



# Promises kept, but job has just started

**The Baillieu Government’s first budget contains few surprises, least of all in the transport portfolio. Election promises on public transport have for the most part been kept, but their proper fulfilment awaits planning work that is yet to be done. This budget is also a poignant reminder that, although much has been promised and will be delivered on Melbourne and regional train services, very little of substance has been promised for the tram and bus network.**

On what we surely hope will prove to be the new government’s most enduringly significant promise—the establishment of the Public Transport Development Authority (PTDA)—the budget allocates \$10 million over the next four years. It is critical that this shakeup of planning and management of public transport go ahead to avoid in future the types of problems seen daily by passengers on the network. It is equally critical that the PTDA be staffed by the best network planning experts available, to get our public transport network performing as it should.

Funding is also provided for planning studies on high-profile promised rail projects, including extensions to the airport, to Doncaster and to Rowville (the latter announced earlier this year). We will also see work start to keep promises to buy new trains, remove level crossings, plan new stations at Southland and Grovedale, and improve regional passenger and freight services.

On the negative side, there appears to be no mention of a promised feasibility study for a new station at Eltham North, nor any forward planning for extending rail from South Morang to Mernda. Upgrades to station staffing, set to proceed under the previous government, have been defunded. Meanwhile the Baillieu Government’s own staffing solution—two armed Protective Services guards on every station after dark—is to be phased in over three years, and in the meantime remains mired in controversy.

Raw budget figures also show the powerful Victorian road lobby is far from vanquished, even if this is the fifth year growth in public transport use has outstripped growth in car traffic. New funding for roads comes to \$601 million on the government’s reckoning, exceeding

by about 50% the \$403 million in new public transport funding. Part of the reason of course is that much of the road funding is for actual construction, while the significant public transport projects are at the planning stage only—a legacy of decades of inadequate planning. There is simply no bottom drawer full of ‘shovel ready’ rail extension plans to match VicRoads’ own forward plans which have been in development since the 1960s.

Trams and buses also see no new budget initiatives: again not entirely surprising as they were not the subject of Coalition election promises. We understand from senior government sources that the opportunity for such initiatives has been lost in the near term due to cost overruns, including from the retention of Myki and the Regional Rail Link project. We maintain that both these projects should have been submitted for wholesale review by the new PTDA, or an interim task force, to ensure they actually do what the public expects of them.

The silver lining is that the PTDA—which we are assured will be up and running this year—should be able to determine future budget priorities for public transport, and will devote the necessary attention to improving train, tram and bus networks as a whole.

**New train timetable ⇒ Page 4**

**Regional Rail Link ⇒ Page 5 and 7**

### In this issue

State budget roundup . . . . .	1
Keeping in touch . . . . .	2
PTUA on station user panel . . . . .	2
Membership fee increase: details . . . . .	2
Members’ meeting report: SmartRoads . . . . .	3
New stations, but no service . . . . .	3
New Metro timetable . . . . .	4
Regional Rail Link news . . . . .	5
Federal budget . . . . .	5
Geelong Branch . . . . .	6
Knox Transit Link broken . . . . .	6
Wyndham and the RRL . . . . .	7
Stud Road backlash . . . . .	7

## Keeping in touch:

### PTUA Office

Ross House  
247 Flinders Lane, Melbourne  
Telephone (03) 9650 7898  
Email: [office@ptua.org.au](mailto:office@ptua.org.au)

### Membership Enquiries

Call or email the office (see above).

### Commuter Club

PTUA members can obtain cheap yearly Metcards. See [www.ptua.org.au/members/offers](http://www.ptua.org.au/members/offers).

### Internet

Our website is at [www.ptua.org.au](http://www.ptua.org.au). The PTUA runs email lists for member discussions, and to stay up to date with PTUA events. Members can also view archived newsletters online. See: [www.ptua.org.au/members/resources](http://www.ptua.org.au/members/resources).

## Committee

Daniel Bowen—President  
Tony Morton—Secretary  
Kerryn Wilmot—Treasurer  
Michael Galea  
Tim Hoffmann  
Ian Hundley  
Mark Johnson  
Jason King  
Tim Long  
Rob Meredith  
Tim Petersen  
David Robertson  
Malcolm Simister

### Branch convenors

Paul Westcott—Geelong  
Jeremy Lunn—Eastern Suburbs

### Contact

All committee members can be emailed using the format `firstname.lastname@ptua.org.au`.

## Member Meetings

### Melbourne

Thursdays at 6:30pm  
Ross House  
247 Flinders Lane, City  
*More details: see insert*

### Eastern Suburbs

Third Tuesday of every month, 7pm  
'The Barn' (behind Box Hill Baptist Church)  
3 Ellingworth Parade (off Station St)  
Box Hill

### Geelong

First Saturday of every month (except Jan), 10:30am  
Multimedia Room  
Courthouse Youth Arts Centre  
Corner Gheringhap and Little Malop Streets, Geelong

## PTUA to participate in railway station design panel

At the government's invitation, PTUA has joined a new "Station User Panel".

Other participants include the Victorian Council of Social Service, Bicycle Victoria, Council on the Ageing, Victoria

Police, Victoria Walks and the Youth Affairs Council.

This is an initiative of the new government in an effort to avoid design problems of the recent past. Over the next 12–18 months the panel is to advise

on station design standards and related community consultation, with a particular focus on accessibility.

Keep an eye open for our requests for your opinions to feed into the process.

## July's membership fee increase

The price of an annual membership to PTUA will rise on 1 July 2011.

Our membership subscriptions have not changed for more than 5 years and are very low compared to similar organisations. The decision to increase them has not been taken lightly.

We have been aware for some time that the organisation is inefficient in its administrative work, consequently that our service to our members is sub-par and the administrative load on our volunteer Committee reduces the time and energy available for our core job of lobbying and advocacy. To address this we have decided to employ an Office Manager for one day a week, but our

current funds do not extend to cover this for a full year. The result is that we will increase our membership rates slightly, although we believe they remain reasonable.

The new rates will take effect from 1 July for all renewals and new memberships. Members will be able to renew at the old rates until the end of June.

Membership category	Term	Current rate	New rate
Bronze (regular)	1 year	\$25	\$30
	2 years	\$40	\$50
Silver (donor)	1 year	\$50	\$60
	2 years	\$80	\$100
Gold	1 year	\$100	\$120
	2 years	\$175	\$210
Concession / Unwaged	1 year	\$12	\$15
	2 years	\$20	\$25
Family / Household / Small organisation	1 year	\$50	\$60
	2 years	\$80	\$100

## VicRoads briefs PTUA members on new *SmartRoads* policy

**Our last members' meeting in March was addressed by Andrew Wall, Manager of Network Operations at VicRoads. His topic was the new *SmartRoads* operating plan which aims to improve road network efficiency, in part by improving priority for public transport.**

Mr Wall opened with the observation that the community can no longer afford to "build its way out of congestion" by providing additional road space. He introduced *SmartRoads* as an "informed approach" to prioritising the use of road space to meet the needs of all road users: bus passengers, cyclists, pedestrians, freight operators and car drivers. It is integrated with land use planning and the concept of activity centres and operates on a triple bottom line basis. Discussion is under way with the Department of Transport on the incorporation of heavy rail into *SmartRoads* (to what end, is not yet clear).

There are several potential approaches to congestion management, but fundamentally a requirement to reduce the demand for road space. This will not be accomplished by making it easier for drivers to access the road system. Mode priority, route selection and time of travel are the key variables in *SmartRoads*, with the basic objective to maximise the movement of people and freight rather than numbers of vehicles.

The concept is considered unique and is to be presented by VicRoads to the World Road Congress in Mexico City in September 2011.

The technical framework for *SmartRoads* is based on road use hierarchy (designating the use of particular roads) and the network operating plan (determining how intersections are managed). The former has now been agreed by VicRoads with 29 of 31 local councils.

The full *SmartRoads* approach has already been employed at specific activity centres including Dandenong, Ringwood and Broadmeadows. Significant improvements have been made to traffic flows and priority in Dandenong in particular.

*SmartRoads* follows a systematic and participatory approach to determining road use, to assist in securing community assent to changes. In the absence of such an approach, politically driven adverse events such as the removal of the Stud Road bus lane are more likely to occur. The hope is that with more public participation and direct engagement between planners and the public, fully informed best-practice outcomes can be achieved.

Mr Wall acknowledged a weakness in the public management of car-centric shopping centres such as Chadstone, Northland and Doncaster Shoppingtown, where VicRoads lacks authority to manage traffic flows. Negotiations that do occur are typically undertaken by the local government authority, which is not always effective.

Mr Wall also recognised that road engineers on the ground have traditionally resisted the idea of removing road space from cars. This is expected to change

under *SmartRoads*. There is likely to be significant scope to recalibrate traffic lights to prioritise public transport, cyclists and pedestrians; however, limitations remain as the software is outsourced to the NSW RTA, and VicRoads currently does not dedicate the resources required to perform this task in a timely manner across the entire road network.

Trams in mixed traffic are seen as a particular challenge, although PTUA research has shown that in peak hour at least, the worst delays by far occur on dedicated tracks in central Melbourne. This is mainly attributable to poor signal sequencing, which is a VicRoads responsibility.

In response to member questions, Mr Wall advised that GPS systems will be available on buses within the next year to permit buses to be given priority at signals (though initially only buses running late will get this treatment). It was agreed that the combination of poor signal timings and stop locations which cause trams and buses to stop twice in close succession need to be avoided in future. For trams, the problem may be aggravated by the fact that tram tracking systems are unable to tell if tram doors are closed or open (whereas bus systems can).

Clearly there are many technical issues with public transport priority that have languished for many years, and require appropriate attention from both VicRoads and the new Public Transport Authority.

### **Yes Minister scenario for new stations**

**It's emerged that new stations at Lynbrook (on the Cranbourne line) and Cardinia Road (Pakenham Lakeside) will be unused for months after their completion, because power upgrades will have to be done before trains can use them.**

That the stations were built and funded apparently without taking into account that more power was needed so trains could stop (and more importantly, depart) at these new stations is just another example of the appalling planning in public transport.

It's reminiscent of a plot from the TV series *Yes Minister*, featuring a new hospital that was operating with a full complement of administrative staff but no patients.

As it is, communities that are desperate for train services will have to keep waiting before they can use them.

# Metro timetable changes: What should they be aiming for?

**It's too early to see the full effect of the new Metro timetables introduced this month, but it was clear from the outset that some passengers would be disadvantaged.**

The move to change Altona Loop trains to run as shuttles between Laverton and Newport during interpeak hours has enraged local residents, with passengers for the city having to change at Newport, and those wanting Flagstaff, Melbourne Central or Parliament having to change again at North Melbourne or Southern Cross. To our knowledge, this is the first time that passengers for some CBD stations have had to catch three separate trains to reach their destinations.

During peak times the Williamstown and Werribee lines now operate to an incomprehensible 11 or 22 minute frequency.

Glen Waverley line trains now run direct to Flinders Street on weekday mornings; perhaps understandable as this is said to reduce "conflicting moves", where trains have to wait for each other. Those passengers wanting the Loop need to change at Richmond: fortunately this is a cross-platform connection, having been planned that way in the 1970s.

All Frankston line trains now run to Flinders Street direct at off-peak times on weekdays, which is inconvenient to Loop passengers, but does bring more consistency than the previous half-and-half arrangement.

More puzzling is the change in express patterns on the Belgrave and Lilydale lines, which has us scratching our heads, and locals writing to their MPs. Laburnum commuters in particular have lost most (but not all) of their morning express services—a drastic drop in the number of trains—but keep most of their evening expresses. The logic here is far from clear.

Further in, many morning expresses will no longer stop at Camberwell or

Glenferrie, but will continue to stop at Surrey Hills; an anomaly introduced by Connex some years ago. This belies the importance of Camberwell and Glenferrie as growing employment centres. For commuters beyond Ringwood on the Belgrave line, there is now just one direct service calling at Camberwell between 8am and 9am (though there are three to Surrey Hills). Again, evening expresses retain the existing pattern.

If the name of the game is simplification, it seems to be two steps forward, one step back.

There are some benefits: previously under-served stations like Spotswood and South Kensington have a much better service, including during peak hours.

## **What good timetabling is about**

There is nothing inherently evil about changing trains. This is a fact of life in many cities around the world. However it needs to be made easier, to ensure using public transport does not become an endurance test.

And of course, timetables do need to evolve, to make better use of our (not inconsiderable) rail infrastructure, and to cut overcrowding and waiting times.

So what should timetablers aim for?

**Multimodality.** This timetable is—we hope—one of the last to be produced under the discredited franchising regime, where the formulation of the timetable is left up to the private train operator and then rubber-stamped by the bureaucracy. Future timetables should be the responsibility of the PTDA, developed through processes which emphasise the joint role of train, tram and bus services in getting people around, rather than treat the three modes and their objectives in isolation.

**Simplicity.** Some train lines in Melbourne have a dozen or more different stopping patterns. These need to be rationalised wherever possible to improve

reliability and legibility. Express running should be used both within and outside peak times, but the majority of express trains should still stop at major district centres and interchange points.

**Frequency.** Cutting the number of express patterns can mean slower trips, but this should be countered by higher frequencies. This cuts waiting times to maintain good overall travel times.

**Loop operation.** This should be simple and consistent. We cautiously support running specific lines direct via Flinders Street, so more services can run on the network overall. But given the effects on passengers, this is contingent on good capacity (to all stations, and within interchange stations), convenience of interchange, short wait times (no more than a few minutes), and good accurate passenger information.

**Loop direction.** No other rail system in the world has a central city loop that changes direction halfway through the day. This made some sense when the Loop was built and trains ran to and from stabling yards at Jolimont and near North Melbourne, but this is now rarely the case. Permanent one-way operation of the four Loop tracks—some clockwise, some anti—would reduce passenger confusion and place the various CBD destinations on a roughly equal footing.

**Participation.** Most importantly, the travelling public must be involved in future changes. Timetablers in the PTDA and Metro must explain why specific changes are necessary, and not just inflict them on passengers with no explanation. Public submissions should be considered on proposed changes as well as on future initiatives. There should also be a more formal role for passenger representatives in governance structures, as occurs with VicRoads through its Advisory Board.

**How are the new timetables affecting you? Email us your thoughts: [office@ptua.org.au](mailto:office@ptua.org.au)**



## RRL announcement sets a worrying precedent

The PTUA is very disappointed that the new state government has given the go-ahead to the Regional Rail Link (RRL) without any real changes.

When he was in opposition, Public Transport Minister Terry Mulder made a number of pointed criticisms of the scheme, yet now he has rushed into announcing that it will continue as-is, even in the face of a huge cost increase.

The Minister has acknowledged our advice in February that the RRL cost blow-out (revealed after the Coalition came to power), coupled with the Federal government delaying its funding commitment in order to deal with recent natural disasters, provided the perfect opportunity to have the project properly re-assessed, and for the alternatives to be fully explored.

So far this has all occurred behind closed doors, but it is nonetheless apparent that the only official review to

date has been done by the same people in the Department of Transport who were involved in designing the project already. Such a 'review' cannot be seen as objective. The RRL project needs to be critically analysed in public, by independent experts, but that chance is being squandered in an unnecessary rush to make a decision.

It is unfortunate that this announcement comes in the middle of what should be very good news. We strongly support the new government's commitment to setting up a single public transport authority to plan and manage Victoria's public transport system.

However, what is the point of creating a public transport authority later this year if it isn't going to be able to review such a massively expensive and far-reaching rail project in time to influence key decisions? More so than ever, the authority risks starting its life hobbled by flawed planning.

The fundamental problems with the RRL which still remain include:

- No definition of the final shape of the project—it is still being designed 'on the run'.
- No service plan or timetables for the new link.
- No clear idea what the diversion of Geelong trains via Tarneit will do to travel times.
- No idea how trains will serve the two new suburban stations in Tarneit.
- No platforms at the crucial interchange point of North Melbourne station.
- A time-consuming bus ride to and from Wyndham Vale for V/Line passengers to Werribee, instead of the present direct connection at Werribee station itself.

## FBT driving incentive goes, but road deficit remains high

The Federal budget will leave Australia's road deficit largely unchanged, despite reform to the FBT company car concession.

The general push to restrain spending means there are no major new transport initiatives in the Federal budget. Instead, the interesting items are found in the fine print.

After many long years, the government has finally reformed the perverse Fringe Benefits Tax rule that rewards people for driving further, and punishes them for driving less. This situation arises from the 'statutory formula' for company cars, which applies different tax rates depending on the car's odometer reading.

The government has adopted the Henry Review's recommendation, replacing the varying tax rates with a single tax rate of 20 per cent. This means there is still a quite generous tax concession

available, but it is no longer tied to the amount of car travel.

Unfortunately, this positive step is largely negated by another budget initiative—the \$5000 capital write-off on new business vehicles. This replaces a different concession (the Entrepreneurs Tax Offset) which applied to business costs more generally, not specifically to vehicles, so represents another subsidy to car use.

The result is that Australia's 'road deficit'—the shortfall between total costs of road transport and the revenue received from road users—changes little as a result of this latest budget. Contrary to the RACV and others who assert that motorists are overtaxed, the government continues to return in tax concessions nearly three-quarters of what it actually collects in petrol tax.

Overall, on the most generous assumptions road transport imposes a net \$17

billion annual cost on the community, or \$700 annually for every Australian.

### Australia's road deficit

Road transport costs	(\$mill)
Road construction	14,100
Land use cost	6,000
Road trauma	16,900
Noise	700
Urban air pollution	4,300
Climate change	2,900
Tax concessions	7,400
<b>Total</b>	<b>52,300</b>
Revenue collected	
Petrol and diesel excise	10,300
GST on fuel and vehicles	5,000
Vehicle registration fees	3,500
Insurance premiums	12,100
Tolls	2,000
Other revenue	2,400
<b>Total</b>	<b>35,300</b>
<b>Road deficit</b>	<b>17,000</b>

See: <http://www.ptua.org.au/myths/petroltax.shtml>

# Geelong Branch report

## Bus interchange saga continues

Almost inevitably, there have been negative rumblings from a few elements in the City of Greater Geelong council about the recently reinstated bus interchange in Moorabool Street, and there's to be a review of it.

We have been pleasantly surprised that a relatively open process has been established for the review, thanks to the efforts of Councillors Andy Richards and Barbara Abley. Submissions are being publicly invited and submitters will be able to present at a panel hearing.

The Branch has urged that at least one regular bus user be on the panel, but have had no response to the suggestion, and we're not holding our breath for one.

## 'Sustainable' Armstrong Creek takes the LA route?

As promised before the recent election, the Coalition government has established a Planning Advisory Panel to inquire into "the relative merits and impacts" of the so-called Section 4C of the Geelong Bypass, which is adjacent to the Armstrong Creek development.

Consistent with our stance at the original Armstrong Creek planning panel hearings in 2007, we have made a submission to the Panel opposing the road's construction. Our submission can be read at [http://www.ptua.org.au/files/2008/section\\_4c\\_committee.pdf](http://www.ptua.org.au/files/2008/section_4c_committee.pdf).

We will try to use our presentation to the Panel to highlight the lack of any public transport plan for the Armstrong

Creek area, despite the development being touted as "best practice" sustainable suburban design. The only public transport initiative so far has been the announcement of an Armstrong Creek railway station to be built on the Warrnambool line, surrounded by a 2,500-space car park!

**The PTUA Geelong Branch meets monthly in Geelong city; see Page 2 for details. Paul Westcott is the branch convenor.**



## Knox Transit Link is broken

### A PTUA Outer East branch study has revealed gaping holes in the timetable for the Knox Transit Link.

The study compared timetables for the 75 Vermont South tram with the 732 Upper Ferntree Gully bus, which is supposed to operate as a shadow tram service to Knox—the kind where passengers might expect to transfer from a tram to a bus and continue their journey within a couple of minutes, as happens in other places where timed transfers take place.

Our study, however, found that only 18% of tram services are met by a connecting bus service timed within two minutes, while one-third of services make you wait 10 minutes or more, or

have no connecting bus at all.

The worst connections by far are in the evenings when buses reliably miss each tram heading towards the city by a mere few minutes. Passengers are generally left waiting 15 minutes for the next tram. This is despite the fact that Knox O-Zone is a popular destination for outer east residents throughout the week in the evening, with restaurants and bars bustling with life.

Gaps and long waits also exist throughout the day, seven days a week. Late night tram services on Fridays and Saturdays have no connecting bus at all.

This is despite the promise made by the former government on April 26, 2004, when Minister for Transport Pe-

ter Batchelor said of the link that "*bus timetables will be synchronised with tram timetables to ensure a seamless journey for passengers.*" The link was said to be as good as the tram extension all the way to Knox, which the same government had promised in 1999.

The findings show the urgent need for a Public Transport Development Authority to take control of the timetables and coordinate connections better.

In the mean time, fixing the bus should be a simple achievement for the Baillieu Government. Ultimately, of course, the tram needs to be extended all the way to Knox.

⇒ [www.ptua.org.au/campaigns/every10minutes](http://www.ptua.org.au/campaigns/every10minutes)

### Evening service from Knox: example

Dep. Knox (bus)	Arr. Vermont Sth (bus)	Dep. Vermont Sth (tram)	Wait (mins)
8:39	8:46	9:02	16
8:57	9:04	9:22	18
9:20	9:27	9:42	15
9:40	9:47	10:02	15

### Waiting time for bus

	% tram services
No bus	12.0%
≥ 10 minutes	20.7%
5–9 minutes	41.6%
3–4 minutes	19.9%
< 3 minutes	17.8%

# Planning in Wyndham: Integrated transport, the RRL and jobs

**Urbanisation of the Werribee area began in the late 1950s during the era of Premier Henry Bolte. The context was rapid population growth; the need to find a spot for 'surplus' population; the attractiveness of relatively cheap land; the primacy of the motor car as the preferred form of transport; and next to no consideration of local sources of employment.**

Since then population growth has outpaced public transport services and job growth in the area. By 2010 the City of Wyndham was Australia's fastest growing municipality with an annual population increase of 12,604. Population has been forecast to double from 158,200 in 2011 to 321,590 in 2031.

While about 53% of the resident population are workers, Census data indicates there are only about 28 jobs for every 100 residents: a severe shortfall. By contrast there are 87 jobs for every 100 residents of the City of Yarra, and 40 for every 100 residents in the City of Whitehorse. Wyndham residents must therefore spend much more time travelling to and from work—mostly by car.

According to the Census less than 10% of journeys to work from Wyndham are by public transport, and only a paltry 2.3% of journeys to work *within* the municipality.

Wyndham residents suffer mediocre public transport services, with four Werribee line stations and 20 substandard bus services to these stations. Most buses have a 35 to 40 minute headway in peak periods. This all but ensures most work and non-work travel in Wyndham is by car. Development of the road network, meanwhile, has paid little regard to the development of accessible and direct bus routes.

There is a clear nexus between intra-regional public transport capability and job availability in our suburbs. So what does the future hold for public transport for residents in the City of Wyndham?

Much of the focus has turned to the controversial Regional Rail Link (RRL), with much government spin devoted to portraying it as a magical transport saviour for Melbourne's western suburbs. Two stations are proposed, one

at Wyndham Vale on Ballan Road, and the other about 9km further north-east on Derrimut Road in Tarneit.

It remains unclear whether the alignment for the RRL and the new stations will provide for transit-oriented development, active transport and ready access for any connecting bus services. These are entirely the responsibility of the state government. At the time of writing the Growth Areas Authority was expected to announce separate Precinct Structure Plans for Manor Lakes, Ballan Road and Black Forest Road near the proposed Wyndham Vale station. This process is likely to be central to the transport future of the area, yet no guarantee has been given that integration with public transport will even be considered.

To avoid the mistakes of the past the government must commit to the future development of transport capability in Wyndham, that will achieve significant mode shift to public transport and active transport, and away from the car-dependency of the dormitory suburbs from the Bolte era.

## Stud Road bus backlash

**In a retrograde step by the Baillieu Government, bus lanes have now been removed from Stud Road between Ferntree Gully and Kelletts Roads in Rowville.**

Commuters on the 901 Smartbus service are already reporting longer journey times as cars queue up in the former bus lane.

Motorists will possibly save a minute or so in the short term, but everyone loses in the long term as congestion continues to increase in the absence of

effective public transport.

We understand that many motorists in this section of Stud Road are using it to link east-west journeys between Rowville and the inner city. This is exactly the kind of journey that the Rowville railway line should cater for. This issue demonstrates conclusively that Eastlink has failed as an effective transport solution for the outer east. Eastlink was supposed to relieve Stud Road congestion to make a 'painless' bus lane possible, but has not done so. The removal of bus lanes is short sighted as we need the bus lanes more than ever to cater for a growing popu-

lation and increased travel. Buses will provide the most convenient means for many Knox residents to access their new rail service.

We call again on the government, as part of its evaluation of Rowville rail options, to discuss with local residents the operation of bus services every 10 minutes or better, along uninterrupted bus lanes on the full length of Stud Road. Outer east residents will not be satisfied with infrequent, empty buses running on dedicated lanes; nor will they be satisfied with stations that can only be accessed through congested traffic.

**Copy deadline for the next PTUA News is 24 June 2011.**

Newsletter contributors: Tony Morton, Daniel Bowen, Jeremy Lunn, Malcolm Simister and Paul Westcott.  
Printed on recycled paper by Flash Print, Collingwood. Our thanks to Margaret Pullar and the dedicated mailout team.

## PTUA News

Newsletter of the Public Transport Users Association, Org. No. A-6256L

Print Post: Publication No. PP 331088/00009

If undeliverable, return to:

PTUA Office, 247 Flinders Lane, Melbourne 3000

SURFACE  
MAIL

POSTAGE  
PAID  
AUSTRALIA

### Inside. . .

State and Federal budgets  
Metro's new timetable, and what they should have done  
Regional Rail Link: theirs but to do and die?

#### Changed your address?

Make sure your PTUA News follows you when you move! Cut out or photocopy this form, fill in and return to us at PTUA, Ross House, 247 Flinders Lane, Melbourne 3000. Or email us: [office@ptua.org.au](mailto:office@ptua.org.au).

Name \_\_\_\_\_

New address \_\_\_\_\_

Town/Suburb \_\_\_\_\_ Postcode \_\_\_\_\_

Phone (H) \_\_\_\_\_ (W) \_\_\_\_\_ (M) \_\_\_\_\_

Email \_\_\_\_\_

#### PTUA office

247 Flinders Lane, Melbourne

Telephone (03) 9650 7898

Email: [office@ptua.org.au](mailto:office@ptua.org.au)

[www.ptua.org.au](http://www.ptua.org.au)

#### Join us

If you are reading a friend's newsletter and would like to join and help the fight for better public transport, it's \$25 per year (\$12 concession). Call the office or see [www.ptua.org.au/join](http://www.ptua.org.au/join).

Responsibility for electoral comment in PTUA News is taken by Tony Morton, 247 Flinders Lane, Melbourne.