer Harbor has more issues that the committee has become in to do with dredging the harbour deeper with the carting of the toxic weed *Caulerpa racemosa* out into the gulf. All these things are snowballing. The dredges are booked to come and do that in July and, yet, the EPA has yet to decide whether it is going to grant permission to do this dredging. So, what are the odds of the EPA? They are like you; they are being put under pressure. That is all I would like to say on those points.

227 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Mr Beilby, we have had evidence on the deepening of the Outer Harbor; in fact, it was a project that unanimously supported by this committee, so I am not quite sure whether your comments on the EPA were actually correct. Provisions have been made to allow that dredging to occur with some strict guidelines. If you could wind up—

MR BEILBY: My source of information on that was the mayor of Port Adelaide Enfield Council at a public meeting a week ago; so, if she is wrong, I apologise, but she said they still have to give permission. I ask the committee to visit our two options. The two options are a land bypass. We originally suggested that the rail be brought through the Gillman shunting yards. Transport SA did not provide a costing that proved that was uneconomical. Mention was made of the local considerations. That would affect the Treasurer's electorate, and it was mentioned that people live near there backing onto the Rosewater area. This committee has to decide what is more important—a few residents in the Rosewater area who might get back to a situation they had before. No-one is going to put a new airport that was not there before. All they are going to do is put back trains that were in that area before and nowhere near the scale of operations that were there before. If you were to be influenced by the fact that a few people might end up in a situation back where they were before, but not on the same scale, and that is given as the only reason that the rail line should not go back in there. I think that is unfortunate.

The way bigger issue is: what influence has any agreement the government has made with Newport Quays had on virtually backing Transport SA into a situation where it has not given a recommendation? I have made notes and I can provide the committee with a record of where I think it was noted, but time and again today Mr Steele, Mr Hook and, to a lesser extent, David Bartlett have been put in a situation where they have been told that a decision has already been made by cabinet that was mindful of an agreement with Newport Quays. We are talking about a \$180 million bridge project here.

Ausbulk is committing \$100 million to grain silos. If all that is being forced because of an agreement with Newport Quays that does not wish to see a rail line kept behind its site, a rail line that involves a tender with respect to enclosing concrete for a lesser cost than the new bridges concept, that is wrong. I can wind up now. I would like the opportunity to provide further written material to the committee within, say, the next week, to be considered rather than take up time now. I would like Alan Rice now—

228 MR BRINDAL: I would like to ask you some questions.

MR BEILBY: Yes. Alan is the Vice Commodore. He can tell you his background in the area. He has come up with a solution to the dredging problem with the river. Transport SA would most likely tell you that it cannot dredge the river further back up to the grain silos, as we recommend, because it has nowhere to put the spoil. He will come up with a solution. We have run the solution past the Department of Environment and Heritage, and it believed that it was a brilliant solution to the risk of carrying this toxic weed 48

kilometres out into the gulf. It gives South Australia something new with which it can promote and sell the state image. I will let Mr Rice introduce himself.

229 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Mr Rice, introduce yourself, please.

MR RICE: Thank you, and giddy to everyone else. I am a marine surveyor and the current Vice Commodore of the Port Adelaide Sailing Club, a member of the Royal South Australian Yacht Squadron and the Cruising Yacht Club (CYC). In 1986 (the state's 150th) I had a great interest in leaving a permanent reminder of that time out in the gulf. It was an island. Nothing happened back then and here we are today. We have got a golden opportunity, a unique opportunity, with all this spoil that is coming out of the river to create a boating island about five nautical miles to the north-west area of the Outer Harbor.

It would just give people in this state, and Adelaide in particular, a great opportunity to go somewhere with a boat. The yacht squadron is currently building new marinas at approximately \$300 000 a berth for boats up to 25 to 30 metres in length. The CYC is also looking to build a similar sort of area for boats of that size. As you come into the channel at North Haven, the CYC owns the actual water. It is having a fight with the residents, but it owns the water and it is quite confident that it will be able to put in berths. Members would know the size of the vessels at Glenelg; they are quite large. Glenelg has 20 to 25 metre vessels turning up, and there is just nowhere to go.

You go out in the gulf, you steam up and down, and you go back in again. There is just nowhere to go. If an island was created in this gulf, it would give the boating industry such a boost as to be well justified. The only problem is that time has slipped away again. Here we are looking at the end of this month and the dredging contract is pretty well in place. The government has agreed to it, and it is all there. It is very hard now to be able to get this into place. The dredge that will pick up the spoil in the river is a draining dredge. It could take it out to the site and drop it in front of a suction dredge. We do need a suction dredge out there to be able to suck it up to create the island. The island could be in the shape of a star. If the wind comes from the west you would go on the eastern side of it. If there was a northerly you would be on the south side of it. It would be sort of a star shape; and, being man made, you can create any shape you like.

230 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I think I understand what you are saying; that is, one of the options (and it linked to what Mr Beilby is saying), hypothetically speaking, is to dredge out the channel toward the Inner Harbor towards where the existing grain silo is and that the material that was dredged could be used to make a man-made island.

MR BEILBY: Virtually all the material. That is right, isn't it?

MR RICE: It is not quite what I was presenting. It was only the current dredging. We are only looking at two—

231 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: The stuff that is going to be dredged from the Outer Harbor. You can still make an island with that, can you?

MR RICE: Yes, you are talking hundreds—

MR BEILBY: I think 300 000 cubic metres I think was a fair estimate.

MR RICE: The basic island was 200 metres long by 160 metres wide—that is the small option—and 10 metres height to allow for tides. You are talking 200 000 cubic metres. What is coming out of there is only a drop in the ocean.

232 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: That is all right. I was trying to get a correlation between what Mr Beilby was talking about earlier and the evidence which you are presenting now, one of which relates to the Outer Harbor, although you have made links between the entire projects that are going on. Could you wind up please, Mr Rice, and we will ask in questions?

MR RICE: That is what I am presenting to you. I have a chart, if you wish to see the chart. If it is north of the Outer Harbor, it is out of the way for shipping, and there are no complaints from Flinders Ports if it is well north of the harbour. It is virtually in line with the existing channel that goes behind Torrens Island. It is well away from the main shipping traffic. This chart shows your Outer Harbor entrance, and I am talking way over here, which is well north of the harbour.

You also have to take into consideration the depth of the water. If you start going out further, the depth from the seabed is quite considerable. You are only talking a five metre range, and you also have to take into consideration that the dredge has to be able to get there, so it cannot be too shallow. You are looking at around about five metres of water at low tide.

MR BEILBY: It means that, instead of the dredge going 58 kilometres out to dump it, it only has to go out five kilometres, and therefore it could do many more trips in the day. Any extra cost in pumping it up would be covered by the shorter dredging time.

MR RICE: It has an enormous advantage of being able to take it out there.

MR BEILBY: He has only suggested using 200 000 cubic metres. From memory, there is roughly 300 000 involved in the current dredging contract that has been let. If they came back up the river to the current silos, the volume could be 600 000. There is a concern about some contaminated material from industry that has been operating in the river. That contaminated material could be put in the core of the island. I have mentioned the sandstone near the end of the channel is to be deepened, and that it needs to be cut with a cutter dredge. They could, for example, put the sandstone around as an outside foundation and put more contaminated stuff from, say, around Penrice in the centre there, or they could maybe have a hollow lagoon in the middle.

233 MR BRINDAL: I think what you are saying is very interesting. However, we need to be careful not to confuse too many projects. The dredging has been approved. The point about whether we do an island or not I find most interesting and I hope you will write in about it. What we have been asked to do today is to decide whether we will approve these bridges and if there is a need for these bridges. The other ideas are great and they are all part of an integrated plan, I can see that, but you are in danger of getting us lost.

MR BEILBY: Where those tie in is that we are pre-empting an objection that might be put to you that there is nowhere to get rid of the extra dredging spoil that would be involved in dredging up to the river. One of our options is to relocate the whole port beside the current grain silos. It saves a seven kilometre journey down the peninsula, which works out to be a saving to a well-known trucking company in South Australia of nearly \$50 a container. You work out 400 containers per ship—and these bridges are supposedly to assist the export and import port facility—if you can save \$40 a container and there are 400 on a ship, that is a really significant saving. If you look at the material we gave you concerning the port beside the current grain silos, it is listed in the PPK reports that there is a 25 minute saving over building new bridges. So, like you said, it gets so wide. But they are all issues that you do have to consider.

234 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: We do have the document that you forwarded to the committee dated 24 May 2005. We understand details of what you said and we have all had the opportunity of reading and digesting it.

I only have a couple of questions. We are a committee that has given serious consideration to matters that you have previously raised. I notice you represent Vision SA, but would you tell me a bit about the organisation you represent and talk on behalf of? Can you include how many members you have, how people join if they want to be members of Vision SA and what, if any, qualifications they need to bring with them? You also mention public comment and the majority of people, and you said it in not specific terms but that the community wanted a tunnel, yet the only evidence that we have in latter times has been a community meeting where they demanded opening bridges. So can you answer that question: the type of organisation, how many members you have, how you join and is there any requirement for any particular qualifications? When you said that the community wanted tunnels, I had not heard that at the most recent public meetings and the outcomes of those public meetings; it was just opening versus closed bridges more than anything else. Can you give the committee an overview on that so we know exactly the organisation that you are speaking on behalf of?

MR BEILBY: All right. The first one I will give limited detail and you can ask further questions if you like. Originally it was intended that a Port Adelaide development association be set up, and a steering committee was formed. The position was reached that we felt if certain events went ahead, such as the bridges across the river at Port Adelaide, it would be very difficult for Port Adelaide to have any serious tourism future other than as a boutique or quaint shopping centre. So, it was then let to lie doggo. Subsequently, we became aware

that there were far wider issues that needed someone to be a voice or a means of these issues being better put forward.

235 MR KOUTSANTONIS: For whom?

MR BEILBY: For people who live in South Australia. There was a PAR run in Port Adelaide to do with the Inner Harbor redevelopment. Excellent community consultation was conducted and excellent record was taken of the community's aspirations. Virtually every key thing that was put forward, such as they wanted no more than three-storey development, was virtually ignored. We have a 24 foot frontage around the wharf. It is like a footpath. You cannot build a road next to someone's fence because the side of a bus or a truck is going to take it out. There had to be a minimum width between the water and what they were allowed to build there. The worst thing with that PAR was that it was supposedly approved in May last year, and we only found that out when the decision was announced at the footy final on 22 September. Members of the community had been dealing with Planning SA and the people that ran that PAR in good faith, not even knowing that it had been concluded.

I managed to encounter Treasurer Foley in his office when I was talking to one of his staff, and I pointed this matter out to him, and I said I had been one of the government's greatest supporters in saying the community had to wait until the government came down with a decision before criticising, because you were pre-empting a decision that had not been made. Foley's response was, 'Well, a decision had to be made some time.' I do not want to be talking this way, but the fact that the public were not advised that a decision had been made months earlier left a bad taste. A PAR is currently being conducted, and it relates to 90 hectares of land on Fosters Road. I went along to the PAR hearing the other night. It has been put up the LMC and Planning SA. It came out during the hearing that what it is applying for is even more intense development than is already allowed in that area. Transport SA does not allow connection of that with the main roads that people will use. Apparently, it will not allow Fosters Road to be connected to North East Road with a controlled intersection.

What came out was that, if Planning SA does not intend to allow this needed approval, how can the government even proceed with considering allowing such a development? A warning was put to that committee that a death would occur at Redwood Street coming onto Fosters Road. That death occurred on Monday night this week. VisionSA wants to know how you get these issues addressed?

236 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Mr Beilby, can you just get back to the question I asked—that is, who does VisionSA represent and who are you speaking on behalf of? I need to get my head around that. We are here to consider your evidence seriously.

MR BEILBY: I am sorry that I talk so much.

237 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I want to know who it is you are speaking on behalf of. You are here as Mr Beilby, and VisionSA is on the sheet in front of you. Who is VisionSA? What is the membership?

MR BEILBY: Shirley McNamara here is the best person to speak to about the legal identity. We have set up a web site and, through that web site, we intend to allow memberships.

238 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: How many members are there of VisionSA at this point?

239 MS CICCARELLO: As clarification, is it a group of business people or residents? How many people are involved? How did they become involved? How is it constituted? How often do you meet? Who do you report to? How do you consult with the community?

MR BEILBY: Shirley McNamara can answer those questions about how it is constituted and so on.

240 MS CICCARELLO: Mr Chairman, it is 10 past one.

MR BEILBY: That is not our fault. This is a \$200 million project.

241 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: With the greatest respect—

242 MR BRINDAL: We should call the witnesses back if one of our members has to go.

243 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: We are still a quorum if one member has to go. I assume you are speaking on behalf of VisionSA.

MR BEILBY: Correct.

244 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: We were told as a committee that you would be the spokesperson for the people here. All I want to know—in the briefest terms—is how many members VisionSA has. Forget the constitution and forget everything else. Mrs McNamara, can you answer, very briefly: in line with the questions I asked, who is VisionSA? Please introduce yourself for the record.

MS McNAMARA: My name is Shirley McNamara. I run a small publishing business called Tourism Information Distributors Australia. I have been involved in some of the issues regarding the public consultation, government and development. We have found that often the meetings we have had with the public have been a farce and that often decisions have been made behind closed doors before the issues have been aired with the public. The voice of the public is not heard, because I think the media takes up the government's cause, because they speak mainly in newspapers—volunteers don't. Therefore, we thought, 'How can we have a voice?' Often, we speak to people, and that is their biggest frustration.

245 MS CICCARELLO: Mr Chairman, with due respect, I think that Mrs McNamara is filling in the background, but we wanted specifics about the organisation.

MR BEILBY: How it is legally structured.

MS McNAMARA: VisionSA is a non-profit organisation. It is incorporated. We have supporters, but we have not yet sought members, although we have had a lot of feedback from various people who have not been consulted. One at Coober Pedy, who runs a tourism business—

246 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I think you have answered the question, Mrs McNamara. You have not sought any members at the moment. At this point, VisionSA is Mr Beilby and other like-minded people, which includes Mrs McNamara. Is that right?

MS McNAMARA: And also supporters.

247 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Do you have a supporter base or a data base? How many supporters do you have and where do they come from—all those type of things.

MR BEILBY: You are starting to lose sight of the—

248 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Mr Beilby, one at a time. I am a very patient man. I asked a simple question to get my head around VisionSA. I do not need to hear any more about VisionSA at this point in time. The other questions I asked sought information about who might comprise your supporters and their qualifications; things like that. It really does not matter at this point of time. We are going to open up for questions of a specific nature that any of us might like to ask. If not, we are going to consider (and I am sure there will be a couple of questions) the information you have provided us with. We will not only review the transcript, which we do at any time, but we will consider that information. Members will choose or otherwise to take into consideration in deliberating this project the matters you have raised.

MR BEILBY: Can I briefly tell you about the tunnel one?

249 MR BRINDAL: Before you do, can we make sure that we have on the record that VisionSA is an incorporated organisation?

MR BEILBY: Non-profit.

250 MR BRINDAL: Non-profit incorporated organisation, which presumably has some sort of management structure?

MR BEILBY: Yes.

PORT RIVER EXPRESSWAY—STAGES 2 & 3

251 MR BRINDAL: So, there is a management committee and, while you have not sought formal membership in terms of members, you have a management committee and you have a support base, which is—

MR BEILBY: From all over South Australia.

252 MR BRINDAL: Do you have any estimate as to how many people may have contacted you in the last three or four—

MR BEILBY: The web site only started on 8 April. We have been busy in the last two weeks preparing all this material for today. We do not have a count on it yet.

253 MR BRINDAL: I am just asking for your best guess, over the last three years, of how many people you have talked to and who have supported you.

MR BEILBY: We have talked to people collecting petitions, etc. It could be in the thousands.

254 MR BRINDAL: So, you would run your supporters into thousands?

MR BEILBY: It is only because of feedback from those thousands that we have set it up.

255 MR BRINDAL: So, you have run your supporters into thousands; that is your answer. So, it is you, your management committee and thousands of supporters who are not yet members?

MR BEILBY: Yes.

256 MR BRINDAL: Thank you; that is what I wanted to know.

257 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Tom, do you have any questions?

MR BEILBY: Do you want the tunnel one; it is a really brief answer? The tunnel one came about because we picked it up from Transport SA's own publication to do with the project. At the back, there was discussion of local people having aspirations for a tunnel. The only reason that the tunnel has fallen off the agenda is because they had become so upset and concerned that the bridges might be fixed—they are so concerned with not getting fixed bridges—they have forgotten about the tunnel. They will accept anything other than fixed bridges. That is my belief based on the people I have dealt with.

258 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Is that your belief, too? We will push the tunnel to the side at the moment. As I have said, I have read where you said there was the potential for the port to be colonial working port, for example. They are your words, not mine. You would prefer the bridges?

MR BEILBY: The ones there.

259 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I understand that. But, seeing that we have been dealing with some hypotheticals this morning, if we push, for a variety of reasons, the tunnels to one side and we were to debunk (and the word 'debunk' was your word, not mine) that position in theory and put it away, would you prefer opening bridges or closed bridges?

MR BEILBY: My position is that there are two better alternatives that do not need any bridges. So, why even consider bridges?

260 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Okay.

261 MR BRINDAL: Very good answer.

MR BEILBY: No; that is the truth. It is so obvious. Everyone you speak to says, 'Why would you want to put bridges there?'

262 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Not everyone.

MR BEILBY: I will try to keep it very brief. A petition was collected originally that saw the government promise opening bridges. Mention was made today of any agreements with Newport Quays, and the response from Mr Hook indicated that the government had made undertakings that the bridges would be opening, and that might have been a factor why they have gone back to keeping that commitment. When we had a meeting in Foley's office—he called a public meeting that no-one knew about—30 of us turned up, and he was there for 2½ hours trying to tell us he was going to get shot down in cabinet trying to push an argument for opening bridges. He had just found out that the Navy was not going visit any more, and that was the last reason left: everyone else is moving. We said to him, 'Why don't you build opening bridges?'

At the end of the meeting, I said to the people at the meeting, 'If you feel strongly enough about this, start collecting petition signatures.' They collected 2 000 signatures over Easter, and I spent half a day with them when they were doing it. I wrote to the Premier and told him, because they did not want to annoy people over Easter. For every person that signed, there were at least another 10 that would have signed.

263 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: That was the petition for opening bridges?

MR BEILBY: For opening bridges.

264 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: And the local Messenger helped out too by printing the front? Why didn't you run a petition that talked about tunnels?

MR BEILBY: To talk about what?

265 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: We have a project before us that we are considering. Part of that project is not for tunnels. You are telling us to consider tunnels. Why is it that you advocated a petition going out that talked about opening bridges as opposed to closed bridges, instead of doing a petition that talked about tunnels?

MR BEILBY: Because we were dealing with you separately from the issue. We had confidence that your committee would consider the best decision, and it should not need 10 different petitions on the matter.

266 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Okay. Tom?

267 MR KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Beilby, I have read your letter. I have tried to make sense of it. The semantics of it make it difficult to read and understand. I will quote two paragraphs on page 3 which state:

If I am correct—

I think you are talking about yourself here—

with my 30-year Australian tourism experience record, we will certainly destroy the prospect of SA ever growing its low current \$3 billion a year tourism worth to its maybe \$10 billion to \$15 billion national average expectancy.

Right?

MR BEILBY: Correct.

268 MR KOUTSANTONIS: You go down a paragraph later which states:

Indeed, this whole new bridges has got so wrong, bastardised, from what originally proposed e.g. 1. were originally only supposed to cost \$39 million, the actual figure now near five times this and not even started yet. Builders were going to fund cost of building. Minister Conlon—

You have 'Conlan'—

according to *Hansard* records scrapped Liberal's idea that current grain silos be used instead—

MR BEILBY: You have the extract here, yes.

269 MR KOUTSANTONIS: Yes—

forces grape growers to \$100 million to build new ones at OH for Foley apparently changed plans so expressway traffic can exit into Vincent Street against project objective to rid Port Adelaide of such traffic—

MR BEILBY: Right. I have a witness here with me who will verify that.

270 MR KOUTSANTONIS: That is all fine.

MR BEILBY: I do not want to cut in, but Transport SA and Mr Hook today said this project has been immensely difficult for them. They virtually indicated that they had never ever seen another one before that has had so many difficulties. That is what I am saying to you there. It has not been your simple, straightforward project. So I apologise if I have—

271 MR BRINDAL: No, no. He told you that he could not understand your semantics. I could. What couldn't you understand?

272 MR KOUTSANTONIS: I do not understand. You said in your evidence that the local residents wanted opening bridges.

MR BEILBY: No. I said they did not want fixed bridges.

273 MR KOUTSANTONIS: Okay. They did not want fixed bridges. They circulated a petition to make the bridges opening.

MR BEILBY: Yes. Correct.

274 MR KOUTSANTONIS: It would imply that they wanted opening bridges.

MR BEILBY: No. They did not want fixed bridges. I forget the exact wording of the petition, but the petition reads that they don't want fixed bridges.

275 MR KOUTSANTONIS: Okay. Local residents do not want fixed bridges, and they circulated a petition asking for opening bridges, yet you claim that they do not want opening bridges either.

MR BEILBY: It is not just me claiming it; it is in Transport SA's own material.

276 MR KOUTSANTONIS: My point is that local residents have overwhelmingly endorsed the petition asking for opening bridges, yet you give evidence to this committee saying, 'No. That's not what they were signing; they were signing that they didn't want fixed bridges.' I have seen those petitions. Those petitions specifically call for opening bridges. So I am not sure from whose point of view you are arguing. Are you arguing from the point of view of local residents who reside in Port Adelaide, or are you arguing from the point of view of Vision SA, which has no members, and which you claim has thousands of members supporting it, who want no fixed bridges or opening bridges. I am not sure of what—

MR BEILBY: It is very clear. The local community does not want fixed bridges.

277 MR KOUTSANTONIS: Why did they sign petitions?

MR BEILBY: Hang on.

278 MR KOUTSANTONIS: Do not interrupt me. Why did they sign petitions calling for opening bridges?

MR BEILBY: Because they did not want fixed bridges. It is self-evident.

279 MR KOUTSANTONIS: It is dumb asking more questions.

MS McNAMARA: Can I speak on the matter?

280 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I prefer you not to. We have Mr Beilby who has been nominated as the spokesperson of the group. I am assuming that he will be able to answer questions. You have nominated him as your Vision SA spokesperson in this matter. We will continue to consider your stuff. Earlier, you mentioned sending us some other stuff in writing within a week. Do that. Mark, do you have any questions for Mr Beilby?

281 MR BRINDAL: Do you know at what point, if at all, because I do not believe—and I will go away and study what you have given us in the past, because I remember talking to you—ever having presented to us an option of fifty-fifty, which was a tunnel under the channel, and a rail link around the port. I do not remember that ever being—

MR BEILBY: You are correct. I do not know whether it is in what I have given to you. I think I gave that to you in the last week.

282 MR BRINDAL: It is not a criticism of you. In coming up with all of this, one would have thought that the responsible public service, which is the abiding will of the people of South Australia—the government is the transitory will—it is true, and I note some of the gallery is laughing because they are public servants and now know true it is. This is not a political problem. This is an infrastructure problem for the state.

MR BEILBY: Politics should be kept out of it.

283 MR BRINDAL: Yes, it is not for the next election: it is for the next 50 years. Therefore, the opinions and the best solutions of our entire Public Service, using their expertise, should have been what was paramount. Mr Beilby, you have mentioned the Deputy Premier a lot. Is there some suggestion here that the Deputy Premier's influence within the cabinet might have subverted this whole process and that our public service has been given 'givens' because of the few electors and the Deputy Premier's need to re-elect himself rather than consider the best interests of South Australia?

MR BEILBY: I would like to think that the local member only has the best interests of his electorate and South Australia at heart. I was talking to a public servant at his front counter when I went to leave some material, and the door behind the counter opened and Foley came out. He looked like he was about to explode, and the public servant got very

embarrassed and the electorate secretary came out of the door and did an instant U-turn and she was not going to get involved. I do not know where he stands, but all I know is there is a right decision for this. We never submitted tunnels before because we took Transport SA's word that tunnels were too expensive. Technology has changed. It was hinted at today that you can now do a metal casing—I am not the engineer, John Murray is—and put a tunnel into a river, particularly if it is not a rail tunnel. David Bartlett, I think, said correctly that you need too long an approach, but a road tunnel you can go down and you can come up. And it was only through talking to a most highly regarded, currently employed, major construction company that is familiar with soil conditions all throughout Adelaide that it came to light that somebody should be maybe thinking of a tunnel. And then further inquiries were made—and we do not want any public servants getting into trouble or anything—and we became aware that perhaps one of the tenders put to Transport SA, or whomever is managing it, includes an option for a road tunnel that is viable and comes in at considerably less than what you are being asked to contribute.

284 MR VENNING: What about putting it on your plan? You have not marked it on your plan.

MR BEILBY: No, the detail is not there but it would go in the exact same location as the bridges, between dock 1 and dock 2 across the river.

285 MR KOUTSANTONIS: You make these claims that there is a leading Adelaide construction company that has told you privately that there has been a tender put through Transport SA for a road tunnel that would be much cheaper. Can you back that up with any evidence?

MR BEILBY: I can, but here is the situation. That company relies on work from government. You have been told time and again, I believe, today that this project has been driven by cabinet decision, not by the body which is normally responsible for it which has refused to give you a recommendation. If I name that company, and there are reasons behind cabinet putting this up, how do we know it is not going to come back against them for future tenders?

286 MR KOUTSANTONIS: Go ring Cameron.

287 MR BRINDAL: No, we will not. You cannot guarantee the efficacy of your—

MR BEILBY: I told you the name of who I believe is the preferred winning tenderer. It starts with the letter A. I do not know if there are any other companies that start with A. If it is not a company that starts with A, I am wrong.

288 MR VENNING: What is your personal background? Are you a surveyor?

PORT RIVER EXPRESSWAY—STAGES 2 & 3

MR BEILBY: No. Basically, I was at university doing engineering. My father died and I went to run a country property. In that period I became involved with tourism. I have a 30 year record of dealing with government to do with policy inputs.

289 MR KOUTSANTONIS: Where?

MR BEILBY: In Queensland and Victoria and a little bit here in South Australia.

290 MR KOUTSANTONIS: Where in Queensland?

MR BEILBY: The Gold Coast. I have an unsolicited letter of thanks from former prime minister Keating for advice I offered him. I have a letter from the President of Ford Australia, who I dealt with from 1999 to 2004. On his leaving he sent me a letter and said that I was instrumental in helping save the company. That is 50 000 jobs. You are talking about the subcontract at Osborne: \$6 billion to create 1 000 direct jobs for South Australia.

Tourism has created 300 000 to 400 000 residents on the Gold Coast. Just open your eyes to that. If it costs \$6 billion to create 1 000 direct jobs for South Australia, if you get this Port Adelaide tourism thing right—and it is senior planning staff with the South Australian Tourism Commission who have backed up my indication that Port Adelaide is the best shot, and they cannot appear because they are not allowed to comment beyond the comment they have already offered. This is the problem your committee faces. There are people out there who have information who cannot provide it to you.

291 MR BRINDAL: So, you are saying that the Public Service has been politically muzzled?

MR BEILBY: No, I am not saying they have been politically interfered with. It is the reality of the position.

292 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Parliament is going to commence in half an hour, and we need to break.

293 MR BRINDAL: I think we need to adjourn.

294 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I do not agree with that at all.

295 MR BRINDAL: I do. How can we make decisions? There is a gentleman here, a citizen of South Australia, in good faith, giving evidence that this committee is considering less than the best infrastructure project over the Port River. That is a decision for the parliament to make.

MR BEILBY: Can I make a quick comment?

PORT RIVER EXPRESSWAY—STAGES 2 & 3

296 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: No, you cannot. Just one second. Mr Brindal, with the greatest respect—

297 MR BRINDAL: I am not making a decision today.

298 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I am not asking you to. You talked about adjourning. We have a proposal before us. I agree with you that a decision will not be made today. Mr Beilby has agreed to send back additional information within seven days that will then be the property of the committee and you can make a decision, as can the rest of the committee, based on that information.

299 MR BRINDAL: That is fine. But I want it on the record that I want Mr Beilby back and I want some other people back and I want some other expert witness. We will not be railroaded into this.

300 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: You have already mentioned that. Mr Beilby, I am going to—

MR BEILBY: Can I just—

301 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: No, you cannot, for one second.

MR BEILBY: I just wanted to respond.

302 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: You are not going to. Just ease up for one minute. Mr Venning, I want you to finish your line of questioning, I want you to do it quickly, then we will allow you a couple of minutes to wind up.

303 MR VENNING: There are two issues that I want to raise. The first is the island and the second is the current facilities for bulk handling. First I refer to the island. It is a great idea. I have never heard it before. It is a separate issue. It is not considered on any of these other options. Has it been raised with any of the other relevant stakeholders and have you considered the sand management issue with respect to that island?

MR BEILBY: We have run the idea past a few people. The most relevant one is the Department of Environment and Heritage. The officer there who would be the most highly placed and regarded officer in South Australia with respect to the issue was not allowed to attend today. What was the second part of the question?

304 MR VENNING: The sand management in relation to that island—it being in the middle of a current.

MR BEILBY: That is one issue that we have to pursue. But I mentioned the fact.

305 MR VENNING: Raise it with the other relevant stakeholders in relation to the dredging, because getting rid of the dredgings is a very expensive process. As you said, it is 58 kilometres out in the gulf. Have you reached any decision—

MR BEILBY: At this stage we have not, because I only became aware of the issue when I attended an environment forum meeting (and I cannot remember how long ago it was) where Alan Rice raised it and by the time I caught up with him, and with all the other matters trying to get ready for this meeting today, no, we have not.

306 MR VENNING: What you said about tourism in the port is right. We would like to have everything here without it affecting each other. Has your group ever considered a new port alternative altogether? Should this port be here in Adelaide? Could it go north, say, to Miponey Point?

307 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: You have actually put that in your report.

MR BEILBY: I made mention of it. We did not want to see everything having to be changed. Initially we tried to fit in with what was suggested, and that is why we suggested a bypass route and then, as the bridge crossings got so high, it became cheaper to move.

308 MR VENNING: I did an extensive paper on this about five years ago, and I am happy to give you a copy. It looked at all these options about the current situation at Port Adelaide. You never mentioned the swing basin: it is just not big enough. Would your plan envisage digging out a bigger swing basin?

MR BEILBY: What we have discovered—and it is fairly public knowledge—is that Flinders Ports, if you get the increased car exports and all that about which you are talking, they do not have enough room at Outer Harbor. There is a one kilometre frontage between the current grain silos and the North Arm. If they built the burrs just along the river's edge and they cut finger wharves in like they did with dock one and two, they could get even greater area.

309 MR VENNING: The facility at Port Adelaide is obsolete and they have to build a new facility, anyway. There is no rail work there.

MR BEILBY: There is currently rail access to the current grain silos.

310 MR VENNING: They are out—no loop.

MR BEILBY: That is right. However, there is a kilometre from there that runs parallel—and we suggested it in our last submission to you. The grand trunk-way runs parallel with the river for a kilometre. They could put multiple holding lines in there. That is one of the difficulties that the rail corporation people have identified which the bridges do not solve. They have mentioned these interface problems at Dry Creek and that is in the material. Both our alternatives solve those.

If I can just reply to the chair. He mentioned that he did not believe that public servants are sometimes in awkward positions. Our engineer and I were in David Bartlett's office—and I congratulate David Bartlett for the tremendous help he has been, but I believe it has put him in a very difficult situation through the possible comebacks he has had from it—and I asked him whether he had talked to the Liberals about some of these things. I cannot remember his exact words, but he indicated that, through his employment, he was virtually prohibited from talking to the Liberals. Is that correct or is that not correct, David?

311 MR VENNING: I think we should cover that—

312 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Mr Beilby, that is fairly outrageous. I will correct the record. I have not said things about public servants. I think we have had enough today.

MR BEILBY: All right, I think I am wrong on that. Do you remember that, Jon? So, we have got two people. Can I just say something?

313 MS CICCARELLO: No, I think we should—

314 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Would you like to correct the record?

315 MR VENNING: I think you had better let him have his say.

MR BARTLETT: I probably said, 'Do not speak direct to politicians'.

316 MR KOUTSANTONIS: That is right; it is policy. You implied that there was a cover-up—

317 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Order!

MR BEILBY: I implied the normal condition of his employment.

318 MR BRINDAL: That is unfair to say that and the member for West Torrens—

319 MS CICCARELLO: Mr Beilby said that he was not able to speak to the Liberals.

320 MR BRINDAL: All he is saying is that it is against the policy of your government—

321 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Mark—

322 MR BRINDAL: Don't shout me down.

323 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: We are just trying to keep this thing in order.

324 MR BRINDAL: It is standing policy of the government that no member of parliament can go directly to your Public Service, other than through the minister. I have got that in writing and so has Ivan. Mr Beilby did not say—and neither did the public servant—anything other than that; and to imply that Mr Beilby did say anything other than what is your government's public policy is wrong and you should apologise to the witness.

325 MS CICCARELLO: I am sorry, Mark. Mr Beilby said—

326 MR BRINDAL: He did not.

327 MS CICCARELLO: —that he did not speak to he Liberals.

328 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Do not shout, Mark.

329 MS CICCARELLO: He did not say he could not speak to a member of parliament.

330 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Thank you very much, Mr Rice, we have heard from you.

331 MR VENNING: In relation to the previous hearing, as the Vice Commodore of the Port Adelaide Sailing Club, is it feasible with yachts to put, say, a winch or an electric winch on the front wire—

332 MR BRINDAL: They are called sheets.

333 MR VENNING: —and to lower them up and down? First, is it feasible; and, secondly, is it done anywhere else in Australia that you know of?

MR RICE: It is done largely in Western Australia. In my experience as a marine surveyor, I did one earlier this year that had what is called a tabernacle. It is at the base of a mast, and that allows you to tilt the mast down. It is quite an operation. You still have to rig poles out to act as a lever. It is all set up. On a 13-metre yacht you would be looking at around \$5 000 for the whole set-up to put on that size yacht, so it is quite feasible. There are many yachts here that have come from the west that do have that sort of system, but you have to take into consideration that with Western Australia you go up through the low bridges there, because they have totally closed off their area and you only have a very short area in the Fremantle harbor itself.

You go underneath a couple of bridges then, once you are up there, you have a large area, and some of the boats stay up there for months, whereas at Port Adelaide it is just a place to go and moor your yacht. So, to come up to the bridge you have to lower your mast, proceed through the bridge and, once you get to the other side, you have to pull your mast back up again, because you do not want all these loose halyards and all your rigging lying all

over the boat, so you set it up again. The next time you want to go out, if you use the boat regularly, you have to drop the mast.

334 MR VENNING: How many berths are we looking at in the Quays project?

335 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I do not believe that Mr Rice can necessarily answer that.

336 MR BRINDAL: They are not all going to be yachts, anyway.

337 MR VENNING: If you multiply it by \$5 000, it would not be a lot of money. My last question is in relation to the River Murray. We have a similar situation with bridges and the *River Murray Queen* goes under there, lowers its funnels and all as it goes under them. There is plenty of precedent for ships lowering their high structures to get under objects.

338 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: A lot of the bridges that the *River Murray Princess* travels under are 30-metre bridges, are they not?

339 MR VENNING: But she lowers them down. Those funnels come down.

340 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: Thank you very much for your appearance before the committee. As I said, we will continue to consider seriously the matters that you bring to this committee's attention. I look forward to receiving the correspondence that you have given an undertaking to provide to us within seven days, which will detail some of the matters that you have spoken about today.

341 MR BRINDAL: My colleague and I will have some more questions. I have not finished questions but I realise that, according to the time, we probably have to let the witnesses go. I just want on the public record that we have not finished this line of questioning.

342 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: You have already mentioned that. The only other point I would reinforce with Mr Beilby, and it is a valid point that you made, is that decisions of this nature, in fact all decisions—and I remind Mark of this—ought to be made outside of politics and ought to be beyond politics, and decisions ought to be made in the best interests of the people that we as a parliament represent.

343 MR VENNING: That is the crux of the whole thing.

344 THE PRESIDING MEMBER: I am talking about politics and playing politics. So, thank you for your time. We look forward to getting your information.