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## INTRODUCTION

On 5 September 2004, the Australian Rail Track Corporation (ARTC) commenced a 60 year lease of the NSW interstate and Hunter Valley rail lines. ARTC previously controlled the interstate rail net work within the area bounded by Albury on the NSW / Victoria border, Kalgoorlie in Western Australia and Broken Hill in wesern NSW. The commencement of the NSW lease consolidated control of the majority of the interstate rail net work under ARTC

In 2002, ARTC developed a detailed infrastructure investment program forthe NSW net work in the context of the lease proposal to NSW. This investment program was worth $\$ 872$ million including complementary investment on the Melbourne - Albury corridor.

Subsequently, the Commonwealth made available $\$ 450$ million to ARTC to invest in the net work, with a focus on the NSW North Coast. The Commonwealth has made a further $\$ 550$ million available for rail freight projects through Auslink, of which $\$ 110$ million is available for works to improve freight access through Sydney.

It is now 3 years since ARTC's NSW investment program was developed and it needed to be reviewed and revised in light of subsequent developments. Similarly, while an indicative scope of works was developed for the $\$ 450$ million, there was also a need to subject it to rigorous analysis, to optimise the scope of works in the context of the available funding and an improved understanding of business needs.

The review and revision process fell naturally into two parts:

- Understanding the needs of ART C's major customers and the freight market they service.
- Understanding how best ARTC can improve its service to these customers, within known and likely funding limits.

In relation to the first of these, a discussion paper was provided to major customers and followed-up with meetings. Discussions covered a range of issues, including:

- predictions of market growth
- factors that will make a material difference to rail's competitiveness with road
- outcomes operators and the market require with respect to transit time, reliability, capacity, yield, pathing etcto achieve predicted rail market growth
- how operat ors will address issues such as rolling stock availability, terminal capacity and operation, and other issues that will affect the achievement of market growth

In parallel with this market evaluation, an extensive review was carried out of the existing infrastructure and operating patterns on the Melbourne - Sydney - Brisbane corridor to define the current situation and provide a datum by which improvements could be gauged. The effects of staged improvements that can reasonably be undertaken within the known development budgets for the next 10 years have then been analysed to see what kind of service can reasonably be offered to customers by 2010 and 2015.

Looking further into the future, there are a large number of projects, mainly deviations on the North Coast line that have been considered in the past to further reduce transit times,.

This report sets out the analysis undertaken of improvement options and integrates the outcomes into a future train plan designed to deliver substantial improvements in transit time, reliability, capacity and above and below rail yield.

## OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES

ARTC has four key objectives it is pursuing to improve the performance of rail freight on the North-South corridor:

- Reduction of bare transit times to facilitate commercially efficient Melbourne - Sydney -Brisbane transits
- Improvements in the reliability of transit times to provide train operat ors with certainty of achievable transit times
- Increase in actual line capacity to accommodate projected medium term rail traffic growth
- Reduced above-rail operating costs, and an acceptable yield for ART C, from an upgraded NorthSouth corridor

Most analytical work on potential infrastructure improvements carried out over the last five years has been undertaken on the premise that the reduction of achievable transit times to a level where overnight transits bet ween adjacent capital cities would be in the public interest by encouraging a long term containment, if not reduction, in long distance road freight movements. It appears that freight train operat ors may take a more sanguine view that until they see physical evidence of usable transit time reductions they would prefer to pursue longer distance (ie Melbourne-Brisbane), in preference to shorter distance (ie Melbourne-Sydney or Sydney-Brisbane) journeys because they are more competitive with road with fewer risks. Of particular interest is also the ability to achieved significant improvements in asset utilization on the Melbourne Brisbane corridor by reducing the cycle time from 96 to 72 hours.

Reliability - that is the extent to which actual transit times vary - is probably the more immediate concern for train operators. Reliability should be measured in terms of the amount of delay over bare transit times that train operators would experience when running bet ween termini. Actual transit times then become the sum of the bare transit times plus a realistic estimate of the amount of delay that particular train services could expect to receive. Therefore, if reliability is to be improved average delay needs to be reduced, either as experienced by particular services or by the train flow as a whole. Delay, particularly in single track territory, generally accrues when trains cannot run free because their paths are obstructed by conflicting trains. Delay in double track territory is more likely to occur when there is a disparity bet ween the running times of particular trains and those of their predecessors. The specific issue in the North-South corridor is the very high level of delay experienced by current train flows, particularly on the NSW North Coast.

Line capacity and reliability are related to each other because an increase in line capacity should lead to a reduction in delay and therefore an improvement in reliability. Those railway operations which prize reliability will often provide nominally excess capacity to buy reductions in delay. Line capacity, which is what a track provider sells, has to meet the dual requirements of being sufficient to keep the growth in system delay in check and of being sufficient for projected medium term traffic levels.

Yield is specifically the track provider's concern. When atrack provider is faced with capital constraints, which is normally the situation, there is clearly a need to achieve the best outcome in terms of a mix of bare transit time reduction, delay reduction/reliability improvement and capacity increase. All classes of project that address one or more of these improvement measures need examination and those measures which deliver the best bare or actual transit time returns for the least cost in decreasing order of effectiveness selected until the capital improvement budget is allocated.

In the light of the above discussion the following strategy was adopted to pursue ARTC's aims:

- Identify and analyse infrastructure improvements to target baretransit times of 24 hours between Melbourne and Brisbane and efficient overnight transits between Melbourne and Sydney and Sydney and Brisbane.
- Provide single track capacity to efficiently handle the most optimistic projections of North-South rail traffic in the medium term (by and large double track capacity in automatically signalled territory comfortably exceeds projected traffic levels).
- Develop a theoretical train plan to validate the performance outcomes once all of the infrastruct ure improvements are implemented.

Because of the uncertainty about the form of future train plans, a flexible infrastructure strategy was developed which would be capable of handling different patterns of train flows, for example, both fleeted and regularised train movements. Furthermore, the infrastructure would still have to perform efficiently as transit time improvements were brought online because these transit time reductions would displace the crossing zones between northbound and southbound train flows.

The scope of projects identified to achieve these performance outcomes was:

- Eliminating train speed impediments such as the Wagga Viaducts and the Murrumbidgee River crossing at Wagga, the Murray River crossing at Albury and the slowtransit through Wodonga
- Applying more aggressive track geometry standards
- Commissioning high yielding alignment deviations
- Progressive loop lengthening and regularisation of sectional running times in single track territory
- Matching the spacing of crossing loops in single track territory to localised levels of traffic
- Eliminating discontinuities in double track sectional clearancetimes through the conversion of remaining double line manual block to automatic signalling
- Providing refuging opportunities in double track territory to cater for transit time disparities bet ween different classes of trains



## THE STUDY AND METHODOLOGY

## Involvement

The work recorded in this report has been undertaken by TMG International (TMG). They have been assisted by BT contractors (BT), who have provided detailed costing information in relation to all the improvement projects considered, and Samrom who have provided operational input. Some analytical input and cost information has been developed internally by ARTC.

## Methodology

The concept of service to customers has been considered in relation to:

- Transit time
- Capacity
- Reliability

Projects that improve these aspects of the corridor operation have been selected on the basis of cost effectiveness. Transit time is reduced by raising the average speed of trains and/or reducing the total distance traveled.

Speed is raised by:

- Increasing super-elevation and increasing cant deficiency on existing curves,
- Increasing curve radii (curve easing),
- Removing the need for temporary speed restrictions.

Distance is reduced by:

- Constructing deviations, or new sections of track, which by virtue of their better alignment will also normally increase average speed.

Reliability is improved:

- By providing more opportunities for passing and overtaking - loops and refuges - at appropriate locations.

The options available to make these changes have been reviewed and train diagrams prepared to show how selected works improve these chosen indicators of service to customers.

## Sources of Information

The following sources have been used to provide information about projects that can be implemented to improve customer service. A full list is provided in the References section of the report. Most of the reports included estimates of project costs, but inevitably they were prepared at different times and involved different assumptions and so are not strictly comparable. To overcome this problem BT has re-calculated the costs of all projects using a similar basis and late-2004 dollars so that comparisons are meaningful.

| Reference | Subject <br> Sydney-Newcastle Corridor: Investigation of High Speed Train Services. | Date <br> Oct 1999 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Preliminary Evaluation Phase. | Sydney-Melbourne-Sydney Reduction of SuperfreighterTransit Times. (Project <br> $12)$ |
| Oct 1999 |  |  |

Fassifern to Hexham Rail Corridor Planning, Land Use and Alignment Study. Interstate Rail Net work Study. Improvements in Superfreighter Performance:

May 2000 Sydney-Brisbane and Melbourne - Sydney Corridors. Final Report
8 Interstate Rail Network Audit Final Report (and Summary Report)
Jan 2001

Bowning to Cootamundra Deviation Report
Apr 2001
~Dec 1999

## Project Identification

The numerous deviation projects that have been identified in the background reports have all been given different names and at times identification numbers. In order to bring some consistency to this process, all projects have been re-named in this study using:

- V to indicate Victoria
- S to indicate the Main South line in NSW
- N to indicate the North Coast line in NSW
followed by a number which represents the round kilometre of the centre of the project on the current chainage system. As an example N159 is the Fassifern to Hexham deviation on the North Coast line in NSW.


## General Assumptions

The following assumptions have been made in orderto undertake the operational analyses:

- Design Train - the design train was hauled by $3 \times$ NR locomotives, was 1500 m long, had a trailing load of 3900 t and a maximum speed of $115 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.
- Speed Restrictions - there are currently numerous temporary speed restrictions on the Melbourne Sydney - Brisbane corridor. In carrying out the analysis of train operations it has been assumed that these can all be lifted with appropriate maintenance over the next 5 years. As a result the train diagrams provided assume that trains can run at the maximum speed around each of the existing curves to appropriate track geometry standards, if they are able to attain it. This is discussed in more detail elsewhere.
- Loops and Refuges - are of varying lengths and unevenly distributed along the entire corridor. It has been assumed that for all future works minimum loop/refuge length will be 1650 m . The philosophy of loop location is addressed else where.
- Sydney Transit - no attempt has been made to analyse freight train movements in the Sydney Broadmeadow corridor. Designated RailCorp freight paths shown in the draft 2008 CityRail timetable have been adhered to for journeys in either direction between Chullora and Broadmeadow.
- Increased Superelevation and Cant Deficiency - is an ARTC initiative to increase speed on curves and hence reduce transit times. Analysis has been undertaken assuming it is possible, but no attempt has been made to determine possible negative effects of this initiative which could include increased maintenance costs for both track and trains. The cost associated with these increases is assumed to be related only to the cost of convert ing to full face concrete sleepers on relevant curves, re-profiling the track and incidental costs of implementation. Costs in relationto this item have been provided by ARTC and not BT.
- Freight Terminals-it is an inherent assumption that freight terminals are able to receive trains when they arrive and dispatch them on the return journey when required by the proposedtimetable. No account has been taken of the inter-modal terminal proposed for Newcastle.
- Fleeting of Trains and Long Crossing Loops - ART C has expressed a desire to construct long sections (up to 50 km ) of duplicated track, so that freight trains can be operated in fleets. There is no reason why such practices cannot be adopted, provided there is capacity for such fleets to pass through the Sydney Metropolitan and Interurban Railways. However, interurban and provincial passenger train services in the NSW Southern Highlands, the NSW Central Coast and in Newcastle and the Lower Hunter Valley appear to constrain path availability to two trains per hour in each direction outside the Sydney commuter peak periods. Furthermore, individual freight customers appear to want to spreadtheir own train flows out in order to make best use of current or projected freight terminals. Therefore, in this study a strategy of seeking to reduce and regularise the spacing of long enough refuges and crossing loops to cater for perceived capacity and reliability objectives has been pursued.


## Analysis

Analysis of transit times and operational constraints has been carried out using the MTRAIN ${ }^{1}$ train performance modelling system and the SKETCH ${ }^{2}$ timetable and infrastructure planning system.

The former model was used to establish the travel time impacts of various infrastructure projects ranging from changing track geometry standards through to the commissioning of worthy alignment deviations. The latter model was used to explore the interactions bet ween infrastructure provision, for example, the number of running lines and/orthe provision of long enough refuges or crossing loops spaced to efficiently separate following and opposing train flows and the out-turn line capacity.


[^0]
## Deviations

TMG used past reports and unofficial analysis of options by various interested individuals to identify the range of deviation options available on the North-South corridor.

In all, 146 deviation options were identified. The projects are generally identified in appendix 1.
TMG analysed the benefit of these deviation proposals on a time saved basis. M-Train was used to model the transit time savings from each of the proposals. Transit time savings were analysed on two basis:

- As individual stand-alone projects and
- As a part of a group of deviations.

Individual projects usually perform better as part of a group of projects as they allows trains to maintain a constant higher speed.

BT contractors then costed each of the projects using estimated construction quantities and current (late 2004) unit rates.

Projects were then able to be ranked on a cost per minute saved basis. In recognition of the synergies from running a series of projects togetherto maintain a consistent train speed, projects were grouped for final analysis. This was done on the basis that where the cost per minute saved was less for a project on a standalone basis than the cost per minute saved for adjacent projects on a grouped basis it was treated as a standalone project. Otherwise it was incorporated into a group of projects so as to optimise the transit time saving.

A list of all deviation projects with their cost, time savings and cost per minute saved is at appendix 2.
The full list of deviation projects with their grouping and ranking is at appendix 3. The total estimated cost of all of the identified projects is $\$ 5.5$ billion. The following table shows the highest ranking deviation projects up to a value of $\$ 1$ billion.

| Project | FROM |  | TO |  | Cost (\$m) | Time <br> Saving <br> (mins) | $\$ \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{m}$ in Saved | Cumulative Cost (\$m) | Cumulative Time Saving (mins) | Cum ulative \$m / min Saved |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Name | km | Name | km |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N573-N591 | Nambucca Heads (Station) | 565.081 | Bonville (Station) | 596.494 | \$39.43 | 8.81 | \$4.48 | \$39.43 | 8.81 | \$4.48 |
| N401 | Taree (Dawson River) | 383.300 | Johns River | 417.801 | \$ 76.41 | 12.53 | \$6.10 | \$115.84 | 21.34 | \$5.43 |
| N379 | Taree North Bypass | 375.000 |  | 382.900 | \$ 20.11 | 3.19 | \$6.30 | \$135.95 | 24.53 | \$5.54 |
| N528-N559 | Tamban (Station) | 520.558 | NambuccaHeads (Station) | 565.081 | \$117.54 | 17.49 | \$6.72 | \$253.48 | 42.02 | \$6.03 |
| N495-N5 12 | Kundabung | 487.197 | Tamban (Station) | 520.558 | \$71.67 | 10.13 | \$7.07 | \$325.15 | 52.15 | \$6.23 |
| N159 | Fassifern | 142.31 | Hexham | 175.530 | \$123.48 | 16.53 | \$7.47 | \$448.63 | 68.68 | \$6.53 |
| S386 | Demond ille | 391.500 | Cunningar | 380.920 | \$48.60 | 6.25 | \$7.78 | \$497. 23 | 74.93 | \$6.64 |
| N433-N457 | Rossglen (Syd. Side) | 439.096 | Telegraph Point (Not station) | 474.000 | \$85.64 | 10.77 | \$7.95 | \$582.87 | 85.70 | \$6.80 |
| N223 | Hexham | 176.480 | Stroud Road | 270.000 | \$361.33 | 43.00 | \$8.40 | \$944. 20 | 128.70 | \$7.34 |
| S343 | Binalong | 350.750 | Bowning | 334.500 | \$60.07 | 7.09 | \$8.47 | \$1,004 27 | 135.79 | \$7.40 |

As shown in the table, the best performing deviation has a cost per minute saved of $\$ 4.48$ million with the next best a jump to $\$ 6.1$ million and then a progressive increase in the cost per minute saved. The cost per minute saved is up to approximately $\$ 8.5 \mathrm{~m}$ by the time the total value of projects reaches $\$ 1$ billion.

## Increasing Train Speed

A review has been undertaken of opportunities to increase train speed to achieve the minimum possible transit time within the constraints of the track geometry of the existing railway.

These opportunities arise from two areas:

- Increasing superelevation and cant deficiency, thereby allowing trains to travel faster on the existing geometry.
- Identifying and eliminating speed restrictions dictated by factors other than track geometry. Typically these include condition related speed restrictions on track and structures, sighting distances issues and optimising the position of speed boards.

These issues have previously been addressed in detail in the Project 12, Project 11 and Interstate Audit studies and most of the necessary works were incorporated in the NSW Lease business case. This study has reviewed and validated the prospective time savings identified in those previous studies.

## Superelevation and Cant Deficiency

Superlevation (also known as cant) describes the relative positioning of the high and low rail's on a curve. Superelevation has two primary purposes:

- To increase the speed that a train can pass through a curve by directing the centrifugal force of the vehicle into the track and
- To reduce friction at the wheel / rail interface by reducing the distance differential that the high and low wheels need to travel through the curve.

For a given level of superelevation there is an equilibrium speed of the train. This is the speed at which the direction of the centrifugal force exactly matchesthe superelevation of the curve.

If a train is travelling faster than the equilibrium speed, this creates a cant deficiency. That is, there is a deficiency in the level of superelevation or cant relative to the equilibrium speed. If the train is travelling slower than the equilibrium speed there is a cant surplus.

Current train speeds in curves in NSW are based on the following criteria:

- Maximum superelevation $=125 \mathrm{~mm}$ ( 140 mm on concrete sleepered track)
- Maximum cant deficiency $=75 \mathrm{~mm}(110 \mathrm{~mm}$ for the XPT)
- Maximum rate of change of superelevation $=55 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{sec}$

Different standards for superelevation and cant deficiency are applied around the world with relatively little research providing the foundation for the selected standards. In Britain for example, the maximum superelavtion is 150 mm , with an absolute maximum of 200 mm and a typical superelevation deficiency of 110 mm with 150 mm for selected vehicles.

Previous studies have proposed increasing thetrack geometry standards for appropriate freight vehicles to:

- Maximum superelevation $=140 \mathrm{~mm}$
- Maximum superelevation deficiency $=110 \mathrm{~mm}$
- Maximum rate of change of superelevation $=55 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{sec}$

Adopting these standards is contingent on:

- Provision of concrete sleepers, or as a minimum a sleeper/rail connection with resilient fastenings,
- A ballast profile to standard with the ballast in clean condition,
- No significant vertical or horizontal alignment irregularities,
- Continuous welding of the rails,
- Suitable vehicle (and particularly wheel) maintenance,
- Wheel/rail profiles matched by grinding,
- Level crossing sighting times to standard,
- Adequate signal braking distances,
- Clearance to structures and track centres to standard.


## Non-Geometry Related Restrictions

Non-geometry related restrictions have previously been identified as follows:

- Casino-Greenbank CTC

The Casino-Greenbank section currently operates on an electric staff system. This requires all trains to stop and manually exchange staff instruments. The delay at each location is approximately 5 minutes.

- Signal braking distance

With a shift to longer and heavier trains which take further to stop, the signal spacing at some locations is inadequate to allow a train to stop between a caution indication and a stop indication. To address this problem, some signals have a speed restriction on them to limit train speed to the level necessary to stop in the available distance. This includes much of the Sydney metropolitan area. The problem will be exacerbated if increased cant deficiency and superelevation is introduced as train speeds on the approach to signals will be higher.

- Temporary speed restrictions

The Melboume-Brisbane corridor has traditionally had a number of long-standing temporary speed restriction on it due to track and structure condition. While these have declined in recent years, the opportunity still exists to improve transit time by eliminating the remaining long-standing restrictions. A particular example is the Murrumbidgee River Bridge which due to the length of the viaducts and bridge structure, and the low speed, imposes a particularly severe time penalty on the corridor.

- Permanent speed restrictions through y ards

Traditionally speed restrictions were placed on yard areas in recognition of the dangers of high speed operation through areas where ground staff were operating. Due to the speed restriction, track in these areas was often maintained to a lower standard than required for high speed running. Despite the almost complete elimination of yard operations, many of these speed restrictions and the lower standard track remain. The opportunity exists to eliminate these restrictions subject to upgrading of the yard.

- Si gnal and level crossing sighting distances

In various locations there are speed restrictions imposed due to either the difficulty of train drivers sighting a signal at sufficient distance, or vehicle drivers sighting a train at sufficient distance at a level crossing. These sighting distance problems are directly related to train speed and require remedial works to improve sighting times. Increasing train speed will increase the number of locations where sighting is an issue and will require remediation.

## Simulation

TMG undertook a simulation of the entire corridor using M-Train to identify those locations where there would be significant benefit from an increase in superelevation and cant deficiency. Benefit arises where the potential speed of the train with the higher superelevation and cant deficiency parameters exceeds the current speed limit.

Typically benefit arises for curves toward the bottom of downgrades, where train speed has built up, and on the lower part of upgrades, before the train loses momentum. There is frequently little benefit in increasing
speeds through curves toward the tops of grades as the potential speed of the train is less than current track geometry standards permit. Indeed, increasing the superelevation at these locations is undesirable as a train travelling at less than the equilibrium speed will place increased pressure on the low-side rail, increasing wear.

The sample chart below is illustrative of the outputs. Between approximately 270 km and 274 km the train speed with increased superelevation and cant deficiency is substantially above the current speed limit, though still constrained by the higher speed limit. In contrast, there is no benefit from increased cant deficiency and superelevation bet ween 279 km and 285 km where the train speed falls below the current speed limit and is unconstrained.


The NSW Lease business case did not fully address the potential for time savings from increasing superelevation and cant deficiency. As noted above, it is highly desirable that concrete be installed on curves to be subject to the higher track forces arising from the changed standards. The business case did not provide for any additional concrete sleepering to facilitate the change to the higher standards.

The analysis indicates that there is substantial additional potential fortransit time reduction by concrete sleepering selected curves on the Main South. Due to the relatively gentle gradients and extensive number of curves on the North Coast, the analysis suggests that there is benefit in concrete sleepering all curves on this line.

It should also be noted that by basing speed on the prevailing track geometry, the simulation also implicitly models the elimination of the other non-geometry related restrictions. The NSW Lease business case provided for most of these restrictions to be addressed. Investment associated with increasing train speed through increased cant deficiency and superlevation will also need to address additional areas where signal and level crossing sighting distances become an issue.

## OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS

## Introduction

There are two issues affecting the adequacy of railway infrastructure on the North-South Corridor bet ween Melbourne and Brisbane:
i) the pattern of futuretraffic;
ii) the most appropriate plan of infrastructure improvements.

TMG modelled a nominal 2015 traffic pattern which reflects a high-end forecast of potential volume. Users include:
i) CityRail, as the operat or of NSW Southern Highlands provincial commuter passenger services;
ii) Countrylink, as the operat or of NSW long distance passenger services between Sydney, Canberra, Griffith and Melbourne;
iii) V/Line Passenger, as the operator of Victorian intrastate passenger services between Melbourne and Albury;
iv) Pacific National, as the major operator of intrastate and interstate freight services; and
v) PPL, QRN, SCT, etc, as the minor operators of intrastate and interstate freight services.

These train service pattems, particularly those of the interstate passenger and freight train operators, probably pose the greatest problem when determining future infrastructure needs. These services are expected to concentrate in particular time windows yet they also have to take into account the practicalities of terminal operation, whereby the rate of receipt and despatch of freight trains will depend upon different terminal configurations (which are outside the scope of this work).

## Melbourne - Sydney

Roughly half the North-South Corridor between Sydney and Melboume is double track. This track configuration largely eliminates conflicts bet ween opposing train movements. However, it still has to deal with conflicts bet ween following train movements. The early completion of automatic signalling will assist in this matter. However, there will still be a need to provide strategically located opportunities to refuge and/or overtake trains. Such opportunities have been factored into the following infrastruct ure assessments.

The bigger problem is expected to be encountered in the single track remainder of the corridor. There will be a need to provide:
i) sufficient capacity for fut ure traffic;
ii) adequate flexibility to be able to accommodate flighted and/or regular train movements; and
iii) as low as practicable delays to the movement of trains to improvethe reliability of the whole train flow.

With these issues in mind we have thus explored a range of infrastructure alternatives south of Junee, the current limit of double track in the corridor. In principle, we need to equalise the sectional running times between those crossing loops capable of refuging 1500 metres trains. These limiting sectional running times should reflect the likely headways between following trains and the sectional clearance times bet ween opposing trains. The limiting sectional running times should be no more than 30 minutes and preferably less, eg 15-20 minutes, in order to accommodate flighted train movements as well as expediting the passage of opposing train flows as is expected to occur between Cootamundra and Albury.
After consultation with ARTC, TMG adopted a common pattern of loop lengthening in NSW in order to provide limiting 15-20 minute sectional running times for intermodal trains while accepting constraints on the ability to lengthen the crossing loop at Wagga Wagga. Thus, we have chosen to lengthen Harefield, Bomen, Uranquinty and Culcairn to accommodate 1500 metres trains to complement the existing long loops at Yerong Creek, Gerogery and Albury. We have also assumed that Junee will be able to stage long freight trains entering and leaving the double track.
The more problematical section is the abutting Victorian NESG. This stretch of railway has irregularly spaced crossing loops but more uniformly spaced intermediate signals so that it is ideally configured for
fleeted traffic running successively northbound and then southbound. While this is certainly the current pattern of standard gauge traffic it is not expected to be the fut ure pattern whereby it is expected that interstate traffic can be expected to spread out over the whole of a working day and over which formerly broad gauge traffic can be expected to be overlaid.
With this futuretraffic is mind we conducted a number of SKETCH infrastructure experiments in Victoria (all with the same crossing loop configuration in NSW) with the previously discussed nominal 2015 traffic pattern, ie:
i) the existing pattern of lengthened loops in Victoria, ie Tottenham ( 10 km via IG), Somerton ( 22 km ), Wallan (47 km), Seymour (101 km), Longwood (137 km), Violet Town (170 km), Glenrowan (219 km ) and Chiltern ( 272 km ) [Case L];
ii) a modified pattern of lengthen loops in Victoria, in addition to the above crossing loops, ie Tullamarine ( 23 km via IG), Donnybrook ( 34 km ), Broadford ( 74 km ), Benalla ( 196 km ) plus a new loop near Springhurst ( 252 km ) [Case M];
iii) lengthening all loops in Victoria, ie addition to the above loops also McIntyre ( 16 km via IG), Tallarook ( 89 km ), Alumatta ( 232 km ) and Wodonga ( 298 km ), but excluding the new loop near Springhurst [Case N ];
iv) all long loops plus division of the Seymour - Longwood, Longwood - Violet Town and Alumatta Chiltern sections with new long loops at Avenel ( 119 km ), Euroa ( 154 km ) and Springhurst ( 252 km ) [Case O];
v) all long loops plus provision of 15-20 kilometre"passing lanes" from Seymour ( 101 km ) to Avenel (119 km), from Euroa ( 154 km ) to Violet Town ( 170 km ) and Alumatta ( 232 km ) to Springhurst ( 252 km) [Case P \}; and
vi) duplication between Seymour (101 km) and Wodonga (298 km) [Case Q].

In all cases, since the above traffic scenario assumed the incorporation of former broad gauge traffic (assumed to be three weekday pairs of Down and Up intrastate passenger trains bet ween Spencer Street and Albury plus two pairs of Down and Up freight trains between Melbourne and northeastern Victoria), it was assumed that passenger stops could be made at Seymour, Avenel, Euroa, Balmattum, Violet Town, Benalla, Glenrowan, Wangaratta, Springhurst, Chiltern, Barnawartha, Wodonga and Albury.
The revised nominal 2015 traffic pattern incorporated 43555 train minutes for 142 trains and 22659 train minutes for 35 intermodal trains (including those only running between Chullora and Cootamundra) in the 24 hours between 1200 on a Wednesday and 1200 on a Thursday. Table 1 summarises the total delays for all trains and just intermodal trains under near optimal timet able resolution for each of the above cases.

| Delay <br> Category | Case L <br> Train <br> minutes | Case M <br> Train <br> minutes | Case N <br> Train <br> Minutes | Case 0 <br> Train <br> minutes | Case P <br> Train <br> minutes | Case Q <br> Train <br> minutes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average <br> All <br> Trains | $\begin{gathered} 4404 \\ (10.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2731 \\ (6.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2563 \\ (5.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1947 \\ (4.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1701 \\ (3.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1357 \\ \mathbf{3 . 1 \%} \end{gathered}$ |
| Best <br> All <br> Trains | $\begin{gathered} 2970 \\ (6.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2240 \\ (5.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2241 \\ (5.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1715 \\ (3.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1472 \\ (3.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1214 \\ (2.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Best <br> I'modal <br> Trains | $\begin{gathered} 1881 \\ (8.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1201 \\ (5.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1179 \\ (5.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 883 \\ (3.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 720 \\ (3.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 624 \\ (2.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

It can be seen that these best rates of delay reduction occur as the existing NESG crossing loops are all lengthened to accommodate 1500 metrestrains after which the three longest sections are divided by new long crossing loops. The substitution of"passing lanes" for these new crossing loops offers a further modest improvement, but at expected cost levels the reduction in delay minutes performs better than the best ranking deviation projects. Accordingly it is preferred as the optimum scope of works. Duplication for 197 kilometres between Seymour and Wodonga then only yields a minor improvement.

The train graph produced for the preferred scope, Option $P$, is attached at appendix 4.

## Sydney - Brisbane

Only one fifth of the North-South Corridor between Sydney and Brisbane is double track. This track configuration largely eliminates conflicts bet ween opposing train movements. However, it still has to deal with conflicts bet ween following train movements. This is exacerbated by the intense Central Coast commuter passenger traffic bet ween Sydney, Gosford, Wyong, Morisset and Newcastle, followed by the busy Newcastle District provincial passenger traffic bet ween Newcastle, Maitland and Dungog. While there are infrastructure alternatives these have not yet been developed into a firm plan. In the meantime, RailCorp is working on providing two guaranteed freight train paths per hour in each direction out side the Sydney commuter peak periods.
Nevertheless, with four-fifths of the corridor single track the immediate infrastructure problems will lie there, on the NSW North Coast Line. There will be a need to provide:
iv) sufficient capacity for fut ure traffic;
v) adequate flexibility to be able to accommodate flighted and/or regular train movements; and vi) as low as practicable delays to the movement of trains to improve the reliability of the whole train flow.

With these issues in mind we thus explored a range of infrastructure alternatives north of Maitland and Telarah, the current limit of double track in the corridor. Because of the currently slow running times throughout the North Coast Railway we adopted a number of infrastructure projects which were expressly intended to reduce running times without direct regard for line capacity. These projects included the conversion of Electric Train Staff safeworking to Centralised Traffic Control, changes to track geometry to raise the speeds of trains around curves and selected deviations. Their nett effect should be to reduce bare running times between Telarah and Acacia Ridge by two hours.

We then turned our attention to measures expressly intended to address line capacity and the reduction of delay (necessary forthe promotion of reliability). Traffic conditions on the Lower North Coast, bet ween Telarah and Craven, are at ypical of the rest of the railway. This is because Newcastle District provincial passenger trains and export and power generation coal trains easily double even future train flows. The solution would be to lengthen all the crossing loops between Telarah and Craven (ie Telarah, Mindaribba, Paterson*, Kilbride, Wallarobba* Dungog, Monkerai and Stroud Road*) to refuge 1500 metres trains. The marked crossing loops are already sufficiently long, thus five additional crossing loops would have to be lengthened over what is currently in place.
We then had the alternative of either selectively lengthening the remaining crossing loops between Craven and Acacia Ridge to provide long crossing loops 25-30 minutes apart for intermodal trains or to lengthen all crossing loops.

The selective lengthening would require long loops at Berrico, Bulliac*, Mt George, Killawarra*, T aree*, Melinga, Johns River*, Kerewong, Telegraph Point*, Kempsey*, Eungai*, Nambucca Heads*, Raleigh, Boambee Beach*, Coramba, Kungala*, Braunstone, Kyarran, Lawrence Road*, Rappville*, a new loop at Namoona, Kyogle*, Loadstone, Glenapp*, a new loop at Tamrookum, Bromelton*, Greenbank and Acacia Ridge*. The marked crossing loops are already sufficiently long, thus twelve additional crossing loops would have to be lengthened over what is currently in place. Melinga was required to reduce sectional running time bet ween T aree and Johns River. On the other hand, it was thought that Grafton might be too difficult to lengthen so that Braunstone and Kyarran were proposed in its place. Similarly, it was thought that Casino might be tooto lengthen so that Namoona was to be constructed in its stead.

The global loop lengthening would require Craven, Gloucester, Bundook, Wingham, Kendall, Wauchope, Kundabung, Tamban, Macksville, Bonville, Landrigans, Nana Glen, Glenreagh, Camira Creek and Leeville to be additionally lengthened: a total of fifteen additional loops.

With future traffic is mind we thus conducted two SKETCH infrastructure experiments along the NSW North Coast Railway to test the operational impact of these alternative loop lengthening scenarios, ie:
vii) global loop lengthening south of Craven and selective loop lengthening north of Craven, as outlined above [Case L]; and
viii) global loop lengthening between Telarah and Acacia Ridge, as outlined above [Case M].

The revised nominal 2015 traffic pattern incorporated 32455 train minutes for 151 trains and 19515 train minutes for 26 intermodal trains in the 24 hours bet ween 1200 on a Wednesday and 1200 on a Thursday. Table 1 summarises the total delays for alltrains and just intermodal trains under near optimal timet able resolution for each of the above cases.

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF REVISED SKETCH NSW NORTH COAST INFRAS TRUCTURE SIMULATIO NS

| Delay | Case L <br> Train minutes | Case M <br> Train minutes |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Average | $\mathbf{2 4 4 2}$ | 2084 |
| All Trains | $(\mathbf{7 . 5 \% )}$ | $(\mathbf{6 . 4 \% )}$ |
| Best | 2041 | $\mathbf{1 7 5 9}$ |
| All Trains | $(6.3 \%)$ | $\mathbf{( 5 . 4 \% )}$ |
| Best | $\mathbf{1 4 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 8 3}$ |
| Intermodal Trains | $(\mathbf{7 . 2 \% )}$ | $\mathbf{( 6 . 1 \% )}$ |

It can be seen that global loop lengthening only slightly improves the operational results so that selective loop lengthening should deliver acceptable reliability as well as a two hour bare transit time reduction.

The train graph produced for the preferred scope, Option L, is attached at appendix 4.

## Conclusions

The key conclusions of the analysis are:

- Increasing train speed through increased superelevation and cant deficiency performs very well on a cost per minute saved basis and should be a high priority. Implementation of higher train speeds also requires a number of consequential works to be completed.
- Loop lengthening works also perform very highly interms of cost per minute saved. The optimum scope of works is:
a. Lengthen all loops on the North Coast between Maitland and Weismantels.
b. Lengthen selected loops north of Wesimantels to give a maximum section running time of around 35 minutes.
c. Lengthen all loops bet ween Melboume and Seymour.
d. Provide 3 sections of double track bet ween Seymour and Albury (with a total distance of around 45 km ).
e. Lengthen selected loops to Junee.
f. Provide a limited number of additional refuging facilities between Junee and Sydney, preferable in conjunction with resignalling schemes.
- The highest ranking deviation works are well justified once the gains from increased trains speeds and an optimized loop configuration have been achieved.
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## Appendix 3

Mel bourne - Brisbane Deviations Options - Ranking

| Project | FROM |  | TO |  | Cost (\$m) | Time Saving (mins) | \$m/min Saved | Cumulative Cost (\$m) | Cumulative Time Saving (mins) | Cumulative \$m / min Saved |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Name | km | Name | km |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N573-N591 | Nambucca Heads (Station) | 565.081 | Bonville (Station) | 596.494 | \$39.43 | 8.81 | \$4.48 | \$39.43 | 8.81 | \$4.48 |
| N401 | Taree (Dawson F ver) | 383.300 | Jo hns River | 417.801 | \$76.41 | 12.53 | \$6.10 | \$115.84 | 21.34 | \$5.43 |
| N379 | Taree North Bypass | 375.000 |  | 382.900 | \$20.11 | 3.19 | \$6.30 | \$135.95 | 24.53 | \$5.54 |
| N528-N559 | Tamban (Station) | 520.558 | Nambu oca Heads (Station) | 565.081 | \$117.54 | 17.49 | \$6.72 | \$253.48 | 42.02 | \$6.03 |
| N495-N512 | Kundabung | 487.197 | Tamban (Station) | 520.558 | \$71.67 | 10.13 | \$7.07 | \$325.15 | 52.15 | \$6.23 |
| N159 | Fassifern | 142.31 | Hexham | 175.530 | \$123.48 | 16.53 | \$7.47 | \$448.63 | 68.68 | \$6.53 |
| 5386 | Demondrille | 391.500 | Cunningar | 380.920 | \$48.60 | 6.25 | \$7.78 | \$497.23 | 74.93 | \$6.64 |
| N433-N457 | Rossglen (Syd. Side) | 439.096 | Telegraph Point (Not station) | 474.000 | \$85.64 | 10.77 | \$7.95 | \$582.87 | 85.70 | \$6.80 |
| N223 | Hexham | 176.480 | Stroud Road | 270.000 | \$361.33 | 43.00 | \$8.40 | \$944.20 | 128.70 | \$7.34 |
| 5343 | Binal ong | 350.750 | Bowning | 334.500 | \$60.07 | 7.09 | \$8.47 | \$1,004.27 | 135.79 | \$7.40 |
| S513 | Bomen curve easing | 515.500 |  | 511.000 | \$13.80 | 1.51 | \$9.14 | \$1,018.07 | 137.30 | \$7.41 |
| N705-N714 | Grafton Exit | 704.250 | Southgate | 714.580 | \$32.22 | 3.26 | \$9.88 | \$1,050.29 | 140.56 | \$7.47 |
| N721-N763 | W arragai Creek | 714.880 | Ampdale | 764.550 | \$159.08 | 15.75 | \$10.10 | \$1,209.38 | 156.31 | \$7.74 |
| N288-N293 | Craven | 285.019 | Upper Avon | 293.200 | \$34.67 | 3.38 | \$10.26 | \$1,244.05 | 159.69 | \$7.79 |
| N346-N363 | Charity Creek | 342.000 | West W ingham | 365.844 | \$98.45 | 9.21 | \$10.69 | \$1,342.49 | 168.90 | \$7.95 |
| S272 | Jerrawa | 297.000 | Breadal bane | 247.000 | \$196.23 | 17.66 | \$11.11 | \$1,538.72 | 186.56 | \$8.25 |
| N822-N841 | Baraimal | 821.500 | Kilgra | 842.600 | \$93.67 | 7.95 | \$11.78 | \$1,632.39 | 194.51 | \$8.39 |
| V98 | Seymour | 97.550 |  | 99.020 | \$3.26 | 0.27 | \$12.08 | \$1,635.65 | 194.78 | \$8.40 |
| N628 | Coffs Harbour - Nana G len D | 610.700 |  | 644.340 | \$162.75 | 13.01 | \$12.51 | \$1,798.40 | 207.79 | \$8.65 |
| S439 | Frampton | 445.530 | Cootamundra South | 433.400 | \$66.44 | 4.90 | \$13.56 | \$1,864.84 | 212.69 | \$8.77 |
| N890-N902 | Glenapp | 887.440 | Ugly Creek | 902.750 | \$76.28 | 5.40 | \$14.13 | \$1,941.12 | 218.09 | \$8.90 |
| 5396 | Nubb a | 399.150 | Demon drille | 392.650 | \$29.94 | 2.10 | \$14.25 | \$1,971.05 | 220.19 | \$8.95 |
| N808-N816 | North Casino | 807.000 | Fairy Hill | 818.360 | \$33.23 | 2.28 | \$14.57 | \$2,004.28 | 222.47 | \$9.01 |
| N766-N799 | Selection Flat Regrade | 765.140 | South Casino | 803.280 | \$107.50 | 7.09 | \$15.16 | \$2,111.78 | 229.56 | \$9.20 |
| N866 | Border Crossing Deviation | 844.490 |  | 886.900 | \$311.46 | 20.08 | \$15.51 | \$2,423.24 | 249.64 | \$9.71 |
| N271-N284 | Johnson Creek | 270.000 | Tereel Road | 284.169 | \$78.93 | 4.81 | \$16.41 | \$2,502.17 | 254.45 | \$9.83 |
| N423 | Johns River (Station) | 417.801 | Rossglen | 427.200 | \$27.36 | 1.63 | \$16.78 | \$2,529.53 | 256.08 | \$9.88 |
| N951-N956 | Olson Road | 950.950 | Greenbank | 955.900 | \$10.89 | 0.64 | \$17.01 | \$2,540.42 | 256.72 | \$9.90 |
| N649-N691 | Glenreagh | 644.340 | South Grafton | 693.700 | \$212.76 | 11.57 | \$18.39 | \$2,753.18 | 268.29 | \$10.26 |
| S365 | Cunningar | 375.220 | Binalong | 355.750 | \$120.98 | 6.28 | \$19.26 | \$2,874.16 | 274.57 | \$10.47 |
| S326 | Bowning | 328.900 | Yass Junction | 322.100 | \$43.43 | 2.24 | \$19.39 | \$2,917.60 | 276.81 | \$10.54 |
| 5381 | Cootamundra North | 428.230 | Bowning | 333.450 | \$763.58 | 38.29 | \$19.94 | \$3,681.17 | 315.10 | \$11.68 |
| S405 | W allenbeen | 407.830 | Nubba | 401.640 | \$23.64 | 1.18 | \$20.03 | \$3,704.81 | 316.28 | \$11.71 |
| N299-N338 | Avon River | 296.184 | Manning River | 341.563 | \$398.53 | 17.40 | \$22.90 | \$4,103.34 | 333.68 | \$12.30 |
| N959-N970 | Greenbank North | 957.250 | Beaud esert Road | 972.180 | \$38.37 | 1.52 | \$25.24 | \$4,141.71 | 335.20 | \$12.36 |
| N376 | W est Taree Devi ation | 375.017 |  | 377.773 | \$16.18 | 0.54 | \$29.95 | \$4,157.89 | 335.74 | \$12.38 |
| S305 | Cool alie Mundanoon Tunn el | 309.550 | Je rrawa | 300.000 | \$53.41 | 1.77 | \$30.17 | \$4,211.30 | 337.51 | \$12.48 |
| S97 | Aylmerton | 126.300 | Menang le | 68.000 | \$563.75 | 18.16 | \$31.04 | \$4,775.05 | 355.67 | \$13.43 |
| S416 | Morrisons Hill | 421.580 | Jindalee | 411.000 | \$49.98 | 1.53 | \$32.67 | \$4,825.03 | 357.20 | \$13.51 |
| N904-N923 | Tamrookum Creek | 887.440 | Sandy Creek | 924.230 | \$60.85 | 1.84 | \$33.07 | \$4,885.88 | 359.04 | \$13.61 |
| N926-N945 | Bromelton | 924.700 | Teviot Brook North | 949.790 | \$89.52 | 2.47 | \$36.24 | \$4,975.40 | 361.51 | \$13.76 |
| S649 | Murray River bridge | 649.500 |  | 648.500 | \$20.18 | 0.49 | \$41.19 | \$4,995.58 | 362.00 | \$13.80 |
| S128 | Mittagong | 128.210 | Aylmerton | 126.880 | \$10.12 | 0.13 | \$77.84 | \$5,005.70 | 362.13 | \$13.82 |
| S231-S229 | Yarra | 231.670 | Goulburn | 227.540 | \$32.65 | 0.38 | \$85.93 | \$5,038.35 | 362.51 | \$13.90 |
| S138-S130 | Burradoo | 138.080 | Mittagong Junction | 228.540 | \$48.69 | 0.43 | \$113.23 | \$5,087.04 | 362.94 | \$14.02 |
| S452 | Bethungra | 456.040 | Frampton | 229.540 | \$99.92 | 0.84 | \$118.95 | \$5,186.96 | 363.78 | \$14.26 |
| N371 | W ingham East Deviation | 368.611 |  | 230.540 | \$29.44 | 0.44 | \$66.91 | \$5,216.40 | 364.22 | \$14.32 |
| S152 | Werai | 153.580 | Exeter | 231.540 | \$34.25 | 1.52 | \$22.53 | \$5,250.65 | 365.74 | \$14.36 |
| S507 | Shepherds | 507.580 |  | 232.540 | \$3.90 | 0.02 | \$194.77 | \$5,254.54 | 365.76 | \$14.37 |
| S183-S179 | Tallong | 183.110 | Winge llo | 233.540 | \$54.71 | 0.24 | \$227.95 | \$5,309.25 | 366.00 | \$14.51 |
| S170 |  | 170.540 | Penrose | 234.540 | \$33.57 | 0.27 | \$124.32 | \$5,342.82 | 366.27 | \$14.59 |
| S192 | Medway | 193.270 | Marulan | 235.540 | \$21.09 | 0.58 | \$36.36 | \$5,363.91 | 366.85 | \$14.62 |
| S214 | W ollondilly \#2 | 212.770 |  | 236.540 | \$32.06 | 0.21 | \$152.66 | \$5,395.97 | 367.06 | \$14.70 |
| S490 | Harefield curve easing | 490.690 |  | 237.540 | \$21.63 | 0.03 | \$720.84 | \$5,417.59 | 367.09 | \$14.76 |
| S165 | Penrose | 165.600 | Bunda noon | 238.540 | \$14.81 | 0.11 | \$134.66 | \$5,432.40 | 367.20 | \$14.79 |
| S320 | Yass Junctio $n$ W est curve ea | 321.150 |  | 239.540 | \$8.06 | 0.15 | \$53.70 | \$5,440.46 | 367.35 | \$14.81 |
| 5331 | Bowning curve easing | 331.600 |  | 240.540 | \$42.82 | 0.01 | \$4,281.50 | \$5,483.27 | 367.34 | \$14.93 |
| S317 | Yass Junction East aurve eas | 317.800 |  | 241.540 | \$17.98 | 0.17 | -\$105.79 | \$5,501.26 | 367.17 | \$14.98 |

Appendix 4 - SYDNEY-BRISBANE 24-HOUR TRAIN DIAGRAM FOR NOMINAL 2015 TRAFFIC



MELBOURNE - SYDNEY 24-HOUR TRAIN DIAGRAM FOR REVISED NOMINAL 2015 TRAFFIC


A $U$ STRALIAN RAIL TRACK CORPORATION

Traín Diagram far 1200 on a Wednesday to 1200 an a Thursday Prepared an 25-Jan-05



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ MTRAIN is a proprietary train performance and signal simulation tool owned by TMG International
    ${ }^{2}$ SKETCH is a proprietary timetable and infrastructure planning tool owned by TMG International

