

CORRECTED TRANSCRIPT

PORT OF MELBOURNE SELECT COMMITTEE

Subcommittee

Inquiry into the proposed lease of the port of Melbourne

Hastings — 28 October 2015

Members

Mr Gordon Rich-Phillips — Chair

Mr Damian Drum

Mr Daniel Mulino — Deputy Chair

Mr Craig Ondarchie

Staff

Secretary: Mr Keir Delaney

Research officer: Ms Annemarie Burt

Witness

Captain Richard Cox.

The CHAIR — I declare open this Legislative Council Port of Melbourne Select Committee public hearing. This hearing is in relation to the inquiry into the proposed lease of the port of Melbourne. I ask that all mobile telephones now be switched off. I welcome Captain Dick Cox. Thank you for making yourself available this morning at such short notice. The committee does not require witnesses to be sworn, but questions must be answered fully, accurately and truthfully. Witnesses found to be giving false or misleading information may be in contempt of Parliament and subject to penalty. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of Legislative Council standing orders. Therefore the information you give today is protected by law. However, any comments made outside the precincts of the hearing may not be so protected. All evidence is being recorded, and you will be provided with a proof version of the transcript in the next couple of days for any corrections. The committee has allocated 45 minutes for this session. I invite you to make a brief opening statement if you wish, and the committee will then proceed to questions. Thank you.

Capt. COX — Thank you, Mr Chairman, for letting me speak today. Right from the beginning I say that I am totally opposed to the long-term lease of the port of Melbourne. Rather than waste the committee's time, I refer to the presentation to this committee on 24 September by Mr Dowling, which I commend to the committee for further reading. I am sure Mr Dowling would not mind me using his presentation; I have attached it to my document for the committee's convenience. I agree with Mr Dowling's presentation on the port of Melbourne, so I will not repeat it, but do not totally agree with his conclusions. He writes from his experience in Melbourne and his interests in Geelong. I have no vested interest in any company, only the interests of my grandchildren in this great state of Victoria.

Mr Dowling writes from an accountant's background, who seem to rule the roost these days. I write from a seagoing background, starting at the age of 16 — a long time ago. In those days I shipped out of a river port wider than the Yarra, close to the centre of a city bigger than Melbourne, which 40 years ago closed down these operations. That area now is a tourist attraction, with high-value real estate and even an airport. I talk about the East End of London. The same has happened in many port cities around the world, and it should have happened in Melbourne a few years ago, as Mr Dowling states. Indeed a chemical storage facility upwind of the city is an environmental disaster waiting to happen. The committee might recall what happened 20 years ago on Coode Island. We were lucky. The Chinese were not so lucky a few weeks ago.

As a past ship's captain and former harbourmaster of the port of Hastings, working in the latter originally in the Port of Melbourne Authority, and when the operations of the port were privatised under — and I stress 'under' — that regime, with my experience, and with discussions with my peers, I believe that ports should be run by governments. Everybody is a stakeholder in a port. Private industry wants to put a fence around its business and exclude as many stakeholders as possible — impossible in a port which has caused many a harbourmaster stressful conflict with his managers.

The committee has heard many presentations from companies with vested interests advocating the long-term status quo. This will enable them to maximise their investments. Unfortunately, these days the accountants are cutting into the engineers' maintenance budgets, wanting to reduce those budgets by 25 per cent year on year — an impossibility with the ageing infrastructure we have in Melbourne, Geelong and Hastings.

As Mr Dowling states, we need a new port on the west side of Port Phillip, which I agree with. But where I differ from him, we also need one in Hastings — two ports, in other words. Ports differ in their requirements depending on the trade. The Victorian bulk trade requires waterfront space for silos and tankage, with differing on-wharf loading-unloading infrastructure to that for containers. They need to be separate. Ship sizes are different, turnaround times are different, anchorage requirements are different, clear wharf areas are different. The bulk port needs to be in Port Phillip, combining Geelong and port of Melbourne facilities, and containers in Western Port, for Victoria's trading future to succeed. Otherwise we will become a backwater and have the added expense of our goods being land bridged from New South Wales or Adelaide. Our businesses will then migrate to be closer to these ports, with dire consequences for Victoria's economy.

The proposed long-term lease of the port of Melbourne, 50 years, seems to be based on Melbourne's container capacity. Many figures have been suggested, but may I put some facts on the table. Container throughput is based on many factors: berth capacity — that is, the number of vessels one can berth at any one time, in other words the length of the berth space; berth turnaround times — the time it takes to complete one vessel and get the next vessel in its place ready to commence loading-unloading; the space available on the wharf for stacking

containers or moving them to their distribution areas; the rate of container movements with container cranes, straddles et cetera — that is, technology.

Up-to-date figures are very hard to find. I have the Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics 2009 report — that is, the BITRE report — for the committee's information, which shows the port of Melbourne in a good light for the number of containers it handled, then 2.1 million, in 2008, which has increased to 2.5 million last year. Predictions for the future are pretty varied, those wishing to maximise the price of the port taking the top end without taking into account any other factors. The Victoria University presentation to this committee mentioned 4.6 million TEUs as a maximum capacity, then produced figures utilising an international benchmark of 2200 TEU per metre of quay line, whereas the BITRE report has an international median of 985 TEU per berth metre. Melbourne in that document was 1146 TEU per berth metre.

The 2200 figure has only been exceeded by a few ports, mainly hub ports rather than end-of-line ports like Melbourne, this figure making a maximum capacity of 5.6 million TEU. They also failed to take into consideration the example they gave in their presentation of the limitations of Swanson Dock. When a longer, wider vessel arrives and all the other berths have to be vacant in a daylight-only operation, this will drastically reduce all the statistics and throw all the calculations on TEU capacity out of the window. What figure should we look at? Definitely the lower one, but it could even be less.

Whatever figure is used, it is internationally accepted that when you get near 70 per cent capacity, you should start building new capacity, which Melbourne is doing with the Webb Dock now. You start to build at 70 per cent, not start planning and obtaining environmental approvals. When do we reach that figure? Probably in 5 to 10 years. When do we need to start planning? I will leave that obvious figure for others to work out.

Bigger ships are coming. One container shipping company wants to bring in 8000-TEU vessels now. Others have mentioned within five years. There are many orders in the shipbuilding yards for 10 000-TEU vessels, the maximum envisaged by all parties for the Australian trade into the future. Victoria University says the great ship channel at Port Phillip Heads is okay for these vessels, but this channel is not up to international standards now, as defined by PIANC, the World Association for Waterborne Transport Infrastructure, for an entrance channel with large cross tides. It is only due to the professionalism of our pilot service that we have not had a *Costa Concordia* incident yet.

This entrance is infamous in the maritime community across the world. Indeed the port of Melbourne harbourmasters directions says that any vessel with a draft over 11.8 metres can only traverse the entrance channel at slack water, when cross tides are down to about 3 knots. What would happen to Victoria's economy if a vessel did hit the rocky sides and sink, blocking the channel? Are we going to dredge the Heads again, opening up the keyhole to create a proper channel, so allowing more water to flow into Port Phillip, bringing the tidal range closer to the 2.5 metres outside the Heads, rather than the less than 1 metre we have now? The flooding, not even taking into account the effects of global warming, would be catastrophic.

Victoria University has put out many reports quoting the destination and origin of containers destined for the port of Melbourne as being to the west of Melbourne, the reason for them saying a new container port should be Bay West. The containers are initially going west as they are removed from the port as soon as possible, transported to the nearest available land over the West Gate or through the suburbs to be sorted and then sent back to their final destination, which for 60 per cent of them is the Dandenong-Braeside area. Back over the West Gate, down the Monash to be emptied, returned back over the West Gate to empty container storage yards, waiting to be sent back over the West Gate to a waiting ship. VU does not report the final destination of containers. What a waste of resources, all because there is no land available at the port.

We are indeed fortunate that previous governments in the 1960s had the vision for long-term provision of easements, so that we have been able to build roads without having to bulldoze housing. Unfortunately, governments of both parties sold off the north-east corner of the ring-road easement, and the trouble and expense that has caused. The port of Hastings was fortunate at the time to have 3500 hectares put aside for port-related uses. Melbourne has 560 hectares; 3500 hectares is roughly the area between Punt Road and Footscray, Alexandra Parade and the Yarra River.

I ask the committee to have the vision, as advocated by Mr Dowling and me, to think of what Melbourne should be like, with more low-level bridges across the river, a far cheaper option than tunnels and high-level bridges, which would be required to be put in place by the government to keep to their side of the lease arrangements. If

the Treasurer and former ports minister has to have a lease for the port of Melbourne, it should be for not more than 10 years, with 5-year options, and with no compensation clauses or additional infrastructure to be put in by the government. In the meantime, get on with planning two new ports.

I am also an environmentalist, being a director of Western Port Seagrass Partnership, an NGO with sustainable development principles obviously concentrating in Western Port and doing practical things to correct the man-made mistakes of the past. But that is a whole new presentation, which we do not have time for today.

The CHAIR — Thank you, Captain Cox. There are a couple of issues you have raised which are essentially new material for the committee that I would like to ask you about. The first is your reference to 70 per cent capacity being a trigger for the construction of a new port. You made the point that is construction, not planning. Can you give the committee some background as to where that has been used, at what other major ports that has been used as a trigger? That is an interesting concept that we have not heard about before, and obviously the second port is something that is pretty central to our considerations.

Capt. COX — Very much so — a third port as well, may I say again. That figure is an accepted figure by the majority of ports around the world. It is a figure that I just use. I have not seen it written down anywhere, but that is what they use. Melbourne is doing the same now with Webb Dock. They know that they need container capacity in the very near future, so they are getting on with Webb Dock. But Webb Dock is only 1 million TEUs. I think that was in the port of Melbourne paperwork and also the Victoria University paperwork — 1 million maximum capacity for Webb Dock, which puts all the other capacity going into Swanson, and there ain't no room there.

The CHAIR — Has that 70 per cent trigger been used without regard to growth rates? A slow-growing port or a rapidly growing port would still look at kicking off new expansion or new construction — —

Capt. COX — New construction when you get to 70 per cent.

The CHAIR — The 70 per cent target?

Capt. COX — Yes.

The CHAIR — I guess that still leaves open the question of when do you hit 70 per cent insofar as 70 per cent of what, which is one of the big issues that you have highlighted?

Capt. COX — If you work it on just over 4 million TEUs, which is what I think — and we are 2.5 million now — we are going to hit that 'start building' figure within that 5-to-10-year mark.

The CHAIR — One of the issues you have touched on in your opening statement and the committee has not heard a lot about but which is a valid consideration is that you reflected on what has happened with East London, the port being redeveloped, including as an airport. I had the misfortune to fly out of it earlier this year.

Capt. COX — It was a great place when I was there.

The CHAIR — It is an interesting part of London, but it does raise the question of the appropriateness of having a port on the edge of the Melbourne CBD and a port potentially there for a further 70 years. Much of the evidence the committee has received from a range of witnesses has been to the effect that that asset should be sweated — it should be extended to its maximum capacity — and the existing sunk investment exported for as long as possible. You are putting a different view, that in fact we should not be doing that; we should be moving away from containers at the port of Melbourne and redeveloping. Do you want to expand on why you have that view, that we should not seek to maximise the asset that is already there and rather redevelop that site?

Capt. COX — We will maximise the capacity that is there on what I am saying at any rate, you know, the 4 million and how we move to a new port in the time it takes. As soon as you get a new port completed, as most people will tell you, the container ships will go there. They will not waste an extra day sailing, total time, by going to Melbourne if they are coming to Hastings. That is the total time if you get a ship coming from the east, the extra time it takes it to get into Melbourne — get up the river et cetera — over the port of Hastings. They would not only not waste that time but they would want to go to a new port where there is new infrastructure and things move quicker, which they will. It will be an automated port, environmentally friendly et cetera.

The CHAIR — The other point you made was that you do not support the lease but you support the retention of the port in public ownership. How should the committee reconcile that with the need for further capital investment in the port, where there is not necessarily the capacity for the state as owner to make further capital investment and hence that is one incentive for a private operator? Why do you believe that the port should be retained in public ownership?

Capt. COX — As a principle I believe that ports should be run in the public interest and we should maintain ownership. The whole operation of a port is very much integrated with all the stakeholders and there are a lot of stakeholders. As I said in my presentation, private industry does not want to have any stakeholders. They want to put a fence around their business and keep everybody out, but government ports in particular have a lot of stakeholders. Every fisherman that is out there, all the people around the coastline — environmental, our tourist industry et cetera — are based around the water. They are the stakeholders. Private industry is not into that. Government needs to look after it.

The CHAIR — In terms of doing that in the context of a lease — if you accept a lease is going to happen, which is what the government is proposing — if you go down that path, would you support there being strong regulatory frameworks around ensuring that there are price controls on things such as rents, charges at port, a mandate on the development of port rail and other such matters to ensure that those infrastructure and outcomes which are in the public interest are delivered and not simply left to the commercial operator to determine from its perspective? Is that one way to get around it?

Capt. COX — I just cannot see that a port manager, coming in when he has done due diligence and looked at all the facts that have been put on the table to the committee, is going to lay out much money on it. You want that capacity thing to stay there because he knows he is going to get compensation. He is going to push for that to be as high as possible. Where do those figures come from? I believe they came from KPMG but we would like to see those. I do not think you will be able to find them, but we would like to see them. He is going to want to push it up as much as possible. I believe the ports minister has dropped his figures down. I heard mention of 6.5 million now and it was against 8 million or something like that.

Mr ONDARCHIE — He is always changing his mind to do with that!

Capt. COX — The former ports minister and I got along particularly well, actually.

Mr ONDARCHIE — Now he is the Treasurer.

Capt. COX — I have got a lot of time for him, but politics is politics, if I may say so.

Mr MULINO — Thanks very much for your evidence and your written submission. You have put forward a really interesting proposal around developing two ports, a bit more specialised than I think a lot of others have suggested for the next phase. This is a really complicated set of issues around the timing of that, around how it might work logistically. Infrastructure Victoria is a body that has been set up to draw together a lot of experts from different fields and try to draw together the different strands of analysis. Do you think that is a sensible place to undertake a broad-ranging piece of analysis around the next port capacity?

Capt. COX — You heard it before me: as long as it is open and transparent. I am a big fan of *Utopia*, actually.

Mr ONDARCHIE — Some of us are living it!

Mr DRUM — We all like that.

Capt. COX — As long as it is open and independent. It has got to be open. It has got to be transparent. Unfortunately we have had the virtual demise of the Port of Hastings Development Authority. They were open and transparent as much as they could be, but if Infrastructure Victoria is the same as that, where they get told from on high — no matter which government is in — what they can say and do, then it will be very difficult for them to make it open and transparent. It has got to be, but it is very difficult these days.

Mr MULINO — I finally wanted to tease out an issue that the Chair asked you about, which is that transition from the port of Melbourne when it finally reaches capacity to another port. You are suggesting Hastings would take over the container traffic. When we go through that process, would you agree with — I

think you do; I just want to clarify — the broad proposition that it is going to be in general the lowest cost for the state's supply chain to increase capacity at a brownfield site rather than build an entire new site to the extent that you can manage both quayside and landside supply?

Capt. COX — In the short term, very short term, yes. Long term, no. Long term for the state to move your ports away from the centre of your city — you are going to have to put so much infrastructure into the centre of the city, with more tunnels, because bridges have to be very high for shipping to get under. That is if they can get under, and they are having problems now.

On that point, I can envisage a ship coming in, getting underneath the bridge, getting in the long side and then not being able to load enough cargo on to get under the bridge on the way out. That is a horrible dream. When moving a port away from the city to get it outside so that you can bring stuff in, your infrastructure costs are that much lower in the long term than trying to keep on retrofitting. All the money that has been spent on channel deepening, which was another big topic, moving the markets, moving all the stuff and building flyovers and one thing or another just to keep Melbourne where it is now is going to be dwarfed in the future to go up to that figure.

There will need to be tunnels. One problem we have with tunnels in Victoria is that there are no placarded loads allowed through them. A lot of the cargo that goes through ports is placarded loads. They are going to have to go through the suburbs or over the West Gate, so you are putting more traffic into the centre. The example I gave of the containers going backwards and forwards across the West Gate down to Dandenong is well known but not used by Hermione Parsons, who I have had many arguments with.

Mr MULINO — A final question just on this: the way you are seeing it develop is that you would get to, say, 70 per cent capacity at the port; you would then start developing another port which would eventually take over?

Capt. COX — You start building then.

Mr MULINO — Yes, you start building.

Capt. COX — Your planning has got to be before that.

Mr MULINO — Not long after that, the port of Melbourne would gradually start to cease operations, and you would reuse the land for residential or other purposes?

Capt. COX — Yes. That is my grandchildren's superannuation, basically. The governments of the future are going to need money. They have got to look for somewhere. In the long term I think you are going to get more money from selling real estate in the centre of Melbourne, the port district now, than you will get for the lease of the port of Melbourne.

Mr MULINO — Thank you.

Mr ONDARCHIE — Captain Cox, I agree with you on a few things because I have the interests of my grandchildren at heart as well. Given your experience, there is probably nobody better to give us some advice on this than the former harbourmaster. There is so much confusing evidence that has been put before us. Is the port of Hastings a deepwater port?

Capt. COX — It is natural deep water, yes. It can take ships of 15.8 metres.

Mr ONDARCHIE — Okay. Thank you. Finally we have got someone who knows what they are talking about. Terrific.

Capt. COX — I could have brought a chart along today — borrowed it from the port of Hastings development office — that is underneath the CEO's glass table. It is from 1865, Lieutenant Henry Cox, no relation, showing all the depths up Western Port bay, the depths at that time. I do not think there was anybody dredging in those days. It shows the natural depth. In 1970 the only dredging that was done was where you have got a little wiggle in the line. They straightened it out for the shipping. The swing basins had to be levelled out, and berth pockets were put in as well.

The very small amount of dredging that was actually done — and I can get those figures for the committee; I have them at home still — was very small, and within five years of the dredging that was done at BlueScope, at the top end of the bay, all the flora and fauna was back where the dredging had occurred. The same person has been doing the examinations up there for BlueScope for the last 35 years, Dr Jan Watson. She is still doing it at 80-odd. She does not dive now; she has a team that does it. She is still doing those tests and everything for BlueScope. She and BlueScope have that information.

Mr ONDARCHIE — That finally answers some questions. You have knocked out about 10 more questions that I was going to ask you, so let me turn to something else. The Port of Hastings Development Authority had some momentum; there were things happening there. Things were channelling along, if you will pardon the pun.

Capt. COX — I would have loved to have worked there.

Mr ONDARCHIE — It seems like a very attractive place to have worked, because — —

Capt. COX — I told the CEO, Mike Lean, that. A lot of the consultancy companies wanted me to go there. I said, 'No. I'll give you all the information I've got, but nobody's going to zip this up'. I am going to say what I want, when I want and to whom I want.

Mr ONDARCHIE — Fair enough, too. Good on you, but it seems like they were really getting on with it.

Capt. COX — Yes, very much so.

Mr ONDARCHIE — Now the government is saying, 'We're handing over all that and everything else to Infrastructure Victoria', which they have only just set up — colloquially, in the last 5 minutes. Do you have some confidence that they are going to get on with it at the same rate as the Port of Hastings Development Authority was?

Capt. COX — I doubt it. very much. It was a very dynamic and extremely professional outfit that was down in the Port of Hastings Development Authority. As I say, it needs two ports at any rate. We have got to look at two. You have got to look at where one has got to go over in the west, because you do not want to bring in the bulk and all that sort of stuff. It just does not match. You have got two requirements.

Mr ONDARCHIE — But whoever it is needs to get on with it, do they not?

Capt. COX — Yes. They need to get on with it now.

Mr ONDARCHIE — My final question is around what we have been told is colloquially called 'the last mile' — where the containers get almost into the port and then are off-loaded onto a truck. They find themselves right round Yarraville and Hyde Street, and there is all sorts of fun around there. People have said, 'Yes, we do need a rail solution for that last mile'. The government will say to you that they are going to ask bidders to propose some ideas around that, but it is not a firm commitment to putting rail into that last mile. Would you like to see that last mile rail committed to in this process before the lease is undertaken?

Capt. COX — In Melbourne?

Mr ONDARCHIE — Yes.

Capt. COX — Yes, but who is going to supply the land and one thing or another for that last mile? There are a lot of complications there.

Mr ONDARCHIE — My real question is: should it be committed to?

Capt. COX — It should be, yes, very much so.

Mr ONDARCHIE — Thank you.

Capt. COX — Rail is very important now. Unfortunately in the 60s, when all this land was put aside, the government in those days actually stated that they did not think rail was for ports, but we know it is for ports now. We see that across the world.

Mr ONDARCHIE — Thank you.

Mr DRUM — Captain, it is interesting that you talk about capacity, because you have even thrown another spanner in the works with this committee trying to gauge who is telling the truth about the potential capacity at the existing port of Melbourne. Until your evidence we have previously had Victoria University talking about capacity based on existing quayside metreage with world best practice operating behind that quayside metreage, bringing the capacity in at about 5.5. Then we have been told by others that somehow or other they are going to increase quayside metreage and therefore increase capacity. Can that work at the port of Melbourne? Can they increase quayside metreage at the port of Melbourne?

Capt. COX — I think Victoria University answered that one. I think they said no, because there is no land backing in behind where they need to go. Where all the bulk berths and things like that are, there is just no landside backing there. They have got maximum landside backing now. Even moving to Webb Dock, they are only talking about 1 million TEU. That is the only place that the big ships can go in, and you can only get one of those at one time into Webb Dock.

Mr DRUM — Until your presentation we believed that the VU calculations were very conservative at the lower end. But you are actually saying that they are using a throughput per metre at 2200, which is exceptionally aggressive. You are saying that currently throughput of quayside metreage is based around half of that amount at the port of Melbourne, about 1100?

Capt. COX — Yes. Those figures were from the BITRE report, and 1195 — —

Mr DRUM — So it is less than half of what even Victoria University's calculations are based on. I am trying to get this. The port of Melbourne, the government and the department of Treasury are trying tell us that they are going to more than double the current throughput per quay-line metreage, and they are going to somehow or other double or triple the quayside metreage to create a capacity somewhere in the order of 7 to 8 million. From someone who has had their whole career in this industry, is there any credibility in these calculations?

Capt. COX — No. Victoria University, which gets most of its funding from the Labor Party, I believe — —

Mr MULINO — I do not know about that.

Mr ONDARCHIE — It would be one of many organisations.

Mr DRUM — Maybe not getting too much into the future.

Capt. COX — They have come up with these figures, which quite surprised me when I read the presentation to the committee. I have used their figures and worked on them. I assumed that they would be giving the best figures available that they thought was the maximum.

Mr DRUM — With the current agreement that we have been asked to pass with the legislation — and I do not know how the realities of all this would play out — is there the potential that a winning bidder can come in and assume: we are going to reach an agreement with government, we are going to pay you a truckload of money, we are going to go to the high end of the spectrum with what we are going to pay for the lease — let us call it 7.5 billion or let us call it 8 billion — we are going to put in a really high capacity, around 8 million TEU? Is there a threat then that that company, that lessee, could be sitting there at the port of Melbourne making really strong returns on their money for the next 20, 30, 40, 50, 60 and 70 years but not actually ever getting to that agreed capacity?

Capt. COX — Yes. They just go on the Victoria University figures. They are not going to get to that figure — they cannot.

Mr DRUM — Until they get to that capacity, they are going to be liable for any — —

Capt. COX — Our grandchildren are going to be paying for it.

Mr DRUM — Any future government of any persuasion, of any colour, is then going to be bound to pay the existing leaseholders the compensation, which is the shortfall between what they are currently operating at and the agreed capacity back in 2015, which might have been 40 years ago?

Capt. COX — I quite agree. There should be no figure at all, no compensation figure. It is absolutely ridiculous.

Mr DRUM — If you do the 6 per cent — which I urged the other council groups to do earlier — at 6 per cent, which is our current growth rates, on the existing 2.5 million, we get to the 4.6 figure in around 2026, so it is 11 years. We get to the next figure of 5.6 in 14 years.

Capt. COX — If you use the 70 per cent capacity, the ‘you should start building’ figure that I have mentioned — —

Mr DRUM — You are nearly already there.

Capt. COX — Less than 4 — say about 3.8, which — —

Mr DRUM — Three point eight is in 2021.

Capt. COX — 2021. That does not give us much time for planning and approvals.

Mr DRUM — No. Again we are being asked by the government to agree to this legislation and we will just leave all that out there in the ether and we will sort it out with the winning consortium after the lease is signed. They will have their agreed capacity. They will worry about where a new or a second port might go — whether that be at Bay West, whether it be at Hastings or whether it be both — but we will worry about all of this after the event and some future government can come up with the money for the infrastructure and possibly the compensation clause.

Capt. COX — As I said, that is our grandchildren’s money disappearing out the door.

Mr DRUM — Okay. Thank you.

Mr MULINO — Just one quick follow-up. This has been a contentious issue, the capacity potential. I was just wondering, have you had a chance to look at the port’s 2006 and 2009 reports?

Capt. COX — I did many years ago, but — —

Mr ONDARCHIE — That was not the one that recommend the east–west link, was it?

Mr MULINO — No, that was 45 cents in the dollar.

Mr ONDARCHIE — That was the 2008 report, was it not?

Mr MULINO — You are supposed to get a dollar for a dollar.

Capt. COX — I am just trying to remember the figure they came up with in their presentation, which was not that high figure.

Mr MULINO — That is where the 7 million to 8 million largely comes from. I guess I am just asking if you have not had a chance to look at them lately, I would be interested perhaps even later on getting any feedback you have on that analysis.

Capt. COX — No, there is nothing later on that at all, unfortunately. Whether that is a figure that KPMG used, I am not sure.

Mr MULINO — I think that DTF is largely relying on that port analysis.

Capt. COX — I fought tooth and nail against channel deepening as well and did not get anywhere there. That should never have happened, but there we go. That is another story.

The CHAIR — Captain Cox, thank you very much for your evidence this morning and your submission. The committee appreciates hearing your perspective on the matters we are considering. There will be a draft transcript for you in the next couple of days for any corrections, but thank you for your time this morning.

Capt. COX — Thanks very much indeed.

Witness withdrew.