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This presentation

• What is the problem?
• What is the solution – in principle?
• What’s stopping us doing it?
Where people live, and where they work (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality (statistical local area)</th>
<th>Work in the locality</th>
<th>Work in neighbouring localities</th>
<th>Work in inner Melbourne</th>
<th>Work everywhere else around metropolitan Melbourne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEST: Hobson’s Bay/Altona</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21% (across Yarra)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST: Wyndham North</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18% (across Yarra)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST: Manningham East</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST: Casey and Cranbourne</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures are rounded to nearest percentage
Where people live, and where they work  
(Australian Bureau of Statistics 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality (statistical local area)</th>
<th>Work in the locality</th>
<th>Work in neighbouring localities</th>
<th>Work in inner Melbourne</th>
<th>Work everywhere else around metropolitan Melbourne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banyule/Heidelberg</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyule North</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures are rounded to nearest percentage

Banyule/Heidelberg

Banyule North
Where people live, and where they work
(Australian Bureau of Statistics 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality (statistical local area)</th>
<th>Work in the locality</th>
<th>Work in neighbouring localities</th>
<th>Work in inner Melbourne</th>
<th>Work everywhere else around metropolitan Melbourne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frankston East</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston West</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures are rounded to nearest percentage

Frankston East

Frankston West
Where people live, and where they work (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality (statistical local area)</th>
<th>Work in the locality</th>
<th>Work in neighbouring localities</th>
<th>Work in inner Melbourne</th>
<th>Work everywhere else around metropolitan Melbourne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frankston East</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures are rounded to nearest percentage
Where people live, and where they work
(Australian Bureau of Statistics 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality (statistical local area)</th>
<th>Work in the locality</th>
<th>Work in neighbouring localities</th>
<th>Work in inner Melbourne</th>
<th>Work everywhere else around metropolitan Melbourne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingston North</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox North</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures are rounded to nearest percentage
Where people live, and where they work
(Australian Bureau of Statistics 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality (statistical local area)</th>
<th>Work in the locality</th>
<th>Work in neighbouring localities</th>
<th>Work in inner Melbourne</th>
<th>Work everywhere else around metropolitan Melbourne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maroondah Croydon</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manningham West</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures are rounded to nearest percentage.
How much of their total time during the day people spend in non-work travel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Travel Intensity Melbourne 1991-2006, Consumption (ratio of travel time in consumption to total time %) p. 15
Uneven distribution of jobs, homes and transport

Spiller, Gibbins, Swan (SGS) Economics and Planning 2013
Unbalanced transport investment

Growth of Freeways and Railways in Melbourne 1955-2010

Figure 7.1 Melbourne: Railways and freeways 1955–2010

## Broken City Link Promises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTUAL VERSUS PREDICTED</th>
<th>Predicted by Veitch Lister for 2001. If City Link were built</th>
<th>Actual data for 2001 (VicRoads) After City Link was built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average travel speeds across the road network</td>
<td>43.8 kph</td>
<td>42.0 kph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel in daily vehicle hours across the network</td>
<td>1,963,800 daily vehicle hours</td>
<td>2,039,500 daily vehicle hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional City Link ramps at Port Melbourne
The public lie

• The lie has now been exposed by Maxwell Lay, writing in *The Age* newspaper (Oct 30th): ‘Opponents play the congestion card, arguing that previous projects have not eliminated congestion, forgetting that this was never their intent’.

• Lay, former Director of Major Projects at VicRoads and former Chair of the RACV should know: he is saying that it was never the intent of projects like City Link to relieve congestion.
‘But the secret forecasts [from a report compiled by consulting firm Veitch Lister], which run to hundreds of pages and include detailed maps, show while some parts of the network such as Johnston Street in Collingwood will improve, other areas will become more congested, largely because of a phenomenon known as “induced demand”’ (The Age, December 9th 2013, p.4)
The real problem

• The problem governments have been trying to solve for fifty years is about car commuter traffic from outer Melbourne to the city.
• They constantly fail. But each episode of congestion leads to a demand to build more expensive motorways.
• The real transport problem is everywhere else around metropolitan Melbourne.
• people are expected to travel long distances from where they live. But the transport connections between where they live and where they go for work and services, are pathetically inadequate and very expensive.
• There is no integrated planning for the location of residential areas and work/service locations and transport connections.
The Transport Integration Act, 2010
Section 11

• ... The transport system and land use should be aligned, complementary and supportive and ensure that –
  – transport decisions are made having regard to the current and future impact on land use,
  – land use decisions are made having regard for the current and future development and operation of the transport system
The Transport Integration Act, 2010
Section 12

1. The transport system should facilitate network-wide efficient, coordinated and reliable movement of people and goods at all times.

2c. The transport system should – facilitate integrated and seamless travel within and between different modes of transport.
How can integrated transport principles be applied to dispersed cities like Melbourne?

• Mixed modes: exploiting the different quality and capacity aspects of the various modes.
• Easy and comfortable transfers between modes.
• A simple network with a clear line structure which is easy to learn and remember.
• Direct route alignment and fastest possible speed of vehicle operations with reliable timetables.

How can integrated transport principles be applied to dispersed cities like Melbourne?

• High frequency services where and when the demand is reasonably high.
• Co-ordinated pulse timetables where the demand is weaker.
• Efficient pendulum lines running through city and suburban centres and major public transport interchanges connecting housing and work areas.
• Supporting ‘soft’ measures such as fare structures, ticketing systems, information and marketing combined with restrictive policies towards car use.

What’s stopping us getting integrated transport?

• There is a policy mindset that says: people will always want to drive cars to work. Cars cause congestion. Cars run on roads. Therefore we need to build new, better, bigger roads to reduce congestion.

• The mindset also says: people will never switch to public transport. Public transport can never serve mobility needs in low density areas. Therefore public transport cannot relieve congestion.

• Every transport expert now knows that these beliefs are WRONG!

• Investment in the PT system will relieve congestion and save travel time. WHY NOT TRY IT!
Institutional barriers

• The professional vision of most engineers is to build the most beautiful and functional object they can possibly build. Max Lay is right when he says, ‘Melbourne in the past 50 years has produced some of the world’s best motorway designs’ (The Age, 30\textsuperscript{th} Oct)

• Traditionally road infrastructure has been called ‘investment’, while supporting public transport has been ‘a drain on the budget’.

• State institutions have been created that maximise investment in roads.
To conclude

• We have an opportunity now to stop this disastrous path governments have been taking for fifty years, and to make them address the real problem of Melbourne’s transport crisis.

• We need real solutions that can be applied in the first term of a new government.

• They are primarily public transport solutions using existing infrastructure. Address congestion and the public transport service across Melbourne.