



HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

PORT RIVER EXPRESSWAY

Constitution Room, Old Parliament House, Adelaide

Wednesday 21 November 2001 at 11.25 a.m.

(OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT)

PARLIAMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

MEMBERS:

Mr M.R. Williams MP (Acting Presiding Member)
Ms L. Stevens MP
Ms M.G. Thompson MP

WITNESSES:

TIM O'LOUGHLIN, Chief Executive, Department of Transport, Urban Planning and the Arts, Level 9 Roma Mitchell House, 136 North Terrace, Adelaide 5000; JON STEELE, Director, Strategic Projects, DAVID BARTLETT, Project Manager, Port River Expressway and PAUL GELSTON, Project Manager, Port River Expressway, Transport SA, 33 Warwick Street, Walkerville 5081 recalled and further examined:

69 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER (MR WILLIAMS): Thank you for appearing before this committee today. I believe that you have all appeared before the committee previously, so that I will dispense with the opening statement. Mr O'Loughlin, I understand that you wish to make an opening statement before the committee puts questions to you?

MR O'LOUGHLIN: With the committee's leave.

70 MS THOMPSON: I have not been able to read the letter that you tabled this morning.

MR O'LOUGHLIN: With the committee's leave, I would like to make a couple of brief statements on some issues that have arisen since we last appeared before the committee. These issues have, perhaps, arisen in the public debate and I would like to draw the attention of the committee to some further information on those issues. The four issues are local traffic management, process, location of the bridges and consultation. With respect to local traffic management, we have written seeking the committee's approval to remove all previous references to this matter and to substitute written advice provided by us which, in summary, is that we have no plans to modify the existing arterial or local road network.

The local road network, obviously, is a matter for the Port Adelaide Enfield Council. For our part, we have no plans to modify the existing arterial network. We still believe that this project will make a significant contribution to improving the amenity of the area for reasons we will discuss later, if the committee wishes. The committee is aware that there are three stages to this project. Stage 1 is the road works between Salisbury highway/South Road Connector and Ocean Steamers Road. That stage is to be delivered by

way of a design, construct and maintain contract, which is fully funded by the federal and state governments.

At this stage, the project stands alone in terms of construction, service delivery and benefit cost ratios. We are ready to call for tenders and we are hopeful that the committee will report favourably on stage 1. Stages 2 and 3, which are the road and rail bridges, are at a different stage of gestation. Both stages will involve the private sector in a build, own, operate and transfer scheme. It is important that we emphasise that, while we can model both the cost benefit ratios and the financial returns to the investors, we cannot know what actual value the private sector will place upon these bridges until we go into the market; and, as a risk management technique, we would like to do that in stages.

First, we would like to go with an expression of interest and then, with the benefit of the response to the expression of interest, develop the final tender before we go to the market. The way in which we are approaching this project is to draw the committee's attention to these bridges and to the issues that are associated with them. We would like to go to an expression of interest and, with the benefit of that advice, return to the committee to provide the results of that expression of interest and to draw the committee's attention to anything that affects it in terms of the evidence we have provided previously.

71 MS THOMPSON: It seemed to me that the department said, 'Well, we are not clear what the obligations are but there is a responsibility for the committee to look at it.' So, we would all be silly if we did not ensure that the committee has had a public report on it. We were looking at those all together. Are you now putting to us that you would very much appreciate a report on Stage 1 as soon as possible and, if we have any issues about Stage 2, we can continue looking at those reports separately on Stage 2, and you will be calling for expressions of interest on that basis and then we will all review it?

MR O'LOUGHLIN: That is correct. If you want to draw to our attention matters pertaining to Stages 2 and 3 now, we would be pleased to receive them, but we will be back to you with the result of that expression of interest and leave it in your hands as to whether you want to see us again.

72 MS THOMPSON: With issues arising from those expressions of interest?

MR O'LOUGHLIN: That is right.

73 MS THOMPSON: That helps clarify the process.

MR O'LOUGHLIN: The third matter is the location of the bridges, and we are aware that in the public domain this remains an issue, so I would like to provide a little more background on that. We have brought a diagram indicating the impact of some other alignments, which we would be happy to take questions on, being aware that we have brought it in cold, but I am happy to respond to questions today. The important point is that there is only one other option that is comparable in terms of price, and that is an option that

does not save any time and runs through the residential area, so it is not a very practical option. Of the next options that we have modelled—the only conceivable ones that we can apply our mind to—the next least cost increment adds \$70 million to the construction cost but, even more importantly, as you move north, our modelling indicates less and less traffic on the bridges. So, not only do you have a \$70 million increase in capital cost, you have a corresponding fall in private sector contribution because that is obviously related to the amount of traffic that is going to go over the bridges.

74 MS THOMPSON: Who do you mean by the private sector?

MR O'LOUGHLIN: Whoever does the build-own-operate and how much they are prepared to pay.

75 MS THOMPSON: Fewer trucks going across the bridge being prepared to pay the toll?

MR O'LOUGHLIN: And, if there is a toll on cars, fewer cars, as well.

76 MS STEVENS: Less revenue to the private operator?

MR O'LOUGHLIN: Yes. Unless they are prepared to pay for it, it is a double whammy—an increase in the capital costs and a separate increase in the cost to government because of the reduction in traffic flows.

77 MS THOMPSON: That is one way of seeing it. Another way of seeing it is less community benefit because you are not getting the trucks out of the heart of Port Adelaide, which is what it is all about.

MR O'LOUGHLIN: That's right. In effect, though, there are two categories of trucks. There are the permit vehicles, which we can put on to the bridges by way of regulation, which do not at present go along St Vincent Street, anyway, and then there is the other non-permit vehicles that we are trying to induce to use the bridges, and the incentive for using them is the timesaving. That is very important. We spoke previously about seven minutes when the bridges commence, but it is significant that, in the evidence that we presented previously, by the time we get to 2011, that seven minutes becomes 15 minutes, just because of the natural growth of traffic in the area.

78 MS THOMPSON: And the way it gets clogged?

MR O'LOUGHLIN: Yes, and the fact that in the absence of the bridges it will get worse, so the benefit grows. The costs of the other alignments are very substantial in terms of economics, but that is not all. All the other alignments that we have been able to put together run through either industrial or residential areas which, in our view, represent a more significant reduction in amenity than the current alignment.

Fourthly, I would like to refer briefly to the consultative process that has taken place between us, the council and the public. The council has participated in a number of studies on this issue including the Port River Crossing Needs Study in December 1992, the Value Management Study in July 1995 and the Port Adelaide-Gillman Integrated Transport Corridor Options Assessment Workshop in July 1997. We have brought several attachments on this to table for the committee's information. The first attachment provides a summary of these studies in relation to bridge location and the list of participants and a summary of sessions that have been held. Copies of the reports of these studies were provided to council at the time and have again been provided to council in the last year. We can provide copies of the studies themselves to the committee if the committee would like to receive them.

More generally, Transport SA has adopted a very rigorous and inclusive approach towards providing opportunities for council from the inception of this project and, more recently, throughout the more detailed development phase of the project. Six workshops have been arranged for council elected members since June 2000 to attempt to engage this project. Council was involved with community consultation for the environmental assessment through attendance at workshops and other briefings. I have also brought a complete list of contact with all council members and staff to support our position on the extent of consultation. In relation to community consultation, we have used the same comprehensive approach which we believe has been successful for projects such as the Southern Expressway.

79 MS THOMPSON: Only just, qualified success, I hasten to add. You have not seen my latest letter. They are still coming.

MR O'LOUGHLIN: There is also the Crafers freeway and the Berri bridge. As part of the consultation process for this project, more than 1 500 letters have been posted to stakeholders inviting them to participate, and we have provided a list of those 1 500 names, as well. Another form of consultation was the release of the draft environmental report for public display, which was supported by advertising in local press and displays set up in shopping centres and libraries throughout the local community. We have undertaken to update stakeholders and the broader community on developments as the project progresses because we are aware that things change as it goes along, and we have mechanisms in place to do that. We have a newsletter, which is letterbox delivered to 31 000 households and businesses throughout the Le Fevre Peninsula. We also have a web site, portable displays, some local signage and a 1300 information line. The details of those things are provided in these attachments, as well.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasise that a lot of time and effort has been invested in the project on the consultation side with both the council and the community to ensure their views have been reflected in the planning. However, we have suffered from some lack of decisive response, it must be said, and it has hampered our progress on this, which, as committee members may be aware, has taken a very long time since 1992 when it actually commenced. We would like a more certain environment, particularly when it comes to testing the market with potential investors. We will go on doing what we are doing, we

have no intention to stop consulting, but we would like to progress the project. Thank you.

80 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: Does that complete what you want to put to the committee?

MR O'LOUGHLIN: It does.

81 MS THOMPSON: I will be pleased to receive all those attachments.

MR O'LOUGHLIN: I am tabling them today.

82 MS THOMPSON: On the issue of consultation, since we mentioned the Southern Expressway, I am only too familiar with how difficult it is and what some of the systemic problems can be. I have spoken to Marcia Hewitt on my experiences from my side, because I recognise that David Grey and his staff worked very hard on it but did not always have the same objectives, and I will be happy to speak further with Marcia now we have been able to review it.

83 MS STEVENS: Mr O'Loughlin, I received a letter from the Boating Industry Association of South Australia Incorporated. It makes some points about their concerns about the project. Are they on your list of stakeholders?

MR BARTLETT: We have corresponded with the boating industry.

84 MS STEVENS: I am wondering whether they have been involved. I quote, in part, from the letter:

The construction across the Port River behind the inner port may place restrictions on the inner port precinct and may prevent this facility from reaching its full potential as a major tourism centre. The short-term gains of constructing a bridge which is located extremely close to the hub of the port means that there is potential for extensive capital expense following this construction to accommodate the changes in vital boating and shipping traffic and also to overcome some road traffic issues.

They go on with some other concerns. If you have received such a letter, I would be interested in your response. If not, I am happy to pass this on to you.

MR O'LOUGHLIN: We would be pleased, if you would, just to make sure and we will provide a response.

85 MS STEVENS: Obviously they would require one, too.

MR O'LOUGHLIN: Presumably it is addressed to you, so we will provide the information.

86 MS STEVENS: Yes.

MR O'LOUGHLIN: I would like to make one very quick response. In terms of the expression 'short term', as I said previously, the benefits increase over time and the benefits are not limited to the port. The benefits are for the whole state in ways that are not immediately apparent in terms of getting more freight onto rail and relieving congestion in some of the terminals in regional South Australia. These benefits, because they are qualitative, have been regarded as secondary benefits for the purposes of the economic analysis, which already shows a 4.1:1 benefit-cost ratio. It is pretty substantial. I think 'short term' is something that I would not agree with.

87 MS THOMPSON: I have one point that I want to clarify as a result of the information that you have provided for us today about traffic management diversions. I understand that the Dare Sutton Clarke report has been withdrawn and is no longer relevant, but in the original submission—I did not have time to satisfy myself clearly about this—on page 17 of the PPK valuation there is reference to indicative toll diversion rates. How would you like us to treat that?

MR O'LOUGHLIN: We can provide you with some revised numbers on that. We have had some advice this morning but we have not had a chance to look over it yet. We can write separately to you about that.

88 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: The committee would like to receive the chart referred to and take an explanation from you on it.

MR O'LOUGHLIN: I will let the project managers for Stages 2 and 3 take questions on this. The option that I spoke of, which is the only one that is comparable, is represented by a dashed red line through the residential areas. We have put a cost next to these other options, and you will see that that is \$120 million. The cost that is before the committee, the total construction cost for this, is \$130 million, but these economics were done at an earlier time. The current option is down as \$110 million, so the \$110 million when this was done is \$130 million today.

89 MS THOMPSON: Which is the current option?

MR O'LOUGHLIN: The solid red line. The next cheapest option is this option up through here.

90 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: For the sake of the *Hansard* report, can you use recognisable landmarks to describe that route?

MR BARTLETT: The option that Mr O'Loughlin is talking about is the project option that runs from the Salisbury Highway-South Road connector through the Wingfield waste management dump, crosses Eastern Parade and then goes across the river between Docks 1 and 2, which is indicated by the solid red line. Associated with that is the railway line which goes from Eastern Parade and across the river, again very close to the road bridge between Docks 1 and 2, and that is shown yellow on this plan.

91 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: Does that plan that you are referring to have a name or number?

MR O'LOUGHLIN: We could give it a label, if you like, which would be alternative alignments.

MR BARTLETT: It is '42 PPK Options, 21.11.2001'. That alignment I have just described is the project base case. Other alignments were looked at as part of the PPK study, which resulted in a report in December 1997, and these options included an extension of Cormack Road, linking up very close to the port viaduct and on to Causeway Road, back along Semaphore Road and joining Victoria Road. That was costed at \$120 million, and, as Mr O'Loughlin stated previously that has a more significant impact on residences in the Rosewater and Gillman Wingfield area.

92 MS THOMPSON: And how can we describe that on the map?

MR BARTLETT: From South Road, and it is extending the alignment of Cormack Road. That is shown by the small red dotted line on the plan. That is road traffic only.

93 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: So that does not provide the rail option?

MR BARTLETT: The rail would be as per previously described.

94 MS THOMPSON: So that would be that there would be two lots of bridges going across the river?

MR BARTLETT: The Cormack Road extension goes around the Port centre. There would be a bridge required adjacent to the current railway bridge.

95 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: But the question is: if that were an option, the rail, which is shown on the yellow line, would not exist. All rail traffic have to go over the existing rail bridge?

MR BARTLETT: The options would be to use the existing rail track more—a decision would have to be made—

96 MS STEVENS: Whether to have one or two rail bridges?

MR BARTLETT: Yes. The rail bridge that currently uses the viaduct and goes around the Port centre, is the passenger transport as well as the freight one, so it has to remain.

97 MS THOMPSON: So that would have the disadvantage of not taking the rail traffic away from residential areas?

MR BARTLETT: It would not have that, and, in terms of the developments which have happened in recent times about the grain terminal proposed for Outer Harbor, there are a significant number of logistics issues you would get in matching the freight and passenger transport on, basically, a single track line.

98 MS THOMPSON: So that would have the likelihood of more rail screeching in residential areas?

MR BARTLETT: There are rail screech problems on this curve here and, potentially, on this curve around here.

99 MS THOMPSON: Either that or you still have another bridge between Docks 1 and 2, impeding the visual amenity of that area.

MR BARTLETT: Yes, that would be the rail bridge.

100 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: The other option that Mr O'Loughlin described was to go to the north?

MR BARTLETT: The other option to the north that was looked at as part of the initial studies exits the first proposal at what we would call North Arm Road or the end of the overshoot area of Dean Rifle Range and heads to the north-west. It needs to do that to get around the significant developments of SACBH and the wetlands, and crosses the river virtually adjacent to Willochra Street, which is shown here. The rail alternative for this option is to extend from Eastern Parade, in the light pink, through the Charlicks intermodal services yards, go across the river and rejoin the rail line on the Le Fevre Peninsula site.

101 MS THOMPSON: And what are the problems with that option?

MR BARTLETT: Several. One is that there is a wider river crossing, of the order of 250-odd metres, compared to about 170 metres, so you have the increased costs of the bridging structures for both. The boundary of the Commercial Ports, recently sold to Flinders Ports, is here, at the alignment of the existing proposed crossing between Docks 1 and 2, so you have a significant amount of commercial shipping needing to go through the bridges, and that commercial shipping has, I guess, some commercial imperatives about time. There is a daily ship that comes into Adelaide Brighton, as well as grain ships, and Western Mining have their main distribution centre adjacent to Dock 2. So far more river traffic, and that river traffic is bigger than it would be designed for in Inner Harbor. You have 30 metre opening design here, but you would need somewhere between 50 and 70 meters of opening structure, and the costs of having a opening structure are significant when, instead of lifting 30 metres of concrete and steel, you are lifting 70, so your costs tend to escalate.

102 MS THOMPSON: So that is the operating costs as well as the construction costs?

MR BARTLETT: Yes. And the number of times you open impacts on the operating costs. In addition, you are putting that expressway traffic along Willochra Street, or adjacent to Willochra street, although Willochra Street has a very wide carriageway. You are also putting it very close to the tank farm. Mobil and BP have a petroleum storage farm down at that location, so there are potentially some logistics issues about that. As Mr O'Loughlin said, your traffic also drops off because there is a need for traffic that is currently using Birkenhead Bridge to access the southern part of Le Fevre Peninsula and to still use that bridge, whereas the northerly crossing drops off some of that potential traffic.

In addition, as we can see from this plan, there is an additional length of road over and above the current expressway. That would extend the expressway so it would still link up with Francis Street, but you have this additional distance, over very poor ground. You can see from the plan this is particularly swampy and low-lying, and probably needs to be built up in the order of 3 metres or so to get above the tides.

103 MS THOMPSON: So there would be extra cost in distance of road and extra cost in distance of bridge, as well as operating costs and inconveniences for shipping, and probably for residents, too, who find that they want to use the bridge and always have to wait while it gets opened.

MR O'LOUGHLIN: And it would appeal to a narrower group of residents as well.

MR BARTLETT: There was a further option, which probably doesn't warrant too much further discussion, and it is this large dotted line, which was to get the containers which currently are processed adjacent to Eastern Parade, and Ocean Steamers Road at Charlicks, to get them down to the container terminal via a flying fox, and that certainly was a significantly more costly option. I did not state before that this northerly option was \$180 million, compared to the \$110 million. So the PPK report of 1997 quantified the difference in cost as well as the benefits decreasing.

104 MS THOMPSON: And that flying fox technology, is that used very commonly?

MR BARTLETT: I do not believe so, and it only gets rid of one element of the freight task. In terms of grain or petroleum or wine, or the other products that are exported, it does not address that issue. In addition, a tunnelling option was looked at, and tunnels were looked at at both these locations, both the northerly and the Inner Harbor option. The Inner Harbor total project costs, including the time, was \$270 million.

105 MS THOMPSON: As compared to the \$110 million.

MR BARTLETT: Tunnelling in those conditions— as you would appreciate, a very tidal and marine type environment—means that tunnelling costs are very significant, as well as the length of the tunnel. You can effectively travel a road on reasonably steep grades, but tunnels tend to be relatively flat, so you need to extend the length of tunnel, probably where you have perhaps 170 metres spanning the river here—so the bridge might be 250 metres to get your abutments, and a tunnel would probably be of the order of 900 metres to a kilometre long to improve the grades, and certainly with rail, from the advice that we have sought very recently, rail in the tunnel is not an option at that location because of the issue of grade.

106 MS THOMPSON: The other thing that immediately comes to my mind with tunnels is that the Sydney Harbour tunnel, which goes through rock, as I understand, is having problems with leaking. The Channel tunnel is having problems with leaking, although I do not know what sort of rock or silt that has gone through. However, here you would be going through silt, so is there any opinion on that? If they cannot get it waterproof in rock, what is the likelihood of getting it waterproof in silt?

MR BARTLETT: The risks are far higher in the sort of environment we have here, because we have very low bearing strength clays, that tend to move with time, and also very subject to earthquake loadings, and that has been a design factor on the preliminary work that has been done on bridge design on Stage 1, with loadings on embankments, and so on.

107 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: So we can take it that the tunnel option is a non option altogether. Thank you, Mr Bartlett. Any further questions of this group of witnesses? In that case, thank you for your attendance this morning, and for the extra material you brought to the committee.

108 MS THOMPSON: And for the explanation of the new process you would like from us.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW

ADDITIONAL WITNESSES:

JOHANNA McLUSKEY, Mayor, HARRY WIERDA, City Manager, PATRICK HANSEN, Councillor, DEIDREE ALLEN, Councillor, and JOYCE SNADDEN, Councillor, of City of Port Adelaide Enfield, PO Box 110, Port Adelaide 5015, called and examined:

109 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER (MR WILLIAMS): Welcome, and thank you for appearing before the Public Works Committee this morning. First, I ask whether all who are proposing to give evidence were in the room earlier when the Chairman, Mr Lewis, read the opening statement in the earlier part of the hearing?

MR WIERDA: Yes, we were.

110 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: Mayor McLuskey, I understand that you will lead off?

MS McLUSKEY: I have not been advised anything in relation to our attendance here today other than that we have been asked to come.

111 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: Does anybody at the table have a statement that they wish to make, or are you here to just answer questions?

MR WIERDA: Perhaps I can lead off. We were asked to come to the committee to put the view of the council in relation to the third river crossing. By letter dated 20 November, I have prepared a summary of the council's position starting at the time that then Premier Olsen, in September 1997, announced and committed the government to the project. As you heard earlier from Transport SA, the project in fact well and truly pre-dates that. In my letter of the 20th I have summarised the council's position. You will notice that there has been strong support for the project overall throughout the whole of the period, and it is only in more recent times that there has been some questioning of where the location of the bridge ought to be.

I have also provided you with a letter dated 21 November whereby I point out the work that the council's administration has done with Transport SA. I pointed out that we have asked the Minister for Transport and Urban Development (the Hon. Diana Laidlaw) to place a load limit on the Birkenhead Bridge in order to divert heavy transport vehicles travelling through the Port CBD. In addition to that, I have advised the committee that the administration feels that there ought to be a traffic study undertaken some one or two years after the bridge is in place and the traffic patterns have settled down so that the council, the community and Transport SA can then look at the impact of the bridge and the expressway on rerouting some of the traffic flows in and around Port Adelaide.

Certainly, it is the council's position that the bridge is a necessity if the

Port is going to have any chance of reaching its full potential, and you would be well aware of the recent government announcements in relation to the urban redevelopment of some of the Port waterfront areas. Without the bridge going in and without removing the heavy vehicle traffic from the Port CBD, we feel that the urban redevelopment will be significantly stymied if heavy traffic continues to go through the Port CBD. That is basically our position. As I say, we have been very strong supporters of the bridge project. There are only some disagreements within the council about the bridge's location.

112 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: One of the main reasons that the committee wants to discuss this matter with the council is because of information we have—in particular, the draft Dare Sutton Clarke report on the traffic management diversion plans within the Port Adelaide precinct—and we have had, amongst other evidence, material tabled this morning by Transport SA withdrawing some of their earlier evidence, including that particular report and an answer to a question which we put to them on that matter. So the ground has shifted somewhat since we first invited you to come before us, but I am sure that we will take advantage of the opportunity of having you here to ask you further questions.

MS McLUSKEY: I have a difficulty, because I know there have been a couple of meetings—there was one, for example, when I was interstate; but I am not aware of the Dare Sutton Clarke report that is being referred to and, therefore, the implications of it being removed.

113 MS THOMPSON: That was the issue. We thought that you were not aware of it, and it proposed the conversion of St Vincent Street from four lanes of traffic to two lanes. We considered that to be a fairly important change, and we had no evidence of your views on it.

MS McLUSKEY: I am not sure that the council, as an elected body, has ever been made aware of that particular report.

114 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: That is why we wanted to hear from the council, because we had no evidence of any consultation.

MS McLUSKEY: It is concerning, because the ground has shifted in more than one respect. But, also, in the context of the time frame over which this has been discussed, there has been an introduction of a proposal to locate grain silos at Outer Harbor and, of course, that has a significant impact on the use of the rail bridge. Whereas the original proposal as described to us was that the rail bridge would be open all the time bar the two or three crossings that it would be closed for, it has now changed to a proposal whereby the rail bridge would be closed and open on only select occasions for the 10 to 15 one way traffic movements—20 to 30 movements of trains per day that they are now referring to. So, the proposition has changed quite significantly since the introduction of the discussions with council. That is part of the reason that there have been difficulties or concerns that have

arisen.

Equally, originally in discussions with the minister, the minister spoke of this (and there is also recent *Hansard* where the minister spoke on this again) and emphasised that this was discussed as a freight route—the road bridge is a freight route. Yet, in discussions at workshops with Mr Bartlett, and separately (and, indeed, in evidence before you today), there have been references to vehicular traffic, not just freight traffic. So, there has been a concern about the diversion of passenger vehicles away from the Port centre, which would be perhaps a contributory issue to the report that you are talking about. That was not part of the original discussions. We were talking about getting heavy freight traffic out of the Port centre. Now there appears to be an equation that is also talking about getting passenger vehicles out of the Port centre, and I wonder whether, indeed, the traders will in fact be pleased with losing those movements past their premises.

115 MS THOMPSON: That is why we wanted to know your attitude to the traffic diversion management.

116 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: A lot of the questions the committee put to Transport SA in previous hearings were along the line that the committee felt that the public—and I am talking about those passenger transport movements you referred to—should have complete freedom of choice about whether they use what will be a toll bridge or the existing transport network through the Port. I do not think there was ever any decision that sedan type motor cars (passenger transport) would be banned from using the bridge. This is one of the concerns that the committee had about this report—narrowing other streets, other roadways, other thoroughfares through the Port to try to drive transport on to the bridge. As I said, Transport SA has walked away from that part of what may have been their earlier option.

MS McLUSKEY: The comments seem to have suggested, shall I say, in a number of different ways, that perhaps the feasibility and the viability of the construction of the third river crossing, to some measure, relied on diverting that passenger vehicle movement across the bridge in addition to the freight movements.

117 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: You heard Mr O'Loughlin a few minutes ago talk about calling for expressions of interest, and that is something which will have to be addressed at some time in the future. Certainly, the figures that have been presented to the committee suggest that the viability will rest, to some extent at least, on getting private motor cars (passenger transport) utilising and paying a toll over that bridge.

118 MS THOMPSON: If they do not, it might not be viable and it may not proceed.

119 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: That is my understanding of it. I think that probably the important question before us at the moment is the particular project we are

looking at is stage 1, the expressway; and the bridge crossing, stages 2 and 3, is a stand-alone project. So, we are primarily concerned with looking at the expressway at the moment but, of course, we are all looking at the future of the bridge crossing. You were very correct in what you said about the grain term proposal for Outer Harbor. One of the components for the sale of PortsCorp is the deepening of Outer Harbor to allow Panamax vessels.

MS McLUSKEY: We have very little information about that obviously, and that was a matter of some concern as to what impact that had on the nature of the project, the choices that were made and the environmental reporting around it. There is one other thing on which I would like to comment. There was some discussion from Mr O'Loughlin in terms of the amount of consultation that has taken place. I would certainly not dispute that there has been considerable consultation with the council in relation to this project, but there has never been an opportunity for the broad community to be consulted in relation to all aspects of the project. At the point that the only broad community consultation took place, the community was told that the location is not debatable. Consequently, that issue was not on the table to be discussed. That was the subject of part of our resolution. It was a concern in relation to the lack of consultation on that aspect of it. The community has not had a say on that.

120 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: Has your council seen the plan that we were viewing a few minutes ago? Have those options been canvassed with your council?

MS McLUSKEY: There have been numerous options: there were about seven, eight or nine. As was suggested, this goes back to 1982 originally. Therefore it predates most of the people on council who are involved in the project at this point. I do not think any of the staff—although I am not sure—would have been around. Two councillors on council now would have probably been involved at the time of the original consultations, but the rest of us are all relatively new to it.

MR WIERDA: Certainly what was put on the white board was the broad range of discussions in which Transport SA engaged the council, both Council's administration and elected members.

121 MS THOMPSON: Do you have anything further to say to us now, given the current parameters that are being discussed about the location? We have had a letter from Ms Allen indicating that she is not happy with the current proposal, but the case that was made on the white board seemed to be fairly strong.

MS McLUSKEY: I think it would be more appropriate for Ms Allen to respond about the correspondence which she has put forward to you. As I said, the concern that I personally would have relates to the issue of the rail crossing and the issues around the grain silos. Whether or not that goes ahead is an unknown quantity literally at this point. There were other ancillary issues around associated roads. I believe that we have mostly remedied those; and it sounds as though there are some that we did not know about but which appear to

have been remedied as well.

122 MS THOMPSON: When you say that the original case was that the bridge would be open, do you mean open for river traffic or open to rail traffic?

MS McLUSKEY: No, the rail bridge was to remain in an open position so the river traffic could go through at any time. As the road bridge was able to be higher, the rail bridge was to be to at whatever height crossing, because the issues are quite different in terms of the height in relation to trains or vehicles passing over. As we understood it and as was proposed to us, the rail bridge was to remain open and only two to three movements were proposed per day. That has changed substantially to the current suggestion, that is, 10 to 15, which therefore have a return journey as well. So there would be, as I understand it, some windows of times when the bridges will be able to open.

123 MS THOMPSON: I would assume that the best case for the port is for there to be heaps of rail traffic across that bridge, because that would indicate a busy thriving port. What impact does that have on the river traffic?

MS McLUSKEY: If river traffic is precluded from coming into the inner harbour—and I say `if'(of course, we have certainly been assured that that will not be the case)—effectively the inner harbour will become sterile. I personally would not like to see it happen and I do not think any of us want to see the port turn into a West Lakes. The character of a port is that it is a working port, and if we lose that, then we may as well put a causeway there.

124 MS THOMPSON: You would ask that, when we are looking at stage 2 and stage 3, we get as much secure information as possible about the times of the openings and closing of the bridge and the impact on the workings of the inner port and that is what is included in the tender documents so that any private operator knows exactly what they are buying into.

MS McLUSKEY: Yes.

THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: You mentioned that it is a working port. As I understand it, a large fishing fleet operates out of Port Adelaide. Would it need the bridges to be open to go up and down the river?

MS McLUSKEY: I do not believe that the fishing fleet would be located within the inner harbour area.

MR HANSEN: I represent the Outer Harbor ward which extends from Willochra Street to the Outer Harbor. The majority of the fishing fleet that exists is located in the North Arm area. From time to time the fleet may come into the inner port, but that is

fairly seldom. Most of the shipwrighting and servicing is done at Snowdens Beach.

125 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: That is north of the proposed bridge as well.

MR HANSEN: Snowdens Beach is adjacent to the PPK. In relation to the traffic movements through Port Adelaide, I think it needs to be separated between Port Adelaide CBD and also access through the Birkenhead Bridge into Port Adelaide. I think it is paramount that we do not have restrictions on car traffic in and out of Port Adelaide CBD. From a residential and commercial aspect, that should not happen. The important part is to remove the heavy traffic out of Port Adelaide. Certainly I would like to see that happen.

The other issue obviously is the rail bridge and the removal of many of the trucks (which was occurring) from Victoria Road onto the rail system. At the moment we have the AusBulk proposal for the panamax ships that come into Outer Harbor to load. We have now been advised that, because National Power has a three year tenure over the land, it does not seem that it will be possible to create a wharfing space at that point and they may have to convey to Outer Harbor for loading which will cause some problems for residents in the North Haven marina area.

The real key issue is that Port Adelaide is growing at 20 to 30 per cent per annum as far as freight movements in and out of Port Adelaide. Port Adelaide is paramount to the economic development of South Australia: there is no question about that. The third river crossing is needed; the railway crossing is needed. What concerns me is that for the last five years, particularly with the wine exports increasing the way they are, there has been a major need to upgrade the transport routes on the peninsula.

That includes the rail crossing and also, I suppose, the third river crossing. My understanding is that BRL Hardy are looking at building a facility next to the McKenzie Southcorp facility at Outer Harbor for the same reason. The Panatalinga Road operation is now hitting maximum, so they want to expand to increase that further. We have a major problem with having semitrailers going at speed down Victoria Road. Each year that is increasing by 20 per cent. That needs to be addressed, and I think that in some ways the rail is more important than the road bridge.

126 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: We have received a very interesting letter from Ms Allen.

MS ALLEN: I hoped to express my concerns about the current location of the bridge and to answer some of the things I have heard today. I want to table this document, and while it is being handed out I will explain to you what it is. The very first thing that you will receive is what was going to be my dot points to speak about today, but as other issues have been raised I might not cover those. That is followed by a speech that I presented to the

council as well as a notice of motion that I moved since the letter that I sent to you when I recorded the other motion that council was considering. I only had to look at my local newspaper last week to be able to get information that is of interest about this issue. It appears on the front page as well as in the letters to the editor and another page that is provided there.

About 20 or so people are in contact with me. I contacted them the day before yesterday and asked them to help me out by sending me information that they felt was relevant to the committee. I have received four responses, so that is a little bit of community feedback. Next is the report that I made about some workshops that I conducted regarding the Inner Harbor redevelopment, and the bridge became the focus of debate for both of those.

We have spoken about community consultation, and Transport SA representatives have said that they undertook community consultation. They said that they undertook six workshops with elected members. I was elected only at the last council election, so I did not attend the previous workshops, but from the beginning of my time on council I have been told that there was no negotiation about the location of the bridges. David Bartlett commented that 1 500 letters were sent out to stakeholders. I am not sure whether or not that is related to the report or the environmental assessment workshops. If that was the case, I would say that there was never any negotiation about the location of the bridge when this impact study was done.

As a result of this impact study coming out, people raised concerns about what was not addressed in the report and as a result another 70 page report was created. Even though it commented on people's concerns, I do not feel that they have actually given us any assurances that the issues that we have concerns about have been addressed. It is as good as lip service, as far as I am concerned.

Regarding this Port River Expressway Environmental Report document, I want to bring to your attention the fact that Brown and Root have a limitation statement in both the reports they have created regarding this issue. They say here that they have presumed accurate certain information or the absence thereof relevant to the Port River expressway project. I asked them at the time whether they could tell me what the information was that they had received and what was absent, and the response was that they would have to speak to their lawyers about it. I have concerns about the scope that the consultants were able to work with in regard to this. To me, if you are to have an environmental impact assessment, you need to decide the best place to locate the bridge; you cannot say this is the only location for the bridge and now we want you to do a study to support that it is in the right place.

127 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: In your letter you say that an opportunity exists to provide a transport corridor that is completely buffered from residents, etc. Can you comment on that? Where do you envisage that that opportunity exists?

MS ALLEN: I have a map here showing the area. This is residential, the

Rosewater area, with industrial zones above Bedford Street. Much of this peninsula here has become rezoned for industry and is currently industrialised. This current proposal will see two bridges—the Birkenhead Bridge and new proposed bridge—coming out at a similar point, whereas if it was located further to the north you could have less impact.

It will be accessing this spot, and the plan is for it then to come out onto Victoria road. Many residents have complained and wanted it to access Elder Road-Mersey Road, but the associated problem that we are hearing is that Elder Road would need substantial upgrading to be able to take the weight of the trucks, and Adelaide Brighton Cement works do not want to share Elder Road-Mersey Road with other industry. At the moment it has operations on both sides of the road and has issues about public safety and the safety of its workers. By locating it further to the north, Mersey Road at this end is able to take heavier vehicles. By locating it further north, all the trucks that were going to Outer Harbor will still be able to continue along there, all those going to the cement works and Mobil will be able to use their existing road, and the industrial zone will serve to buffer the residents, whereas further up near Taperoo it is a residential area on both sides of Victoria Road. These people on the eastern side of Victoria Road will be isolated by a further, busier road than what is currently happening.

128 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: The point where you are suggesting the crossing should be made is south of Willochra Street?

MS ALLEN: I think the bridge should be located over the old sulphuric acid works, remediating land that is currently being proposed for a housing development.

129 MS STEVENS: You have heard the proponents essentially knock out that option. What do you say in response to that? They were saying that residents further south would not be able to use the bridge if it were further up, where you are suggesting. What do you say to what they have said?

MS ALLEN: The purpose of the bridge is to remove the trucks out of Port Adelaide. In fact, it has been said that it would not save much more time. You will notice that the Port River expressway is continuing along through the Gillman area, then coming down towards Port Adelaide and going the entire length of the peninsula from Victoria Road as well, so nothing here is trying to remove or isolate the residents from the industry. The way I see it, that we have this opportunity: we have industrial zones from Gillman through to the peninsula, so we have the opportunity to have a servicing road that is buffered by industry and making a safer haven for residents.

One of the answers given when I first asked why it was being located here was that Brighton Cement works trucks would still be accessing the Birkenhead bridge. But the point of having the road located further north is that that road then becomes their own.

130 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: I am not trying to put the case for the proponents, but you are suggesting that if the bridge was basically just a heavy transport route it could go anywhere along the river to the north and still satisfy the needs of heavy transport?

MS ALLEN: Yes.

131 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: Whereas my understanding is that, at least as part of the option of getting private enterprise to build/own/operate the bridge as a toll bridge, there would be some requirement for private passenger-type vehicles to utilise that and contribute to the cost. I think that is seen as being part of a key to getting a private consortium or private company to enter into such an agreement to build the bridge.

MS ALLEN: When I consider the need for this bridge and the need for the working port of Adelaide; when I consider the potential for Port Adelaide as a tourist destination and the potential revenue that could be drawn from that if we utilise it to its fullest, I think that the justification of paying extra and putting the bridge in the right location to benefit everyone (the primary producers and the tourist potential, the businesses and the residents in the port), is worth it.

MS McLUSKEY: If I might add a comment from one of the attendees at the workshop from the community, it illustrates how some people feel about it. I have not heard from anyone who does not support the construction of a bridge. They want to get the trucks out of the port. The difficulty some people have and have expressed is that they have watched \$41 million being spent on a soccer stadium. This is a more significant contributor economically to this state, yet the project, location and other issues around it seem to hinge on being able to get some passenger vehicles across it. They question the merit of an argument that is based on that. The bridge is going to be there for a very long time.

132 THE ACTING PRESIDING MEMBER: I take your point but, since it is on the record, I will correct your statement that it is \$41 million. The construction of the soccer stadium is actually \$26.5 million.

MS McLUSKEY: I was quoting someone from the meeting.

133 MS STEVENS: The principle is the same.

134 MS THOMPSON: What concerns me is that money having been wasted, in my opinion, on a range of projects, we have limited options. I cannot quite follow which roads need to be built on the peninsula as a result of your proposal that do not currently exist. We have already heard that that would add about \$100 million to the cost. Residents of the western suburbs are suffering from the failure to redevelop the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I recognise your arguments, but an alternative government might have to look at that.

MS McLUSKEY: There has been some debate about the use of Elder Road and Mersey Road as an alternative freight route, and a large number of councillors have been very supportive of attempting to at least partially remove the freight movements from Victoria Road because of the impacts of the increasing freight traffic along there, particularly on the residents on the eastern side, between the river and Victoria Road. Over time, as freight vehicle movements increase, that will be a very isolated community, and to me that is concerning. There are also schools on that side, and I find that difficult as well. The amenity for those residents must be poor.

So, there were discussions with the Housing Trust, requesting that they not sell properties that were fronting Mersey Road or embargo sales of such properties, to try to help create a buffer. That is necessary anyway, because of the poor amenity for those residents facing Penrice Soda Products. I certainly would not want to live there. Nevertheless, I asked Mr Bartlett from Transport SA straight up: 'You're not really going to do this, are you?' and the answer was, 'Well, no.'

There is a four lane road, Victoria Road, that is quite capable of carrying the traffic. I do not believe that there is any intent on the government's or on Transport SA's part to upgrade Elder Road or Mersey Road as an alternative route, and I do not think that they can actually justify it. Whilst I can understand it, I have concern for the residents in Taperoo and Osborne.

135 MS THOMPSON: I can understand your concerns about the increased traffic on Victoria Road, but I am trying to get an appreciation of the dimensions of the additional costs to follow the options that Ms Allen has put to us. If we say that the estimates of \$100 million extra to go north apply to your option, I want to understand whether it also means additional expenditure on the redevelopment of Mersey Road.

MS McLUSKEY: That would not necessarily follow. Elder Road/Mersey Road is a option that can still be discussed and pursued as a separate matter. The construction of a third river crossing does not necessarily tie in to an upgrade of Elder and Mersey Road. We can continue to discuss that and see whether that option remains, but it is probably more difficult at the current location because of the use by Adelaide Brighton Cement. My understanding is that they actually want it closed, so that makes it more difficult.

136 MS THOMPSON: It is a huge additional amount of money. I can understand the benefits, but you heard us talking about an expenditure of \$8 million to get water to people in Streaky Bay and whether there were benefits in that. This is the level at which we have to be saying that it would be nice but we actually want the hospital. You would not have had the figures, but we were looking at \$8 million to bring water in on the trunk route, which has problems, compared with \$11 million to desalinate locally, which would have been very desirable to a lot of people. We are saying that we cannot afford the extra \$3 million to desalinate locally, so \$100 million for a nicer option is—

MR HANSEN: It comes back to that original question of trying to move it from the road to the railway as much as we possibly can. There are problems with Great Southern Rail because of the number of crossings along Elder Road and Mersey Road for all the industry or commerce that is located on the western bank of the Port River. At the moment, they are looking at rationalising quite a few of those crossings, but if you actually put in a four lane highway, which would probably need to have an 80k speed limit to give it some efficiency, to get some return, it is very difficult to get turning lanes across railway lines.

Assuming 24 movements of trains a day, that is a considerable number of trains. On that basis, you would need to have level crossing after level crossing after level crossing. One of the major problems is the amount of infrastructure that Adelaide Brighton Cement has put on its site since the major redevelopment. It has spent about \$180 million going from a wet process to a dry process of making cement. It is not necessarily a viable situation. The other thing is that council has its pumping stations right alongside Elder Road and, again, there is a major amount of engineering works being done there.

MS ALLEN: You mentioned the cost of the bridges. The other thing that needs to be taken into account is the cost to health in the community of Port Adelaide. The World Health Organisation has said that communities should have a voice in their destiny and in developments that are occurring around them. I do not feel that is what is happening here at all.

I want to heighten the issue about the train bridges. It is proposed to have a single line track that is one to 1.5 metres above the high water mark and it is predicted that 10 to 15 goods trains will run a day. At a recent public forum people had done the sums and came up with a proposal that it would give us a three hour curtain a day in which the bridges could be open or the rail bridge could be open. We could end up with another five or so trains a day, so there will not be a window of time to have the bridge open.

I have concerns about the fact that it is going to be only a single track train bridge. I am hearing that the road bridge is only being proposed for three lanes yet when we build bridges we should look to the future. The population is growing and there is more demand.

In relation to the location of the bridge, it is based on collecting a toll from cars. People will travel up to 30 minutes to avoid paying a toll because they do not want to queue or pay a cost. We could end up with a bridge and not many cars going over it. I have heard about the option of a tunnel.

In my workshops, people were saying they thought it would be a viable alternative. I have heard of other proposals of a bridge further up. The road bridge would be high enough to have all the big vessels going under it and be permanent. The rail bridge

would be lifted by the road bridge and it would take 10 minutes to open up the bridge to allow incoming vessels. Why are we locating it here? Every time I get answers to the reasons why, I am not satisfied I am getting the real story.

As time goes along I am still finding out things. There is a situation at the moment where I know about land being rezoned and the reason for its rezoning, but the residents have no idea. Community consultation was one of the things I wanted to highlight today. I think there is something going wrong. It is fair enough when you are first doing preliminary ideas to keep it in camera, but once you know you are going to build a bridge somewhere, I think from that point onwards it should go to the community. Consultants should be feeding back to government the best options. Currently, I feel that the government is telling consultants, 'Bring us a report regardless of what your findings might be.'

MS SNADDEN: I have been a councillor for Port Adelaide area for 18 years. I have heard very little against the location of the bridge. There were about 30 or 40 at the public meeting and, other than those attending the meeting, I have not heard anything. There is an indication of a bridge in an article of the *Portside Messenger*. It was a plan of the South Australian Harbors Board in 1964. It shows a highway running near Gillman, which is laid out as an industrial estate. The article states:

Early glimpses of the current plans for the multi function polis [which has gone by the board], the highway plan indicates the intention to continue the road all the way to Port Adelaide and build another bridge over Port Adelaide connecting with Elder Road.

That was in 1964. They have been discussing it for many years. In this undated annual report of Port Adelaide—I think 1995—it states:

Council is working on studies with the Department of Transport to identify the preferred crossing point for a bridge to cater for heavy road and rail traffic with an opening section for shipping. Transport Minister Diana Laidlaw is committed to the position of this new river crossing north of Dock 1.

This has been going on for many years. As I said, I have heard very little complaint about the location. All they want is a bridge to get traffic out of Port Adelaide. I do not know about that two lanes in St Vincents Street, because we will still get delivery trucks through the area. As far as a bridge at Willochra Street, anything that goes over there, quite a lot will come back southwards because there is still industry and there is a need for it to come south. I am happy for it to be where it is to be honest. It is the lesser cost.

MR HANSEN: The article in the *Portside Messenger* is dated Wednesday, 3 October 1990.

MS ALLEN: People can receive information such as that; it can be delivered to every letterbox and people can read it and still not absorb exactly what is happening. Quite

PORT RIVER EXPRESSWAY

J. McLUSKEY
P. HANSEN

H. WIERDA
D. ALLEN
J. SNADDEN

often, it goes straight in bin, or articles in newspapers are overlooked.

MS SNADDEN: I was interested to hear 31 000 letters were sent out. I have not heard anything about them or what is in them.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW