



# National Freight Network Strategy

Concepts discussion overview  
July, 2010

# Welcome

## Y Purpose:

- **inform about background & concepts**
- **your reaction on issues, concepts & what next**

# Background

## ÿ Who are we?

- **advisers** to Infrastructure Australia & National Transport Commission

## ÿ What are we doing?

- national freight network strategy / plan
- bedrock for national transport

## ÿ Next:

- process to date
- freight today
- themes from consultation
- other issues



# B1: Our process to date

- ÿ **Research**
- ÿ **Concepts**
- ÿ **Consultation**
- ÿ **Reality check rail**

## B2: Freight today

- **Infrastructure is shared**
  - with personal transport
  - priority not priced
- **Reflects market response to land & transport planning**
- **Essential for productivity**
  - perceptions?
- **Different tasks & issues** 
  - complexity

Task example	Issue example
High volume minerals	Export capacity & access regime
Low density / seasonal rural	Fit for purpose infrastructure
Long distance line haul general freight	Seamlessness & safety
Urban & distribution	Reliability & amenity

## B3: Themes from consultation to date

### Y Most say they would like some national freight network

- inclusive of ports
- different ideas as what it should be
- historical context?

### Y Concerns about such a network:

- being left off network / no say / ad hoc decisions
- city & land planning / state freight plans
- road or rail / community impacts
- freight “priority”
- **can it be done?**

## B4: Other issues (where from)

### Y Complexity & inertia

- more complex = more analysis = slower start
- incremental approach is best until?

### Y Transport growth?

- on shared infrastructure where priority is not priced (growth forecasts)

### Y Identification of long term needs?

- a need to preserve options? (only funded projects announced)

### Y Net additions to economy and community?

- demonstrate best safety, amenity (winners & losers)
- productivity improvement (project identification)
- funding (revenue not related to future need)

## **B5: Your issues**

- Y** Do we understand
  - the themes?
  - the issues?



# Response themes: Concepts

- ÿ What problems are being solved?
- ÿ What ideas do we have
- ÿ The ideas and what's wrong with them
- ÿ Are there other ideas?

# C1: What problems would a national freight network help solve?

## Y What is a network?

- infrastructure to enable move from “A” to “B”
- interconnected, interoperable, intermodal (seamless)

## Y What is a freight network?

- infrastructure used to move freight?
- **or** infrastructure with freight in mind / “priority”?

## Y A network answers only some transport problems

- connectivity

## C2: A national freight network might help?

### Y National freight connectivity problems

- absolute need probably limited (much freight is local)
- ability to help would be limited (a national network is limited)
- but connectivity might help? (keep options open?)

AND

### Y A focal point for national attention to freight?

- 20 year view differs from 5 year view
- adequate identification of long term needs
- cross govt engagement & coherence
- a place for freight to have a say

# C3: Our approach: simple 2 step policy

## For strategy:

1. agree national ambition
2. advance towards this

**to allow progress to ambition, not debate \$**

## For projects:

1. identify volume when project needed
2. forecast when that volume might occur

**to allow preservation of options**

## For decision making:

1. advice
2. decisions

**adviser independent of decision maker**

## C4: looking back and forward: examples

Field	Last 20 years or so	In play
<b>Trucks used</b>	B doubles	HPV trials on a limited network
<b>Truck payments</b>	Heavy vehicle rego & excise	Direct road charging
<b>Roads</b>	National highways, motorways	Further upgrades
<b>Freight trains</b>	Longer trains, privatisation	QR privatisation
<b>Rail network</b>	Vertical separation, DIRN, Melbourne-Adelaide gauge	Southern Sydney Freight Line Advanced train control systems
<b>Freight nodes</b>	Individual terminals, DCs	Government identification of lands
<b>General policy</b>	National competition policy	City planning
<b>Organisations</b>	ARTC, NRTC-NTC	-
<b>Advisers</b>	NRTC-NTC, NTS	Infrastructure Australia, NTC
<b>“Programs”</b>	National highways / Auslink	Nation Building

# C5: Ideas

## Not rebranding

- . Additive
- . Options to improve
- . Not requiring congestion pricing

1. national, freight, network
2. 20 year plan: operations for economic & social aims
3. infrastructure pipeline
4. customer involvement
5. access and improvement regime

## C5: Results of ideas

### Results:

1. **Seamless** network for line haul general freight
2. **Interconnected** to major settlements' ports
3. **Interoperable** at efficient general freight vehicle sizes
4. **Need** positive impact on **safety, amenity, sustainability**

### Whats wrong?

- ÿ The need for a seamless network eg. to ports?
- ÿ Mixed use of infrastructure
- ÿ Very limited routes
- ÿ Large vehicles not wanted
- ÿ Could be interpreted as commit government \$

## C6: Results of ideas

### Results:

5. Long term “planning” on cross modal basis
- 6 Direct charges & “priority”
7. Rights of connection from State strategic zones

### Whats wrong?

- Ÿ Who does the planning?
- Ÿ Road charges: for capacity? timing? grants?
- Ÿ “Priority” does not currently exist for roads
- Ÿ “Priority” may cause community concern or conflict with current directions



## C7: Results of ideas

### Results:

8. **Transparent** data, decision making
9. **Progress measured** & publicly reported

### Whats wrong?

- ÿ Currently data is a “real problem”
  - impact on ability to do plan?
- ÿ Decisions on infrastructure not (just) about freight
- ÿ Decisions made by different governments
- ÿ Bureaucracy

# Potential actions: Other results of ideas

## Results:

- Y Consistent with ports strategy
- Y Maps of future and current network
- Y Pipeline freight infrastructure program
  - options protected now eg. precincts, corridors, gradients
- Y Publication of State strategy documents
- Y Customers influence decisions & timing of improvement

## Problems:

- Y “Interfaces” & management (but note ARTC experience)?
- Y Need for port traffic interoperability?
- Y Project identification encourages speculation?
- Y Inconsistencies in positions highlighted
- Y Customer expectations too high

# What next?

- ÿ Other ideas?
- ÿ Where to?

# W1: Are there other ideas?

- ÿ Do they lead to long term plan / preservation of options?
- ÿ How do they relate to road charging?
- ÿ Is freight limited by government funding?
- ÿ Do they untangle regulatory from engineering issues?
- ÿ Improving safety, amenity and sustainability?
- ÿ Is there a national freight network?
- ÿ Who is being relied on to deliver?

## W2: what next

- ÿ Draft paper for Council
  - including recommendations
- ÿ Public consultation draft
- ÿ Intend to governments by end 2010
- ÿ Infrastructure Australia/ NTC can initiate
- ÿ **But customers must drive reform**
  
- ÿ **Thank you for your patience & help.**