

TEMPE 2020

**SUBMISSION IN RELATION TO THE M5 CORRIDOR
EXPANSION TO THE ROADS & TRAFFIC AUTHORITY**

12 MARCH 2010

Contents

Introduction	3
1. Community Impact	4
The destruction of picnic area/trees/kids playground in Tempe Reserve	4
Destruction of Tempe Reserve playing fields and blocking of the bike path	4
Destruction of dog off-leash area	4
Tempe Eco Wetlands	5
Cooks River as a Wildlife Corridor Biodiversity Strategy - Marrickville Council	5
Pollution – Visual / Noise / Atmospheric	6
2. Efficacy of Proposed Road	7
Connection to Airport Drive from the Southern Sydney Connection	7
End of the road – St Peters & Surrounding Suburbs	7
Port Botany Access	8
The M4 East	9
IKEA Development and Traffic Generation	9
3. Other Alternatives	10
Improvements to Public Transport and Rail Freight Facilities	10
Parallel Public Transport Improvements to assist Transport Corridor Congestion	11
Airport Access, Demand Management and Public Transport	12
Active Transport, Bicycle and Walking Tracks	14
Active Transport and the M5 Expansion Proposal	14
4. Project Execution	15
M5 Tunnel Duplication and lack of stack filtration	15
Potential fast track delivery timetable and Environmental Assessment	16
The F6 Corridor and the M5 Expansion	16
5. Conclusion	17
APPENDIX A	18
Discussion Paper regarding the process of the M5 Transport Corridor Feasibility Study and the development of the Indicative Preferred Option, and associated documentation	18
Cover Letter January 22	19
Meeting 22 Jan 2009 Premiers Department/ Transport Ministry	20
Overview	20
A) Refinement of preferred strategic option	20
B) Option D	21
Budget	21
Rapid Economic Analysis	22
Traffic Modelling	22
Multi-criteria analysis (MCA) of strategic options	22
Comparative appraisal	22
C) Comparison of Rapid Economic Appraisal with the IPO and Option D	23
Benefit Cost Ratio	23
Estimated Capital Cost	23
Direct User Benefits	23
Summary	24
Request for Clarification	25

Introduction

Residents of the area of Tempe east of the Princes Highway have chosen to present a group submission on the M5 Corridor Expansion, because the community as a whole is extremely concerned about what this will mean to both our neighbourhood and that of St Peters. Residents have come together in their hundreds as they have learned about what has been proposed, and they are incredulous, horrified and angry.

Our primary concern is the arterial road referred to in the RTA's Transport Corridor Feasibility Study of November 2009 as the 'Southern Sydney Connection Road'. This road was developed as a "concept" to improve access to Port Botany, the airport, the CBD and surrounding areas, due to the M5 East freeway and the Princes Highway exceeding capacity in the very near future. Tempe 2020 believes that the justifications given in the Feasibility Study are not correct, and will detail this later in our submission.

In the first instance, the Transport Minister's statement of 1st February 2010 that the Southern Sydney Connection Road "has no status" makes the request for submissions pretty much a moot point. What is the point of preparing a submission on a road that has no status? However, given that the road in question is still part of the proposal, we believe that a submission stating our opposition in the strongest of terms is essential to ensuring that the State Government and the RTA are under no illusions that the residents of Tempe, St Peters and surrounding suburbs will ever agree to, sanction or be coerced into agreeing to the Southern Sydney Connection Road or any similar proposed road.

The RTA's officers have stated that the RTA is seeking residents' input to help them develop options by supplying submissions. Tempe 2020 believes that developing options for roads as part of the M5 Corridor Expansion is the task of the RTA and the State Government, not the residents of this area. As members of our group were responsible for highlighting failings in the Feasibility Study, resulting in the RTA backtracking to develop the other four options not fully explored through the original study, we as a group do not intend to offer suggestions as to what the new preferred option should be (see Appendix A for further details). That both the RTA and the State Government would even suggest we should points to an unfortunate waste of taxpayers' money. Why spend \$15 million on a feasibility study in the first place if you are first going to ignore much of the study's findings, and then call for community suggestions to effectively start the whole process again? If you are serious we wonder about the competence of the process; if you are not, the process itself seems, at best, disingenuous.

1. Community Impact

The impacts of this proposed road on the community are many and varied, and we detail them as follows.

The destruction of picnic area/trees/kids playground in Tempe Reserve

Tempe Reserve has recently seen the end of a two year period of disruption while Sydney Water's desalination pipeline was laid through Tempe Reserve. During this period, the children's playground was relocated for several months, the picnic facilities were removed, the walking/bike paths were blocked, and the use of the playing fields were limited due to construction and pipe storage areas. Hundreds of families, both locals and those from out of area, use the picnic and playground areas both during the week and particularly on weekends.

Now, after all of these facilities have been restored, and families can once again make use of the picnic area and the playground for birthday parties, barbeques and relaxation under beautiful fig trees, a four lane road is proposed to destroy all of these amenities. In a local council area with a limited amount of green space, to take away facilities such as these will affect families over many suburbs.

Destruction of Tempe Reserve playing fields and blocking of the bike path

While the route of the proposed road as per the Feasibility Study does not invade the playing fields of Tempe Reserve to a great extent, having a 15 metre high road overhanging the playing fields will impose noise, atmospheric and visual pollution on a leisure and sporting area used by hundreds of people each week. The noise of hundreds of cars each hour will make the area extremely unpleasant to hold sporting fixtures, as players won't be able to hear each other on the field. The Reserve is used for cricket, soccer, rugby league, touch football, volleyball, jogging, dog walking and cycling. The road will also potentially block the cycling track that goes from the Reserve crossing Alexandria Canal and along Airport Drive to Mascot and Alexandria, cutting off a non-main road alternative for cyclists to ride into the CBD.

Destruction of dog off-leash area

As the proposed road goes up the ridge from Tempe Reserve, it effectively takes out the dog off-leash area adjacent to the container terminal. This will take away an area which is constantly in use 7 days a week by both locals and non-locals, including many dog walking businesses. There is no comparable nearby area for off-leash dog exercise, and the community will suffer greatly from the loss of this much used amenity.

Tempe Eco Wetlands

Marrickville Council has spent millions of dollars to repatriate the current wetlands area from the old Tempe Tip. The result is a fantastic, tranquil area filled with flourishing native plants, species of fauna that are being regenerated and walking tracks for locals to enjoy. To have an overhanging road with cars and trucks emitting fumes immediately adjacent to this ecologically sensitive environment will be disastrous.

All the plants used are native to our Cooks River Valley, an area with very little native vegetation left. Some of those plants were grown from seed collected in the few tiny pockets of actual remnant bushland (the original vegetation growing on un-cleared land) left in our area, and then grown on by local volunteers, so these plants are the offspring of our original local flood plain and sandstone forests and heaths.

This valuable habitat has become home to many species of fauna including frogs and small birds which are increasingly rare in our suburbs. The grey-headed flying fox (a threatened species) can be found in Tempe Lands. The Lands also provide an opportunity for our children to learn about ecology, biodiversity and other sciences.

Pollution from motorways has a devastating effect on both plant and aquatic life and will destroy this high quality habitat, leaving only the species that can best cope with such environmental pressure. Such plant species loss will, in turn, have a significant impact on the fauna living there now, since they will no longer enjoy the full range of habitat required for survival.

Cooks River as a Wildlife Corridor Biodiversity Strategy - Marrickville Council

In November 2009 the Marrickville Council endorsed the "Cooks River as a Wildlife Corridor Biodiversity Strategy" for the Marrickville area which brings into context the broader need to develop and conserve wildlife corridors for vegetation and fauna in urban areas.

The quality of life for present and future generations is dependent on both the conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of natural resources. Biodiversity is important for both its intrinsic value and the ecosystem services it provides to communities.

Local government is increasingly being asked by the community and required by law to take a greater role in the management, protection and enhancement of the natural environment. Recent changes to Local Government legislation mean that sustainability considerations are now a core function of all Council operations. One of the key aspirations in Marrickville Council's Community Plan 2025 is to be "a centrepiece of inner-city ecologically sustainable development (ESD)" and 'Conservation of Biodiversity' is one of four components of ESD.

Tempe 2020 Submission

A defined plan to enhance wildlife corridors in Sydney came with the GreenWeb – Sydney project, undertaken by the Sydney Regional Organisations of Councils in 1997 to begin to address vegetation management across the metropolitan area. Central to the plan is the establishment of habitat corridors which link fragmented patches of bushland to facilitate the migration of wildlife and natural dispersal of native plants. A number of existing corridors have been identified as important in this process, two of them being the Cooks River foreshore and the GreenWay: Iron Cove to Cooks River.

Marrickville Council is one of the key supporters of the Cooks River Foreshores Working Group (CRFWG), which aims to collectively improve the health and amenity of the Cooks River and its foreshores. Guided by the Cooks River Foreshores Strategic Plan 1997, a main objective is to involve stakeholders in creating wildlife corridor opportunities.

The Southern Sydney Connection and any development of the M5/F6 Corridor from Marsh St and Eve St Wetlands to St Peters through Tempe Reserve, Tempe Wetlands and Sydney Park Wetlands is at odds with strongly felt community resolve and Council objectives to preserve and create urban wildlife corridors and protect biodiversity along the Cooks River and large areas of adjoining lands.

Pollution – Visual / Noise / Atmospheric

Situated as we are between a large airport terminal and a major national highway, the last thing the area of East Tempe needs is the addition of up to 80,000 vehicles per day within close proximity to our residential and leisure areas. When combined with the existing pollution load coming from both Sydney Airport and the Princes Highway, this new pollution load could well push overall air pollution to dangerous levels for residents.

This area is home to many young families. A large majority of the neighbourhood children walk to local schools and childcare centres, and already brave the noise and air pollution of the hundreds of trucks, cars and buses that flow along the Princes Highway. In fact, so great is the existing noise levels, it is not even possible to carry on a normal conversation whilst walking along the Princes Highway at Tempe. These nearby educational institutions, despite being on the other side of the highway to the proposed road, will still experience this extra level of pollution.

2. Efficacy of Proposed Road

Connection to Airport Drive from the Southern Sydney Connection

In the RTA's Feasibility Study, the Southern Sydney Connection is proposed to connect to Airport Drive to service traffic to and from the M5 East only (not from Campbell Road). Currently this traffic from the M5 East at Marsh St can either access the Airport via Qantas/Airport Drive or General Holmes Drive.

In the Study's examination of the Southern Sydney Connection, the same traffic can still access the Airport via Qantas/Airport Drive or General Holmes Drive, or join the Southern Sydney Connection and then connect to Airport Drive and onwards to the Domestic Terminal (not the International Terminal) – but for what purpose?

Tempe 2020 questions what real advantages the proposed route will offer when it will be longer and involve a confusing and complex mix of junctions and mergers. The result will not be to remove the bottleneck in this area, but simply to move it further along Airport Drive from the Marsh Street end, and perhaps even make it worse! While this proposed connection may make it faster to get to the Domestic Terminal during the PM peak, it will be no different and may even be worse during the AM peak; indeed, it would take a very savvy regular local driver to know the difference. It doesn't seem to provide any access to the International Terminal, and is relying on diverting traffic travelling to the Domestic Terminal to reduce congestion.

Given the cost of this road, the advantages are at best dubious and will do nothing but move the bottleneck along a few hundred metres, if that. The whole Southern Sydney Connection and connection to Airport Drive is nothing but a \$1 billion gamble that commuters would prefer to use it rather than the current roads.

End of the road – St Peters & Surrounding Suburbs

The ending of the Southern Sydney Connection road at Campbell Road, St Peters, is one of the most ill-conceived elements of the proposal. The RTA's literature has stated that the road will "service the areas north of the airport". Sending up to 8000 cars per hour into an already crowded industrial area and surrounding residential suburbs via a road which is little bigger than a suburban laneway can not be considered to be servicing an area effectively. Why would a resident of a western suburb such as Liverpool want to travel to the CBD via an area which would experience major bottlenecks and traffic chaos?

Tempe 2020 Submission

The residents not only of St Peters, but many surrounding suburbs, including Tempe, Marrickville, Alexandria, Mascot, Green Square, Redfern, Newtown, Enmore and Sydenham will all suffer greatly from increased traffic arriving at the end of the Southern Sydney Connection Road, as the flow-on effects will be felt for many kilometres around. For example, the close proximity of Campbell Road to the Princes Highway and King Street, Newtown will create a traffic nightmare for an already-choked major road.

Residents of Campbell Road itself will experience an unbearable deluge of new traffic into their already crowded neighbourhood. Users of Sydney Park will be affected in a similar fashion to the users of Tempe Reserve in terms of noise and atmospheric pollution. A number of local schools and childcare centres will also be impacted by the increased traffic and associated pollution that will flood surrounding streets, including St Peters Public School (directly off Campbell Road itself), St Pius School at Enmore, Camdenville Public School, Tempe Public School, Tempe High School, Tillman Park Child Care Centre and Betty Spears Child Care Centre.

The RTA has also stated that the suburbs of Waterloo and Redfern will see "substantial growth" with accommodation for 4000 new residents and 18,000 new jobs planned. This will inevitably bring additional vehicles into the area, on top of the influx that the Southern Sydney Connection Road will bring. Despite having train services and some buses in this area, these suburbs already suffer from high traffic volumes, particularly at peak times. This veritable logjam also affects traffic flowing into the CBD and to areas such as the Fox Studios/Sydney Cricket Ground/Sydney Football Stadium/Centennial Park precinct. The impact of additional traffic from the Southern Sydney Connection Road will have a profound effect for many kilometres beyond its end point.

It is absolutely astounding that the RTA has not provided traffic modelling or management plans for the St Peters end of the Southern Sydney Connection Road within the Feasibility Study. To omit this aspect is to indicate a complete lack of foresight of myriad potential problems that the location of this road end point will create.

Port Botany Access

To deal with Sydney's long-term trade growth, the Ports Authority is building new facilities designed to last 100 years, with a projected three million container movements annually within 13 years.

The RTA is missing the opportunity to provide direct access from the Port to the M5, but is instead proposing to build the Southern Sydney Connection from Marsh St to St Peters, claiming this will ease congestion on General Holmes Drive, which runs under the East West Airport runway to the M5. This defies all common sense and is not even supported by the RTA's own \$15 million M5 Transport Corridor Study.

Tempe 2020 Submission

The M5 Transport Corridor Feasibility Study claims that as a result of the Southern Sydney Connection project, there will be a five to ten percent reduction in traffic on key roads surrounding Port Botany and Sydney Airport. Preliminary traffic assessment puts the northbound peak volume on General Holmes Drive at 8,191 vehicles. The Southern Sydney Connection will reduce traffic on General Holmes Drive by 520 northbound vehicles an hour during the AM peak period (a mere 5.5%), with less of a reduction southbound and at other times, at a cost of \$1 billion. Tempe 2020 believes this represents an extremely expensive, short term solution for what will be an ongoing and increasing problem long into the future. The small reduction on General Holmes Drive will be quickly absorbed by new traffic generation from the M5 Expansion.

The Southern Sydney Connection does little to improve access to Port Botany. Any road from Marsh St should connect directly to Port Botany and the CBD, improving access for the long term trade growth needs of freight and commuter traffic generated by the widening and duplication of the M5.

The M4 East

Many recent reports and submissions to the NSW Transport Blueprint mention the "missing link" between the oft-proposed M4 East Extension and the M5. Even though the Johnston's Creek corridor has now been abandoned, the location of Campbell Road as an effective end point for the M5 raises many questions for anyone looking at a map of motorways around Sydney.

We know the RTA has stated repeatedly that the M4 East is not an option at this point, due to lack of funding. However, since the NSW Government has repeatedly failed to comprehensively plan for the city's road and transport needs over many years, we are understandably cynical when obvious intentions such as this link are mentioned by organisations such as Sydney Airport Corporation, Infrastructure Australia and consultants Evans and Peck, yet not mentioned by the Government or the RTA. The RTA itself has mentioned the need to be "transparent" in its dealings with the community, and we would ask that it live up to this intention.

IKEA Development and Traffic Generation

The new IKEA Asia-Pacific Headquarters development proposes great congestion challenges for our local community, as it will be a great traffic generator. The travel mode data for IKEA visitors is focused towards motor vehicle travel (92% by car) due to bulky goods purchases.

IKEA expects 700 cars per hour through its gates during the afternoon peak, and each weekday, 81 truck movements per hour to the airport freight facilities. That adds up to some 700 plus truck per day - more than one per minute.

Tempe 2020 Submission

The 700 cars visiting IKEA for shopping will use the Princes Highway to access the site. We assume that 700 cars visiting the site will also mean another 700 cars leaving the site as well. Either way, this is a lot of cars during the pm peak (at closing time).

Freight movements will access the site from Bellevue St off the Princes Highway, and then access Qantas Drive or Joyce Drive via General Holmes Drive to access Domestic and International Freight Depots.

The RTA must consider solutions to the traffic generation of the IKEA Development on the Princes Highway and the traffic spillage into local suburban streets.

3. Other Alternatives

Improvements to Public Transport and Rail Freight Facilities

The M5 Transport Corridor Feasibility Study makes the following statements regarding public transport passenger and rail freight facilities:

"There are no sections of the M5 corridor where improvements to public transport facilities may form part of an overall project that could meet the study objectives."

Page 45

"The results of the modelling show that higher than predicted movement of freight from Port Botany by rail would not substantially reduce traffic volumes in the corridor."

Page 80

"A preliminary assessment of the impact of tolling on public transport in the corridor has been undertaken. Transport modelling by the Transport Data Centre showed that a tolled or an untolled option had little effect on bus and rail passenger trips"

Page 78

We find the above conclusions hard to fathom, and we are very concerned that the study is dismissive of public transport. Indeed, Tempe 2020 would like to see the documentation that provides evidence for these claims.

At the St Peters Town Hall RTA/ Marrickville Council community consultation, concern was expressed that the M5 Transport Corridor Feasibility Study's assessment of transport options would be biased by the fact that it has been undertaken by the RTA - a road-building agency, that the scope of the study was not broad enough in the first instance, and as such, has fulfilled its own objectives to justify building a roadway while dismissing other options without proper consideration. This concern is further expressed in the Marrickville Council M5 Expansion Draft Submission.

Tempe 2020 Submission

To address this concern we request other Government Agencies are given adequate funding from the \$15 million M5 Expansion Study Funding to properly research and advise on public transport options for the M5/F6 Corridor:

- Ministry of Transport Planning Dept to develop proposals on realistic public transport options and travel demand management
- Rail Corp to advise on Rail Freight
- Ports Authority to advise on the Freight needs and solutions for Port Botany
- Department of Planning to oversee methodology, planning, process and transparency issues.

Parallel Public Transport Improvements to assist Transport Corridor Congestion

The recently released NSW Metropolitan Transport Plan states that:

"We will continue to invest in roads to support freight movements and efficient economic performance of the network, but we cannot build our way out of congestion. Public transport alternatives must be available for as many journeys as possible."

Tempe 2020 believes that by focusing on ways to get commuters off roads and on to public transport, congestion will be eased and roads will become more effective. One method which would appear to be cost effective and relatively simple is **speeding up the rail network**. By improving the frequency of trains on suburban networks, more commuters will be able to utilise the service. More rail users means less road users.

Plans to **duplicate the Illawarra line** and the soon to be completed **duplication of the Cronulla line** are only some of the improvements that could make a large impact on commuters coming into the city. By making improvements to rail lines coming from the south, many more commuters would be diverted from the Princes Highway, which feeds into the M5.

Another example of effective public transport use is **bus rapid transit**. In Brisbane and Adelaide, bus rapid transit has been extremely successful, due to the frequency of services. Sydney has one bus rapid transit service (Liverpool to Parramatta) but it is a cross-corridor service only. Brisbane has also benefitted from the transitways running parallel to major motorways, and running into the city via underground routes (which can also accept light rail in the future). By dedicating one lane each way within the M5 Expansion to bus transitway and running a frequent service into the city with stops along the major points of the M5, thousands of cars each day would disappear from the M5 and Eastern Distributor. This type of service could also divert along Marsh Street and service both airport terminals.

Yet another solution could be **frequent shuttle-type buses across the south-western network that deliver passengers to railway stations**, making more rail hubs and reducing congestion at larger stations. Commuters will take to public transport in droves if a frequent and convenient service is provided. This concept will take cars off motorway feeder roads, allowing the existing roads to adjust to a more manageable capacity, and is an idea that could work across the whole of the city. Obviously, improvements to the rail network and ticketing (about to come into effect via the new Metropolitan Transport Plan) would ensure this scheme's success.

Airport Access, Demand Management and Public Transport

A number of recent reports, including the RTA's M5 Transport Corridor Feasibility Study and the Sydney Airport Corporation's submission to the NSW Government's Transport Blueprint, highlight the growth in Sydney Airport's usage over the next twenty years. The Feasibility Study states that the airport will require better access due to increased demand, but does not offer alternatives to road transport.

The fare structures of public transport options to the airport discourage public transport use while encouraging personal vehicle and taxi use. The price point of public transport needs to be such that the inconvenience of travelling with luggage is compensated and be cheaper than a taxi or self-drive options.

While the Airport Link offers an excellent, frequent, fast and convenient service it is not competitively priced. There is a Gate Pass added on top of the City Rail Fare. Airport train stations charge an Adult Single Gate Pass of \$11.80 compared to \$2.60 at Mascot and Green Square stations. There is only one STA bus route that services the Domestic and International Terminals (route 400 – Burwood to Bondi Junction), for an area with thousands of people coming to and from it every day of the week.

For two or more people it just isn't economical to use the Airport Link. It is even cheaper to park at the airport for 2 hours than for two people to take the Airport Link. For short trips, a taxi is cheaper than the train.

A frequent good value shuttle bus from Sydenham Station would greatly reduce the costs of public transport to the airport. It would introduce competition with the Airport Link and encourage competitive pricing for the Airport Link Gate Pass. A regular service would reduce travel time in many instances. Airport Link needs to encourage train use with a competitively priced Gate Pass or the Government needs to look at how effective this public/private partnership is in servicing the needs of airport and other road users with a view to reducing congestion.

SACL has been asking for a reduction on the price of the Gate Pass for some time, since there is growing traffic congestion at the terminals as well.

Tempe 2020 Submission

SACL has also been asking for a shuttle bus from Sydenham Station and it seems like a good idea because it could offer a cheaper alternative to the Airport Link and introduce competition. There are plans to introduce lifts for disability access at Sydenham Station, which would cater for those with luggage as well.

Sydenham Station has a catchment covering Bondi Junction, Waterfall, Cronulla, Liverpool, Lidcombe, Bankstown and City Circle connecting with the following train lines:

- Bankstown
- Eastern Suburbs and Illawarra
- Airport and East Hills

The cost of short trips to the Airport for more than one person is such that it encourages private transport use:

- Airport Link Erskineville to Domestic Terminal \$15.40
- City Rail Erskineville to Sydenham \$3.20
- Taxi Erskineville to Domestic Terminal \$15.00 or \$20.00
- Domestic Airport parking two hours \$21.00.

Longer trips on the M5 from Liverpool, for example, still encourage private transport:

- Airport Link Liverpool to Domestic Terminal \$17.20
- City Rail Liverpool to Sydenham \$5.40
- Taxi Liverpool to Domestic Terminal – More than \$50.00
- Domestic Airport parking two hours \$21.00.

A well-priced shuttle service would greatly reduce the cost of public transport to the airport and introduce competition to the overpriced Airport Link.

The Ministry of Transport and the RTA need to work with SACL, City Rail, Airport Link and Sydney Buses to encourage the use of competitively priced public transport options to the Airport to discourage private transport and reduce congestion on roads around the airport by:

- **Reducing the Airport Link Gate Pass price**
- **Introducing a shuttle from Sydenham Station**
- **Introduce new bus services.**

This kind of 'co-operative planning' would ensure that road usage around Sydney Airport would be significantly reduced, and the need for the Southern Sydney Connection Road would be redundant.

Active Transport, Bicycle and Walking Tracks

Bicycle and walking transport should also be integrated to cater for short to medium trips along the entire M5 Corridor. City of Sydney has a target of ten percent bicycle use by 2012. Bicycle and walking tracks must be developed with expert consultation to create paths which are world's best practice.

If the RTA set the same target as the City of Sydney of ten percent bicycle use, it would do as much to reduce traffic on General Holmes Drive as the whole Southern Sydney Connection proposes to do at a fraction of the cost. The reality is it takes more than stencilling the silhouette of a bicycle on a congested road to create an effective safe bicycle network.

Active Transport and the M5 Expansion Proposal

The fact that the M5 Expansion Proposal makes no provision for 'active transport' means it is out of step with community expectations and world's best practice, which requires all new transport proposals to seriously consider the development of active transport solutions.

While the M5 Transport Corridor Study cites active transport in the following manner:

"Identification of strategies and actions

- Increased active transport including bicycle usage
- Education and promotion of active transport modes
- Improvements to facilities.

Identification of Initiatives

Long list of initiatives

Public transport initiatives

- Increase active transport including bicycle usage. (Along) Full corridor
- Education and promotion of active transport modes
- Improve facilities at key centres."

The study then quickly drops active transport from all further investigation. We are disappointed at this dismissive approach to what has been proven in many international cities as a viable mass transport option. Not only is this lack of research on active transport disappointing, it shows a further lack of transparency and competency in the development of the proposal.

If Sydney sees itself as a truly global city, it is time for the RTA, the State Government and the residents of Sydney and NSW to admit that bicycling and active transport should no longer be considered as fringe or recreational options. Rather, they provide viable and cost effective measures to reduce traffic congestion.

Tempe 2020 Submission

Local Perspective

Tempe 2020 requests the following initiatives:

Walking and bicycle tracks should be separate from each other, safe from vehicle traffic, separate from vehicle traffic and feel pleasant to use.

Bicycle and Walking paths should include:

- From Tempe Reserve and Marsh St to Sydney Park and on to King St,
- To the newly opened \$1.8 million Bourke St cycle path and onto the announced Taylor Sq cycle hub.
- Access to Airport via Alexandra Canal footbridge
- Improved access to the Cooks Cove Development via Alexandria Canal and Giovanni Brunetti Bridge

Tempe 2020 requests that the RTA outsource an Independent study of Active Transport Options for the M5/F6 Corridors, to be conducted as part of the M5 Corridor Expansion proposal, to be undertaken by the most respected academics in this area of study. We also ask that any such study involves thorough community consultation. ALL opportunities to connect with established, planned and new bike and walking paths should be explored, with a view to reducing short/medium car trips and congestion, with particular attention paid to shopping, schools, recreation and work hubs.

4. Project Execution

M5 Tunnel Duplication and lack of stack filtration

The RTA's M5 Corridor Expansion Feasibility Study discusses tunnel ventilation at length, but does not mention tunnel filtration. On Saturday 6th March, the NSW Transport Minister announced the opening of the new filtration system for the westbound M5 East Tunnel, while admitting that there will be no filtration of the eastbound tunnel.

"The four-kilometre \$800 million tunnel was last year labelled the world's dirtiest, with nitrogen dioxide levels up to four times higher than comparable tunnels around the world. Now a study has found motorists are exposed to ultrafine particulate matter - one of the deadliest air pollutants - at levels 1000 times higher than in suburban streets." - Sydney Morning Herald, August 2009

Such findings render this tunnel dangerous to motorists, particularly those with conditions such as asthma and respiratory conditions, as well as residents living in close proximity to the tunnel's stacks. The RTA has a moral obligation to fix the current problem immediately by fast-tracking a filtration system for the eastbound tunnel before commencing any duplication of the tunnels. If the tunnels are duplicated without filtration, the risk to motorists and residents will be doubled, with catastrophic consequences.

Tempe 2020 Submission

When the NSW Government talks of Sydney as Australia's global city, it needs to back up the positive talk with positive action. To have one of Sydney's major motorway tunnels called "the world's dirtiest" does not reflect well on the NSW Government's manner of achieving a "global city".

Potential fast track delivery timetable and Environmental Assessment

The M5 Corridor Expansion Feasibility Study details a fast track delivery timetable, which allows for the Environmental Assessment to take place at the same time as investigation, design and construction planning. Tempe 2020 cannot understand how a road with "no status" can be the subject of an environmental assessment. At the RTA's Tempe Information Day held on 20 February, it was still mentioned that the EA would be prepared from late 2010.

This fast track option also states that the period between obtaining planning approval to commencing construction could be approximately 3 to 6 months. We question whether that allows for further community consultation after the project is approved. It has already taken three months for the RTA to provide sufficient information on the initial proposal to the Tempe community. This does not augur well for future information being passed on in a timely manner should this project be fast tracked.

The F6 Corridor and the M5 Expansion

By anyone's reckoning, the expansion of the M5 corridor cannot help but raise questions about the existing F6 Corridor, part of which will be used by the Southern Sydney Connection Road. As parts of the corridor no longer exist, and the remaining section has been unused for public or private transport use for nearly 50 years, it would appear that the NSW Government have no intention of utilising the corridor for its original intention.

Tempe 2020 would like to see the F6 corridor re-zoned in its entirety, as the NSW Government has held the affected residents in limbo for long enough.

5. Conclusion

Tempe 2020 as a group is of the opinion that the RTA's reasons for the Southern Sydney Connection Road are invalid, as they will not achieve their stated aims:

- It will not significantly reduce traffic on General Holmes Drive
- It will not service areas north of the airport effectively, as it will just bring large amounts of extra traffic into an already congested area
- It will not improve access to Sydney Airport; on the contrary, it will create another bottleneck onto Qantas Drive
- It will not provide an effective alternative route into the Alexandria/Mascot areas and the CBD, rather it will spew traffic into inevitable jams at Campbell Road and many surrounding suburbs

Tempe 2020 also believes that there are many problems with the indicative preferred option for the tunnel duplication of the M5, which has been chosen in a manner that does not reflect a serious and detailed examination of all other possible options, and in fact virtually excludes elements such as public transport, active transport, the potential of rail freight and the impact of the lack of tunnel filtration.

The snarl of motorways and their traffic will eventually engulf this city if unchecked, which is a scenario that will make Sydney a pariah amongst cities of comparable size. Transformation of the government's mindset from road building to effective public and rail freight transportation is of paramount importance.

The RTA needs to completely remove the Southern Sydney Connection Road from the equation once and for all, never to be revisited. It also needs to work closely with all other government agencies to completely overhaul its plans for the M5, in order to create an effective motorway that will not only service the needs of commuters and the country's freight, but will incorporate public and active transport to ensure Sydney's future as a healthy, sound and liveable city.

APPENDIX A

Discussion Paper regarding the process of the M5 Transport Corridor Feasibility Study and the development of the Indicative Preferred Option, and associated documentation

The close of submissions on March 12th marks 7 weeks since Tempe 2020 met with Gavin Hill from the Ministry of Transport and Cass Wilkinson from the Premier's Department on January 22, 2010. At that meeting, Tempe 2020 presented Gavin and Cass with letters addressed to Minister Campbell and Premier Keneally, along with a discussion paper on the M5 Transport Corridor Study Nov 09 and 3 points for clarification (see below).

At that meeting, Gavin Hill promised an answer within two weeks - that time has now lapsed by a further 5 weeks. The letter was addressed to Minister Campbell and Premier Keneally, and we expect a reply directly from the Minister and/or the Premier, not the RTA itself. Andrew Korous of the Ministry has indicated that the RTA and Ministry are still negotiating an answer. We are surprised how difficult it has become to get an answer.

We have made contact with the Ministry of Transport or the RTA regarding our still outstanding request on the following occasions:

January 12 Email Fiona Court RTA (copied to Gavin Hill and Cass Wilkinson)

February 10 Phone Call to Gavin Hill

February 10 Voice Mail left from Andrew Korous - "...we have received the response. My understanding is the RTA is still looking into the issues and we will be responding to you shortly..."

February 10 Message left with Ministry switch - No reply

February 11 Message left with Ministry switch - No reply

February 22 Email sent to the Ministry - No reply

It seems obvious that the RTA or the Ministry is stalling on the letter, and the Premiers Department is not following up on its delivery, or there is something very much amiss.

Tempe 2020 tables this discussion paper as part of our submission to the RTA and expects the issues will be researched and addressed as part of the community consultation. In the meantime, we still await an answer from Minister Campbell and Premier Keneally as a separate issue.

Tempe 2020 Submission

Cover Letter January 22

(same letter also to Minister Campbell on the same date)

Ms Kristina Keneally, MP. Premier
Level 40 Governor Macquarie Tower
1 Farrer Place
SYDNEY NSW 2000
22/1/10

Dear Premier,

Attached is a document we presented to a meeting at the Premiers Department on Friday 22 January 2010 to discuss the proposed southern Sydney connection.

It is a discussion paper on the process of the M5 Transport Corridor Feasibility Study and the development of the Indicative Preferred Option.

On page 7 there are 3 questions for further clarification in the light of this discussion paper.

A) How is the southern Sydney connection a legitimate refinement of the preferred strategic Option E? Is it not a NEW strategic option which has failed to undergo a legitimate feasibility study process?

B) Given that strategic option E has not seemed to met expectations as illustrated by the addition of the southern Sydney connection, Tempe 2020 asks why was Option D was not adopted as the next preferred strategic option?

C) When Indicative Preferred Option's REA is so poorly compared to Option D the question is raised why the study didn't recommend Option D or at least have given a Feasibility Assessment for a more detailed BCR?

Please contact me if you require clarification of the paper or questions.

We look forward to your reply so as to move forward and have meaningful negotiations with your department.

Luke Cutler
For Tempe 2020 group

Tempe 2020 Submission

TEMPE 2020

Meeting 22 Jan 2009 Premiers Department/ Transport Ministry

RE: M5 Transport Corridor Feasibility Study

Overview

After reading the \$15 million, 18 month, Federal and State government supported "M5 Transport Corridor Feasibility Study" the Tempe 2020 group have become very concerned :

- with *the process* in which the Indicative Preferred Option (IPO) has been developed,
- and the *ignoring of legitimate strategic* options which so clearly fulfil the study's objectives.
- that after 18 months and \$15 million, the M5 Transport Corridor Feasibility Study has *ignored its own findings* and produced an Indicative Preferred Option which has not been tested by its own criteria and processes.
- *that an IPO has been produced that is inferior* to all other strategic options on many grounds and has made a mockery of the study itself.

Tempe 2020 is shocked about the waste of Federal and State Government funding, and *wishes to clarify the decision making process* that has led to the adoption of the IPO.

Tempe 2020 also wish to *receive assurance that no duplicity has interfered with the due process*, and that the RTA has been transparent in presenting its Indicative Preferred Option as the result of an honest and fair feasibility study.

A) Refinement of preferred strategic option

While the southern Sydney connection may be called a "refinement" it must be noted:

- The estimated cost of Option E was 2 billion, with refinements the Indicative Preferred Option is now 4 Billion. The "refinement" has doubled the estimated cost of the preferred strategic option
- The "refinement" has added (say) 10 km of new arterial road, connections and Bourke Rd changes with the southern Sydney connection and a (say) 4 km westbound tunnel to General Holmes Drive all of which was not part of the Preferred Strategic Option (PSO) Option E or had even been previously mooted in the study. Effectively the "refinement" has at least added 14 km of roads to Option E.

Tempe 2020 Submission

- The southern Sydney connection are roads which were not on the Long List or Short List, have not been subject to a Strategic Merit Study, Preliminary Environmental Investigation, Multi Criteria Analysis or a Rapid Economic Appraisal with the same criteria as the other Strategic Options.

- The refinement of Option E has lowered the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of the Indicative Preferred Option (untolled) from 1.63 down to 1.10 - a reduction of 53 points. In fact, the Indicative Preferred Option has a lower BCR than ALL the strategic options (B 1.22, C 1.13, D 1.20 or E 1.63).

Given the above, it seems the Southern Sydney Connection is not a refinement of Option E but is effectively new and untested "strategic option" which has escaped the rigors of the \$15 million Feasibility Study.

The RTA has slipped the Southern Sydney Connection into the Feasibility Study alongside the other legitimately tested options.

How is the southern Sydney connection a legitimate refinement of the preferred strategic Option E? Is it not a NEW strategic option which has failed to undergo a legitimate feasibility study process?

B) Option D

As illustrated below, Option D has been highly appraised, economically, long-term increased traffic capacity, constructability and the highest benefits, and all within budget. Option D should be the second preferred Option before proposing a brand new road such as the southern Sydney connection.

Budget

The M5 corridor expansion Overview November 2009 states the estimated cost of the project to be \$4.5 billion which is *greater* than the estimated cost of Option D at \$4.39 billion.

Rapid Economic Analysis

Option D has:

- the second lowest Benefit Cost Ratio but by a whisker of only 2 points and would have been be equal second highest.
 - highest direct user benefits ahead by \$.4 to \$2.42 billion of all strategic options.
 - highest travel time savings ahead by \$.29 to \$2.92 billion all strategic options.
- Page 68

Option D (1.20) has a higher BCR than the Indicative Preferred Option (1.10 untolled) by 10 points.

Traffic Modelling

Of all the strategic options both D and C were the only options which would be operating under or near capacity in 2026. All other strategic options were over capacity for at least some peak periods by 2026.

Multi-criteria analysis (MCA) of strategic options

Option D passed the MCA - "The MCA demonstrates that Options B, C, D and E can be taken forward for further assessment", page 66.

Option D and C are NOT considered too difficult to achieve and the problems; "changes to the water table in the area increases the potential risk of ground settlement over the tunnel" are not considered insurmountable.

Comparative appraisal

Option D - "The option provides the highest benefits as it provides direct link to the CBD. The high cost of this option balances the benefits resulting in the second lowest BCR. This option, similar to Option C, significantly increases the road capacity of the corridor. Utilisation of this capacity is nominally higher than Option C as it provides a connection to the CBD, although traffic flows would be constrained by the capacity of the corridor west of Bexley Road." Page 68

Given that strategic option E has not seemed to meet expectations as illustrated by the addition of the southern Sydney connection, Tempe 2020 asks why was Option D was not adopted as the next preferred strategic option?

C) Comparison of Rapid Economic Appraisal with the IPO and Option D

Options	REA	
Option D	BCR	1.2
	Est. Capital Cost	4.39 B
	Direct User Benefits	4.79 B
Indicative Preferred Option	BCR	1.1
(Untolled)	Est. Capital Cost	4 B
	Direct User Benefits	4.018 B

See pages 68 and 77

Benefit Cost Ratio

Option D (1.20) has a higher BCR than the Indicative Preferred Option Untolled (1.10) by 10 points.

Estimated Capital Cost

Option D is \$390 million more than the Indicative Preferred Option (Untolled)

Direct User Benefits

Option D has \$772 million more in Direct User Benefits than Indicative Preferred Option (Untolled)

It seems the higher cost of Option D (\$390 million) is balanced by a much higher Direct User Benefit (\$772 million) and a higher BCR..

Given Option D has a higher BCR and has much higher Direct User Benefits than the Indicative Preferred Option it is inconceivable that Option D hasn't been considered for recommendation by the Study for Feasibility Assessment.

When Indicative Preferred Option's REA is so poorly compared to Option D the question is raised why the study didn't recommend Option D or at least have given a Feasibility Assessment for a more detailed BCR?

Note: Only the Rapid Economic Appraisal can be compared as Option D has been denied a full Feasibility Assessment.

Summary

1) The extraordinary differences between the "preferred strategic option: Option E" and the "Indicative Preferred Option" where Option E emerges virtually unrecognisable and can only be described as a "new strategic option". The Indicative Preferred Option is no more "Option E refined" than any of the other Options D, C or B.

2) The lack of due process in the study is of concern. The "southern Sydney connection" was introduced at the final stage during refinement without a Strategic Merit Study, Preliminary Environmental Investigation, Multi Criteria Analysis or a Rapid Economic Appraisal (with the same criteria as the other Strategic Options).

3) The study chose Option E as the preferred strategic option largely because the REA showed it had an exceptionally high Benefit Cost Ratio of 1.63. In the refinement process the BCR was reduced by 56 points as untolled roads to a BCR of 1.10. In all fairness the Indicative Preferred Option would never have been chosen from the REA as the "preferred strategic option" as it has the lowest BCR of ALL options in the study.

4) When Option E did not meet expectations the other strategic options D, C and B which have passed all the due processes of the feasibility study have not been considered as the "preferred strategic option" or refined to become the Indicative Preferred Option.

5) The Indicative Preferred Option is clearly inferior to strategic option D and C on most grounds.

Request for Clarification

Tempe 2020 asks the Premiers Department and Transport Ministry to clarify the following questions in the light of this discussion paper.

A) How is the Southern Sydney Connection a legitimate refinement of the preferred strategic Option E? Is it not a NEW strategic option which has failed to undergo a legitimate feasibility study process?

B) Given that strategic option E has not seemed to met expectations as illustrated by the addition of the southern Sydney connection, Tempe 2020 asks why was Option D was not adopted as the next preferred strategic option?

C) When Indicative Preferred Option's REA is so poorly compared to Option D the question is raised why the study didn't recommend Option D or at least have given a Feasibility Assessment for a more detailed BCR?

Jan 21 2009