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Introduction

Infrastructure Victoria, an independent statutory body tasked with developing a 30-year infrastructure strategy for the state, undertook a program of consultation with stakeholders and the community in the first quarter of 2016. The consultation program was independently designed and coordinated by Nation Partners, a consulting firm specialising in stakeholder relations and engagement.

The central focus of the program was *Laying the foundations*, a discussion paper that set out what Victoria’s 30-year infrastructure strategy was trying to achieve and what infrastructure challenges and opportunities need to be addressed.

The purpose of the consultation was to engage with the broader Victorian community and capture their understanding of and support for the draft strategic framework.

This report, prepared by Nation Partners, summarises the outcomes and key findings of the consultation program. The report is divided into three sections:

**Section 1** provides an overview of the key findings, an outline of the consultation approach, a profile of participation and representation, and a description of the overarching methodology applied by Nation Partners.

**Section 2** synthesises and summarises the feedback received on the overall framework and the draft Objectives and Needs, and provides samples of verbatim comments taken from the consultation.

**Section 3** summarises lessons from the consultation program and provides supporting appendices.
a. Key findings

- There was strong participation in the consultation program: **126 formal submissions were received** from stakeholders and community members; **92 stakeholders attended workshops**; and **443 surveys responses were received** through an online engagement exercise.

- Stakeholders from **local government, transport and economic development sectors were among the most active contributors to the consultation process**. Conversely, there was a low number of submissions and attendance by stakeholders in the energy, ICT and justice and emergency services sectors.

- There was strong **support for the Infrastructure Victoria process and underlying principles**, particularly non-build solutions with a desire to better utilise existing infrastructure.

- At a general level, feedback received during the workshops and in submissions was that the **draft Objectives were too passive**. Stakeholders and submitters called for a more proactive tone to be adopted.

- Many consultation participants made clear and quantifiable suggestions for **improvements to the focus and meaning of many of the draft Needs**.

- At a specific level, key words contained in the Needs have been identified and questioned by stakeholders and submitters – feedback indicates that some require **greater clarity and others more context** for their inclusion.

- Across the three forms of consultation, **draft Objectives 1-5 and their associated Needs** (the first half of the framework) generated the majority of the feedback throughout the consultation.

- **77% of the formal submissions received addressed Laying the foundations**, providing direct feedback on the draft Objectives and Needs or discussion in general.

- **23% of submissions did not directly address Laying the foundations**, but instead offered infrastructure solutions or commentary on infrastructure topics of special interest.

- Of the submissions that provided feedback on **Laying the foundations**, **50% were regarded as broadly positive** towards Infrastructure Victoria’s strategic framework; **38% were seen as neutral**; and **12% were classified as arguing for a fundamentally different approach**.

- In workshops, formal submissions and online, the **needs of regional and rural Victoria** emerged as a strong theme, with many submitters proposing reframed or additional Needs and Objectives to capture the particular infrastructure challenges faced by regional Victoria.

- In addition to this topic, a number of other key themes were identified, among them: the central consideration of **funding and financing** in infrastructure planning and development; the integration of **land use and infrastructure planning**; the role of local government; and support for growth of multiple **decentralised activity centres** in suburban and outer suburban Melbourne and regional Victoria to provide for population growth and to relieve pressure on the city centre.
b. Consultation approach

Infrastructure Victoria’s consultation on *Laying the foundations* ran from 15 February to 11 March. Stakeholders and community members were engaged via three key activities:

1) Workshops

Four stakeholder workshops were held - three in regional Victoria (Sale, Bendigo and Ballarat) and one in Melbourne. The workshops were led by independent facilitators, who sought feedback on what was most important to stakeholders about infrastructure planning over the next 30 years and how the draft Objectives and Needs could be improved. Stakeholders were invited to write their thoughts, ideas or feedback on post-it notes. These notes were then gathered at the conclusion of the workshops and later transcribed and analysed. Stakeholders were also asked to prioritise the draft Needs through a simple voting exercise.

2) Submissions

Stakeholders and community members were able to provide formal submissions to Infrastructure Victoria. Submitters were provided with prompter questions as follows:

*Hearing from you*
- What is most important to you in planning Victoria’s infrastructure for the next 30 years?
- Improving the objectives
  - How could the objectives be improved?
  - Should any objectives be added, removed or combined?
- Prioritising the infrastructure needs
  - How could the infrastructure needs be improved and, in particular, what needs don’t appear that you would like to see included?
  - What needs are most important and least important to you? Think top and bottom three.
- Drawing on evidence
  - Can you think of any examples to illustrate your points?
  - What evidence might support your views or help improve the strategy?

Submitters were able to lodge submissions via the *Your Say* portal or by sending an email to a generic Infrastructure Victoria address.

3) Online engagement

Online engagement activities provided a forum for participants to table ideas and comments to Infrastructure Victoria through the *Your Say* portal. The portal offered users four separate consultation inputs:
- *What is most important when planning infrastructure for the next 30 years? Share a Thought*
- *Needs survey*
- *Comment on an objective*
- *Think there’s something we missed? Tell Us Here*
c. Participation and representation

The consultation process engaged a broad spectrum of stakeholders and community members across Victoria. Stakeholders from local government and transport accounted for the largest number of contributors in workshops and written submissions. As Figures 1a and 1c illustrate, there was a low level of engagement from stakeholders in some sectors, particularly energy, ICT and justice and emergency services.

Stakeholder workshops

92 stakeholders attended workshops in Sale, Bendigo, Ballarat and Melbourne, mainly from the local government, transport and economic development organisations. Figures 1a and 1b show the spread of attendees by sector.

Figure 1a. Workshop attendees by sector (Sale, Bendigo, Ballarat and Melbourne)

![Figure 1a. Workshop attendees by sector](image)

Figure 1b. Workshop attendees by sector - multi-sector (Sale, Bendigo, Ballarat and Melbourne)

![Figure 1b. Workshop attendees by sector - multi-sector](image)
Submissions

126 written submissions were received with nearly half received from individuals (25), councils or local government representative bodies (24) and transport stakeholders (17).

Figures 1c and 1d show the spread of submissions by sector. No submissions were received from stakeholders in the energy, ICT or justice and emergency services sectors.

**Figure 1c. Submissions received by sector**

![Bar chart showing submissions by sector](image1)

**Figure 1d. Submissions received by sector (multi-sector)**

![Bar chart showing submissions by multi-sector](image2)
Online engagement

Community members and stakeholders were able to participate using several online engagement activities. The most popular activity was the Needs Survey tool. 443 separate surveys were conducted in the Needs Survey section, with a total of 4310 votes received.

Age Profile of survey respondents
Respondents aged between 35 and 44 accounted for the largest range of respondents (86 surveys lodged). 75 surveys were completed by those aged under 15, most from postcode 3149 and surrounds. It is likely these were submitted by students from a local secondary school. Only a small number of surveys were lodged by those aged 15-19 and 20-24 (see Figure 1e).

Postcode profile of survey respondents
64 surveys were received from those located in postcode 3149, Mount Waverley and it appears all bar one were submitted by the aforementioned students. The next largest number of votes was: 3066 (Collingwood) 8 votes, 3000 (Melbourne) 8 votes and 3995 (Wonthaggi, Cape Paterson, Kilcunda) 8 votes. Around a third of all survey responses were made from regional Victoria (see Figure 1f).

Figure 1e. Age of online needs survey respondents

![Age of online needs survey respondents](image)

Figure 1f. Location of online needs survey respondents

![Location of online needs survey respondents](image)
d. Feedback analysis and reporting methodology

Preparation of this report and the underpinning reports has been conducted through an intensive method of data capture and analysis. NVivo, a qualitative research tool, has been used to provide a comprehensive data organisation and analysis process.

NVivo was used throughout the consultation program to organise, categorise and ultimately analyse the data given to Infrastructure Victoria. In addition, a professional research consultant with advanced knowledge of NVivo was engaged to guide the analysis and reporting process.

The task for the data analysts was to sift through many hundreds of individual pieces of data (post-it notes taken from workshops, submissions sent to Infrastructure Victoria, content provided online by website users), and to analyse this and apply ‘a code’. A code frame that could best sort and analyse the data was developed. Having established the code frame, the analysts sorted and intensively read through the collated data, applying a code that best reflected each input.

The following samples provide an indication of the coding method.

- These comments were both identified as relating generally to the framework and Laying the foundations paper:
  “The paper is a serious effort to articulate the challenges facing the state, and has a strong grasp of some of the key environmental considerations.”
  “There needs to be a high-level goal, and the objectives need to deliver on that goal. This might prioritise the objectives.”

- Whereas the following feedback was coded as relating specifically to improvements to Need 1C:
  “1C Needs to be ‘education’ not just ‘school’, pre-school, primary, secondary, vocational, higher education”.


2. Detailed review of consultation feedback

a. Feedback on overall framework

Stakeholders and individual consultation participants were largely supportive in their assessment of the overall strategic framework employed by Infrastructure Victoria. That said, there were some calls for major change. The following represents a summary of the diverse array of responses received.

Many stakeholders felt optimistic about the approach adopted by Infrastructure Victoria, in particular, the focus on social, economic and environmental outcomes and the cross-sector, state-wide scope:

“Now that Infrastructure Victoria has been established, it provides us with great confidence to see its robust and well-considered approach to the development of its first 30-year infrastructure strategy.” Committee for Melbourne

“The focus on outcomes in Laying the foundations is encouraging. Such an approach recognises that infrastructure is not an end in itself. It ensures that infrastructure priorities are targeted at the most pressing areas of need and enables non-build solutions that facilitate the more efficient use of existing assets to be evaluated against proposals for new assets.” Victorian Chamber of Commerce and Industry

“It is refreshing to see the consideration of infrastructure to be broader than that associated with the important issue of transport alone. G21 therefore supports the guiding principles outlined in the paper and considers the identified draft objectives and draft needs as comprehensive.” G21 - Geelong Regional Alliance

“The Murray River Group of Councils welcomes the development of the 30 year infrastructure strategy and in particular welcomes the ‘Whole-of-Victoria approach’.” Murray River Group of Councils

The draft Objectives and Needs, and the Laying the foundations paper more generally, were seen to have captured the infrastructure challenges confronting Victoria:

‘I think you have covered most of the pressing challenges.’ Online contributor

“Comfortable that the objectives capture all relevant issues – particularly when read in conjunction with the needs.” Melbourne workshop participant

“Agree with objectives, can’t think of anything that has been missed.” Sale workshop participant

“The paper is a serious effort to articulate the challenges facing the state, and has a strong grasp of some of the key environmental considerations.” Environment Victoria

Support was also expressed for specific objectives and needs:

“VCOSS welcomes the focus on reducing disadvantage [draft Objective 3] in the Laying the foundations paper. Too often infrastructure development has focused on narrow economic benefits and ignored the potential to develop a fairer Victoria.” Victorian Council of Social Services
“Supporting Victoria’s changing global integrated economy (Draft Objective 6) is essential if Victoria is to remain competitive with the rest of the world. Emerging markets and trade export opportunities need support from State and Federal Governments if the economy is to grow and prosper.” Committee for Portland

“The separation between Objective 7 [Promote sustainable production and consumption] and 8 [Protect and enhance natural environments] is supported, as there appears to be a useful functional distinction between our production and consumption (which may have wider impacts at a national or even global scale) which is distinct from the specific impacts to natural ecosystems in Victoria, which may arise from local impacts of population growth and other factors.” City of Port Philip

While recognising the general and specific support for the framework and Infrastructure Victoria’s approach to its strategy development, it is essential to note calls for fundamental changes to the draft framework. These comments were not restricted to one form of consultation input but could be identified across workshops, formal submissions and in online feedback.

Specific suggestions on how Infrastructure Victoria’s strategic framework should be revised were made by several stakeholders.

Some suggested a new framework should replace the existing one:

“We believe that there are too many objectives in the current discussion paper and that many of these are too micro or specific. We have therefore suggested a simplified set of objectives framed around desirable outcomes for our society – these objectives focus on maximising outcomes in relation to Global Competitiveness, Productivity, Liveability and Sustainability.” KPMG

Others recommended that the framework be refined, not overturned:

“We fully support the scope and diversity of the draft Objectives presented in Laying the foundations, however we find some of the Needs to be tactical... compared with others that are more strategic... We recommend that an Objectives | Strategies | Tactics framework be adopted in preference to the Objectives | Needs approach to make room for strategic responses to the draft Objectives and to enable specific tactical outcomes to be articulated.” Institute of Public Works Engineering Australasia

“The objectives proposed by Infrastructure Victoria in Laying the foundations are sound and worthwhile. They balance economic, social and environmental considerations and are broad enough to capture the range of issues facing Victoria... Unfortunately the draft needs set out in the paper seem to lose the broadness of the objectives. This will significantly constrain the matters and projects that can be considered when developing the 30-year Infrastructure Strategy and appears to be ‘picking winners’ and infrastructure outcomes.” Municipal Association of Victoria

“We believe that the needs listed under each draft objective relate to multiple objectives. To illustrate this point we have attached a matrix which reflects this interconnectedness.” Committee for Melbourne
The consultation process drew out several calls for a vision or goal statement to be added to the framework, among them:

“There needs to be a high-level goal, and the objectives need to deliver on that goal. This might prioritise the objectives” and “[the frameworks needs] a column to the left of higher order objectives.” Melbourne workshop participants

“Interface Councils feel there is an absence of a ‘vision for the people of Victoria’ in the current strategy framework. It is crucial this is at the forefront of Infrastructure Victoria’s 30-Year Strategy, and that the objectives respond to this vision.” Interface Councils

“The 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy should to be guided by a vision for the people of Victoria. The vision should focus on delivering equitable access to social and physical infrastructure that facilitates day to day living that enables the community to successfully achieve healthy and fulfilling lives.” City of Whittlesea

The comments above give a sense of the overall response to the strategic framework set out in Laying the foundations. Many stakeholders expressed support for the framework, and even those who proposed some fundamental change often saw value in parts.

But whether supportive or challenging, most participants in consultations had suggestions for how the draft Objectives and Needs could be improved. The following section summarises this feedback.

b. Feedback on draft Objectives and Needs

This section provides an overview of the comments directed at the draft Objectives and Needs throughout the consultation. It is not an exhaustive catalogue of each and every comment made across the different forms of consultation.

Instead, this section draws attention to those comments and feedback that make specific suggestions and offer new insights into the improvement of the suite of Objectives and Needs. The scope of this section is to highlight what should be changed, not what should stay the same.

Objective 1 and Needs A, B, C

Draft Objective 1: Respond to population growth and change.
Draft Needs for Objective 1:
A. Address infrastructure deficits in high-growth areas.
B. Manage increasing demands on health infrastructure.
C. Provide access to high-quality school facilities.

The consultation program received significant feedback for draft Objective 1 and its accompanying Needs. From formal submissions received, to feedback in workshops, to other engagement activities, stakeholders and community members revealed an abiding engagement in this area.

Among the various forms of feedback were suggestions for changes to wording and tone. In essence, consultation participants wanted: ‘shape’ or ‘plan for’ instead of just ‘respond to’.
“The objective is written in a reactive manner. Mitchell Shire supports a proactive approach to delivering infrastructure to support growing populations including the delivery of enabling infrastructure and the early delivery of critical community infrastructure.” Mitchell Shire Council

A secondary trend that emerged through the consultation on Objective 1 Needs A, B, C was the view that the focus on outer urban growth areas was limiting, and that pressures were also felt in fast growing established areas and in areas experiencing decline:

“Recommendation 1. The strategy acknowledges the particular infrastructure pressures faced by inner urban areas experiencing major population growth and change.” Maribyrnong City Council

“Consideration must be given to areas of declining or static growth and a scaled approach developed to deliver basic infrastructure…” Peri Urban Group of Rural Councils

“What are the consequences of focussing primarily on high-growth areas?” Sale workshop participant

A third trend to note was a questioning of the focus on ‘health and ‘schools’ in Needs B and C, with suggestions to expand the needs:

“Why only demands on health infrastructure? Other social support infrastructure – aged care, disability.” Melbourne workshop participant

“[W]e would suggest point C be amended to ‘Provide access to educational facilities, thus expanding the targeted age and range of facilities to be accommodated.’ Eureka Bulk Shipping

“1C Needs to be ‘education’ not just ‘school’, pre-school, primary, secondary, vocational, higher education.” Bendigo workshop participant

Objective 1 and the accompanying Needs A, B and C produced a number of additional objectives and needs, a small sample of which includes:

“Better integrated infrastructure requirements into planning decisions.” Bass Coast Shire

“Prioritise growth to existing Activity Centres thereby maximizing existing infrastructure use.” Brimbank City Council

“Add need 1D. Provide for an ageing society (it is an economic imperative that seniors are fit, active and participating as long as possible).” Melbourne workshop participant

**Objective 2 and Needs A, B, C, D**

**Draft Objective 2:** Support healthy, safe and vibrant communities.

**Draft Needs for Objective 2:**
A. Enable physical activity through infrastructure and urban design.
B. Provide good public spaces where communities can come together.
C. Strengthen access to cultural infrastructure.
D. Maximise positive impacts on amenity and wellbeing from infrastructure.
Objective 2 Needs A, B, C and D generated much discussion and input from participants across the three streams of consultation.

Commentary was largely focused on three areas – a view that this Objective was too passive, the need to include more all-embracing language in the Objective and Needs and a desire to expand the meaning of the existing Needs.

On the issue of passive language, some participants commented:

“Is the word ‘support’ strong enough for Objective 2?” Melbourne workshop participant

“Change ‘support’ to ‘build’, support is a nothing word.” Melbourne workshop participant

The reference to ‘communities’ in Objective 2 captured the interest of several stakeholders. With one of the comments proposing ‘communities’ be prefaced with ‘diverse’ or ‘inclusive’. As represented here:

“Recommendation: Draft Objective 2 ‘Support healthy, safe and vibrant communities’ be amended to include ‘inclusive’ as an objective.” Carers Victoria

The draft Needs A, B, C and D also saw some scrutiny. Several proposed refinements were offered, for example:

“There is value in making specific reference to addressing the shortage of quality sports and recreational facilities across regional Victoria.” Cricket Australia

“Cultural infrastructure - It’s not just about improving access, but also about improving the quality and type of cultural infrastructure to make Melbourne a truly global city.” Online contributor

Online engagement revealed a strong interest in Objective 2 and Need A, B, C and D. While online commenters did not always reference or acknowledge the draft Objectives or Needs, their comments revealed deep engagement in the challenges and opportunities relevant to this section of the framework:

“Focus on community and green spaces.” Online contributor

“People are happy and healthier in a green, natural setting so services must be designed and built to reduce the land that is used.” Online contributor

A limited number of additional Objectives and Needs were proposed, for example:

“There needs to be a 5th need which acknowledges the importance of community voice in the development, planning and construction of infrastructure.” La Trobe City Council

Objective 3 and Needs A, B, C

Draft Objective 3: Reduce disadvantage.

Draft Needs for Objective 3:
A. Improve accessibility for people with disabilities and/or mobility challenges through infrastructure.
B. Address housing affordability challenges with better social housing.
C. Support changing approaches to social service and justice delivery through infrastructure. Draft Objective 3 and Needs A, B and C were the subject of significant engagement and interest.

Some participants questioned the use of the word ‘disadvantage’ in the objective, suggesting it required clarification and better definition:

“Reduce disadvantage – perhaps not a separate objective but rather addressed through every objective/need.” Ballarat workshop participant

Other stakeholders and community members argued that the emphasis should be on ‘advantage’ and ‘growth’ not ‘disadvantage’.

“Objective 3 ‘promote’ or ‘facilitate’ advantage rather than disadvantage.” Ballarat workshop participant

“Reduce disadvantage suggests fixing the problem of inequity rather than proactively seeking to prevent it. Therefore, we recommend that this objective should be renamed Encourage equity or Support equity of access to take a more positive and proactive approach to preventing as well as addressing disadvantage.” City of Whittlesea

There was an appetite to broaden Need 3A:

“Accessibility needs to be broader – ‘whole spectrum’ of disadvantage; homeless, ‘fall on hard times’, all strata of society.” Melbourne workshop participant

“More than disabilities, accessing of the ‘walking dependent’ – in many services, disabilities, and young children, i.e. those who don’t drive or who are dependent on another.” Melbourne workshop participant

The reference to social housing generated some interest from stakeholders:

“Address housing affordability challenges with more social housing, quality, availability and stability.” Melbourne workshop participant

“‘Better’ social housing needs to also consider location. For accessibility of transport, services, jobs of community integration.” Bendigo workshop participant

“We would like to see the further development of point 3 Reduce disadvantage to include broader action than the one outlined in draft need B. Address housing affordability challenges with better social housing.” Community Housing Federation of Victoria

**Objective 4 and Needs A, B, C**

**Draft Objective 4:** Enable workforce participation.

**Draft Needs for Objective 4:**
A. Provide access to the diversity of employment opportunities offered by the central city.
B. Provide better links to non-central city employment centres.
C. Improve access to early childhood care facilities.

Feedback on passive language represented much of the commentary on Objective 4 and Needs A, B and C.
Stakeholders in workshops and in submissions recommended employment of more proactive language:

“4 drive workforce participation.” Sale workshop participant

Another submission suggested that 4A should be expanded:

“4A. Needs to be broadened – regional centres can accommodate opportunities, regional cities not new, but leveraged existing.” Melbourne workshop participant

A significant number of new Needs were proposed during the consultation process. Stakeholders and community members were keen to highlight the need to enhance access and mobility to jobs and within employment areas, evidenced by these comments:

“4 improve access and availability of training education in smaller regional centres.” Ballarat workshop

“4. focus on infrastructure that supports job creation across the state.” Ballarat workshop

“Need 4. Must have a need that looks at improving mobility within employment centres (walkability is key).” Melbourne workshop participant

Online engagement provided some engagement with the issues specific to Objective 4 and Needs A, B and C. Of most interest was the need to better connect people with jobs.

“Rural & Regional Victorians are being disadvantaged through lack of support in employment opportunities and productivity opportunities.” Online contributor

And as another suggested: “Bring jobs to people, people closer to jobs.” Online contributor

Objective 5 and Needs A and B

Draft Objective 5: Lift Victoria’s productivity.
Draft Needs for Objective 5:
A. Improve the efficiency of freight supply chains through infrastructure.
B. Move people to and from airports more efficiently.

Consultation participants made little reference to the language or tone of this draft Objective, but instead offered a raft of suggestions as to how Need B could be expanded.

Several stakeholders indicated a view that Objective 5 and Needs A and B could be best met by focussing on existing infrastructure.

“Objectives 5: get more out of existing assets ‘sweat the asset’.” Ballarat workshop participant

“Improved productivity and capacity by better utilisation of the road, rail and port assets currently in place.” Victorian Transport Association

Significant criticism was directed at the reference to ‘airports’ in relationship to Need 5B:
“The need ‘Move people to and from airports efficiently’ is narrow and can only be satisfied by a project linking to the State’s airports. A need that could be used as a more general measure would be ‘Ensure connectivity between different transport modes’ or ‘enhance interstate and international connectivity’, which could include freight, High Speed Rail, ports as well as airports.” Consult Australia.

“Airport reference is very specific. Should instead focus on an integrated transport system that includes airports/ports. Need to address gaps as well as efficiency.” Municipal Association of Victoria

The online engagement activities revealed some appetite for an Objective and Need that was focused on moving goods or connecting people efficiently:

“We need to make it easier and cheaper for people to get around. No one wants to spend hours every day just to get to and from employment. Life’s too short to be stuck in traffic and it makes us mad.” Online contributor

“I think that we need to connect the city better. I would be happy to pay for roads through tolls. However it is hard to want to pay just to sit in gridlock.” Online contributor

“Congestion in both public transport and roads during peak hour is a big challenge. Furthermore, as freight and passenger share the same infrastructure and passenger is the priority, inefficiencies in freight movements occur.” Online contributor

**Objective 6 and Need A and B**

**Draft Objective 6:** Support Victoria’s changing, globally integrated economy.

**Draft Needs for Objective 6:**
A. Boost tourism through infrastructure provision.
B. Enable the growth of a highly skilled, digitally connected workforce through infrastructure.

Objective 6 and the accompanying needs received limited comments and feedback across the consultation.

Some submissions did question the inclusion of this Objective:

“Objective 6 may not be needed as Need A could be incorporated into Objective 4, if the focus is adjusted slightly, and Need B could be incorporated into Objective 5.” City of Whittlesea

One recurring theme that emerged within the captured commentary was a questioning of the inclusion of ‘tourism’:

“Boosting tourism seems to come out of nowhere – why is no one supporting a changing economy?” and “6a? How does it meet Objectives? Very targeted.” Melbourne workshop participants

**Objective 7 and Needs A and B**

**Draft Objective 7:** Promote sustainable production and consumption.

**Draft Needs for Objective 7:**
A. Improve rural and regional water security.
B. Manage pressures on landfill and waste recovery facilities.
Objective 7 and Needs A and B were the subject of only a small number of comments throughout the consultation process. A sample of these is as follows:

“The anthropocentric approach of Objective 7 and separation from Objective 8 narrows the view and increases the potential for removing the consideration of environmental outcomes in productive landscape uses.” City of Whittlesea

“7. Sustainable consumption could mean “maintaining” consumption, or have an environmental meaning for sustainable. Should it be “reduce consumption per person” for natural resources?” Melbourne workshop participant

“Objective 7B. Minimise waste generated by household and industry.” Melbourne workshop participant

Objective 8 and Needs A and B

Draft Objective 8: Protect and enhance natural environments.
Draft Needs for Objective 8:
A. Help preserve natural environments and minimise biodiversity loss through infrastructure.
B. Improve the health of waterways through infrastructure.

Objective 8 and Needs A and B received minimal feedback from stakeholders and community members. Most of the comments revolved around including new words or expanding the existing Needs to encompass additional elements, such as:

“[We recommend] that the integral connection of these waterways to our coastal and marine environment through estuaries, lakes and bays, which are themselves suffering significant degradation, be clearly articulated.” Victorian Coastal Council

“Include marine environments i.e. ‘Improve the health of waterways and marine environments through infrastructure’” Interface Councils

“Recommendation 10. The Strategy looks to establish parity in the treatment of, and investment across, all of Victoria’s major waterways.” Maribyrnong City Council

Online engagement revealed an interest in the infrastructure challenges particular to this Objective and Needs. As reflected in these comments:

“Enhanced coastal and in-land waterway infrastructure emphasising access.” Online contributor

“Ensure that there is plenty of naturalistic areas and linked habitat corridors for people to enjoy and for fauna to use.” Online contributor

“Planning for infrastructure that complements coastal and marine natural processes, biodiversity and amenity values.” Online contributor

Objective 9 and Needs A and B

Draft Objective 9: Support climate change mitigation and adaptation.
Draft Needs for Objective 9:
A. Smooth the adjustment to a carbon-constrained world through infrastructure.
B. Adapt infrastructure to changing climate conditions.
Objective 9 and Needs A and B received minimal discussion and feedback throughout the consultation process. Only a small number of comments, mostly from stakeholders who had brought specific focus on the content area, were captured.

“Climate change is a passive approach – the way it has been framed.” Bendigo workshop participant

Another stakeholder who attended the Ballarat workshop suggested a shift in language on Objective 9A. “Use ‘low carbon energy efficient’ rather than ‘carbon constrained.’” Ballarat workshop participant

“Greater emphasis should be given to transitioning from fossil fuel based energy to sustainable energy solutions.” Base Coast Shire Council

“9A. Focus should be broader than energy, for example construction materials, passive design.” Melbourne workshop participant

**Objective 10 and Needs A and B**

**Draft objective 10:** Build resilience to shocks.

**Draft needs for objective 10:**

A. Improve the resilience of critical infrastructure to disruptive events.
B. Address infrastructure-related emergency response challenges.

Objective 10 and Needs A and B generated minimal feedback throughout the consultation process. Stakeholders and community members who did offer feedback, generally believed the Objective and accompanying Needs could be expanded or repositioned:

“[Objective 10 could] be widened to include reference to security issues.” City of Greater Dandenong

“why just disruptive? the key is longevity, future proofing, maintainability, scale up/scale down, not just dealing with one off events.” Ballarat workshop participant

“Objective 10: define disruptive events, is it just natural disaster?” Ballarat workshop participant

Furthermore, Objective 10 and Needs A and B were also identified as requiring a proactive framing. As La Trobe City Council stated in their submission:

“The needs highlighted has a very post event focus. The document needs to consider a more proactive approach to support communities and infrastructure to have greater resilience to shocks.” La Trobe City Council

At the online engagement level, there was a low level of engagement in this subject area. One comment received that did relate to Objective 10:

“Most pressing issues covered in general, but urgent specific needs are not canvassed. Emergency egress from ultra high fire risk area of Warrandyte Eltham, kangaroo ground Doreen etc have largely been ignored or postponed. Bandaid measures as mooted are not acceptable. More independent egress paths are needed NOW both as life saving measures and as long term infrastructure.” Online contributor
c. Needs voting

In addition to the qualitative data on the draft Needs discussed above, quantitative data on how Needs should be prioritised was gathered through simple voting exercises in stakeholder workshops and online. Full results are at Appendices A and C.

Workshops

In order to establish a general understanding of how the draft Needs should be prioritised, stakeholders at workshops were invited to vote on the 25 draft Needs by allocating 10 dots. Stakeholders could allocate multiple dots to one Need or spread them across the Needs of most importance to them. Additional needs identified during the workshops were also added to the list of 25 for voting.

The results revealed some interesting trends across Ballarat, Bendigo and Melbourne – all of which favoured addressing population change, supporting communities and economic-focused Needs. In Sale, results were notably different where stakeholders favoured Needs focussed on the environment, production and agriculture.

Need 5A – Improve the efficiency of freight supply chains through infrastructure was among the top four Needs in Sale, Ballarat and Melbourne.

Need 6B – Enable the growth of a highly skilled, digitally connected workforce through infrastructure was also popular in both Ballarat and Melbourne earning 9% and 5% of the vote respectively.

In Sale, a Need created in the workshop to “Redress urbanisation trend to see regional Vic help to manage population growth” was the most popular, scoring 12%.

In Bendigo, Need 1B – Manage increasing demands on health infrastructure scored the highest with 8% of the vote.

In Ballarat, 6B – Enable the growth of a highly skilled, digitally connected workforce through infrastructure was the most popular Need, receiving 10% of the vote.

In Melbourne, the most popular Need among stakeholders, 1A – Address infrastructure deficits in high-growth areas, scored 9.2% of the vote.

Online needs survey

In addition to this exercise at workshops, the Your Say portal provided a survey for consultation participants to vote on their preferred Need. Website users were able to cast 10 votes for their preferred need. In total 4310 votes were cast.

The Need which scored the highest number of votes was an alternative Need to “Improve transport to jobs and services in regional centres”, with 59% of respondents voting for it.

The second most popular was also an alternative Need: “Better integrate infrastructure requirements into planning decisions”, with 54% of respondents expressing their support.

Third most popular was 1B – Manage increasing demands on health infrastructure, supported by 49% of respondents and fourth was 2B – Enable physical activity through infrastructure and urban design, supported by 46% of respondents.
Least popular was Need 2C – Strengthen access to cultural infrastructure and Need 6A – Boost tourism through infrastructure provision, both being supported by just 10% of respondents.

d. Key themes

Across the three streams of consultation, a number of broad themes emerged. While these themes did not necessarily always relate to specific Objectives and Needs, they were captured because they related broadly to Infrastructure Victoria’s task of developing a 30-year infrastructure strategy for the state.

Regional/rural focus

A common theme that resonated throughout the consultation program was the desire for a stronger regional/rural focus. Stakeholders and community members called for greater attention to be paid to the challenges and opportunities particular to regional Victoria and expressed the desire for greater referencing of the regional Victorian context in the draft Objectives and Needs:

“RCV is very supportive of Infrastructure Victoria’s bold plan to develop a much needed strategic, long-term approach to infrastructure development in the state… [but] after careful reading of the Foundations document, RCV’s response is one of disappointment at the seemingly cursory manner in which regional Victoria has been treated in your initial thinking, a point raised not only by us, but also by other representatives at the workshops.” Regional Cities Victoria.

“VAFI supports the intention of the strategy objectives and recommends that they clearly recognise regional Victorians, noting that the final strategy should balance the needs of regional Victoria and metropolitan Melbourne.” Victorian Association of Forest Industries

“Communities which are not growing in population or declining in population, such as in many rural areas, are also entitled to modern standards of infrastructure as much as growth areas. The only difference that should be considered is the scale and quantity of infrastructure that needs to be provided in rural areas – not the quality.” Horsham Rural City Council

Several submissions argued that, with the right infrastructure, regional areas had the potential grow and thrive, and to reduce population pressures in Melbourne:

“Our vision is of a state that has not just an urban sprawl of Melbourne and a number of small satellite cities, but a state of integrated regional hubs. These hubs will have vibrant communities and thriving industries connected to an attractive and green Melbourne.” Committee for Greater Shepparton

“Regional Victoria should be seen as providing a relief valve for population pressures…There is merit in considering Victoria as a series of hubs located at Melbourne and our regional centres with spokes and cross-connections to smaller communities and employment zones; rather than espousing an old-fashioned Melbourne hub with spokes to the regions.” Regional Development Australia Committee – Gippsland
Decentralisation more broadly, including within Melbourne, was also advocated by a number of stakeholders:

“As our population and economy continues to grow, the pressure on Melbourne’s CBD is likely to increase significantly. One way to help relieve some of this pressure is to facilitate a more decentralised infrastructural architecture that accommodates high-value economic activity to take place outside our city’s CBD.” Committee for Melbourne

“Engineers Australia supports a decentralisation program with a focus on improving our connectivity. The capacity of our road and rail infrastructure, connecting our cities, and accessibility to air and sea ports is what will give us the competitive advantage so dearly sort in today’s economic climate.” Engineers Australia

**Connectivity**

Although not a Need or opportunity identified in the discussion paper, the term connectivity, emerged as a recurring topic in submissions. The term was raised by a diversity of stakeholders, in a variety of different contexts: public transport, technology, social inclusion, freight and logistics. In many cases, submitters called on Infrastructure Victoria to incorporate the term in the Objectives or Needs, typified in this statement:

“Consideration should be given to including an objective around improving the connectivity of Victoria including digital connectivity (mobile phone and internet), human connectivity – roads, passenger rail, air travel and also freight and logistics. Connectivity is and will remain crucial to the social, economic and environmental vitality of Victoria and disproportionately affects regional Victoria.” Murray River Group of Councils

“Connectivity is a fundamental objective when considering regional infrastructure planning and future demands. Connectivity includes addressing mobile phone black spot areas, particularly along the Vline train corridor and through South and East Gippsland, and enabling a faster rollout of the National Broadbent Network, including for business.” Committee for Gippsland

Furthermore, a lack of connectivity was seen by one submitter as a primary cause for economic and social disadvantage in communities. As such, its conceptual application within Infrastructure Victoria’s foundations was identified as an important step towards redressing these challenges:

“The lack of connectivity between these communities with employment, education, health and social activities is a significant driver of lower socio-economic outcomes for these communities.” Bus Association of Victoria

**Local government**

Local government was a popular topic of discussion in the workshops and the formal submissions. In part this could be explained by the considerable number of submissions lodged by local government stakeholders and their respective representative bodies. However, references to local government could be found in submissions made by many other stakeholders. Among these comments was a consensus that local government has a fundamental role to play in the planning and delivery of infrastructure and that this role had been insufficiently recognised in Laying the foundations:
“One significant conceptual drawback in the Foundation Paper is its lack of specific recognition of the local government sector and its role in infrastructure planning and provision.” Brimbank City Council

“The document makes very little reference to the role of local government. Given it is the key deliverer of community infrastructure and local transport network infrastructure and also undertakes strategic planning at the local and regional level it is clear local government has a significant contribution to make to the development of strategy content.” City of Greater Geelong

“We request that the process of developing the Infrastructure Strategy enable the consideration of local government issues such as clear roles and accountability in the provision of infrastructure and funding, and can provide clear structures and a pathway for their resolution.” Municipal Association of Victoria

“Our key response to this document is the lack of attention that it gives to the critical role of local government in planning for, and providing infrastructure, at a local level. For example, the Discussion Paper suggests a number of objectives for the 30-year strategy on issues ranging from population growth, to safe and vibrant communities, workforce participation, tourism and climate change adaption. Whilst these objectives might be described in such a way that they respond to statewide issues relevant to infrastructure planning, it is very much at a local level that these issues are felt, experienced and addressed.” Victorian Local Government Association

“Include community infrastructure and local government’s infrastructure responsibilities in the strategy.” Online contributor

Integrated planning

The consultation process has revealed a high degree of engagement with the topic of integrated planning and, in particular, the relationship between Infrastructure Victoria’s 30-year strategy and Plan Melbourne and the Regional Growth Plans:

“What is recommended: Strengthen the links between planning and infrastructure investment.” City of Greater Dandenong

“Further increase the level of integrated planning, reduce duplication and increase multiple user group approaches to community facilities funded by a mixture of Federal, State and Local Governments.” Netball Victoria

“Whilst it is evident that the 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy refers to Plan Melbourne, this needs to be significantly strengthened by evidence based planning of infrastructure that aligns to community needs and is consistent with Plan Melbourne. This will ensure that the strategy clearly responds to the Government’s planning agenda. Furthermore, it can encompass infrastructure needs that are not addressed in Plan Melbourne.” City of Whittlesea

“Experience with…waste water treatment plants shows that decisions made with respect to changes in adjacent land use can lead to large capital and operating costs within the plant, for instance to mitigate odours. Whilst this expenditure is a necessary outcome to safeguard community health, it highlights the nexus between urban planning and infrastructure planning, and the need to consider other development opportunities that may be more compatible with the existing treatment plants.” Melbourne Water
Funding and financing

Funding and financing was a recurring topic of discussion throughout the consultation process. A number of submissions drew attention to the challenge of infrastructure funding and some proposed recommendations for how this challenge could be best met:

“Governments should be borrowing as much as they can sensibly invest to start repairing the infrastructure backlog, and fit our big cities for the growth they have had in the past decade, let alone the growth to come.” Save Our Suburbs

“Promoting responsible funding and financing is a key in the push to improve infrastructure.” Committee for Geelong

“The introduction of rate capping through the State Government Fair Go Rates System will further tighten the capacity of local government to respond to the expectations of community about the type and quality of infrastructure provided in their local area. The infrastructure backlog in growth and peri-urban communities is also of growing concern, well in advance of the 30-year time frame of Infrastructure Victoria’s proposed strategy.” Victorian Local Government Association

“I think it is important that Infrastructure Victoria is seen to have a comprehensive and balanced approach to funding and financing. This requires a transparent approach to communicating the impacts of various funding and financing strategies by showing the likely value each party would receive from a particular funding/financing option.” Ray Winn
3. Conclusion

Infrastructure Victoria’s consultation program engaged stakeholders and a number of community members from across Victoria, and gathered useful and specific feedback on the draft framework, Objectives and Needs.

However, the level of engagement with *Laying the foundations* and the representation of stakeholders warrants consideration for planning further phases of engagement.

While many stakeholders commented specifically on *Laying the foundations*, other submissions and online inputs did not refer directly to Infrastructure Victoria or the framework. As with any public consultation, this is to be expected to some extent.

Although a substantial number of formal submissions were received from local government, transport and economic development sectors, there were other key sectors that were less involved in this process. Stakeholders from ICT, energy, justice and emergency services were notable absentees from the workshops. Formal submissions from these sectors were also lacking.

The online engagement portal, *Your Say*, was a useful platform for engaging with community members. It provided users with the opportunity to consider their preferred Needs and it asked them what Infrastructure Victoria had missed in its framework, but gathered limited substantive feedback on the draft framework.

The identified trends in engagement and representation may indicate that more time or alternative communications approaches are needed to build awareness of Infrastructure Victoria’s work and to reach and actively engage a diverse set of stakeholders.

These learnings will be incorporated in planning further engagement activities which will support the preparation of the 30-year infrastructure strategy.
Appendices

Appendix A – Workshop Report

Infrastructure Victoria, Laying the Foundations – Workshop report

a. Overview

This overview report provides qualitative and quantitative analysis of stakeholder feedback provided to Infrastructure Victoria over four consultation workshops in February 2016. Drawing directly from collated stakeholder inputs, the document serves to inform Infrastructure Victoria in three ways:

1. Highlighting suggested improvements to the draft Objectives and Needs
2. Identifying stakeholders proposed additional Objectives and Needs
3. Tabling stakeholder voting support for the draft Needs

While stakeholder support for Infrastructure Victoria’s draft Objectives and Needs and overall framework will be noted in different sections, the main focus of this report is the capture of suggested changes and improvements.

b. Summary of findings

Across the four workshops, there was significant engagement in the consultation process. Despite the short time frame, stakeholders attended and contributed meaningfully to conversations surrounding Infrastructure Victoria’s Laying the foundations paper.

Concerns that stakeholders would invest most of their time promoting individual projects or focusing on infrastructure setbacks would prove to be unfounded. For the most part workshop participants navigated their way through the draft Objectives and Needs with success, providing frank and considered responses to the questions asked by the facilitators.

This report demonstrates:

- There is a clear and quantifiable call from stakeholders for improvements to the language and meaning of many of the draft Objectives and Needs.
- At a general level, participating stakeholders frequently raised concerns that the draft Objectives and Needs are too passive, and a preference for a more proactive approach.
- At a specific level, key words contained in the Objectives and Needs have been identified and questioned by stakeholders – feedback indicates that some require greater clarity and others more context for their inclusion.
- In the main, the first half of the draft Objectives and Needs table generated the most feedback and identifiable engagement from stakeholders.
- Need 1A and Need 1C produced the most suggested changes and critical comments from stakeholders – 11 and 10 respectively (out of 96).
- Among the Objectives, Objective 2 generated the largest amount of feedback among stakeholders – 12 pieces of data were recorded (out of 57).
A variety of new Objectives and Needs have been developed during the stakeholder workshops. Out of 101 new Objectives and Needs identified by stakeholders, 18 new Objectives or Needs were recorded for Objective 5, and 17 new Objectives or Needs were recorded for Objective 2.

When voted upon, the most popular among all the stakeholders was Need 5A - Improve the efficiency of freight supply chains through infrastructure was among the top 4 Needs in Sale, Ballarat and Melbourne.

Across all of the assembled data, Objectives 7, 8, 9 and 10 generated the least interest and critical engagement from stakeholders – very few improvements and pieces of feedback were noted compared with the focus given to other Objectives and Needs.

c. Approach and methodology

Preparation of this report has been conducted through an intensive method of data capture and analysis - one that began with gathering the data, entering it manually into a word processor and uploading the data into the research software program, NVivo. NVivo has enabled the report’s authors to categorise and analyse and then ‘code’ several hundred Post-It notes (the majority of data provided by stakeholders) collated across four stakeholder workshops. In addition, several voting sheets on draft Needs were also included.

In recognition that Infrastructure Victoria would require an understanding of the stakeholder feedback on the draft Objectives and Needs, a code frame was established within NVivo that captured that critical feedback. This code frame reflected the format and activity assigned to Discussion Two and Discussion Three of the workshop – whereby stakeholders were asked what they would ‘Improve’ ‘Add’ or ‘Remove’ from the draft list of Needs and Objectives.

The act of sorting through the collated data, and applying a code that best reflected the perspective of the stakeholder is not without its challenges. The analyser must establish a code frame, and then apply the data according to that code frame. On most occasions it is possible to interpret stakeholders’ views. On other occasions, it is very difficult. Therefore, it is necessary to point out the process is not foolproof.

d. Feedback on draft Objectives and Needs

Draft Objective 1: Respond to population growth and change

Stakeholders gave critical feedback on draft Objective 1 and made a number of suggested changes to language. Two main themes emerged from these responses:

- Stakeholders preferred a more proactive tone for this Objective: ‘shape’ instead of just ‘respond’ and ‘Plan for’ not ‘Respond to’.
- Concern that this Objective failed to capture the possibility of population decline - in particular, they felt that this Objective was inclined to focus on areas of growth.

Other examples of stakeholder responses:
“Objective 1 also Needs to address declining populations in smaller towns” Ballarat Workshop
“Objective 1: Change is also decline” Bendigo Workshop
“1. Shift of intention; should be more proactive” Melbourne Workshop
Draft Needs for Objective 1:

A. Address infrastructure deficits in high-growth areas.

- Stakeholders requested a shift in the language of this Need. Many took issue with the reference to ‘high growth areas’, with several arguing it took focus away from addressing deficits in regional Victoria or areas of low growth. One stakeholder preferred to see ‘high growth’ replaced with ‘all areas’.

Examples of stakeholder responses:
- “Objective 1 Needs A. Infrastructure deficits not just in “high growth areas”” Melbourne workshop participant
- “What are the consequences of focussing primarily on high-growth areas?” Sale workshop participant
- “1A. address infrastructure deficits in high and close negative growth areas” Ballarat workshop participant

B. Manage increasing demands on health infrastructure.

- Nine responses called for either improvements to the language used in this Need, or a change to meaning implied by the Need. Several responses made note of the reference to ‘health’. Either suggesting it should be removed altogether or coupled with references to other community or social support infrastructure.

Examples of stakeholder responses:
- “Needs 1B. Why only demands on health infrastructure? Other social support infrastructure – aged care, disability” Melbourne workshop participant
- “1B. Managing increasing Needs on “community” and health infrastructure” Melbourne workshop participant

C. Provide access to high-quality school facilities

- 10 comments from stakeholders recommended improvements to be made to this Need. Many of those comments referenced the use of the word ‘schools’ to be narrow and in need of expansion.

Examples of stakeholder responses:
- “C. expand school facilities to include universities and early years” Melbourne workshop participant
- “1C change ‘school’ to ‘education and training or learning’ make it broader” Ballarat workshop participant
- “1C Needs to be ‘education’ not just ‘school’, pre-school, primary, secondary, vocational, higher education” Bendigo workshop participant

Draft Objective 2: Support healthy, safe and vibrant communities

- Draft Objective 2 recorded the largest number of critical responses throughout the four workshops. Stakeholder feedback was focused on two matters – the general passive approach to this Need, and replacing the word ‘vibrant’. Several comments suggested ‘communities’ should be prefaced with ‘diverse’ or ‘inclusive’. All of the suggested changes to draft Objective 2 were taken from the Melbourne workshop.

Examples of stakeholder responses:
- “Is the word “support” strong enough for Objective 2?” Melbourne workshop participant
“Add: Need for diverse communities to be included in Objective 2, perhaps replace “vibrant” with “diverse”” Melbourne workshop participant

Objective 2: missing “inclusive” Melbourne workshop participant

Objective 2, change “support” to “build”, support is a nothing word” Melbourne workshop participant

Draft Needs for Objective 2:

A. Enable physical activity through infrastructure and urban design

- Some stakeholders recommended the following changes be made to Need 2A:
  - “Need 2A. “enable” not strong enough, should be “ensure”” Melbourne workshop participant
  - “Need 2A. Physical activity needs to be beyond passive recreation” Melbourne workshop participant

B. Provide good public spaces where communities can come together

- One stakeholder at the Ballarat workshop provided this proposed improvement regarding 2B: “2B. What is ‘good public space’? Making spaces equitable” Ballarat workshop participant

C. Strengthen access to cultural infrastructure

- Unlike the other Needs under Objective 2, Draft Need 2C generated a number of comments from stakeholders. Several called for subtle shifts in the language while one questioned why cultural infrastructure was prioritized altogether.

Examples of stakeholder responses:
- “Cultural infrastructure > confusing” Sale workshop participant.
- “2C. Improve (rather than strengthen) access to cultural infrastructure” Ballarat workshop participant
- “Objective 2C add, Change the way infrastructure is managed in bigger centres to meet rural” needs, eg hours of operation (theatre, performances)” Bendigo workshop participant

D. Maximise positive impacts on amenity and wellbeing from infrastructure

- One stakeholder at the Melbourne workshop made the suggestion that ‘safety’ should be inserted into this Need:
  - “Maximum positive impacts on amenity, safety and wellbeing from infrastructure” Melbourne workshop participant

Draft Objective 3: Reduce disadvantage

- Draft Objective 3 prompted considerable feedback from stakeholders across the four workshops. Several respondents questioned the use of the word ‘disadvantage’, suggesting it requires clarity and definition. For other stakeholders, the premise upon which the Need is based is flawed. They argue that the emphasis should be on ‘Advantage’ and ‘growth’ not ‘disadvantage’.

Examples of stakeholder responses:
- “Change “reduce disadvantage” Objective to “focus on equality”” Melbourne workshop participant

Objective 3: reduce disadvantage and inequality” Melbourne workshop participant
Draft Needs for Objective 3:

A. Improve accessibility for people with disabilities and/or mobility challenges through infrastructure

- Several stakeholders criticised this Need on the basis that it did not empower those with disabilities, acted to further stigmatise them and did not encompass the whole spectrum of disadvantage.

Examples of stakeholder responses:
“3A. More than disabilities, accessing of the “walking dependent” – in many services, disabilities, and young children, i.e. those who don’t drive or who are dependent on others” Melbourne workshop participant
“Need 3A. Expand to address larger range of disadvantage” Melbourne workshop participant.
“Including accessibility in reducing disadvantage is limiting not empowering” Melbourne workshop participant

B. Address housing affordability challenges with better social housing

- This Need generated a sizeable amount of feedback from stakeholders. While some respondents supported its inclusion but preferred to see minor changes, others wanted the meaning of this Need to change significantly. Much of this feedback argued that a disjuncture existed between ‘housing affordability’ as a challenge and ‘social housing’ as the solution.

- “Objective 3 Need B. Refer social housing could be one of many “solutions” for affordable housing”. Melbourne workshop participant

Other examples of stakeholder responses:
“3.B. Affordable housing needs to be expanded beyond social housing – social housing will never meet the need/need other solutions” Melbourne workshop participant
“3.B. Addressing housing affordability requires a broader focus than social housing – housing needs to be suitable” Melbourne workshop participant
“B3 ‘better social housing’ or ‘more diverse, affordable housing’” Bendigo workshop participant

C. Support changing approaches to social service and justice delivery through infrastructure.

- No suggested changes and improvements to this Need were recorded across the four workshops.

Draft Objective 4: Enable workforce participation

- Much of the feedback provided on draft Objective 4 highlighted the lack of reference to specific jobs or employment. The use of passive language was again identified as a possible area to be improved by Infrastructure Victoria. One participant suggested that with an ageing population, this Objective would be enhanced by broadening its scope to ‘social participation’.

Examples of stakeholder responses:
“Enable workforce or creative workforce opportunities, connectivity” Melbourne workshop participant
Draft Needs for Objective 4:

A. Provide access to the diversity of employment opportunities offered by the central city

- This Need was regarded by several stakeholders as too ‘Melbourne centric’, failing to encapsulate regional cities and regional centres.

Examples of stakeholder responses:
“4A. Needs to be broadened – regional centres can accommodate opportunities, regional cities not new, but leveraged existing” Melbourne workshop participant
“4 in (a) add regional and technology” Melbourne workshop participant

B. Provide better links to non-central city employment centres

- As with 4A, 4B was challenged by stakeholders for its focus on city employment. Each of these responses recorded believed this Need should point to regional cities.

Examples of stakeholder responses:
“4B. Non central city employment to consider broader areas that Ballarat, Bendigo, but perhaps Gippsland – across the state” Melbourne Workshop
“Does 'non- central' mean regional? If so, that's not clear” Sale workshop participant
“4B misses the regional cities (all metro clusters)” Ballarat workshop participant

C. Improve access to early childhood care facilities

- This Need generated little feedback from stakeholders. One respondent in Melbourne said:
   “Workforce participation also affected by lack of access to facilities to assist with caring more broadly – not just early childhood”. Melbourne workshop participant

Draft Objective 5: Lift Victoria’s productivity

- Stakeholders made only a handful of recommendations on Draft Objective 5.

Examples of stakeholder responses:
“Make productivity Objective much more ambitious” Ballarat workshop participant
“Objective 5: Lift productivity (don’t Need to say ‘Victoria’)” Bendigo workshop participant

Draft Needs for Objective 5:

A. Improve the efficiency of freight supply chains through infrastructure

- Two responses from the Ballarat workshop have outlined ways 5A could be reframed.
  “5A supply chains used to consider/include road, rail, air and sea” Ballarat workshop participant
  “Objective 5. Specific focus on road/rail/port interface connectivity” Ballarat workshop participant

B. Move people to and from airports more efficiently
Three stakeholders have questioned the inclusion of ‘airport’ in draft Need 5B. These stakeholders suggest that the focus should be moving people, rather than on airports specifically.

Examples of stakeholder responses:
“Airport need too specific – not a priority, it’s a moving people problem more like Objective 5A” Melbourne workshop participant
“5B. Not sure people getting to the airport increases productivity” Melbourne workshop participant
“Objective 5: Moving between major cities and centres” Ballarat workshop participant

Draft Objective 6: Support Victoria’s changing, globally integrated economy

Only one recorded improvement was cited for draft Objective 6:
“6. Reduce social, economic and environmental disadvantage”. Melbourne workshop participant

Draft Needs for Objective 6:

A. Boost tourism through infrastructure provision.

Several stakeholders questioned the inclusion of ‘tourism’ in this Need. In particular, they suggested that ‘tourism’ appeared to lack rationale or was seen as too targeted.

Examples of stakeholder responses:
“6. why limit boost to ‘tourism’” Ballarat Workshop
“Boosting tourism seems to come out of nowhere – why no one supporting a changing economy?” Melbourne workshop participant
“6a? How does it meet Objectives? Very targeted” Melbourne workshop participant

B. Enable the growth of a highly skilled, digitally connected workforce through infrastructure

Mixed feedback was recorded on this Need. One respondent regarded the inclusion of ‘highly skilled’ as problematic. On the other hand, another stakeholder wished to enhance the language and referral to digital economy.

Examples of stakeholder responses:
“6B. Service missing? Melbourne workshop participant
“6B. Remove “highly skilled”, highly skilled, this group capable already, misses those who Need support” Melbourne workshop participant

Draft Objective 7: Promote sustainable production and consumption

Stakeholders made a number of minor changes to the wording in this Objective. For another, the link suggested in the Objective was not clear.

Examples of stakeholder responses:
“Deliver sustainable production – not promote” Bendigo workshop participant
“7. Victoria’s production and consumption is sustainable” Melbourne workshop participant

Draft Needs for Objective 7:
A. Improve rural and regional water security.

- Only one comment was made regarding this Objective, “Objective 7. Add energy to (a)” Melbourne workshop participant

B. Manage pressures on landfill and waste recovery facilities.

- This Need generated comments from stakeholders regarding the importance of recognising waste.
  “7B. Waste generation missing – 7. If packaged well, less waste (freight supply chain)” Melbourne workshop participant
  “Objective 7B. Minimise waste generated by household and industry” Melbourne workshop participant

Draft Objective 8: Protect and enhance natural environments

- Stakeholders called for a change in the language here to include co-ordination of services, and modifications to include ‘heritage and cultural environments’.

  Examples of stakeholder responses:
  “8 – heritage and cultural environment” Bendigo workshop participant
  “Objective 8 inclusion of word ‘coordination’” Melbourne workshop participant
  “8. How about enhancing built environment? Quality outcomes, not necessarily cheapest.” Melbourne workshop participant

Draft Needs for Objective 8:

A. Help preserve natural environments and minimise biodiversity loss through infrastructure

- One comment was recorded that called for a slight shift in the wording of this Need.
  “8A. Amend wording; enhance natural environments and improve biodiversity (positive working, broader options)” Ballarat workshop participant

B. Improve the health of waterways through infrastructure

- No comments or feedback on suggested improvements were recorded for this Need.

Draft Objective 9: Support climate change mitigation and adaptation

- Two comments were recorded:
  “Climate change is passive approach – the way it has been framed.” Bendigo workshop participant
  “9. Climate change mitigation and adaptation is enacted” Melbourne workshop participant

Draft Needs for Objective 9:

A. Smooth the adjustment to a carbon-constrained world through infrastructure

- Two comments were recorded; both suggested the frame or focus of this Need should be adjusted.
  “Objective 9A. Use ‘low carbon energy efficient’ rather than ‘carbon constrained’” Ballarat workshop participant
9A. Focus should be broader than energy, for example construction materials, passive design” Melbourne workshop participant

B. Adapt infrastructure to changing climate conditions

- No comments or feedback on suggested improvements were recorded for this Need.

Draft Objective 10: Build resilience to shocks

- Stakeholders suggested this Draft Objective was too narrow. Two suggestions were made to expand the scope of the Objective.
  “Objective 10: build resilience to change” Ballarat workshop participant
  “Objective 10: remove ‘to shocks’ includes service delivery” Ballarat workshop participant

Draft Needs for Objective 10:

A. Improve the resilience of critical infrastructure to disruptive events

- Stakeholders proposed that the term ‘disruptive event’ needed better definition or broadening.

Examples of stakeholder responses:
  “Objective 10: define disruptive events, is it just natural disaster?” Ballarat workshop participant
  “Add 10A: I would broaden why just disruptive; key is longevity, future proofing, maintainability, scale up/scale down, not just dealing with one off events” Ballarat workshop participant
  “10. Define disruptive event? In Needs?” Melbourne workshop participant

B. Address infrastructure-related emergency response challenges

- No comments or feedback on suggested improvements were recorded for this Need.

e. Voting on Needs

The following tables record the results of the needs voting exercise at workshops. Note that new Needs proposed by participants are in italics

Sale workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Number of votes</th>
<th>Percentage of votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redress urbanisation trend to see regional Vic. help to manage population growth</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the efficiency of freight supply chains through infrastructure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and plan for long-term energy needs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide better links to non-central city employment centres</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth adjustment to a carbon-constrained world through infrastructure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve rural and regional water security</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address infrastructure deficits in high-growth areas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boost tourism through infrastructure provision</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bendigo workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Number of votes</th>
<th>Percentage of votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manage increasing demands on health infrastructure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to high-quality school facilities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable physical activity through infrastructure and urban design</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide better links to non-central city employment centres</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximise positive impacts on amenity and wellbeing from infrastructure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable the growth of a highly skilled, digitally connected workforce through infrastructure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide good public spaces where communities can come together</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the efficiency of freight supply chains through infrastructure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve rural and regional water security</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt infrastructure to changing climate conditions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to the diversity of employment opportunities offered by the central city</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help preserve natural environments and minimise biodiversity lost through infrastructure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>Number of votes</td>
<td>Percentage of votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the health of waterways through infrastructure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boost tourism through infrastructure provision</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address infrastructure deficits in high-growth areas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support changing approaches to social service and justice delivery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth adjustment to a carbon-constrained world through infrastructure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the resilience of critical infrastructure to disruptive events</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to early childhood care facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage pressures on landfill and waste recovery facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen access to cultural infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve accessibility for people with disabilities and/or mobility challenges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move people to and from airports more efficiently</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address housing affordability challenges with better social housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address infrastructure-related emergency response challenges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritise innovative thinking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve integration and coordination of infrastructure planning and service delivery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ballarat workshop**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Number of votes</th>
<th>Percentage of votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enable the growth of a highly skilled, digitally connected workforce through infrastructure</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the efficiency of freight supply chains through infrastructure</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling value-adding activity at the source in rural areas</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide better links to non-central city employment centres</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve rural and regional water security</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on infrastructure and policy initiatives that support job creation across the State</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better utility of existing public transport assets and expansion</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address implication of population reduction in geographic communities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage increasing demands on health infrastructure</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address infrastructure deficits in high-growth areas</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable physical activity through infrastructure and urban design</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to the diversity of employment opportunities offered by the central city</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess better utilisation of public assets</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage pressures on landfill and waste recovery facilities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to high-quality school facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide good public spaces where communities can come together</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximise value of agricultural areas and enhance productivity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support changing approaches to social service and justice delivery</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve accessibility for people with disabilities and/or mobility challenges</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>Number of votes</td>
<td>Percentage of votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximise positive impacts on amenity and wellbeing from infrastructure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address housing affordability challenges with better social housing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boost tourism through infrastructure provision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help preserve natural environments and minimise biodiversity lost through infrastructure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the health of waterways through infrastructure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the resilience of critical infrastructure to disruptive events</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide public spaces and infrastructure that responds to universal design principles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to early childhood care facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move people to and from airports more efficiently</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth adjustment to a carbon-constrained world through infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen access to cultural infrastructure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt infrastructure to changing climate conditions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address infrastructure-related emergency response challenges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Melbourne workshop**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Number of votes</th>
<th>Percentage of votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address infrastructure deficits in high-growth areas</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximise positive impacts on amenity and wellbeing from infrastructure</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the efficiency of freight supply chains through infrastructure</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable the growth of a highly skilled, digitally connected workforce through infrastructure</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address housing affordability challenges with better social housing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the resilience of critical infrastructure to disruptive events</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher productivity of existing assets/infrastructure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide good public spaces where communities can come together</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve accessibility for people with disabilities and/or mobility challenges</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise energy infrastructure to enable the distribution of energy from a range of sources to replace dependency on fossil fuels</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable physical activity through infrastructure and urban design</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide better links to non-central city employment centres</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt infrastructure to changing climate conditions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to diversity of employment opportunities 'in and around Victoria'</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boost tourism through infrastructure provision</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth adjustment to a carbon-constrained world through infrastructure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage increasing demands on health infrastructure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage pressures on landfill and waste recovery facilities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to the diversity of employment opportunities offered by the central city</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move people to and from airports more efficiently</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>Number of votes</td>
<td>Percentage of votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated budget planning between potential co-investors of community infrastructure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to high-quality school facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support changing approaches to social service and justice delivery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve rural and regional water security</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen access to cultural infrastructure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help preserve natural environments and minimise biodiversity lost through infrastructure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure infrastructure provision responds to an ageing population</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to early childhood care facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the health of waterways through infrastructure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address infrastructure-related emergency response challenges</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve water security in metropolitan Melbourne to include storm water capture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**All workshops**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Number of votes</th>
<th>Percentage of votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the efficiency of freight supply chains through infrastructure</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable the growth of a highly skilled, digitally connected workforce through infrastructure</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address infrastructure deficits in high-growth areas</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide better links to non-central city employment centres</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage increasing demands on health infrastructure</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve rural and regional water security</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximise positive impacts on amenity and wellbeing from infrastructure</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable physical activity through infrastructure and urban design</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide good public spaces where communities can come together</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to the diversity of employment opportunities offered by the central city</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage pressures on landfill and waste recovery facilities</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the resilience of critical infrastructure to disruptive events</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to high-quality school facilities</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boost tourism through infrastructure provision</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth adjustment to a carbon-constrained world through infrastructure</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt infrastructure to changing climate conditions</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address housing affordability challenges with better social housing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve accessibility for people with disabilities and/or mobility challenges</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help preserve natural environments and minimise biodiversity lost through infrastructure</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support changing approaches to social service and justice delivery</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Need | Number of votes | Percentage of votes
--- | --- | ---
Improve the health of waterways through infrastructure | 11 | 2%
Move people to and from airports more efficiently | 8 | 1%
Strengthen access to cultural infrastructure | 6 | 1%
Improve access to early childhood care facilities | 5 | 1%
Address infrastructure-related emergency response challenges | 2 | 0%

**Appendix B – Submissions Report**

Infrastructure Victoria, Laying the foundations – Submissions report

**a. Overview**

This report offers qualitative and quantitative analysis on formal submissions made to Infrastructure Victoria during its consultation on *Laying the foundations* in February and March 2016.

**b. Summary of key findings**

Infrastructure Victoria’s formal submission input sought to engage stakeholders and the community on the framework of a 30-year infrastructure strategy captured in *Laying the foundations*.

- 126 submissions were reviewed and analysed for this report.
- The majority of submissions came from the local government, transport and sport and recreation sectors. No submissions were provided by stakeholders in the energy, ICT and justice and emergency services sectors.
- Of all submissions received, 77% addressed *Laying the foundations*, providing direct feedback on the Objectives and needs or discussion in general.
- 23% of submissions did not directly address *Laying the foundations*, but instead offered infrastructure solutions or commentary on infrastructure topics of special interest.
- Of the submissions that provided feedback on *Laying the foundations*, 50% were regarded as broadly positive towards the paper and Infrastructure Victoria’s framework, 38% of submissions were seen as neutral, and 12% were classified as arguing for a fundamentally different approach.
- Of the submissions that engaged directly on the draft Objectives and Needs, it was Objectives 1-5 and their respective Needs that aroused most of the discussion and suggested improvements.
- Many of the submissions focused on transport solutions, either relating to prioritisation of public transport over road projects, or the need to improve freight infrastructure and efficiency.
- The needs of regional and rural Victoria emerged as a strong theme, with many submitters proposing reframed or additional Needs and Objectives to capture the particular infrastructure challenges faced by regional Victoria.
- A number of other key themes are identified across the submissions. The centrality of funding and financing in the infrastructure planning and development, the integration of land use and transport planning, the role of local government, and support for growth of multiple decentralised activity centres in suburban and outer suburban Melbourne and
regional Victoria to provide for population growth and to relieve pressure on the city centre.

- Submitters have called for the inclusion of less passive and more proactive language, and in some cases an approach which is more proactive in substance.
- Strong support for the Infrastructure Victoria process and for underlying principles, particularly non-build solutions with a desire to better utilise existing infrastructure.

c. Approach and methodology

Formal submissions provided stakeholders and community members with a key opportunity to offer substantive feedback on *Laying the foundations*. Throughout February and March, Infrastructure Victoria accepted emailed and submissions online via the *Your Say* portal. These submissions were collated and analysed methodically by consultation team members. The submissions were coded using the qualitative research program, NVivo.

In recognition that Infrastructure Victoria would require an understanding of the stakeholder feedback on the draft Objectives and Needs, a code frame was established within NVivo that captured that feedback. This code frame sought to capture comments that were calling for specific improvements, changes to meaning, wording of Objectives and Needs, or comments relating to other key topics of relevance to Infrastructure Victoria.

The act of sorting through the collated data and applying a code that best reflected the perspective of the stakeholder is not without its challenges. The analyst must establish a code frame, and then apply the data according to that code frame. On most occasions it is possible to interpret stakeholders’ views. On other occasions, it is very difficult. Therefore, it is necessary to point out the process is not foolproof.

d. Themes by Objectives and Needs

Submissions tended to focus on Objectives 1-5 and their respective Needs. Much of this discussion called for improvements to language or changes in the meaning of Needs. Conversely, the Objectives did not generate major discussion or feedback. Some submissions argued there were key gaps or omissions in the strategic framework, and a number of additional Objectives or Needs were submitted. These have been noted under ‘Other additional needs and objectives’. Limited consideration was given to Objectives 6-10 of the draft Objectives and Needs table. As a consequence, few additional Objectives or Needs were made relating to this section.

Objective 1 and Needs A, B and C

- Submitters have identified the need for more proactive language to be used in Needs A, B, C.
- The use of ‘respond’ to population growth has been identified as requiring a revision.
- Submissions have emphasised that infrastructure Needs are not just in high growth areas but in established areas and areas experiencing decline – as such they are seeking changes that reflect this.
- Submissions suggest changing Need B and C to refer to the full range of social services - not just health or education - and expanding beyond schools to consider the full range of education.
- In addition, some submitters have identified a preference for decentralisation to cater for population growth and maximise existing infrastructure use.
Examples of submissions relating to Objective 1 and Needs A, B, C:

“Responding to numbers is of itself an inadequate objective. It is recommended to amend this objective to ‘Respond to population change and growth consistent with enhancing the livability of suburbs and regions.’” Brimbank City Council

“This needs to recognise infrastructure deficits in areas. Consideration must be given to areas of declining or static growth.” Peri Urban Group of Councils

“An alternative approach to adding an additional need would be to change the objective itself, to something along the lines of: ‘Respond to population growth and ageing.’” Victoria Walks

“We would suggest point C be amended to “Provide access to educational facilities”, thus expanding the targeted age and range of facilities to be accommodated.” Eureka Bulk Shipping

“The discussion paper also states that Objectives 1 (Respond to population growth and change) and 2 (Support healthy, safe and vibrant communities) were originally combined under the title ‘Maintain Victoria’s livability’. While the Victorian Chamber acknowledges the reasoning behind separating these out, we contend that liveability should be prioritised as an objective for infrastructure planning.” Victorian Chamber of Commerce and Industry

“Re-word ‘Address infrastructure deficits in high growth areas‘ to: ‘Put infrastructure where it is needed most’ as the current wording could be confused with Growth Areas from a Land use planning perspective. This may imply infrastructure shortfalls in established areas are not as significant to address.” Interface Councils

“It is critically important that new infrastructure is delivered to support population growth and change. However, the objective is written in a reactive manner. Mitchell Shire supports a proactive approach to delivering infrastructure to support growing populations including the delivery of enabling infrastructure and the early delivery of critical community infrastructure.” Mitchell Shire Council

“The objective and needs suggest a focus on high-growth communities. However, there is a substantial backlog within existing areas, some of which may have little population change, and others have significant increases forecast. There will be employment growth in metropolitan and regional activity centres, and infrastructure and services need to respond to these changes in demand. Recommend the objective be “Respond to travel demands.” RACV

“VCOSS notes that Laying the Foundation highlights the needs for health and school infrastructure in response to population growth and change. These are important but are not the only services infrastructure needed in communities.” Victorian Council of Social Services

**Other additional Objectives and Needs – Objective 1 Need A, B, C:**

“Strengthen planning for infrastructure” A more positive statement around the provision of infrastructure to current and future growth areas is needed.” Municipal Association of Victoria

**Objective 2 and Needs A, B, C and D**
Submitters have called for improvements to the Objective 2 and its Needs, in particular seeking:

- More proactive language eg ‘create’ instead of ‘support’.
- Submissions seek to widen the scope of this objective, in some instances calling for the inclusion of more all-embracing language: ‘healthy, safe, vibrant and inclusive’.
- Several submitters (mostly from Sport and Recreation) call for a strengthening of access to cultural and sporting infrastructure.
- Yet again, submissions refer to the particular needs of regional communities

“This section could be improved by including reference to improving utilisation of under-utilised public spaces.” Planning Institute of Victoria

“Recommendation: Draft Objective 2 ‘Support healthy, safe and vibrant communities’ be amended to include ‘inclusive’ as an objective.” Carers Victoria

“It is recommended some objectives be combined due to unnecessary overlap, including: 2 & 3 under ‘Equity of Access’. This is one of the most important objectives. Disadvantage is created when people do not have equal access to infrastructure and services that make for healthy and vibrant communities, when they need them thus justifying the combination of objectives two and three. A change in the title of this objective arises from the logic that addressing disadvantage means waiting for something to happen rather than being proactive.” Interface Councils

“This objective supports developing public spaces to accommodate population growth. Officers believe however that the objective should be more proactive in creating high quality public spaces.” Latrobe City Council

“The combined objective must also address accessibility for residents in the interface: Physical isolation underpins socioeconomic disadvantage and lack of social participation access to health services is limited, particularly for the elderly.” Interface Councils

“Need to focus on ensuring that the full community benefit of infrastructure is achieved through shared use or multi-use of facilities.” Municipal Association of Victoria

“The draft could be enhanced with a reference to increasing the permeability and walkability of our urban environments to support social interaction throughout the public realm, rather than just in parks or dedicated places for gathering.” City of Port Philip

Other additional Objectives and Needs – Objective 2 Needs A, B, C:

“Recommend inclusion of the suggested alternative need to ‘Improve the condition, capacity and quality of community infrastructure.’ There is substantial evidence supporting the link between quality of design of community infrastructure and the extent of use and therefore community wellbeing.” Brimbank City Council

“Affordable Housing should be identified as a need of draft objectives 1, 3 and 4. Affordable housing is the key to addressing most of the objectives of the plan. Quality, well located, affordable, rental homes will be the cornerstone of this state’s
long term liveability, sustainability and economic vibrancy.” Community Housing Federation of Victoria

“There needs to be a 5th need which acknowledges the importance of community voice in the development, planning and construction of infrastructure.” Latrobe City Council

“2E Improve the safety of Victorians when using infrastructure.” RACV

Objective 3 and Needs A, B, C

Submissions suggested changes such as ‘improve the ability of disadvantaged people to participate in society’ and expand beyond social housing to consider renting and ownership and including housing suitability and accessibility.

“Draft Need B - Address housing affordability challenges with better social housing” confuses two separate concepts and Needs. It is recommended this be replaced with the following: Improve housing affordability through greater medium density development facilitation within Activity Centres and along transport corridors.” Brimbank City Council

“Need B (page 46) is to ‘address housing affordability challenges with better social housing’. This need is too narrowly defined with the current focus on social housing, excluding other tenures such as private rental and home ownership that make up the substantial majority of housing tenure at around 96 per cent of all housing.” Carers Victoria

“The objective should be broader in its scope in addressing the issue that the paper appears in to have suggested a solution before analysing the situation. See ‘Draft Need B — Address housing affordability with better social housing, where it seems to be focused on the provision of social housing - a more holistic approach should be considered.” Latrobe City Council

“Reduce disadvantage suggests fixing the problem of inequity rather than proactively seeking to prevent it. Therefore we recommend that this objective should be renamed Encourage equity or Support equity of access to take a more positive and proactive approach to preventing as well as addressing disadvantage.” City of Whittlesea

Other additional Objectives and Needs – Objective 3 Needs A, B, C:

“It is of the highest importance to include access to public transport as a need in this section.” City of Whittlesea

“Another need is to unlock the ability to increase housing supply close to jobs and services.” Planning Institute of Victoria

“Recommendation: Need B (housing affordability) be expanded to include housing suitability and address affordability for all housing tenures beyond social housing.” Careers Victoria

Objective 4 and Needs A, B, C

Several comments made by submitters indicated support for development of suburban and regional activity centres.
Commentary was also received on making Objective 4 more specifically focussed on creating employment opportunities through to improving the language to include social and economic participation.

“The “Draft Need A - Provide access to the diversity of employment opportunities offered by the central city” is not agreed for the following reasons:
The future infrastructure demands that further centralising employment in the core of Melbourne will create are significant and avoidable.
The quality of citizens’ lives are diminished as they spend significant time each day commuting from “dormitory” outer suburbs to the Central Business District.
The focus should be on creating employment nodes in Activity Centres, such as Sunshine, in preference to the Centre of Melbourne.” Brimbank City Council

“By identifying specific needs i.e-child care facilities there is a potential inference that smaller scale projects may sit ahead of more critical game changing infrastructure or that the strategy sets its delivery objectives to broad and high.” City of Geelong

“Reference to the central city is unclear. Key regional centres and employment clusters are also relevant given focus in Plan Melbourne and Regional Growth Plans.” Municipal Association of Victoria

Other additional Objectives and Needs – Objective 4 Needs A, B, C:

“Objective 4 - Enable workforce participation Comment on draft needs
This section should include a need to:
Develop and encourage employment generating industries and infrastructure in the regions.
The provision of employment opportunities close to home will ease transport congestion, increase community resilience, reduce youth disadvantage and unemployment and halt the outwards sprawl of Melbourne.” Peri Urban Group of Councils

Objective 5 and Needs A and B

- Objective 5 and its respective Needs draw attention to the subject of Victoria’s freight network.
- Submissions tended towards focussing on ‘moving people’ suggesting a range of solutions but particularly a drive to move more people by public transport.
- Submitters commented that the reference to airports in Need 5B was too narrow, and that the airports should be broadened to consider connectivity between all transport modes.
- In addition, poor digital connections have been identified as a key barrier to productivity for the state. Several submitters located in regional areas have identified this point.

Examples of submissions relating to Objective 5 and Needs A, B:

“Draft Need A - Improve the efficiency of freight supply chains through infrastructure” is too vague.” Brimbank City Council

“improve productivity and capacity by better utilization of the road, rail and port assets currently in place.” Victorian Transport Association

“The need “Move people to and from airports efficiently” is narrow and can only be satisfied by project linking to the State’s airports. A need that could be used as a
more general measure would be “Ensure connectivity between different transport modes” or “enhance to interstate and international connectivity”, which could include freight, High Speed Rail, ports as well as airports.” Consult Australia

“May we respectfully suggest terms such as “port of entry” or “places of entry” or even “ports and airports.”” Eureka Bulk Shipping

“Airport reference is very specific. Should instead focus on integrated transport system that includes airports/ports. Need to address gaps as well as efficiency.” Municipal Association of Victoria

Other additional Objectives and Needs – Objective 5 Needs A and B:

“I encourage Infrastructure Victoria to consider “Move people between home and work locations more efficiently” as an alternative Need to lift Victoria’s productivity under draft Objective 5.” Phil Marley

“Suggest an additional need “Improve energy, water and materials efficiency and productivity through infrastructure investments”. With increasing energy and water costs and resource scarcity there is a greater need for infrastructure to support more efficient and productive use.” Environment Victoria

“Improve labour mobility and availability.” Victorian Council of Social Services

Objective 6 and Needs A and B

Due to the small number of improvements suggested by submitters, trends and themes could not be identified. This is a snapshot of the comments:

“6. Support commercial and industrial flexibility.” Tony Smith

Other additional Objectives and Needs – Objective 6 Need A and B:

“Infrastructure to support a diverse economy.” Interface Councils.

“Develop inclusive and flexible workplaces.” Victorian Council of Social Services

Objective 7 and Needs A and B

Due to the small number of improvements suggested by submitters, trends and themes could not be identified. This is a snapshot of the comments:

“7A and 8B fall a long way short of what is ever more urgently needed with respect to waterways.” Tony Smith

“Re-word Improve ‘Rural and regional water security’ to ‘Water security’. This issue is bigger than just rural and regional areas. We need security of supply at an appropriate quality for agricultural, amenity and environmental purposes.” Interface Councils

“More than just water security, also about access to water unlocking production opportunities.” Municipal Association of Victoria

Other additional Objectives and Needs – Objective 7 Need A and B:
“Consider including a need to address the maintenance of viable farm lands or food bowls as well as natural environments and biodiversity in terms of food security, including protection against threats from urban expansion.” Interface Councils

“Protect the State’s agricultural areas and encourage increases in production.” Peri Urban Group of Councils

**Objective 8 and Needs A and B**

Due to the small number of improvements suggested by submitters, trends and themes could not be identified. This is a snapshot of the comments:

“It is similarly important that we look at environment and heritage more in terms of engagement rather than simplistically framing them in terms of protection.” Tony Smith

**Other additional Objectives and Needs – Objective 8 and Needs A and B:**

“Protect and manage the coast including the marine environment for future generations” an extra need under Objective 8.” Victorian Coastal Council

“Include an additional need 8C- Preserve and enhance Indigenous and European History.” Interface Councils

“It is recommended that Objective 8 include an additional need, namely “Protect and manage coastal and marine environments for future generations”. This third need is required for the protection and management of coastal and marine areas, to ensure amenity and natural values are retained for future generations.” Victorian Coastal Council

**Objective 9 and Needs A and B**

Due to the small number of improvements suggested by submitters, trends and themes could not be identified. This is a snapshot of the comments:

“Greater emphasis should be given to transitioning from fossil fuel based energy to sustainable energy solutions.” Bass Coast Shire Council

Objectives 9 and 10 can be merged Move Need A “A smooth adjustment to a carbon constrained world through infrastructure” to Objective 7 “Promote Sustainable Production and Consumption.” Planning Institute of Victoria

Objective 9 and 10 have the capacity to be easily combined as Building Resilience is integral in responding to shocks or the extreme weather events that define climate change. City of Whittlesea

**Other additional Objectives and Needs – Objective 9 Needs A and B:**

“Consider a more explicit need to provide infrastructure that supports the renewable energy sector.” Interface Councils

“A distributed energy network that includes bioenergy from wood waste (Objective 9).” Victoria Association of Forestry Industry

**Objective 10 and Needs A and B**
Due to the small number of improvements suggested by submitters, trends and themes could not be identified. This is a snapshot of the comments:

“Objective 10 be widened to include reference to security issues.” City of Greater Dandenong

“There is an opportunity to incorporate a notion of resilience that goes beyond the specific environmental, climate change and water initiatives already outlined in the plan. Specifically, Infrastructure Victoria could model an understanding of resilience that drives better integration of the way integrated thinking about infrastructure could deliver address social, environmental and economic challenges.” City of Melbourne

**Unclassified additional Objectives and Needs**

A series of additional Objectives and Needs were also captured. These did not sit under existing Objectives or Needs and were usually included by submitters to fill identified gaps.

“11 Optimise the use of existing assets” RACV.

“A gap (in objectives) with regard to adequate transport infrastructure exists. Although it is inferred in Objective 4, a more explicit emphasis on the importance of ensuring access, frequency and reliability of transport infrastructure, is required in the strategy. It is suggested an objective ‘Supporting sustainable transport infrastructure’ (i.e. roads, bicycle networks, rail (freight and passenger and, public transport) be included.” Interface Councils

“An objective around ‘the efficient movement of people’ is desirable. Needs falling out from this objective could include an efficient arterial road network, accessible public transport and/or ‘modal shift’ to public transport.” City of Casey

“Also there needs to be more emphasis on the role of the digital economy as a means to improve connectivity and access to services and resources – it is implicit but needs to be more explicit in the objectives.” Brimbank City Council

“Potential Additional Objective: Build a robust innovation and research focused economy.” La Trobe University

d. **Solutions**

The vast majority of submissions contained one, if not many infrastructure solutions. In some cases, solutions formed the entire basis of documents. While in others, solutions formed only a small part of the overall submission made.

A broad ‘Solution’ folder was created during the process of analyzing submission data. All general and specific infrastructure solutions were coded in this folder. For example, ‘More frequent public transport in metropolitan areas” would be classified as a ‘Solution’.

In total nearly 200 different ‘Solutions’ were coded. Almost all of these referred to transport projects – be it road infrastructure, public transport or port and freight infrastructure. It is worth noting that many of these were existing high profile projects or proposals. What follows is a brief overview of specific infrastructure solutions identified by submitters:

“North East Link between Ringwood and Greensborough is the VTA’s first priority for road
improvement. By investing in the North-East link and de-consolidation locations throughout the outer fringe, approximately 30%-40% of vehicles will be removed from the West Gate and Bolte Bridges, allowing better access and flow for commuters from the western suburbs.” Victorian Transport Association

“The Port of Hastings development is also a critical enabler of export competitiveness for Gippsland.” Committee for Gippsland

“A railway line for the Mornington Peninsula west coast can drastically improve tourism, local mobility and accessibility, and reduce transport costs for commuters, importers and exporters in the region.” Robert Whitehall

“My submission is for a light rail line from the city along the Eastern Freeway to Doncaster Shoppingtown and the rest of Manningham to Donvale, via Doncaster Rd.” Nick Defteros

“The Inland Rail Project is also a must for Victoria in the near future.” Victorian Transport Association

“I want the bus stop reinstated that was lost in transition from TransOtway to V/Line”. Tony Smith

“1. Revitalised freight rail hubs that fan out from the port (to keep freight off suburban areas).” Moreland Community Action on Transport

“While Melbourne’s road networks become even more congested over the coming decades, projects like the East West Link and the concept of a third major airport (for freight and passenger) become more compelling.” Committee for Gippsland
Appendix C – Online engagement report

Infrastructure Victoria, Laying the foundations – Online engagement report

a. Overview
This report provides qualitative and quantitative analysis of data received through the Your Say portal on Infrastructure Victoria’s homepage.

b. Key findings
- The bulk of submitted online content did not directly engage with the draft Needs and Objectives
- Infrastructure solutions dominated much of the submitted content
- Discussion on contemporary social, economic and environmental challenges also accounted for a large proportion of submitted feedback
- Transport was the focus of almost all solutions made through online consultation
- Submitters expressed a wish for a range of major road projects and public transport initiatives
- Many of these solutions reflected a preference to improve mobility (in high growth areas and across the state), reducing congestion/traffic, increasing non-vehicle transport solutions and enhancing the existing public transport network and providing better links to Melbourne airport
- Very few contributions criticised Laying the foundations outright or suggested wholesale changes
- 442 submitters were surveyed for their preferred need, casting a total of 4310 votes. The highest rating Needs were the “Improve transport to jobs and services in regional centres” and “Better integrate infrastructure requirements into planning decisions”.

c. Approach and methodology
The Your Say portal on Infrastructure Victoria’s homepage provided website users with four avenues to offer feedback:

- What is most important when planning infrastructure for the next 30 years? Share a Thought Website users were invited to reflect on what was most important when it came to planning infrastructure for the next 30 years.
- Needs Survey, in which respondents were asked to vote on their preferred draft needs and provide comments.
- Think there’s something we missed? Tell us here? In which respondents were asked to provide feedback on whether Infrastructure Victoria had ‘missed’ anything in their Laying the foundations report.
- Comment on an Objective, which called for specific comment on the draft Objectives.

This format presented participants with several opportunities to have their say. However, the data ultimately received through the online consultation process provided very limited direct feedback on Infrastructure Victoria’s draft Objectives and Needs. Instead submitters were almost exclusively focussed on discussing areas of interests – or to draw on the language from Laying the foundations - challenges and opportunities.
As with the other consultation inputs, all consultation data was placed in NVivo and coded according to the pre-set code framework. Although website users may not have directed their commentary towards the Draft Objectives and Needs, comments submitted online could inevitably be coded to an existing Objective or Need. For example, a comment such as: ‘Children in outer suburban areas want to play cricket but there are no ovals for them to access’, would be coded to Objective 2. A comment such as ‘Our tourism operators need better infrastructure to meet international visitor demand” would be coded to Objective 5.

It should also be noted that the Needs Survey exercise, as with other activities on the online platform, was open to manipulation. Votes could be cast on multiple occasions, and the same person or submitter was not prohibited from making several contributions to the same consultation inputs. This does not render an analysis exercise useless. Instead it reinforces the need for those who use this data to do so with measure; to be mindful of the limitations of the data.

d. Key identified challenges

Overall the Objectives (1, 2 and 3) contained the most number of references. This reveals a strong focus on behalf of submitters to infrastructure challenges related to population, communities and productivity (through movement).

Submitters were keen to highlight the challenge of responding to population growth and change (Objective 1):

“Victoria’s most pressing issue is long term planning for infrastructure. It is clear in the outer urban sprawl that planning for infrastructure is not there, when there is a need for vacant space to be left to accommodate future growth, it is not.”

“The most pressing matters in my opinion refer to adapting to a growing population adequately. I would spend the most time in these areas.”

“Population growth in Melbourne and Victoria will provide many challenges towards infrastructure between now and the future. Many of these challenges have not yet been identified and their is a fear that these challenges will be dealt with when it’s too late.”

Submitters also strongly engaged with the challenges and opportunities related to create better communities (Objective 2):

“People are happy and healthier in a green, natural setting so services must be designed and built to reduce the land that is used.”

“There is a need to create a system/network that encourages individuals to use transit and active travel particularly within outer regions of the Melbourne metropolis. Creating a greenbelt that connects infrastructure with residential and business areas is important to reintebrate the different zones together so the city becomes unified.”

“Focus on community and green spaces.”

“Ensure the City of Melbourne does not keep sprawling; extraordinarily inefficient infrastructure is required and spoils environment. Plan more parks. Require much denser development along existing tram and train routes - and around existing commercial, educational and health facilities.”
“I think one of the most important factors to consider is are we building infrastructure that can contribute to delivering better health outcomes for people? Investment in sport facilities in essence should deliver better health outcomes if they are focused across the entire range of physical activities available.”

Improving productivity (Objective 5) and developing more efficient solutions to congestion was another challenge identified and commented upon by submitters:

“We need to make it easier and cheaper for people to get around. No one wants to spend hours every day just to get to and from employment life’s too short to be stuck in traffic and it makes us mad.”

“Congestion in both public transport and roads during peak hour is a big challenge. Furthermore, as freight and passenger share the same infrastructure and passenger is the priority, inefficiencies in freight movements occur.”

“I think that we need to connect the city better. I would be happy to pay for roads through tolls. However it is hard to want to pay just to sit in gridlock.”

e. Solutions

The data received from the Your Say portal revealed a very strong preference for the tabling of infrastructure solutions. Submitters used this platform as an opportunity to express their support for high profile infrastructure solutions, or to provide little known options to infrastructure challenges.

Solutions were coded according to a corresponding sector. Inevitably the majority of these solutions related to transport. Of the 199 solutions coded, 152 related to transport.

Solutions devoted to transport were predominately divided into two: public transport (rail in particular) and roads.

An example of the data related to roads includes:

“Rural Road network. More funding needs to be directed into rural roads and preventative maintenance programs.”

“Roads, roads, roads”

“Yes. I think that reducing congestion on Melbourne’s inner city roads is highly important. We need a better inner west to inner east transport link.”

“Fix the road traffic bottle necks at the Domain tunnel and Alexandra Parade.”

“Significantly improve the structural integrity of our regional roads by improving the quality of materials used to build them in order to reduce the damage caused by heavy vehicles and occasional significant natural events.”

The scrapped East West Link was mentioned on many occasions.

“build the east west link.”

“projects like East West link and the outer ring road are still critical projects for the state to benefit greatly”
We need the East West Link plus we need money spent on public transport."

could not find where to tick (and it would have been my first choice) for improved major road and rail infrastructure within Greater Melbourne to enable fast access East West (yes, we urgently need the East West Link despite political madness that has cost us dearly)"

Public transport dominated most of the solutions provided:

“I think it’s important to distinguish public transport infrastructure from just roads. A greater emphasis on public transport, rather than roads should be key goal.”

“Public transport across the Melbourne. Currently it is quite difficult to go by public transport from one suburb to another i.e. Ashburton to Blackburn."

“Improve the quality and reliability of public transport in rural and urban areas. This will be critical in a future Victoria with growing population and necessary to reverse the trend to living in cities and leaving rural areas.”

“I think that public transport should be improved to enable more efficient use and reduce the amount of cars on the road."

f. Needs survey
The following tables record the results of the online needs survey. The first includes the results from all 443 respondents. The second excludes the 75 responses received from those aged 15 and under on the basis that the majority of these responses appeared to represent a single demographic profile (likely a high school in Mount Waverley).

Results of needs survey (all respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Number of votes</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve transport to jobs and services in regional centres</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better integrate infrastructure requirements into planning decisions</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage increasing demands on health infrastructure</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable physical activity through infrastructure and urban design</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address infrastructure deficits in high-growth areas</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide good public spaces where communities can come together</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to high-quality school facilities</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove or reduce market inefficiencies that hinder renewable energy production</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help preserve natural environments and minimise biodiversity lost through infrastructure</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide better links to non-central city employment centres</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move people to and from airports more efficiently</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth adjustment to a carbon-constrained world through infrastructure</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the infrastructure connections within and between regional centres</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address housing affordability challenges with better social housing</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support student access to the full breadth of the school curriculum</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target infrastructure investments to help areas with acute and/or entrenched socio-economic disadvantage</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the efficiency of freight supply chains through infrastructure</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address infrastructure-related emergency response challenges</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve accessibility for people with disabilities and/or mobility challenges</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt infrastructure to changing climate conditions</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve rural and regional water security</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximise positive impacts on amenity and wellbeing from infrastructure</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve ICT infrastructure to help strengthen the links between regional, domestic and international economies</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable the growth of a highly skilled, digitally connected workforce through infrastructure</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the health of waterways through infrastructure</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the resilience of critical infrastructure to disruptive events</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage pressures on landfill and waste recovery facilities</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan infrastructure to help mitigate the effects of changing weather patterns on agriculture</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to the diversity of employment opportunities offered by the central city</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to early childhood care facilities</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop research facilities that support the growing service sector and commercialisation</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasise infrastructure provision to support Victoria’s Aboriginal communities</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boost tourism through infrastructure provision</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen access to cultural infrastructure</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support changing approaches to social service and justice delivery</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Results of needs survey (excluding 15 and under age group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Number of votes</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better integrate infrastructure requirements into planning decisions</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transport to jobs and services in regional centres</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address infrastructure deficits in high-growth areas</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable physical activity through infrastructure and urban design</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage increasing demands on health infrastructure</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide good public spaces where communities can come together</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove or reduce market inefficiencies that hinder renewable energy production</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide better links to non-central city employment centres</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>Number of votes</td>
<td>Percentage of respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to high-quality school facilities</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the infrastructure connections within and between regional centres</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move people to and from airports more efficiently</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth adjustment to a carbon-constrained world through infrastructure</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help preserve natural environments and minimise biodiversity lost through infrastructure</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address housing affordability challenges with better social housing</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target infrastructure investments to help areas with acute and/or entrenched socio-economic disadvantage</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the efficiency of freight supply chains through infrastructure</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximise positive impacts on amenity and wellbeing from infrastructure</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable the growth of a highly skilled, digitally connected workforce through infrastructure</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt infrastructure to changing climate conditions</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve ICT infrastructure to help strengthen the links between regional, domestic and international economies</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support student access to the full breadth of the school curriculum</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve rural and regional water security</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the health of waterways through infrastructure</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan infrastructure to help mitigate the effects of changing weather patterns on agriculture</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address infrastructure-related emergency response challenges</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve accessibility for people with disabilities and/or mobility challenges</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage pressures on landfill and waste recovery facilities</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the resilience of critical infrastructure to disruptive events</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide access to the diversity of employment opportunities offered by the central city</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boost tourism through infrastructure provision</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop research facilities that support the growing service sector and commercialisation</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support changing approaches to social service and justice delivery</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to early childhood care facilities</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen access to cultural infrastructure</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasise infrastructure provision to support Victoria's Aboriginal communities</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
g. Commentary

The data received through Infrastructure Victoria’s Your Say portal has provided limited direct feedback or commentary on the Draft Objectives and Needs.

However, the data still tells a story of its own. It indicates that of those who responded to the online consultation, many were deeply engaged with challenges related to population growth, movement, connectivity and community. At a conceptual level, these topics are most closely aligned with Objectives 1, 2 and 5. Respondents are engaged primarily in the issues of congestion, traffic and enhancing mobility, and furthermore they are focussed on community safety, health and amenity.

Transport, in particular roads and public transport, dominated many of the solutions provided.

The data received has also made cursory mention of planning processes, and the necessity for infrastructure to be transparent and de-politicised, *Infrastructure projects should not be fully controlled by politics and political decisions but based on sound judgement*. The view articulated in these comments was articulated by another: “*There needs to be a focus on process, to make sure we implement properly*”.

Finally, it is worth noting that very few calls for fundamental change to Infrastructure Victoria or its framework were received through the online consultation exercise. Comments were largely neutral, constructive, or were positive about the emergence of such a body.