



**AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED**

ACN 110 028 825

**T:** 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

**E:** [clientservices@auscript.com.au](mailto:clientservices@auscript.com.au)

**W:** [www.auscript.com.au](http://www.auscript.com.au)

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

---

O/N H-1043856

**INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MEETING WITH ROAD AND MARITIME SERVICES**

**RE: MOOREBANK INTERMODAL WEST CONCEPT PLAN  
AND STAGE 1 MOD 1**

**MOOREBANK INTERMODAL PRECINCT WEST STAGE 2**

**PANEL: DIANNE LEESON  
ALAN COUTTS**

**ASSISTING PANEL: DAVID WAY**

**ROAD AND  
MARITIME  
SERVICES: COLIN LANGFORD  
RACHEL CUMMING  
MALGY COMAN**

**LOCATION: IPC OFFICES  
LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET  
SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES**

**DATE: 1.04 PM, TUESDAY, 2 JULY 2019**

## THIS PROCEEDING WAS CONDUCTED BY TELEPHONE CONFERENCE

MS D. LEESON: All right. Good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin, I  
5 would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, the  
Gadigal People. I would also like to pay my respects to their elders past and present  
and to the elders from other communities who may be present today. Welcome to  
the meeting. SIMTA the applicant is seeking to amend the concept plan and  
undertake construction of stage 2 of the Moorebank Intermodal Facility West in the  
10 Liverpool City Council area.

My name is Dianne Leeson. I'm the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me is my  
fellow Commissioner Allan Coutts as well as David Way from the Commission  
Secretariat. Due to a scheduling conflict, John Hann is unable to attend this  
15 afternoon. John will review the transcript of this morning's meeting and, should he  
have any additional questions, he will provide them to the Commission Secretariat to  
follow up with RMS.

In the interest of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of  
20 information, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced  
and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the  
Commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of  
the process and will form one of several sources of information upon what the – upon  
which the Commission will base its decision.

25 It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify  
issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you're asked a question and are not in  
a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any  
additional information in writing which we'll then put up on our website. Um, I  
30 would ask that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the  
first time. That's very important to help with the transcription, particularly as it's  
over a telephone conference call, um, and therefore, the ability to sort of, ah – or,  
sorry, the request to not speak, ah, over the top of each other if you can at all avoid it.  
So we will now begin. Um. Thank you again. You have an agenda at your end, I  
35 believe – I hope.

MR C. LANGFORD: Yeah – yes, we do.

MS LEESON: Terrific. So we've been through the opening – through the  
40 introductions and the opening statement. What we'd like you to do, I think, is give a  
high-level overview of RMS', um, analysis or comments on the project and any  
comments you have to make about the submission as it was put forward. That will  
probably open it up for some questions from us, um, around the applicant's proposal,  
the department's assessment and, um, it'll probably close the meeting out for us. So  
45 if – if I can hand to – I'm not sure who it is. You, Colin, or Rachel or Malgy?

MR LANGFORD: Yeah. Yeah, Di, I'm – I'm happy to, sort of, take the lead.

MS LEESON: Thanks. Thanks, Colin. So - - -

5 MR LANGFORD: Okay. Um, sorry - - -

MS LEESON: Some comments.

10 MR LANGFORD: For the record, um – oh. So, yeah, for the record – so Colin Langford. I'm, ah, Roads & Maritime's director of the northwest precinct, and I guess, um, I've been leading, um, the interactions with the proponents, with MIC and Qube for the intermodal terminal, um, for a number of years since – predating the, um, concept plan agreement. So more than five years. So I think I'm, yeah, well placed to be able to sort of give you the overview. So during the – the – the  
15 development pro – proposal, um, we've been working with, um – in the beginning, it was – it was two separate proponents for the Moorebank Intermodal Precinct East and Moorebank Intermodal Precinct West where we're dealing with, um, Qube entities for the eastern precinct and MIC, the Commonwealth arm for the western precinct.

20

MS LEESON: Yep.

MR LANGFORD: Um, so they both were running separate parallel, sort of, planning processes both through the state and federal system. Um, so we need to go,  
25 um – they combined under a joint venture and so, essentially, Qube is the developer and operator of the 99-year lease on behalf of – of MIC. Um, so during that time, it's a – it's a large-scale development. It's a – as a – I'm – I'm sure I don't have to tell you what the intermodal is itself. It's, essentially, a – a shuttle service between Port Botany, um – train shuttle service from Port Botany in – in Moorebank. Um, but the  
30 overarching concept plan does include over half a million TEUs per annum over interstate at the future – future state of the development.

Um, so with that, we – we're training containers into the precinct, and that creates a large number of truck movements where those containers will be, then, distributed to  
35 the border parts of Sydney generally into the – the western parts of Sydney. So to try and ascertain, I guess, the, um – the development impact and potential mitigation measures as part of that process, um, we jointly, um, between the three parties, um, we, as in, RMS led the development of a – of a broad ranging, um, traffic study that covered off the – the broader Liverpool and Moorebank precincts, and that - - -

40

MS LEESON: So – so sorry to interrupt, Colin.

MR LANGFORD: - - - that – yep.

45 MS LEESON: So – ah, just – just - - -

MR LANGFORD: Yep. You're all right, Di.

MS LEESON: Sorry to interrupt. Um, so if I clarify, is it – that take it sort of up to, um, Newbridge Road – um, we've seen some diagrams within the assessment report and what have you which describes the network, I suppose – the regional network. That was – was that agreed between you and – and the proponent?

5

MR LANGFORD: Yes, it was.

MS LEESON: Okay.

10 MR LANGFORD: And it – and it – and it – and it extended, essentially, from the Georges River, um, in the north. It included right up to, um, essentially, Cumberland Highway, Hume Highway take-off up at, um, Macquar – Macquarie Government Drive. Um, west, um – west of the Hume Highway and south, um, down to the crossroads, but it was a – it was a very large study area because we had to ascertain

15 the – the regional impacts of this development, and it is a very, um, constrained, complex part of the network where you have – potentially, you've got the M1 Hume Motorway, um, got the Hume Highway through there to Liverpool. Got Cumberland Highway to the north. Um, M5 Motorway which is, I guess, our – the – the main – main connection east, west connection through to Sydney.

20

Um, so you've got this confluence of all these major roads on the doorstep of Moorebank Avenue, um, where the – where the proponent site is. So this study was quite broad ranging. From that, as we move onto, um, the specific, um, Stage 2 West development proposal, um, clause in the LEP requires satisfactory arrangements to

25 be put in place. And so RMS led the – the discussions and – and, I guess, assessment process with the proponent, um, for the whole – whole state government, both transport and – and with planning – Department of Planning's help in trying to develop up a rea – a reasonable contribution framework to offset those impacts at a – from a reasonable infrastructure point of view.

30

Um, you'd note there – you might have a copy in the – of the information you've got of a letter that we provided to – to Qube back around May last year, May 2018, that – that describes RMS' approach to, I guess, quantifying a contribution package around that – that modelling platform. And from that, we then further articulated that and

35 worked up a voluntary planning agreement that sets out what we think is a fair and reasonable contribution to be paid for by – by the development, by Qube, that would satisfy that LEP requirement for the .....

30

MS LEESON: Oh – yeah.

40

MR LANGFORD: So – so, Di, I don't – if you'd like me to go into the specifics  
- - -

MS LEESON: Well, there's – there'll be a couple of things around the VPA. Um, we note that on the Moore park – oh, I keep calling it Moore park – Moorebank East Stage 2 application, it was, um, approved with, um, a requirement for regional upgrades to be in place by 2022. That seems to have been overtaken by the VPA

45

and, now, responsibility for delivery of the various elements will be a matter for RMS. I think our question is around RMS' view of the timeliness of those upgrades and whether they're, perhaps, in RMS' program to start delivering. So, in a nutshell, is there a threshold point at which you need those upgrades in place, and with the  
5 proponent making a contribution to those, is there a subsequent commitment from RMS to deliver?

MR LANGFORD: Ah, so – so – okay. So I'll just unpack that. There's a couple of  
10 – couple of questions in that.

MS LEESON: Yep.

MR LANGFORD: So those – the – the VPA, um, doesn't take – doesn't replace the  
15 requirement under the Moorebank Precinct East conditions of approval under the Stage 2 East conditions of approval. Um, Moorebank or Qube has to develop a work, um – deliver works in kind which includes upgrades to the existing Moorebank Avenue, um, and Anzac Avenue intersection, and then upgrades to Moorebank Avenue around the interchange with the M5 Motorway, and also some  
20 small intersection upgrades up towards Northbridge – um, Northbridge Avenue and, um – and Terminus Street. So, um – and oh, Heathcote Road. So those – those requirement – there's works requirements under – under the east approval, Stage 2 East, are still – are still required to be delivered by Qube.

In addition to that, when you add in Moorebank Precinct – West Precinct, um, that's  
25 where the – the requirements of the VPA come in – come into place. Ah, the only thing the VPA does do is when we've finalised the – the – I guess, the portion – or contribution framework we – through the VPA that we did take on a holistic view of the whole precinct. So both east and west – excuse me. Both east and west  
30 combined and the accumulated traffic impacts of the combined precinct in its ultimate, sort of, operating fashion. So – so east is, sort of, still separate to some extent in delivering those conditions of approval, and – but west is, I guess, the finalised package of works of the whole combined precinct when it's fully operational.

35 MS LEESON: Right.

MR LANGFORD: Under the – under the VP – under the VP – so – so they've still  
got to do those works under ..... conditions for east. For – for west and what's –  
40 what's, um, detailed in the voluntary planning agreement that we signed back in March, I think it was, um, there's – there's sort of two main components of that VPA. There is the, ah, realignment of Moorebank Avenue around the precinct on the eastern side of the precinct, and that's generally to accommodate their future, sort of, automated container movements between the two precincts. So the existing Moorebank Avenue runs straight between the middle of two sites or the two  
45 precincts, and they're proposing to build a new four-lane road around that eastern perimeter of the – of the precinct. Therefore to accommodate their – their operations within the combined site.

So that's – now, that is subject to a separate planning approval that will – will get developed. And we've put timelines in the VPA about when those works are to be delivered by. Should planning approval not be granted for whatever reason, sort of, maybe if there is fauna and issues out there that we know of, community and  
5 everything else, that before that can be – if that doesn't get approval, then that's – they revert back and they have to upgrade the existing Moorebank Avenue, between, essentially, the top of their site and south to just shy of the East Hills railway line, to four lanes. So the traffic modelling showed that ultimately we need four lanes of through traffic through – through the precinct, so it's either – either go around or it  
10 will be upgrading and go through the middle still.

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR LANGFORD: The other component of the – the only other – the other  
15 component of the VPA is a – is a monetary contribution to those broader regional impacts, so regional infrastructure. We've – we've agreed that \$48 million is a fair and reasonable component to be delivered by Qube. That was based on their – their traffic impact or generating – traffic generation in the broader context of the whole Liverpool/Moorebank precinct. And that's what's referenced in that letter back in  
20 last year, around how those calculations were – were based on the modelling results for that was completed.

MS LEESON: Okay. I'm not sure that I've seen the letter. We have a copy of the draft VPA, but we will track down that letter.  
25

MR D. WAY: We will track down that letter, yes.

MS LEESON: So David might - - -

30 MR LANGFORD: Yes. We – and we can give you a copy.

MS LEESON: If you could provide that, that would be terrific.

MR LANGFORD: Yes. David, we'll – I'll get – I'll get Rachael to send you the  
35 letter – the letter tomorrow.

MR WAY: Thank you very much.

MS LEESON: Okay.  
40

MR LANGFORD: So it's dated the 8<sup>th</sup> of May 2018. And it sort of sets out ..... it bookends different ways to apportion the – from the model to apportion Qube's, sort of, traffic component of that, and ways to then put that into a monetary figure.

45 MS LEESON: Thank you. Thanks. If, in sending that through, you could also send through a simple summary of what physical works Qube will – SIMTA or Qube will do as part of Moorebank East Stage 2, what they are proposed to do under this

Moorebank West Stage 2, and what RMS will do in the broader – or – sorry. What's RMSs work in the broader regional network that's not part of those. I'm just trying to line up, for clarity, what network upgrades will be undertaken by Qube and what they will be making a contribution to RMS to actually undertake, and now be clear  
5 that RMS is comfortable that all of those works will be done in a timely fashion, so that by the time Moorebank West Stage 2 is on foot, the traffic measures are in place – what's the threshold point for RMS.

MR LANGFORD: Yep. Yep. So – so yep. We can – we can provide that.  
10 Malgy's got all that information.

MS LEESON: Yep.

MR LANGFORD: But just to – to, sort of, give you a bit of a lens on that, so we're  
15 comfortable that the contributions from – from Qube and MIC are fair and reasonable from – from their impact, but, more generally, this is already an existing constrained part of the network, so it would be unreasonable to expect, even, Moorebank to – to – to fix all of the existing or future growth problems out there.

20 MS LEESON: Yeah. Sorry, I didn't mean to - - -

MR LANGFORD: So - - -

MS LEESON: - - - suggest that they should be doing more than their development  
25 contributes to.

MR LANGFORD: No, no, no, no, no, no.

MS LEESON: No.  
30

MR LANGFORD: I – yeah, don't worry. I understand that.

MS LEESON: Thanks.

35 MR LANGFORD: But that's to try and give you a sense of where we're coming from, so – so as part of – RMS has led, sort of, broader investigation – we developed up a long-term strategy for – for future improvements to the network around Liverpool and Moorebank.

40 MS LEESON: Okay.

MR LANGFORD: Short to medium-term priorities were flagged as improvements around the M5 Motorway between Moorebank Avenue and the Hume Highway.

45 MS LEESON: Mmhmm.

MR LANGFORD: Which is, ah, the bridge crossing over the Georges River, and in the south ..... upgrades to Cambridge Avenue, which would link – link back through Greenfield to – to, um, Campbelltown Road and the – and the Hume – Hume Motorway.

5

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR LANGFORD: We – as in, we – RMS is currently progressing planning a business case for both of those projects, but as part of this process, there is no commitment from the New South Wales Government to deliver those works. And that's something I can't – I can't fetter the rights of government to make an investment decision in the future.

10

MS LEESON: Understand.

15

MR LANGFORD: And what we have – so what the VPA does do is this \$48 million contribution, monetary contribution, is targeted for upgrades within – within the – the Liverpool/Moorebank precinct, but there is no obligation of time in to be spent or which works will be delivered as part of that.

20

MS LEESON: Thanks. Just a couple of other things. Maybe if we can just close out on the operational aspect, when we met with the community last week or the week before, we got some quite detailed commentary and presentation around the traffic analysis. There's someone there who seems to have done a lot of – lot of modelling themselves. A number of times, some issues came up around B-triples using the site. Can you explain to us what the arrangements are around B-triples accessing Sydney and whether they will be able to use the Moorebank site or not?

25

MR LANGFORD: Um, yep. So, um, am I the only – might need to take this on notice, but my understanding is that there is no B-triple access into Sydney at the moment. We have a few isolated areas where we're running, um, larger than 30-metre, sort of, um, PBS vehicles within Port Botany itself, you know, around – around, um ..... Foreshore Road. But there is no B-triple access, sort of, beyond Campbelltown from the south. That doesn't actually exist at the moment.

35

MS LEESON: Okay. If - - -

MR LANGFORD: So as part of our – as - - -

40

MS LEESON: If you – if you need to confirm that, feel free.

MR LANGFORD: Yeah, and I will confirm that.

MS LEESON: Yeah.

45

MR LANGFORD: As part of our planning for the works, though, we – we do look to provide – so the intersection layouts to – to accommodate those future growth



vehicles, those future larger – larger vehicles, but, um – but there have been no – I’m not aware of any talk around B-triples.

5 MS LEESON: Okay. Thanks. And just on that, um – your strategy for the network – and you talk about the M5 between, say, Moorebank Avenue and I think you said the Hume Highway. We also heard a lot of concern around a weave movement which I understood to be as – as vehicles left the Moorebank Avenue site heading west, there was a complicated weave move in a fairly short space of time. Is that something that would be addressed as part of the project you’re looking at?

10 MR LANGFORD: Yeah. So that is - - -

MS LEESON: Or - - -

15 MR LANGFORD: - - - that is the project that we’re currently, um, yeah, doing some early planning work on.

MS LEESON: Okay. Okay.

20 MR LANGFORD: And it’s – and it’s called - - -

MS LEESON: Thanks.

MR LANGFORD: Yep. And it’s called the M5 Westbound Weave Project.

25 MS LEESON: That’s a - - -

MR LANGFORD: So, um, yes. But - - -

30 MS LEESON: That’s a very imaginative name and that’s very clear.

MR LANGFORD: That - - -

MS LEESON: Thanks.

35 MR LANGFORD: Yeah. So that’s, um, exactly what we’re currently – we have – we have planning money at the moment to progress to a business case for that – for that project.

40 MS LEESON: Okay. Okay. My only other question – and, um, perhaps, ah, Alan might have some, I think – is around the construction traffic. From the report that we’ve got in front of us, it looks like the Moorebank Stage 2 East construction period wasn’t modelled in the overall traffic construction traffic analysis, and that may well be a timing issue; I’m not sure, but, um, are you – do you know whether it was a  
45 timing issue, or are you happy that the modelling excluded the Moorebank East Stage 2 construction period?

MR LANGFORD: Um, so I think this is part of the challenge that we've had with both precincts having separate planning pathways. So – but they – the – the – and maybe, Malgy, you can answer this – but my understanding is that, ah, the specific construction impact modelling that they did for West Stage 2 did consider the  
5 accumulative impacts of – of east and the – and at what staging they would be up to, um, as this gets – as west gets progressed while East is – is potentially operational or partly operational.

MS M. COMAN: Colin, do you mind if we take this one on notice?  
10

MR LANGFORD: Yeah. No, that's fine. No, you – yep.

MS LEESON: Yeah. If you could have a quick look at – I mean, we were out there for a site visit the other week, and Moorebank East does look like at least the  
15 imputation of fuel is largely complete, but if you can have a look at that and come back to us, that would be appreciated.

MR LANGFORD: Yep. Will do.

MS LEESON: Okay. And then in – associated with that, there was a question the – the proponent has indicated they'd like to work until 10 o'clock at night using – to haul fill into the site. Does RMS have any particular views around the merits of enabling fill to come in into the evening?

MR LANGFORD: Malgy, can you remember if this one was – was brought up during the discussions?  
25

MS COMAN: I have to go through some of my notes, so I might need to take that one on notice as well.  
30

MS LEESON: Thank you. I mean, the department is not looking to approve the 10 o'clock timeframe at this moment, but they have indicated they would consider a subsequent application to – to do that, so it's not on foot at the moment, but it's just something I thought I would ask, seeing as we had the opportunity.  
35

MR A. COUTTS: Yeah, Colin - - -

MR LANGFORD: Yeah, no. Um - - -

MR COUTTS: Alan – Colin, Alan Coutts here. I mean, in the discussions we had with the proponent – because we've specifically raised this question with them because in their – their plans they had operations until 10 o'clock in the evening and their argument was that – in fact, I think their argument was that RMS saw some benefit because they weren't having truck operations in peak hour, morning and –  
40 morning and evening peak hours. So by allowing them to go to 10 o'clock, um, it enable them to have truck movements happening outside those peak hour periods.  
45 Now, the department's view is they – they've recommended, ah, just a normal 9 to 5

or whatever it is hours, and Qube putting a case to them separately with some arguments as to why they should vary those hours. So I guess we were just trying to weigh up the – the benefits of going along with what Qube/SIMTA were suggesting or whether just sticking to what, ah, the department is putting forward. So - - -

5

MR LANGFORD: Yeah. So, Alan, would - - -

MR COUTTS: So we – so we'd be – so we'd be – we'd be interested in what your, ah – your views are, ah, on that.

10

MR LANGFORD: Yeah. Alan, so, I guess, my – my quick thoughts are – and – and we'll – we'll come back if we've got any further information, um, that's been discussed previously, but from a – from a network operation point of view, um, if I can avoid extra truck movements in the peak period, um, I think, obviously, that would be a – would be beneficial for the overarching network.

15

MR COUTTS: Yep.

MR LANGFORD: I would have thought, given the adjoining residents in – in Wattle Grove, though, the additional hours and noise would be – would be a big concern, and – and – and safety of vehicles exiting – exiting or entering the site, um, of a night. Now, if it's through very signalised intersection movements, then that's probably reasonable. Um, you – you certainly wouldn't want increased truck – uncontrolled truck movements of a night if you could avoid it.

25

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MS LEESON: All right.

30

MR COUTTS: Okay.

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR COUTTS: The only other question I had for you is that at the public meeting and, I think, in the submissions that came as part of this exercise, there has been a fair amount of criticism around, ah, the traffic modelling. In fact, we had a couple, ah, supposed expert traffic modellers who were suggesting that, you know, their traffic modelling was quite different to what the – the company was putting out and expressing a concern, I guess, that RMSs modelling wasn't being made available. I mean, do you have a comment, first – firstly, I suppose, on your confidence levels around the traffic modelling, and (b) - - -

40

MR LANGFORD: Ah, yep.

45

MR COUTTS: And (b) – and (b) is there a policy issue for you at RMS that you don't make your traffic modelling available?

MR LANGFORD: Ah, yep. So – so, Alan, yep. So – so first point. Um, I am extremely confident with the – the broader Moorebank/Liverpool modelling we did is – is – is the best example we're going to get. Um, I think there's also – should be very mindful that modelling is a tool. It's by no means the be all and end all. It's not  
5 black and white.

MR COUTTS: Yep.

MR LANGFORD: But it's a – it's a very good tool to – to base our forecast on and  
10 – and – and relevant impacts assessment. So I'm – we had had that modelling peer reviewed by – by three separate organisations because, um, back in the day, both SIMTA, MIC and ourselves, um, were reliant on agreeing the upfront, um, traffic generation forecasts from the two operations, and – and the – and, obviously, agreed that it was – there's an accumulative impact there from both precincts, and we should  
15 be looking at it as a whole precinct impact, not – not individually. Um, and that's why RMS actually took the lead and developed the model over a – over an extensive period of time, and that – that model's – and not only peer reviewed by both of the organisations, but also, um, we had it separately peer review, um, as – as – for ourselves. Um, so I'm – I'm – I'm more than confident that the modelling is –  
20 represents best – best, sort of, scenarios that we're going to develop.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MS LEESON: Thank you.  
25

MR LANGFORD: Um, the – the – the – and probably by saying that, I do know those – the two community people that do have modelling background. Um, they – the – the – we – we provided the – our model to Liverpool Council, um, with conditions. Um, but one of the reasons – to your second point, Alan, around – we  
30 don't provide an extremely detailed, um – and this is a mesoscopic model to the public because unless you're a modelling expert and understand the – the way it was developed, then it's a bit meaningless anyway. Yeah, you're far better off in reading the – the – the actual associated traffic report – modelling report that comes out of that model. So we don't generally provide models to – to individuals. Um, but for  
35 broader planning purposes around Liverpool, we did provide it, um, under confidentiality to Liverpool to – to use for their – their broader planning for Liverpool Council.

MR COUTTS: Yeah. I mean, Liverpool Council doesn't seem to be particularly  
40 happy with – with this project in particular, but – I – I – I gather just with traffic impact generally in the area, I mean, do you have an observation on that or not?

MR LANGFORD: Ah, so – so RMS supported Greater Sydney Commission and Planning in Liverpool through the collaboration investigation. So Liverpool  
45 collaboration area in the last couple of years, and – and – through that process, I am confident we worked up a sort of medium to long-term strategy to – to keep the

transport network working in and around Liverpool over the – over the – over the – the forward growth, sort of, 10, 20 years.

MR COUTTS: Right.

5

MR LANGFORD: So – so I – I – I think we – we do have a – a – a logical plan to – to upgrade the network over – over the – over the coming years - - -

MR COUTTS: Yeah.

10

MR LANGFORD: - - - to – to keep network performance satisfactory.

MR COUTTS: Yep. And – and whilst I understand, ah, that you need to put business cases together for these network improvements, and what – can I assume that the network improvements we're talking about and your modelling going forward for that area would be within the framework of what your budget generally would be? These – these wouldn't be something that you will have to seek additional funding over and above your normal network activities?

MR LANGFORD: Ah, Al – Alan, um, we obviously have a – a forward 10-year program.

MR COUTTS: Yep.

MR LANGFORD: Um, capital – capital ..... um, the – couple of these projects are, I guess – but it's ..... within that forward program.

MR COUTTS: Yep.

MR LANGFORD: But, again, it's – it's subject to the government investment decision in the future.

MR COUTTS: Yeah. No, I – I understand. I'm just – I suppose I'm just trying to get a bit of a sense in terms of – you know, this sits within the framework of what you would expect to be not ..... improvements out of that area.

35

MR LANGFORD: Ah, definitely.

MR COUTTS: Yeah.

40

MR LANGFORD: Definitely.

MR COUTTS: Yep. Okay. Thanks, Colin, and I don't have any more questions for you.

45

MS LEESON: Okay. No, I don't think I have any other questions either. David, before we wrap up, is there anything from the Secretariat's perspective that would be useful to you?

5 MR WAY: Um, no, that, ah, was really helpful. Thank you very much.

MS LEESON: Okay. All right.

MR COUTTS: It was very helpful, Colin. Thanks.

10

MS LEESON: Yeah, it was.

MR COUTTS: That was good.

15 MS LEESON: It was very useful. So - - -

MR LANGFORD: No. Thank - thank - thank you, both, and I'm sorry, Di, I couldn't see your face.

20 MS LEESON: No, that's all right.

MR LANGFORD: But nice to hear your voice.

MS LEESON: That's - that - that's fine. Thanks, Colin.

25

MR COUTTS: By - by the sou - by the sound of you, we probably don't want to see you face to face.

MS LEESON: That's - - -

30

MR LANGFORD: No - yeah, I would - definitely not, yeah. I - - -

MS LEESON: Sound - sounds - - -

35 MR LANGFORD: It's probably right.

MS LEESON: - - - like you're not well. So what we'll do now is thank you very much for your time and, um, I hope you recover quickly. So thanks, Colin. Thanks, Rachel.

40

MR LANGFORD: No worries.

MS LEESON: Thanks, Malgy.

45 MR LANGFORD: Thank you.

MS LEESON: We'll close the meeting.

MS COMAN: Thanks very much.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**[1.38 pm]**