

TRANSCRIPT

STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMY AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Inquiry into infrastructure projects

Melbourne — 15 September 2017

Members

Mr Bernie Finn — Chair

Mr Khalil Eideh — Deputy Chair

Mr Jeff Bourman

Mr Mark Gepp

Ms Colleen Hartland

Mr Shaun Leane

Mr Craig Ondarchie

Mr Luke O'Sullivan

Participating members

Mr Greg Barber

Ms Samantha Dunn

Mr Cesar Melhem

Mr Gordon Rich-Phillips

Witnesses

Ms Gillian Miles, Head, Transport for Victoria; and

Mr Jeroen Weimar, CEO, Public Transport Victoria.

The CHAIR — Welcome to the public hearing of the Economy and Infrastructure Committee. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege; therefore you are protected against any action for what you say here today, but if you go outside and repeat the same things, those comments may not be protected by this privilege.

I just ask you to make a few opening comments — maybe 5 or 10 minutes worth — and we will follow up with questions. It will be relatively painless, I hope.

Ms MILES — Thank you, Chair. We have provided a presentation. If it suits, Chair, we will go through the presentation and take you through some of the work we have been doing.

Thank you for the invitation today. I will just make some opening remarks. On the Victorian population, growth is the context for the work that we are doing on disruption at the same time that public transport patronage is increasing, and Jeroen will talk a bit more about where and how we are dealing with some of those more localised issues. But the context for us is of 100 000 people added to the population and therefore some of those on the network each year.

The state has embarked on a significant multi-year major transport infrastructure program worth nearly \$20 billion of investment. It will reshape both our road and public transport networks. Many of these are well known to you: Melbourne Metro will be completed in 2026; level crossing removals, 10 gone to date and 16 in design and construction; Mernda rail link construction now underway; the Hurstbridge track duplication, also underway, completion expected in 2019; the Ballarat line upgrade, major construction expected to start later this year; CityLink Tulla widening project, works are underway; Monash and M80 upgrades, works are underway on both those projects; the West Gate tunnel is awaiting planning approvals; the north-east link is in business case development; and the high-capacity Metro trains are on order by the state, are being built and will enter into operation in the second half of 2019 then progressively until 2026.

If you turn to page 3, there is just some context. Transport for Victoria was created as a central entity to coordinate and integrate the state's transport system, planning and policy, operational coordination during times of disruption, and the rollout of the infrastructure program. We enable the planning, development and management of the network on a much more integrated basis than we have done before. It brings together planning managing, including the planning for disruptions on the network.

On slide 4, when planned disruptions occur we take a coordinating role in a multi-agency approach, so on that picture you have in front of you all those brands are known to you and the projects will be known to most people in this room. We have a single-agency approach to managing the disruption, so the role of Transport for Victoria is to work with all the agencies and select an operational lead, which is often Public Transport Victoria. Jeroen will take you through some of the work he has been doing in this space. But it enables us during critical and peak times to facilitate the real-time operation and provision of up-to-date information to passengers throughout the disruption.

Slide 5 just gives you a sense of the method that we are using, adopted from experience in other jurisdictions — in London and closer to home. The Sydney disruption program: they also use a similar methodology for both designing the disruption management program but also providing information to users on the network. So central to Transport for Victoria is putting people first, and the disruption management program that we implement attempts to do that. Our priority is to ensure that we are clear about the choices that are available to people during disruption and to take appropriate steps in minimising the disruption that is caused.

We have tested this approach a number of times over the past 10 months. In December–January our focus was on supporting users who were impacted due to the closure of the Tullamarine Freeway. So access to the airport was restricted on the Tullamarine Freeway. We had a logic of re-time journeys, so people who needed to make the journey were asked to allow 45 minutes additional to their normal travel time. The rethink message actually generated a 40 per cent reduction of user travel in the area, which then enhanced the experience of people who needed to travel. The outcome of that planning was that people who were expected to have 45 minutes additional time to their journey experienced only about 20, which was actually a very good outcome. Over the Easter school holiday program the Swan Street Bridge and tram renewal program was balanced against the needs of people — again not on holidays — who needed to commute and the start of the AFL season. I might hand over to Jeroen, seeing as my voice is dying fairly quickly, particularly to talk in more detail about some of the work that we have been doing in recent months.

Mr WEIMAR — Thank you, Gill, and thank you, committee, for the chance to speak to you this afternoon. I am Jeroen Weimar, CEO of Public Transport Victoria. As Gill has said, the management of this major infrastructure rebuilding program along with record numbers of people using public transport and of course the road network is pretty problematic. We have to work very closely with our passengers and the wider community to ensure that we keep them engaged and informed about the investments that we are making but also give them alternative travel choices when we do cause some of those disruptions. If I take you back over the past 12 to 15 months or so, we had significant closures on the Frankston line in last year in January and July, we had a five-week shut to the Sunbury line in September–October of last year and of course, as Gill has mentioned, in January of this year the Blackburn and Heatherdale level crossing removal works, the significant works around the Tullamarine Freeway and then more recently in July of this year the St Kilda Road works, which I will come back to.

In each of those major disruptions we have had to work very closely with the immediate communities involved but also with the wider passengers on those rail corridors and road corridors to give them viable alternatives. We do that on the basis of — we obviously have a lot of metrics and analysis about where our passengers are currently travelling. We are heavily using the survey data that we have as well as information such as Myki data to identify where people are travelling to and when they are travelling. Of course in planning the major infrastructure works a lot of time and energy is spent between the construction agencies like Evan Tattersall this morning from Melbourne Metro Rail Authority, the Level Crossing Removal Authority and their alliances and people such as myself and my team to understand what the options are about how we best manage both the needs of the construction program and the needs of the ongoing connection network to keep people moving.

So we see very different approaches taken to disruptions. I am sure Mr Leane will remember the work we did in his area around where we had much shorter occupations — much shorter closures of the line — and we were able to do a lot of work in parallel. Similarly with the Dandenong to Caulfield occupation we were able to keep the rail services running much more often and have fewer, shorter disruptions to service while we did critical bits of work. However, on the Frankston line, where there was a narrower corridor to work within and the complexities of digging the trench, we ended up with significant four or five-week closures to enable those works to go on.

So the work we are doing in those areas is we are spending a lot of time thinking about what are the alternative replacement services. We know that for our passengers — for example, on the Frankston line — around a third of those passengers who would use the Frankston line actually diverted onto the Dandenong line during the period of occupation. We know that around a quarter of the passengers diverted away onto the Sandringham line, and then the residual number of passengers used the bus replacement service that we provided between Moorabbin and Caulfield. Over that five-week period we provided over a million passenger journeys on that bus replacement service. The challenge was making sure that we had sufficient signalling and capacity on both Nepean Highway and Jasper Road to ensure that buses could move freely and provide a continuous and reliable service to enable people coming off the train at Caulfield to move down to Moorabbin and vice versa, from Moorabbin up to Caulfield.

We did a similar exercise with Blackburn–Heatherdale. Again around 800 000 passenger journeys were carried on the bus replacement services during that four-week period, reflecting the intensity. In doing so, we obviously — on the next slide — have to consider all the passengers and all the people that currently rely upon those transport services. So we are spending a lot of time to understand the specific customer needs that we have in those areas, to ensure that the buses that we are putting on as rail replacement services are low floor and also putting in some specific demand responsive services for those who have more complex mobility needs. We have done it in all the occupations so far, always ensuring there has been provision for those who need that extra bit of support to enable them to complete their journeys.

A critical part of all this is actually how to keep people informed before these disruptions start to occur and how to give people real travel choices before, during and after their journey, as Gill has outlined. Beyond the consultation we did around the actual infrastructure works — so people do have a sense of this work is coming and this is why we are doing it — we also spent a lot of time and energy ensuring we were working with the community and major employers in those areas, particularly in St Kilda Road, around this timing of major works and the alternative choices that are available both to employers and to employees. From that point on we are then talking to passengers about their existing travel options, because where possible we would like people to use the existing public transport network rather than just relying upon the replacement services. That is why

the dispersal to Sandringham line, Dandenong line or in the case of St Kilda Road and also with the Sandringham line, that provides some encouragement that people are willing to try alternative existing public transport services.

We also therefore provide an awful lot of information through mass-market media to give people plenty of notice that these changes are coming. And obviously we time these disruptions where possible to the lowest periods of demand in the calendar, and there is a fair amount of logistical manoeuvring to ensure that we hit those windows effectively. When we get onto the site itself, beyond the online information and given the fact we now have real-time information on all of our public transport services, it clearly gives people a good ability to plan and provide alternative routes and for us to get warning information out to them. We also provide a lot of customer support. A lot of staff are used to provide information to people where they have to come off services and give them information about temporary replacement services — a lot of visual aids, a lot of pop-up tents and a lot of customer service centres — to ensure that people can complete their journey.

I thought it might be worth a brief moment on St Kilda Road, which was completed quite recently. St Kilda Road is the biggest single tram corridor anywhere in the world. It has eight tram lines running up and down it. More to the point, we have a tram up and down that route every 1 or 2 minutes and around 200 000 people using that corridor every single weekday. It carries as many people as the West Gate Bridge, but rather more efficiently than the West Gate Bridge. To sever those tram connections for the 2.5-kilometre section of the St Kilda Road works, roadworks are critical to enable the early preparation works for the new Metro tunnel station at Domain. We provided 80 replacement buses working on a continuous loop up and down St Kilda Road.

We made the decision to prioritise the 200 000 public transport users on the residual available road space. So by providing quite assertive bus priority we were able to keep those buses moving very reliably, and the net impact was that the average journey time delay for people travelling through the St Kilda Road block was around 10 to 15 minutes and significantly less than we had actually anticipated. As Gill said, it also was part of this information campaign where we encouraged people to find alternative journey patterns and we encouraged car users to find alternative journey patterns to avoid congestion in the area. The early works around Punt Road that had been done last year also enabled that area to generally keep moving.

Looking ahead, yesterday we announced that there is a further significant works period coming up as we head into the spring holidays — although it does not feel like spring out there. So we have during a period of around three weeks 10 metropolitan lines and three regional train lines that will have some degree of disruption over various periods to enable removal of level crossings, to enable early work on the metro tunnel and to enable early preparation works for the high-capacity metro train. We have got a nine-day closure on the Hurstbridge line for track duplication, but we are managing a lot of the other work into the overnight and weekend periods. So we have started to get more creative about how we manage regular maintenance and disruption work into the very low periods of day, and we are getting, I guess, more efficient about how we do some of those works in lower demand times.

We are obviously providing a series of bus and coach replacement services and also managing it around the critical AFL Grand Final series. So we are managing not only a major construction program but existing demands and replacement services, all around a very congested sporting calendar, and there will be no disruptive works being taken while the grand final is on or during the Royal Melbourne Show.

On my last slide, Chair, before I head back to some questions, we obviously worked very closely to understand how Melburnians and how our passengers feel about the work that is being undertaken, and the recent survey we did in August of this year really tapped into — having done a lot of these disruptions over the last two years — how people feel, and the very strong sentiment coming out is that 91 per cent of the people that we talked to agree that the short disruptions are worth the long-term benefits. So people understand that putting the complexity and the scale of infrastructure in is critical to the future of not just the public transport network but actually to the wider growth and development of the city, and I think at the moment 73 per cent of those surveyed still find their travel experience to be generally positive.

We are not complacent. Gill and I and our teams are very conscious of the pressure that we are putting regular passengers and commuters under and the burdens they face as they travel around these complex sites. I think we have learned a lot over the last year and a half as we have been trying a different approach. We have continued to make improvements, and we look forward to enabling the delivery of a major infrastructure program while

keeping Melbourne moving and carrying more passengers than ever before. I will hand back to you, Chair, for any questions.

The CHAIR — Thank you very much indeed for your presentation. We heard this morning from some St Kilda Road residents who were very critical of the lack of consultation that had been taken in the process, and in fact that there was not a lot of concise basic information that they needed for their daily lives. What is your response to that?

Mr WEIMAR — If I can take that, having spoken at various points to residents around St Kilda Road, I think there are two issues here, Chair. One of which is clearly there was a lot of consultation undertaken around the nature of the construction works on St Kilda Road, and Evan would have talked about that this morning in terms of the size of the worksites, the alignment of the worksites and how they were going to be made to operate. At that point it was locked in. We then started working on how we would manage people through that disruption program.

We put a lot of information out there in terms of I think three commuter sessions were held in the weeks in the run-up to the St Kilda Road closures. We did a lot of local leafleting of affected premises — so residential premises and business premises — and a lot of mass advertising around the existing public transport network in the St Kilda Road area to warn people of those changes.

I think moreover we also managed the scale of that disruption into a very narrow window of time, so we managed it within a 10-day window, and we had a lot of customer service staff both on site and at a call centre to deal with any complaints around noise and any complaints around through-flow in the area. The fact that we were able to keep the roadways moving throughout that entire disruption I think was very important, so local residents who needed access to their car were able to continue to use it, and of course we were able to keep public transport flowing through that area.

The feedback we have had from residents and affected passengers has been overwhelmingly positive. We had a very low number of complaints, and I think on balance we feel that we got a difficult, complex bit of work more or less right. I was pleased to see the return to service go so smoothly, and St Kilda Road is now functioning as well as, if not better than, before.

The CHAIR — There is obviously going to be a lot of work next year which is going to impact access to the city, either by public transport or by private vehicle. That is going to impact severely, I would have thought, on businesses within the city. Do you have any plans to provide compensation for businesses that are adversely affected by these works?

Mr WEIMAR — I think, Chair, the priority for those of us in Public Transport Victoria that are running the public transport system and our focus is on ensuring we maintain the public transport system at all times and that people, commuters and travellers are able to keep their journeys going and that they are able to continue to get to work, to get to the shops and to do all of the things they need to do. So far we have been able to demonstrate that through all of the major infrastructure works that we have undertaken, so our focus is on ensuring that any public resources we have are used to maintain and to improve the effectiveness of those temporary alternative arrangements.

There are clearly separate conversations had between the major construction agencies, such as Melbourne Metro and the level crossings authority, around specific business disruption in those localities. I cannot comment on those, but certainly in terms of keeping Melbourne moving, for Gill and I and our teams, our brief is: keep the network running, keep giving people travel options and ensure they can continue to complete their journeys.

I fully appreciate that in specific cases that is not without some pain, and certainly when you close a railway line for a number of weeks — and that is why we do it in the holiday periods — it causes some disruption, but so far we have been able to prove that people can continue to make their journeys. The feedback we have had from the business community over the last year and a half has been very positive. They recognise that the state has gone to significant efforts to keep things moving, and we will continue to do so.

The CHAIR — I perhaps should have directed that question to Ms Miles. From your perspective is there any compensation, any support, for businesses that will struggle as a result of the lack of access to the city because of these works?

Ms MILES — I echo Jeroen's comments on that. It is dealt with through each of the major projects on a localised basis. There is no overarching compensation regime; there is an ongoing conversation with all the local providers as the works are being developed.

The CHAIR — Now, tell me: Transport for Victoria, is that just a rebadged transport department? Is it new? Is it a new level of bureaucracy? What exactly is it, could we hear in your words?

Ms MILES — Transport for Victoria, the way I would describe it myself, is bringing life to the Transport Integration Act, which has been around since 2010.

The CHAIR — That is a very nice PR term, yes, but what exactly does that mean?

Ms MILES — It is actually identifying and clarifying the point of integration for the network, so their legislation anticipated an integrated approach to network planning, network development and network management. Transport for Victoria as an entity has some powers to bring the disparate bits of the portfolio together when required, so mostly working with VicRoads and PTV, joining those bits together to make sure that we provide a holistic view of the network need and, in this case, manage disruption that actually affects all modes.

The CHAIR — What can you do that the department of transport could not?

Ms MILES — I can be more directional than we have been previously, given that the need to manage, for example, road space, public transport on roads, is now such a vital and important issue for us to solve. The powers that exist in the position of head of Transport for Victoria enable that to be a much easier process than previously.

The CHAIR — How many are employed at this new body?

Ms MILES — The same number that were employed one year ago.

The CHAIR — And what was that?

Ms MILES — I actually do not have that number off the top of my head. It is basically VicRoads, Public Transport Victoria and the departmental resources, so it is that reconfiguration. We have moved some elements around in the portfolio — for example, we have integrated the planning task, and we have integrated the disruption management task.

The CHAIR — How many are you responsible for? You are the top of the tree. How many are on the branches under you?

Ms MILES — In the department there are about 400 —

The CHAIR — No. In terms of your body, Transport for Victoria, how many are you directly responsible for?

Ms MILES — About 490 people.

The CHAIR — Within the department?

Ms MILES — Within the department.

The CHAIR — One question that we seem to come back to quite often, and this has an impact also on access to the city — Ms Hartland and I have a particular interest in this, because it will impact on the inner west, and probably the outer west too, I would suggest — is the West Gate tunnel, if it is still called that this week; I am not sure. Where are we with that?

Ms MILES — The West Gate tunnel is in the middle of a planning process.

The CHAIR — We have been told this is progressing and it is all going wonderfully well, but Transurban say that they are not responsible for it and the government is saying it is a private concern. Who is actually running this show?

Ms MILES — From the government side it is the West Gate Tunnel Authority, previously known as the Western Distributor Authority.

The CHAIR — Yes, I am aware of that, but what role does Transurban have in this, given that they will be the greatest beneficiaries of this project?

Ms MILES — I do not think I can add anything to that right now.

The CHAIR — So Transurban is there, what, barracking? Do they have any role at all, because we have had Mr Charlton in here on a number of occasions talking this project up like there is no tomorrow — and understandably so, given that his company is going to make squillions out of it. Are we to assume that Transurban has no official role in this at the moment?

Ms MILES — Not in the planning process.

The CHAIR — Not in the planning process, but what about the overall project? Does Transurban have any role at all in the overall project?

Ms MILES — Transurban have been involved. They run part of the network and have contributed advice and information on broader network planning.

The CHAIR — Do they have any official role in the tunnel project as it currently stands?

Ms MILES — I need to pass that on to the Western Distributor Authority. That is not a question I can answer.

The CHAIR — But you oversee the whole project?

Ms MILES — The Western Distributor Authority is a separate entity under the major projects program.

The CHAIR — I just want to get this sorted out. You do not oversee West Gate tunnel from your new position?

Ms MILES — No, I do not.

The CHAIR — So which projects do you oversee from your new position?

Ms MILES — The major transport infrastructure program, led by Corey Hannett, has four main entities under it looking after four of the major projects: the north-east link program, West Gate tunnel project, Melbourne Metro project and the level crossing program. The other infrastructure programs that are in the portfolio sit with PTV and VicRoads.

The CHAIR — But you oversee the West Gate tunnel?

Ms MILES — No.

Mr LEANE — I think you are barking up the wrong tree.

The CHAIR — No, I am trying to find out whether I am barking up any trees at all on that.

Ms MILES — No, I do not. The answer is no, I do not.

The CHAIR — The West Gate tunnel project remains the greatest mystery since the creation of the world, I think, just at the minute.

Ms HARTLAND — I will continue with questions on the West Gate tunnel, because it is a mystery to me as well, and I live there. It has become quite clear that the West Gate tunnel is going to funnel a huge amount of

traffic into the CBD. How are you going to manage that in terms of active transport, in terms of cycling et cetera?

Mr WEIMAR — At this stage, as with a number of projects under the OCG portfolio, our primary function at the moment is twofold, one of which is to ensure that there is a network integration of any future infrastructure programs into the long-term network, so we are looking very closely at how the West Gate tunnel is configured around, in my case, the railway network and the road network of the west of Melbourne. We do a similar function for the Level Crossing Removal Authority, the Metro tunnel and the others. There is a longer term rail transport plan that we are developing, that is about how these pieces come together and how does it help a staged development of the longer term transport network. I am not close enough to the modelling that my transport planning colleagues are undertaking on traffic flows for the West Gate tunnel, but it forms part of a longer network plan in terms of how we expect the road network to develop and the railway network to develop as we go forward.

Ms HARTLAND — One of the problems that I have had with this project is the lack of transparency, especially around the traffic modelling, and the government is now refusing to release the Allard report that was done around traffic modelling. How can I be assured as a local resident? My understanding is that it is going to funnel huge amounts of car traffic through the CBD, a CBD that is attempting to become more pedestrian-oriented, which is going to affect cycling and active transport, yet it does not sound like there is a coordinated approach to what is going to happen here.

Mr WEIMAR — As we said earlier, the West Gate tunnel is currently in the planning process, so all these issues are now being explored between West Gate tunnel, its backers and the local councils. I understand that recently the City of Melbourne have reviewed their traffic modelling assumptions in interactions with West Gate tunnel and have come to a reasonable landing space. Again, I am not privy to those conversations directly, but that is my understanding. That is, I think, entirely rightly the role of the local planning process of the local councils, to ensure that —

Ms HARTLAND — It is not a local council planning process.

Mr WEIMAR — No, but the planning process is actually involving the local councils.

Ms HARTLAND — It is not. The local councils do not have control over this as a planning process; it is the minister.

Mr WEIMAR — No, I am not saying that, but the planning process is taking submissions from all affected stakeholders —

Ms HARTLAND — That is right.

Mr WEIMAR — including the local councils, and we know, and I have seen, that they are very actively engaged with the West Gate tunnel project team to understand how these different scenarios, the different alignments and the different modelling may impact. I respectfully have to say my role is to operate the public transport network in Victoria and to ensure these major projects interface effectively with it. If there are detailed questions on the West Gate tunnel project, I would ask you to put those to my colleagues at West Gate tunnel.

Ms HARTLAND — We do not get any response, so it is very hard for me as a local resident and an MP to actually understand what this project is when the government is not transparent. It sounds like you, as an authority, also do not know what is actually going to happen, so then I would say that it is going to be very difficult for you to plan if you do not know what effect this project is going to have on public transport.

Mr WEIMAR — I have no concerns around the interfaces between that project and how we understand the modelling and the impact on our public transport network going forward. From a technical and demand modelling perspective we are comfortable on that basis. Those conversations are taking place, as you would expect, between these kinds of agencies.

Ms HARTLAND — They are certainly not happening with the community, and we only live there, so I know we are not really relevant. Anyway, if I can go to the issue around the major system fault on 13 July, obviously there have been a lot of conversations about this. I understand people have been compensated

et cetera. But do you understand what happened on that day? Is there a clear understanding of why it happened, and what you will do to prevent it happening in the future?

Mr WEIMAR — Yes, I will give you my assessment of what happened. We have undertaken three investigations into the cause of the network failure on 13 July. I will just do a quick recap on the history of what happened. At around 4.00 p.m. on that Thursday there was a failure in a server in the train control management system, which in real time manages the movements of trains and signals on the metropolitan train network. There are around 200 trains at any moment in time moving around the network. The failure in the server led to an error in how the system allocates between the main site and the backup site. The system is configured in such a way as to say if there is a problem in the main site it goes automatically to a backup system. If there is a problem in the backup system it goes back to the main system. The nature of the failure in this server — it is a Hewlett-Packard server — was that it had intermittent faults that kept coming on-off, on-off, and therefore the system was unable to prioritise between whether it should use the main system or the backup system.

It is a bit like when my laptop goes into a spinning circle of doom. The system could not resolve that particular fault. The engineers identified that after around 40 minutes, so they then disconnected the backup system from the main system, restored the main system and after 70 minutes we had signals and trains back online and able to start running into service. That is what happened. We have identified the fault. The fault is in the Siemens-configured, managed and run systems operated by Metro Trains. There was a failure of a server within there. The server has been repaired. That was repaired within three days and the system reactivated and brought back to its full state, as it now continues to operate. We understand the failure mode of that particular server, and that failure mode has now been addressed, And there continues to be a meaningful conversation with Siemens around the configuration of the network to ensure that cannot happen again.

Ms HARTLAND — I have been told that Metro was actually aware that they had a problem in their Metrol room. Can you talk about that — what they did or did not do in the lead-up to this incident? What preventative work do they do, what maintenance work do they do to make sure that something like this does not happen?

Mr WEIMAR — So there are two parts to that question. If I could stay on the system side of it, as I said, the train control management system was designed, built and maintained by Siemens under a contract with Metro. One of the causes of the failure in the server is, we understand, that Siemens did not necessarily undertake all the correct updates of software in the run-up to the event. That was not known at the time by Metro Trains, and it certainly was not —

Ms HARTLAND — Why was it not known?

Mr WEIMAR — Because essentially within the contract it is left to Siemens to maintain, manage and update the software of the system.

Ms HARTLAND — So Metro were not managing that contract?

Mr WEIMAR — Metro were managing the contract. There appears to have been a failure by Siemens to properly update the software on some of their servers. That is an issue that is now currently being explored between Metro and Siemens, and there will be a commercial discussion for them to have between them. That is why we have held Metro entirely accountable for this fault and we continue to hold them entirely accountable for that fault. That is why they have been penalised commercially, and that is why they have paid for the compensation to all of the passengers that were involved in the incident. We understand why that happened, and that is an issue to be resolved between those two commercial operators.

The secondary issue with the Metrol control room is around the configuration of our disaster recovery site. We have a full disaster recovery site in an alternative location, well away from the main building. That disaster recovery site is staffed during peak operating hours. Under the new contract with Metro Trains that starts on 30 November it will be staffed 24/7, so it will be a fully redundant backup, and we have resolved the issue in terms of the computer system in terms of how it allocates.

Ms HARTLAND — I am still a bit amazed by the fact that Metro was not overseeing their contract for something that clearly ended up being a total disaster on the night. How are they now managing that process to make sure that this actually happens properly?

Mr WEIMAR — There are two things now happening. Metro now have continual monitoring of a series of fault indicators on the individual servers within the train control management system, so those logs are now being monitored in real time by Metro's own technicians as well as by the technicians employed by Siemens. Siemens continues to have contractual accountability and operational accountability for managing the system. Nobody else can get their hands on that, because that would risk the integrity of that system, and certainly Metro and Siemens, under our supervision, are having a series of conversations around how to make sure that those contractual flaws do not re-present themselves again.

Ms HARTLAND — So have Metro actually employed extra staff to make sure that this happens, or are they just stretching their current staff?

Mr WEIMAR — No. Siemens have employed extra staff to actually do the work on the system which should have been done all along. That continues to be their accountability, with Metro ensuring that happens. Metro have sufficient software engineers to oversee these fault indicators, and as I have said we are now starting to ramp up the additional staffing in both the disaster recovery centre and the main centre for the start of the next franchise on 30 November.

Ms HARTLAND — So the new room does not get set up until November?

Mr WEIMAR — No, the new room is already set up, so we already have a disaster recovery site. It will now be fully staffed and deployed around the clock.

Ms HARTLAND — From now?

Mr WEIMAR — From 30 November.

Ms HARTLAND — What happens if the same thing happens between now and 30 November?

Mr WEIMAR — We are confident that the fault in the train control management system has been addressed. We are confident that any replication in any other part of the system would be identified by Metro. There are now workarounds in place, and they have given us complete assurance that that set of circumstances cannot re-present because they have addressed them.

Ms HARTLAND — If it happens again, what kind of fine would they expect to receive?

Mr WEIMAR — The fine they were issued with in July was \$1.2 million for that month, which is entirely on the back of that incident, plus a \$700 000 compensation cost to our passengers. That was a commercial settlement that we imposed on them at the time. We have now made that a contractual requirement in the new franchise, so if there were to be a network error that affected more than 50 per cent of services for longer than half an hour, Metro would have imposed a contractual fine of \$700 000, plus any operational penalties that would be added on top of that.

Mr LEANE — Thanks for assisting our inquiry today. This is an inquiry around infrastructure. There are only three of us, and I would hope that we would all get along today. Just to clarify for my colleagues, your role is around running the public transport system, and when it comes to infrastructure you have a very important role in interacting with the authorities and the alliances that are actually working on the networks.

Mr WEIMAR — That is correct.

Mr LEANE — We have spoken about Metro, and I accept Colleen's criticisms of some issues, but one issue I have found, firsthand, of something they do well is the replacement buses when they have got time to program them and they know that there is going to be a shutdown for a certain period of time. With the new contract is there any extra onus on that sort of delivery? Is there anything extra that has been looked at upon them?

Mr WEIMAR — Yes. One of the areas we have spent a lot of time on with MR4 is improving for both Metro and Yarra the operational response to unplanned incidents, so there is a lot more focus on particularly customer experience, passenger experience, for those major incidents. They will be revisiting and strengthening their bus replacement contracts to support any unplanned and planned disruptions. If you look at the way that we deploy bus replacement services in response to, particularly, planned incidents, those have been improving

over the last two years and they will continue to improve, and we will be bringing some of those learnings into unplanned disruptions.

I have to say unplanned disruptions, when we have a significant incident — we could have a suicide incident, we could have trespass, we could have a major line failure, we could have a car going through a level crossing and blocking a line for a few hours — those are very difficult challenges for any operator to respond to. When they happen in a morning peak, that is a particularly exposed time for the network because most of the buses will be fully deployed on the network getting people from A to B, so then to put that surge capacity in place is quite complicated. So there are broad challenges in doing that. That said, Metro have got very stringent targets within their contracts to deploy replacement services within a certain time limit from when an incident is notified and to then follow that through, obviously maintaining that alternative service until the regular services come back.

Mr LEANE — With the scheduled shutdowns, particularly on the heavy rail and when the replacement bus service is supplied, there are some individuals for whom the replacement buses are inadequate for their needs. Is it just a matter of Metro organising a maxi taxi for those individuals?

Mr WEIMAR — That is right. We have a contracted requirement for both unplanned and planned disruptions, whereby every passenger that we would normally carry on Metro trains or Yarra trams has to be provided with alternative transport arrangements. So if a member of the public who, for example, is in a heavy Motability chair is asked to disembark a train and to take a replacement bus, then Metro would arrange a maxi taxi or an alternative vehicle to get them to their final destination. It is absolutely right that in both unplanned disruptions and planned disruptions we look after everybody who is relying on the public transport network to get around.

Mr LEANE — Just continuing on the work around special needs — as you said, obviously a large infrastructure program has been delivered in the last few years, and it is needed as far as the future of the network is concerned. I am not too sure what the learnings are from what was done before, but there is a lot of emphasis on dealing with stakeholders, as in it might be people who are employed or people with a disability. I am sure Bernie appreciates that people with autism are used to routine and so a lot of work has to be done weeks before.

Mr WEIMAR — That is right, and it is. Systemically we work very closely with a lot of organisations who help us with passengers who have particular needs. We have a public transport accessibility committee, which comprises some excellent organisations. It gives a real personal insight into how we plan our regular public transport services versus how we manage disruption and new schemes. The advice from colleagues on PTAC has been instrumental in also thinking about our future design of stations and how we ensure we are bringing the right provisions in the future network and do not make some of the same mistakes that we still see in our infrastructure today. So that has been very important.

But, yes, we also consult very closely with organisations and groups on the ground, because some of these issues are very localised. How do you provide people with a confident, reliable information service to get from A to B? A lot of it is around information and a lot of it is around consistency. So we know that our particular passengers who have additional needs when they are travelling need to have really good information about what they are going to find when they are being asked to do something differently. Can I still rely upon, as you say, an accessible service? Can I still rely on a toilet being there? What is the frequency of these services going to be? How will I know when I get there? That is why we spend so much time on getting the information right.

I think if I compare my experience a year ago on some of the Frankston replacement services to what we have been doing more recently and what we did at St Kilda Road, it is significantly improved, and it will improve again because we continue to learn more around some of the quite subtle issues that people do find really troubling when they have become used to a routine and a certain way of travelling and then we try to make some changes to them.

Mr LEANE — Just on the global learnings, you mentioned that when one of the rail lines was shut a number of people moved to a different line. There is a lot of work being done and will be done on the Dandenong–Frankston line. Is there modelling to show that X amount of people living between that wedge will —

Mr WEIMAR — We saw when we had the Frankston closures in July of last year — it was a five-week shut — that 30 per cent of regular passengers on the Frankston line, between the Moorabbin and Caulfield section, migrated to the Dandenong line. Essentially they self-selected. They looked at information, they looked at our PTV app and they said, ‘If I’m living in Bentleigh, actually it’s easier for me just to cut across and jump on the Dandenong line rather than to jump on the bus replacement service’. So people make their own choices, and we encourage that. We should be doing that.

In the St Kilda Road closure a few months ago we provided some additional services on the Sandringham line, because it actually runs parallel to St Kilda Road, and for some people that was a better way to make those movements. Some of these are quite small adjustments, but they are significant because they give you that extra bit of capacity to get people through.

The one other point that it might just be worth making, Mr Leane, is around, particularly, unplanned disruptions. We still have some work to do around how we provide better information to passengers who are going through unplanned disruptions. I was at our accessibility committee yesterday, and it was pointed out to me again by members of the community that if you are vision impaired or if you are hearing impaired, it is even more disorientating about what is happening to you when there is an unplanned disruption, because we rely then solely on announcements, and if you are vision impaired, announcements do not really work for you, and if the information screens are not providing the accurate information, then you are really disorientated about how you are going to get around. So we have some more work to do with our operators around providing consistency of information to people when we are going through unplanned disruptions. That is part of our work program with Metro and Yarra in the new contracts.

Ms HARTLAND — Can I just jump in there? This is not during unplanned disruptions; it is regular with the trains that I catch that the signals are telling me that I am at North Melbourne when I am at Footscray.

Mr WEIMAR — That is right.

Ms HARTLAND — All the time. So what can be done to fix that? I see people getting off the train and they are totally confused because they have relied on that.

Mr WEIMAR — Look, we have a significant error rate in the display screens on trains being out of sync with where the train actually is. It is a fairly rudimentary system that we have. It runs on a bit of a loop, and if the loop starts at the wrong place, then the whole thing just runs its spool in the wrong way. So we have got some work to do. Under the new contracts there are financial penalties to the operators for failing to maintain some of those customer information systems in the right way.

What I will say is we have actually now deployed real-time passenger information systems on all trains and all trams, so we have those digital displays. We now need to make sure they are being used 100 per cent of the time properly. I completely understand where you are coming from, and I think you are right; it is something we still have some work to do on.

Mr LEANE — Getting back to your role of keeping the buses, trams and roads moving, last year there was a lot of work done on the network. This year there is a lot of work that has been done and that is being done on the network. Do you see next year as being any different? There are concerns being pumped out there that no-one will be able to get into the city because it is all going to be too hard because of the works. Is next year going to be any different to the last couple of years?

Mr WEIMAR — We will continue to see this level of work being done on the network. If we look at the ongoing level crossing removal work, obviously we are finishing off the Caulfield to Dandenong sections. We are then heading down towards Frankston and doing another eight removals down on the lower end of the Frankston line, and so on it goes. We expect absolutely that the level of infrastructure investment and regular maintenance continues to step up. Under the new Metro contracts and Yarra contracts we have seen a one-third increase in the resources spent on regular maintenance, and all that has to be fitted into the working calendar.

The system will continue to have to work very hard to make these pieces come together. That is why, as Gill says, we have built this integrated planning approach to ensure that where we can combine works in an effective way and where we can coordinate works in an effective way we do so to minimise the net impact on people travelling around Melbourne, because we recognise that our first duty, and certainly Gill’s duty and my duty, is

to ensure people can get from A to B in a reliable and effective way. We just have to do that while we manage this big works program. But it will be as big as we have seen over the last few years, and we will continue to see that for the next five or six years

Ms MILES — The comment I would add to that is that we actually see this as a really good way of working across the network and managing the network. So whilst there is a lot going on, we are getting better. So Jeroen's comments before were that every time we have done it we have got a bit better and we have learned more. From both a VicRoads and a PTV perspective it is actually a really good way for both agencies to manage the network. It is kind of like the new way of running the system.

Mr LEANE — I suppose in line with that, the last thing I want to ask is: what does that look like? With the Level Crossing Removal Authority, how long before they disrupt anything on the network do they have to come to you? What does it look like? What is the structure?

Mr WEIMAR — There is a long and tortuous process, as you could imagine, that we have, in this case, between the Level Crossing Removal Authority, the alliances, our rail and tram operators and PTV and TfV where we work together. Let us take the Frankston eight: this is a work we want to go and do; this is the scale of work we have to do; this is how the engineers want to approach it. In many cases there will be options. We can either shut the whole thing for a month or we can have six shutdowns of one week each over a longer period of time. There is a meaningful debate between me and my colleagues and the operators and Gill and her team around what the best outcome is, given the window of time and given the people travelling on the network, and what is the least disruptive way of doing it and how you trade that off against the delivery timescales and the cost of doing the project. There is a three-dimensional chess game going on when you look at that project in the context of what is happening on the road network, what is happening on other parts of the network and how we manage the impact on the overall network. We then agree on an approach, as we have done with all the other previous occupations. We will agree on the strategy for doing it: this is when the timeslots are going to be for the major disruptive works and this is how we then manage the community around those disruptive works. Then the engineers and the constructors get going, then there are problems, then we fix the problems and then the whole thing just repeats.

Ms MILES — And as we are getting better at it, skilled at it, we are actually seeing a longer time running into each of the programs. Originally when we started, it was like six weeks out. We are kind of like five or six months out now in terms of really deep planning — really meaningful planning — about how things are going to operate. That is one of the learnings: the earlier we get in there, the better the planning and the better the strategy from our perspective.

Ms HARTLAND — I was out at St Albans station this morning. It is beautiful; it is a fantastic station. It has made such a difference to Main Road West. It is really accessible. The station that I use a lot is West Footscray station. It is a great job; it is really accessible. And then you have somewhere like Essendon station — it is old, it is dirty, it is tired, the ramp is a shocker. Who, within all of these organisations, is the one that says, 'Right, these next five stations are the ones that we have to do. They are not going to be rebuilt. It is not a major restructure, but the internals have to be done to make them compliant'? How is that done?

Mr WEIMAR — That is done largely through PTV. We have assessed all the infrastructure on the metropolitan railway network, particularly for compliance to disability accessibility standards. There are many parts of the network, as you would be aware, where we are not compliant with DSAPT. So we have a full infrastructure inventory. We have an ongoing program which is addressing some of those factors. In the last month we installed, I think, seven raised boarding platforms at seven different stations across the network. We continue to roll out the tactile ground surface indicators across the network. We have just replaced the lifts at Dandenong station. We are about to do the lifts at Watergardens station, which is much talked about and rightly so because they are a shocker.

So there is an ongoing program of investments and adjusting the existing infrastructure that we have. I have to say that the majority of that work program is based on the small to medium end of the scale — we are not knocking the station down and rebuilding it. We are saying, 'Let's take a station like Watergardens or Ringwood and what can we do within the realms of a reasonable amount of resources to make this more compliant or to make it easier for people to use, and to improve the condition of that station?'

From time to time we will then look at the stations where we have significant concerns, because either the scale of the problem is so large or because the passenger experience is so poor or because the demands on the station are so great. So then we look at what the case is to do some really serious engineering works. As you would appreciate, that then becomes a matter for government, and at certain times we will go through and look for opportunities to get those stations funded.

Two other points I would make are: we have been very, I guess, agile at using the level crossings and other infrastructure programs as much as possible to get as many benefits for passenger outcomes that we possibly can. So I make no excuses for pushing our colleagues from the level crossing removal program as hard as I possibly can, in the same way that you push Evan to get the best possible outcome for the wider network. So we ask, 'While you're there, can you do these things as well?'. There is absolutely a line there somewhere that says I am not going to rebuild the entire Dandenong line just because I am replacing a few level crossings, but you can see in the approach we have taken on that corridor that we are taking a macro approach to doing as much as we can to upgrade, in this case, five stations on that entire line as well as replacing the level crossings. So we push the envelope where we can.

And finally the operators under the existing franchise agreements, and certainly under the new franchise agreements, will have much higher standards to maintain in terms of the cleanliness of the stations and the maintenance and upkeep of the stations, including these disability benefits.

Ms HARTLAND — There is also cycling. I live in Footscray, and I do not cycle because I am too scared. It is just a scary way to try to get around. Is there a plan for the metropolitan network? I understand there is a plan. But that issue around the separation of cyclists from cars for safety, do you see that as a priority?

Mr WEIMAR — I am at the outer edges of my professional role, but in that I am an active cyclist, I can give you a personal view. I think we are trying to integrate within the public network how we enable people to connect journeys by bike and public transport. I think that is an important part of any future solution. If you look at the deployment of the Parkiteer cages at the stations, I think that has been a helpful thing to do to enable cyclists to cycle to stations and park the very valuable bikes we all ride now in a more secure space. Obviously we deploy within the central zone the Melbourne Bike Share scheme. That gets used to run and provide a useful travel activity within the CBD and the inner suburbs.

Ms HARTLAND — That is the blue bikes, not the yellow bikes?

Mr WEIMAR — Yes, the blue bikes, not the yellow bikes. Do not get me started on the yellow bikes.

Ms HARTLAND — I am just so confused because those yellow bikes have just suddenly appeared everywhere.

Mr WEIMAR — Do not put me on the record on those. So there is some provision there, and of course we have just completed the first phase of the pilot of putting bike racks onto buses. We have run a couple of pilots within the metropolitan bus network.

Ms HARTLAND — Are they metropolitan?

Mr WEIMAR — Yes, up in the north of Melbourne. I forget which suburb it was, but we ran it on a couple of routes up there and also in Bendigo. So we have run a couple of pilots there, and we are keen to continue to explore how we might deploy that going forward. So there are some things we are doing in the active travel space. There is a wider conversation that Gill, John Merritt and I have on a regular basis with VicRoads around how we build in cycling facilities. If I go back to the infrastructure discussion we started with, we worked very hard on St Kilda Road to integrate cycling into the disruptive arrangements on St Kilda Road and provide safe routes for cyclists through that big disruption area.

Ms HARTLAND — In Denmark there are trains where one carriage has benches just on the one side so that people with kids in prams or with wheelchairs or bikes — on every single train not special trains — always have the availability to use the train and to cycle. Is there any thought towards those kind of carriages?

Mr WEIMAR — We have done a lot of work in the last couple of years around dealing with some of the conflicts with space, because I have to say my primary concern at the moment with our train fleet is ensuring that people who have got disability needs can have access to the accessible spaces and that they are not then

having to fight for that space against cyclists and strollers and a whole bunch of other bits and pieces. So a lot of work has been done in the last year by colleagues here to strengthen the role of the driver to ensure we can get people with mobility needs onto the trains and to reserve that space.

Actually we are trying to keep bikes out of those spaces at all costs, and we have put signage out across the network to do that, and that is being well respected and enforced by the authorised officers. There is probably a longer term debate we need to have, with a growing patronage base and with increased pressure for space generally speaking on our trains and in the morning peak, about what provision we might make for them going forward.

Ms MILES — The V/Line pilot.

Mr WEIMAR — And there is V/Line, yes. We are doing a pilot on the regional rail network at the moment around putting bikes on some of those trains as well and putting in some bike racks on the interior of the V/Line trains, particularly for those who are going out to the country for a day.

Ms HARTLAND — I think there are some trains that already have them.

Mr WEIMAR — There are; that is right.

Ms MILES — Yes, there are.

Mr WEIMAR — So the old classic fleet, going back a bit, used to have the guard's van where you could pile a whole bunch of bikes in. Now on the VLocity fleet we have created some dedicated luggage and cycling spaces to put two or three bikes in.

Ms HARTLAND — Yes, I have seen those — very popular with people using the rail trails.

Mr WEIMAR — That is right.

Ms MILES — Yes.

Ms HARTLAND — While we are on infrastructure and rail crossings, and you may not be able to answer this, but I am aware that there was actually a list of which are the most dangerous crossings, and Yarraville was on that list. There has never been any planning or thought about Yarraville being done — the crossing being lowered. The access to the station is very poor because the underpass was filled in years and years ago. People will wait on one side sometimes for up to 20 minutes to get to the other side because the booms are down and the gates are locked. So how do you decide which stations are required for that level crossing upgrade?

Mr WEIMAR — I can give you a partial answer to that. I chair a Victorian road safer crossings committee, which looks at all Victorian level crossings across the state, both metro and regional. We, along with our colleagues in ARTC, VicTrack, V/Line, Metro et cetera, have between us an ALCAM database: a database which has every level crossing in the state, both the rural crossings with no protection all the way through to the fully protected ones here in the city. There is a complex set of risk ratings around those crossings.

Those risk ratings are based on what protection is there at the moment, the level of road crossing activity, the level of rail activity, and those and a whole series of other variables around curvature and sightlines and things that engineers look at. Some of those variables change on a continual basis, so if roads become more busy, then that will push one location up from a risk point of view versus something else. When we deploy infrastructure into those locations, so when we have got booms and barriers and bells in, then of course that crossing tends to be more safe, so it will then go down the priority order for something else.

As part of that we are running a safer crossings program, where 55 country crossings are being upgraded, so with bells, booms and barriers. We are halfway through that program at the moment, and the rest of that will be completed by early next year. There are a further 25 pedestrian crossings, because actually pedestrian crossings are a real risk on the regional rail network. We always think about road crossings but the pedestrian crossings can be very, very dangerous. Both of those are progressing well, and we continue to oversee that risk rating. Where we have resources to put in, we will continue to target those high-priority locations.

Of course we also take opportunities — it is the same as the station rebuild program — that come along. If there is work being done on the roadway or we are about to rip up all the road or there is a big shopping centre about to open up and that is going to change the configuration of local demand, you take those opportunities and do the work there and then. So there is a bit of randomness in all that as well, but that is how the process works.

Ms HARTLAND — So Yarraville, as I understand it, is at a high risk, but it does not appear that it is going to be dealt with. It never seems to appear anywhere.

Mr WEIMAR — I am afraid I could not tell you right here and now where that sits on the 1700 I have got.

Ms HARTLAND — If you could take that on notice, that would be really good.

Mr WEIMAR — I would be glad to take that on notice.

The CHAIR — I should thank Ms Hartland, because in raising Yarraville station she has reminded me that I should ask about the Buckley Street level crossing. I think that when I last raised this with you, you were not aware of it — this is going back some time. Have you been brought up to date on what has happened there since?

Mr WEIMAR — My understanding is it is part of the level crossing removal program, and they are looking at that site at the moment and working their way through it.

The CHAIR — The local community, including the local council, has expressed the very strong view that this will destroy Essendon as a community because it is going road under rail and it will build a dirty, great ditch which will destroy the Rose Street shopping precinct, create untold traffic hazards for the educational precinct on the other side of Buckley Street and create a situation where indeed that whole area will only be able to be accessed by Park Street, which is a fair distance away, and that will be just one way to get in. Is there any way that the local community can get the government, yourself or somebody to see sense on this?

Mr WEIMAR — I have to say, Mr Finn, that is a matter for the Level Crossing Removal Authority in terms of the consultation and engagement they are doing with the local community.

The CHAIR — Is that your responsibility?

Ms MILES — It is Corey Hannett's responsibility.

The CHAIR — Okay. Fair enough. We will have to get him in one day, because there is a lot of Indians but I think there is a helluva lot more chiefs, just between you, me and the gatepost. Sorry, you were saying?

Mr WEIMAR — That was my answer.

The CHAIR — That is it? No, well, the government has given the finger again, so that is fair enough. Mr Weimar, I have got this quote here: 'We will hold Metro accountable'. Now there are a helluva lot of people that I have spoken to in the last week or two who have said that if you were holding Metro accountable, they would not have the new contract. What would you say to those people, given that Metro's reign in this area has been far from spectacularly successful?

Mr WEIMAR — I think what I would say is that if you look back over the almost eight years that Metro have had the franchise, we have seen significant improvements in reliability and punctuality of the railway during their stewardship. We have seen a significant increase in customer satisfaction with the Metro railway network over that period of time, and we have seen significant growth in ridership as well during that same time period. They are far from perfect as an operator, and as a result they have regular, if not continuous, attention from me and my office in terms of how they are running aspects of their business. And they are regularly given a pretty rough time in terms of the outcomes that we are trying to push them towards and the things they have to do, but that does not take away from the fact that not only at a contractual level did they qualify for the right to negotiate an extension but in qualifying for the right to negotiate an extension they demonstrated a far superior performance on the network than their predecessors over the last two franchise periods and were able to put together a proposal for government that the government felt was the right thing for the state to accept and to give it the confidence to go forward for another seven years.

The new contract is a significant step up in terms of the requirements on that franchise. It is a much more challenging regime in terms of the granularity of the performance management, the granularity of asset condition attention, the details around the passenger performance regime and the scale of penalties and fines that could be imposed on them should they fail to deliver.

The CHAIR — One last question from me, and that is to Ms Miles. If by some extraordinary circumstance we were to get an answer out of somebody on the West Gate tunnel, who would that person be?

Ms MILES — My suggestion would be that you go speak to Peter Sammut, who is the CEO of the West Gate tunnel project.

The CHAIR — Okay, we will make a note of getting him in.

Ms HARTLAND — We will not get any answers.

The CHAIR — We will not get any answers. Ms Hartland has expressed the view that we are not going to get any answers from Mr Sammut. If we were serious about getting answers on the subject, who should we speak to? Honestly, I really want to know. I am really keen to know what is going on here.

Mr LEANE — I do not think they have the answer.

The CHAIR — I really want to know what is going on with this thing, because it is a great mystery.

Ms MILES — Peter Sammut is the CEO, and the other thing I would add to that is that the hearings finish next Tuesday, and I am sure there will be more to say after Tuesday when the planning process finishes.

Ms HARTLAND — It would have been nice if we had the information during the planning process, and it would have been nice if we had access to things like the Allard report so that we could base our submissions on actual traffic modelling rather than guessing what is going on. It is not a transparent process by any means.

The CHAIR — A very sniffy one in fact, I think it would be fair to say.

Ms HARTLAND — Almost as bad as the east–west link in terms of the business case not being released.

The CHAIR — Thank you very much for coming in. You will receive a transcript in the not-too-distant future. Have a look at that. There will be no typos or anything like that because I have absolute and total faith in these Hansard people. They are just wonderful; they do a wonderful job. Have a quick look at that, and if there is anything that you might think could have turned out better, except for changing the concept of what we were talking about, that would be a wonderful thing. Thank you very much indeed for coming in. We do appreciate your time.

Ms MILES — Thank you.

Mr WEIMAR — Thank you.

Witnesses withdrew.