

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

RAILWAY (FORRESTFIELD–AIRPORT LINK) BILL 2015

Consideration in Detail

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

Clause 4: Authority to construct railway —

Debate was interrupted after the clause had been partly considered.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: My question relates to the construction time frame. In question time today we heard the minister's concerns about seven hours of debate on this bill. This bill was introduced in April this year. Why have we not debated this bill until now? Why did the minister not bring this on for debate earlier this year?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I am not sure what that has to do with the passage of this bill that is going through at this point.

Mr P. Papalia: You were asked a stupid dorothy.

Mr D.C. NALDER: The member is now referring to question time.

The commentary I made is that we now have the bill here.

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Girrawheen!

Mr D.C. NALDER: I am happy to debate any specific points that relate to this bill, but we are not doing that. We are talking about everything else other than the passage of this bill. I find it amusing when members opposite support this project and we want to get moving with it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am a bit confused because the minister said in his answer that seven hours of debate on a key piece of legislation is too much. There was 22 hours of debate from the minister's side on legislation for the Perth–Mandurah railway line, but he is saying that that seven hours could impact the construction time frame for this project. If that is the case and the minister is confirming today that that seven hours of debate will impact the construction time frame, why did he not bring this bill forward before this week?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I did not say that it impacts the construction time at all; I have said that the opposition is supportive of this bill —

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

Mr D.C. NALDER: As soon as the opposition starts to lose an argument, we get personal attacks.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Because the member for Albany loves me so much!

This debate is not impacting the construction of the rail line. We have a bill before us relating to the construction of a railway, which the opposition supports. The Leader of the Opposition said so in his reply. All that has been talked about is everything else to do with public transport and nothing to do with this bill. I just find that really quite strange when members opposite argue that they want to proceed with the construction of this railway line. I do not understand why we spent 10 and a half hours talking about everything else.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Obviously, the minister's answer to the question he was asked today was completely irrelevant to this bill.

I want to go to the construction of this railway line. As we know, clause 4 deals with the authority to construct the railway line, as outlined in schedule 1. I want to talk about the confirmation that 12 trains will run just past Bayswater station to Perth an hour. What is the current capacity of the Midland line?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We are looking at running six trains an hour from both the Midland station and the Forrestfield station, which will be 12 trains running into the city. The capacity is around 18 an hour.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: So, the capacity is 18 trains an hour. Thank you very much for that.

Again, I understand that tunnelling will commence just past Bayswater station. What will be the cost per kilometre of the tunnel and, in particular, what is the exact length of the tunnel that will be built?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We do not have the exact cost at this point because that is out at contract, and we do not have those tenders; we are down to our final three. Because the dive structures have to go in, we are saying that the tunnel will be about eight kilometres long, but it is approximately seven and three-quarter kilometres long.

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What is the distance between the consolidated terminal station and the Forrestfield station?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We do not have the exact distance between the consolidated station and the final Forrestfield station at this point. We are putting in three stations over the eight kilometres. My understanding is that the consolidated one is slightly closer to the Forrestfield side, so there is more length coming from the Bayswater station than from the other side. There will be about two kilometres between the consolidated station and the Forrestfield station.

Ms L.L. BAKER: I might just put together a couple of questions. In relation to the 12 trains an hour with a capacity for 18 an hour, what modelling has been done on the impact of the crossovers on Caledonian Avenue and probably further down as well? I am particularly interested in the crossover at Caledonian. Could the minister tell me what the capacity is there? Does the minister want me to ask the second question?

Mr D.C. Nalder: I am happy for you to ask.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Secondly, in order to cope with the additional passengers and travel that is expected on the Bayswater–Perth line, what will the parking capacity be? At the moment there are about 180 to 200 parking bays at Bayswater train station. With 21 000 commuters expected on it—a massive increase—I am expecting there will be a significant increase in the parking capacity as well. So that is two questions. Firstly, what modelling has been done on the impact of traffic flowing across the electorate—I am just talking while the minister is thinking, so that is okay—going from the east to the west or the west to the east along Caledonian Avenue off Guildford Road or down Railway Parade or Whatley Crescent? What would be the impact at the crossing? Secondly, what parking modelling has been done?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Firstly, in relation to the question about the level crossings, we know that there will be a 100 per cent increase in closure times of the level crossings, but there are a number of answers to that. We have not done anything about those level crossings specifically, but in a broader context, work is being done around Third Avenue and those bridges across the railway to allow for the increased flow in different directions. Work is also being undertaken on traffic light sequencing to try to get better flow in other areas and corridors. A precinct area is being looked at. The second part of the member's question was around car parking bays. Potentially, the new line will slightly increase patronage because of latent demand, but at this stage that is outside the scope of the project.

Mr D.J. KELLY: What is the anticipated additional patronage on the Midland line between Bassendean and Bayswater because of the opening of the Forrestfield line? I assume the minister expects people to get to the airport first by using the Midland line, say, between Bassendean and Bayswater. What additional patronage is expected on that part of the line and will additional car parking be made available?

Mr D.C. NALDER: There is anticipated latent demand. No specific modelling exists around that latent demand when the line goes through. We expect 20 000 passengers to go through to the airport, and the additional patronage is seen as a direct proportion of what is coming in on all the lines. I do not have the specific numbers, but I am more than happy to get them for the member. Modelling for additional car parking around other train stations is outside the scope of this project.

Mr D.J. KELLY: Can the minister clarify whether modelling has been done and he does not have it with him—if it is not part of this project—or that that modelling has not been done?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We have broader modelling on how many people will use the Forrestfield–Airport Link, and within that assumptions are made as to where they are coming from. We also believe there is latent demand that sits within specific stations that we may not have picked up; it has not been modelled down to that detail. We have done high-level broader modelling. We can provide some high-level broader numbers, but we cannot go down to the detail around the latent demand that might exist for a particular station. We have made assumptions based on current patronage and a relevant percentage calculated.

Mr D.J. Kelly: Can you provide that by relevant modelling?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We can provide it on a line basis; I am not sure we can provide it on a station basis.

Mr D.J. Kelly: Could you give us what you have got?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We will look at it, because we are still at the contract stage at this point. We want to make that information available, but we do not want to put anything at risk during the contract phase. As I said, the contracts will be in place well in front of any election, so we will get the information out. The timing of it depends on what we can and cannot do.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Again, the minister can correct me if my question is not appropriate for this clause. I am interested in what will happen with the platform of Bayswater train station with the new trains that will come into operation. I have not seen any comment about it being changed. People will have a problem getting luggage

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

on and off trains when they are going to the airport. No mention has been made so far of any changes or improvements to the platform itself. I also wonder where the toilet is going to go.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Come on, member!

Ms L.L. Baker: It is a good question.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I do not have the detail on exactly where the toilet is going. I do not even know if they have got that far.

Ms L.L. Baker: But there is a toilet?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Yes, as I understand. We have to make sure it has disabled access and it is in the appropriate spot. Unlike some cities that have specific trains to the airport designed with luggage space, our access between the train and the platform is on a flat level. We will use existing trains to go to the airport, so no specific work is happening at stations for that, because people should be able to wheel their luggage on and off. The trains will have no specific area to provide greater storage for people travelling to and from the airport. They are the same trains.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What funding has been allocated for works between Bayswater station and the Perth station?

Mr D.C. NALDER: There is no allocation.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: How much has been allocated to the Bayswater station for the upgrades to which the member for Maylands referred?

Mr D.C. NALDER: The question has two elements here: disabled access and work on the tracks at crossovers and things like that. In all, it is approximately \$7 million.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: So \$7 million has been allocated to Bayswater station for associated works and nothing has been allocated for works between Bayswater station and the city. How many level crossings exist between Bayswater station and Perth station?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We do not have that information here. I know of two level crossings, but we think it is three, although I cannot think of the third one. Claisebrook and Caledonian Avenue are the only two. On this bill, we have all the information on constructing this project, and work is required just after the Bayswater station on the dive structures, and we need to make sure everything ties in. Things such as car parking, other stations, level crossings, and whatever we are thinking of doing is separate.

Mr D.J. Kelly: Hopefully you are not going to try to retrofit things after the event, because that would be very bad planning.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Retrofit what?

Ms L.L. BAKER: I have a question about security gates and turnstiles at Bayswater train station. The minister said \$7 million had been allocated for the upgrade. Would that include any thinking around putting in security turnstiles?

Mr D.C. Nalder: No.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Has the Public Transport Authority undertaken any analysis or estimates of the removal of level crossings in that section of line?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Yes; and additional work has been done. Again, members are going right off the bill. There are 31 level crossings across the metropolitan area and work has been undertaken to prioritise work on them based on incidents and other factors. All members would agree that it would be ideal if we could remove level rail crossings. There has been broader analysis of that, but this project is being run totally separate.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I think that the minister said in Parliament the other day that the anticipated cost of removing level crossings was between \$50 million and \$70 million. Are those figures relevant to the two level crossings on the Perth–Bayswater line?

Mr D.C. NALDER: The number I used the other day was a rough estimate. We know that the Lord Street underpass will cost around \$84 million. The advice that I received on that when I first became minister was very broad. The estimated cost for Denny Avenue was \$100 million, but more accurate information suggests it will be around \$70 million. Broadly speaking, the work will be in that \$50 million to \$70 million, but that is based on high level estimates across the 31 level crossings. We do not have any specifics, other than Denny Avenue and a couple of others that are on the high priority list. We know from our experience with the Lord Street underpass that relocating services and other such difficulties blows out the cost. I do not have that detail across the 31 level crossings.

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

Ms L.L. BAKER: I mentioned earlier—I cannot remember when it was; it seems like days ago—the cyclepath that goes along the train line at Bayswater, which comes all the way down the Midland line. The minister knows all about it because I think it has just been extended.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Yes.

Ms L.L. BAKER: It is great. However, there is a huge safety problem when it runs through Bayswater. I do not know whether the minister is aware, but at the top of the Bayswater train station, where the cyclepath hits the train station at the northern end of the platform, the cyclepath goes through the car parking lot with about 80 bays. At the moment when a person comes cycling from Midland, with a bit of headwind up because they are coming downhill, they come into the car park—and kaboom-pha! Someone is likely to die when they enter that car park, where 80 people could be trying to park. Given the increased traffic that is expected on the line, what are the government's and minister's plans to fix the potential death problem?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Whenever we look at major pieces of infrastructure, we are very committed to attend to the cycling infrastructure that surrounds it. As the member says, we are aware that the cyclepath ends at either end of the car park. Part of the \$7 million will be spent on linking up that cyclepath and moving it out of the car parking space.

Ms L.L. Baker: Do you have any idea how that will work? There is no room.

Mr D.C. NALDER: The car park will have to be moved back from the boundary to create the space, potentially. But we do not have the detail on that. Again, it is not part of what we are trying to do today, but work will be done to try to fix that.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I understand that the construction contract will be awarded later this year.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Next year.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Will it be in different packages? Is there a station package? Will it be done in defined packages, as was done with the Perth–Mandurah line or New MetroRail?

Mr D.C. NALDER: There will be some forward-works-type packages, but it is a whole design-and-construct package for the entire rail stations.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I know it is out to tender, but what is the approximate or the budgeted cost for the three stations?

Mr D.C. Nalder: We will not go into that level of detail at this point. We will not get into breaking that down while we are out to tender at this time. We have budget estimates and they have been signed off. We have been finding as we have been working through a lot of the construct contract costs that construction costs have come right down because of the state of the economy, and we are benefitting from that. We really want to make the most of this opportunity to get them done, and we do not want to declare a hand on what we think the costs are going to be.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The situation now is different from what happened previously because budget estimates and a breakdown were provided for other projects, such as New MetroRail. Why is there a new approach so that we cannot get a breakdown of expected construction costs?

Mr D.C. NALDER: If we were looking at a station in isolation or something like that, we would give a broad figure, whether it be a P50 or whatever, of the assessed cost. But when this is combined and we are in current negotiations, my sole interest is to deliver the best possible outcome for this state. This project will be under construction by next year. Therefore, the need to keep that confidential will be removed, and we will be more than happy to expose it, but we do not think it is relevant to anything so far as proceeding with this. We have an overall budget. We have had a good track record over the last couple of years getting contracts in under budget and I want to make sure that we get the best possible deal for Western Australia on this contract.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I think the minister's answer was that he would be comfortable providing some P50 estimates for station costs.

Mr D.C. NALDER: No. I said that if we were looking in isolation and were building a station on its own, we would put out a rough budget estimate for that. However, at the moment, this is encapsulated in a whole design and construct of the stations and rail together. At this point we have given a high-level figure of what it is, but we do not want to break down the elements of that whilst we are negotiating. We do not think that that is the right thing to do at this time. Once the contracts are finalised, there will be a time to provide that information, but right now I do not want to take one degree off getting us the best possible result. I may be more conservative than other ministers in the past, but I do not see the benefit of that information going out at this time if there is any risk to our getting the best possible deal for this.

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: When does the minister believe that he will be able to provide a breakdown of the cost components of the rail line?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We expect to be in contract by some time in June next year—so I would say after that.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Although the tunnel work will be occurring a little bit out of the village, can the minister anticipate how much impact that tunnelling will have on the people who live in the residential precinct close to the Water Corporation land?

Mr D.C. NALDER: The construction is deliberately starting at the Forrestfield end because the biggest impact will be the extraction and removal of sand. The most convenient space to get that out is at the High Wycombe–Forrestfield site. Discussions are underway with different parties about what to do with that fill, and, apart from that, as we move underneath, it is not expected that there will be any impact on anyone. Obviously we have to get the exit or entry to the tunnels, which is on the east side of the station. So I would imagine that during the daytime, there could be some construction at the entrances, in the same way as would happen with any normal roadworks.

Ms L.L. Baker: No more than normal roadworks?

Mr D.C. NALDER: If we were building a bridge, there would be construction activity. We are lucky in the sense that we will be boring through predominantly sand or lime sand, so we will not get the same level of vibration and noise that would result from boring through rock. That makes it better in some respects, but worse in others, because whilst we will not have vibration, casing has to be built as the work proceeds, whereas we would just bore through rock. Engineering-wise it will make it more difficult. From an impact perspective, we are expecting minimal impact on anybody.

I have heard that in other cities around Australia where tunnels have been constructed through sand, people have been concerned and they have not realised that work is going on until all of a sudden the tunnels have passed under them. That is the feedback I am getting from other jurisdictions with similar soil types to ours.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Will the tunnelling and construction methods be similar to those of the Perth–Mandurah rail line? Once that went into the tunnel configuration, the concrete casing was in three parts, as I recall, and they were put together. Will that same mechanism be used? Will the Consolidated Airport station be the same as the 140 William Street station?

Mr D.C. NALDER: It will be very similar in construction. The technology has obviously improved a little since then. A five-ring structure will be going in, but it will be basically the same. For the station, yes, it will be very similar. A box will be built, and then the station. The boring tunnels will come into that box structure, which will be the station. So it will be very similar to what the member is saying. So from an escalated cost perspective, that will probably give the member a ballpark figure, but I do not want to go into it any further than that.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As the Airport West station is a complete underground station, will it be a similar construction to that for the Consolidated Airport and 140 William Street stations?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Airport West station is more similar to the Esplanade station.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I have a further question relating to the cost. I do not want to do anything to jeopardise contract prices. Are we looking at \$200 million or \$300 million a kilometre for tunnelling?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We have said that this is a \$2 billion project. It will be a P50 rail. Until we get the contracts back, that is our budget allocation. I will not break down the kilometre cost of the rail because then it will start to fill in. We know that it is an eight-kilometre line, it has three stations and it will cost roughly \$2 billion. I would rather leave it at a very high level.

Ms L.L. BAKER: What discussions have occurred between the City of Bayswater and the state government about this development? In particular, have any arrangements been made to share costs or will there be some investment from the City of Bayswater to smooth this project over for the Bayswater precinct or improve outcomes for the people who live in Bayswater? A packet of lollies perhaps?

Mr D.C. NALDER: It is fair to say that Kalamunda and Belmont have been a lot more proactive in approaching the PTA and compiling structure plans and so forth. There has been no discussion about this project. Although we interface, the activity occurs within the Department of Planning. However, not part of this project but moving forward, we expect to have further conversations with the City of Bayswater.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Contracts will be awarded in the middle of next year. Can the minister provide a brief outline of the construction timetable for the project?

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

Mr D.C. NALDER: We expect that work will commence on the box structures and the dive works in late 2016. That will be negotiated as part of the contract; that is, when they can be mobilised. That is the best information I can give at this point.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I understand that the \$2 billion includes \$7 million for Bayswater and does not include any other funding for any other works between Bayswater and Perth. Will any other associated platform work be required to gain access to the trains from other stations?

Mr D.C. NALDER: My response is similar to the response given to the question asked by the member for Maylands. Our B-series trains will be utilised on this line, which have the same configuration that fits on every other station. There will be no change to that.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5: Compliance with Airports Act —

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I understand that this clause is a departure from previous railway bills because we are now talking about the fact that we are going through commonwealth land—airport land. What is the effect of this clause?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Clause 5 clarifies that a written law that applies to the construction or maintenance of the railway applies to the railway to be constructed on Perth Airport land only to the extent that it is not inconsistent with the commonwealth Airports Act or its related subsidiary legislation. For example, the Building Act 2011, which governs the requirements for obtaining building permits for building works in this state, does not apply to building works on or under Perth Airport land as it is inconsistent with the building permit process established by the commonwealth's Airports (Building Control) Regulations 1996. Similarly, the requirement under the Planning and Development Act 2005 and the metropolitan region scheme to apply for development approval through the WA Planning Commission, a development assessment panel or a local authority before proceeding with the development does not apply to developments proposed with respect to Perth Airport land as the Airports Act has a separate process of development approval via the submission of a major development plan to the commonwealth. That is why the train had to tie into its plan. The WAPC had to seek approval through the commonwealth, and that process is part of its broader strategic plan.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 6: Application of *Land Administration Act 1997* —

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What is the impact of this clause?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Clause 6(1) excludes the operation of the compulsory acquisition and compensation provisions in parts 9 and 10 of the Land Administration Act 1997 from applying to any acquisition of interest in Perth Airport land as those provisions are inconsistent with the Commonwealth Places (Application of Laws) Act 1970. It is similar to the previous clause. Therefore, the right to enter Perth Airport land and to obtain land tenure to construct and maintain the railway on part of Perth Airport land is to be negotiated and agreed with the commonwealth and its airport lessee. Clause 6(2) excludes the operation of section 266 of the Land Administration Act 1997 in respect of any interest in Perth Airport land acquired for the purpose of the railway. Section 266 of the Land Administration Act provides that once a railway is discontinued and the land on which it is situated is no longer required for railway purposes, the land reverts to the Crown, free of any interest in favour of third parties. This provision cannot apply to that proportion of the railway located on Perth Airport land if the railway was to be discontinued in the future as it is contrary to the commonwealth's subsisting title to the airport land.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In relation to what is called airport land, how far down does it go? Is the tunnel in commonwealth land or is it in state land?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Commonwealth land titles go to the centre of the earth.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Were there any options or discussions that would allow the state to take control of all the land that this rail line goes through?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Ultimately, this land is commonwealth land with a lessee. There were substantial negotiations with the commonwealth, as the ultimate landlord, but we were required to negotiate with the lessee, being Perth Airport, as well. Both negotiations have occurred.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I think we touched on this earlier. What assurances does the minister have that any construction works carried out on airport land are done in consideration of a tunnel being built underneath? What requirements does Perth Airport have to ensure that its works will not disrupt our stations and our rail line?

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

Mr D.C. NALDER: Development can occur above the rail lines. Part of the negotiation process related to load limits to ensure that there was no risk to the train line itself.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 7: Exercise by Public Transport Authority of powers under *Public Works Act 1902* —

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What will be the impact of this clause of the bill?

Mr D.C. NALDER: Clause 7 provides that the Public Transport Authority must exercise powers under section 99 of the Public Works Act in respect of that section of railway to be located on Perth Airport land in accordance with the Airports Act. It just reinforces the things that we talked about before.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 8: Planning approval not required for underground section of railway —

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Because the line will be underground, we do not require any planning approval or any amendments to the metropolitan region scheme. Can the minister confirm that that is the case? I think the MRS process has begun for that part of the line that will not be underground, but can he advise where that process is at?

Mr D.C. NALDER: The member is correct. Clause 8 of the bill specifically exempts underground railway works, other than railway stations, bus transfer facilities, car parks et cetera, from Western Australian Planning Commission approval to reflect and formalise common practice. For all ground-level development works, the normal provisions of the metropolitan region scheme will apply.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Where are we at in the process of the MRS amendments?

Mr D.C. NALDER: It will be done as part of an omnibus amendment to the MRS. We are in the process of that. I cannot give the member a specific date at this point.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Because construction will start at the Forrestfield end, and that requires an MRS change because there is no passenger rail there and the railway station will be above ground, would amendments to the MRS not be required before the government enters into contracts for construction?

Mr D.C. NALDER: No. My understanding is that we need to put in a development application as part of that process.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What is the anticipated time frame for the MRS amendments?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We have to put in a development application as part of the station development, but the timeframe is in the hands of the Department of Planning. We are going through that process, but it is not a question specifically related to the bill. I would have to get that from the Minister for Planning.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In relation to the application for the MRS, is a subcommittee of cabinet or an interdepartmental committee with directors general of departments or relevant offices looking after this railway line? Do the DGs of the Department of Planning and the Department of Transport sit on any committee for this railway line?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We have multiagency processes. I am not getting into anything regarding cabinet and so forth, but we have project groups across agencies that work on this to make sure that everything is smooth so that when we start the project, every box is ticked.

Clause put and passed.

Schedule 1: Line of Forrestfield–Airport Link —

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I would like to go through each part of the schedule. I understand that the Forrestfield–Airport Link will start diving at that round circle.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Just east of Bayswater station.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: How far east will it start diving?

Mr D.C. NALDER: It will be approximately 600 to 800 metres east of Bayswater station, because there is the commencement of the dive structure, the start of the tunnel and all those things. I do not have the specifics, but a rough estimate is that it will be 600 to 800 metres east of Bayswater station.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Do any homes or buildings need to be acquired or demolished to allow that?

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

Mr D.C. NALDER: I was asked that question earlier. There is a bit of Western Power land, but there will be a bit of construction on the dive tower. Obviously, with the downward line on the Midland line, there will need to be a bridge across it, because as it dives, it will have to cut across, so there will be some works there.

Ms L.L. Baker: Where was that again?

Mr D.C. NALDER: It is about 600 to 800 metres east of Bayswater station, where the dive structure will be. Obviously, it will go down and around and the Midland line will come across. It will not be a big visible bridge, but there will be bridge work.

Ms L.L. Baker: So there will be a rail bridge that goes over the Midland line and then the tunnel will come in under it.

Mr D.C. NALDER: On the inward-bound line, yes.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Can the minister just describe that better? The line heading to Midland will veer off to Forrestfield. Will it go over the other line or under it?

Mr D.C. NALDER: It will go under it. On the Midland line, it will dive and swing around; so, effectively, it is a bridge but it will still come straight across, if the member knows what I mean. The line to Midland will keep going. There will be two lines. One will join the Midland line to Perth and the one heading to Forrestfield will have to cross over the city-bound line, so it will start to dive and turn. Effectively, a bridge will go across the top. It will not be a bridge up; it will be a bridge across.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: At one point, there will be four lines in a sense before it starts moving down. Can I just confirm whether there will be any additional height in that area?

Mr D.C. NALDER: There is potential for it to go up a bit, but it is marginal. We are not talking a height above or anything like that. It will be a maximum of two to three metres, so a maximum of my height.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In relation to other infrastructure or services, is any additional work required by the utilities or Main Roads? Has the minister identified any key services or infrastructure in that area that need to be relocated?

Mr D.C. NALDER: There are service works. There will be impacts on Dundas Road with the station being built. There is ATCO Gas Australia, pipe relocation and things like that, Western Power, fibre optics and water. There are the general services that we have to look at with major infrastructure projects, whether it be road or rail, that often use these corridors.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Are those costs incorporated as part of the \$2 billion or is that something that each agency will be asked to contribute to?

Mr D.C. NALDER: No; we incorporate all those costs all the time into the project, so they are part of the \$2 billion.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: How much has been allocated for the works around Dundas Road?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We will not break down these costs. I want to stop going to a level of detail there. A lot of the works that will happen will be part of the forward works, so the services will be picked up predominantly in the forward works. As we said, this is slightly different from the design and construct of the line itself. We really want to stay high level, guys, because we go out to contract on all these different things and we do not want to go there.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Just to clarify, the forward works have commenced or the contract has not commenced. Can the minister give the time frame for the forward works?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We are negotiating with them, but they will commence later next year.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The route veers off and runs parallel to Tonkin Highway underground and then it goes under the river. How low will it go under the river?

Mr D.C. NALDER: The lowest point of the tunnel will be 26 metres, which is pretty much under the middle of the river.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: How will that compare with the lowest point of the new metro rail project?

Mr D.C. Nalder: Which one?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Perth–Mandurah line.

Mr D.C. NALDER: We are saying 11 metres. Just to add to that, the average depth of the tunnel right across is 15 metres.

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I asked about the fill the minister talked about before. Everyone always seems to look at Whiteman Park as a potential receiver of the fill. I know that was talked about for Elizabeth Quay, but for whatever reason that did not eventuate. Where is the sand dug up likely to be taken; and, how much sand is it estimated will be extracted from this tunnel?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We are negotiating with a lot of providers at the moment. One potential use is for the third runway for the airport, so discussions are underway. It is fair to say that this soil will need to be treated because it will be high in acid sulphate, so there is a bit of a way to go to negotiate exactly what it can be used for, but it could potentially be fill on the third runway for the airport.

Mr D.J. KELLY: One of the interesting parts about this project is the fact that there is a tunnel. Why was a tunnel chosen as opposed to going over the ground, which everyone assumes would be a less expensive option?

Mr D.C. NALDER: In the investigation of the tunnel, which I cannot take all the credit for as it was started before I became minister, looking at the engineering requirements of above and below, it was found that there were some real difficulties above. It was found that to go above, a bridge would have to be built above the Swan River, it would have to stay above ground to go down Dunreath Drive and then there is getting across Tonkin Highway and Great Eastern Highway. One of the options was to go further down Tonkin Highway. We looked at the Labor option, but that was actually a much longer line, so by tunnelling and going on a direct route, we were able to drop costs. We also found that once we were underneath, it was cheaper to keep going. A lot of the costs come into the dive structures and when we started to draw up the cost estimates, my understanding, if I remember correctly, is that this was cheaper than the option we took to the election and cheaper than the option Labor took the election. There were engineering difficulties making the Labor option was almost impossible because of the Gateway WA works, with all the things going on at Horrie Miller Drive and Leach Highway, and there would have to have been a dive structure through there. That added to the costs, along with the length. I am getting pretty specific, but the cost was within \$20 million of going half above and half under—if we had come across the top of the river and just followed a straight line instead of coming down Tonkin Highway, which is the plan we took to the election. It had not been taken into consideration that if we had gone anywhere down Tonkin Highway, it would have had to have been shut down to one lane each way for a minimum of 18 months, perhaps two years, so there would have been quite a large a disruption to the economy. Exploring all this, we felt that cost-wise, doing a tunnel matched up to going above because of the bridge and other engineering difficulties in getting across Tonkin Highway, around Horrie Miller Drive and so forth, and this was a favourable option. When we looked at the environmental and social impacts, by keeping the route away, the disruption is kept away from everybody moving around those areas and it does not impact on the environmental aspects that are there. We weighed it all up and this was considered to be a fantastic outcome because the prices were relatively similar.

Mr D.J. KELLY: Even though there will be tunnelling, a route has been chosen that basically goes down the road reserve of the Tonkin Highway, I understand, to keep it away from houses or above-ground structures. With modern tunnelling techniques, if the tunnel was under houses or other above-ground structures, in the minister's understanding is there really an issue when it is 15 metres below ground?

Mr D.C. NALDER: The advice I have received now is that there is no issue. Recently in Brisbane, people did not even know the tunnel was going under, so there is not an issue. It is still a pretty direct route, although a couple of corners could perhaps be taken off here and there. Essentially, going down Brearley Avenue is the route connecting straight under and lining up the international airport and getting it straight out, so that comes straight through. It was just as simple to keep it going, so we took away some of the political debate and concern that may be there. All the advice we have is that these days, with the technologies that exist, there is very little to no impact from tunnels. No-one really knows they are there. There is no concern with an average of 15 metres of depth. We also had to think about how we would cross the river and where a good point across was, and that is why the route also lined up with the Tonkin Highway on that aspect. Yes, it is convenient that it is not impacting on the houses, but we were not concerned that there would be any impact on houses. It was about getting across the river and trying to make as direct a route as we could.

Ms L.L. BAKER: I will change the tone slightly. The minister said the tunnel starts 600 to 800 metres up the line from Baysie. Does the minister think with the extra work that has to come on in bringing the additional line down into Bayswater as it comes in that there will be room left in that road reserve, that 600 to 800 metres, to put extra parking up and down the line? I am just trying to get a picture of how much room will be left in the rail line reserve down that area.

Mr D.C. NALDER: One of the primary issues is that when it gets to 600 to 800 metres away, it starts to get too far away to where we want to put car parking; we try to keep that closer.

Ms L.L. Baker: Yes, sorry not quite that high, but all the way down.

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

Mr D.C. NALDER: Back there it obviously branches off into four lanes, and that will impact on the amount of reserve left.

Ms L.L. Baker: So there will not be that much room then?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I do not know how wide that reserve will be, but I am going on the advice I am getting, which is that there will not be that much reserve there. I am not sure what is on the west side.

Ms L.L. Baker: A bit.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Yes, but that is part of a broader plan, that is not part of this construct. Looking at the whole development of Bayswater, I would encourage it and I think there is an opportunity here for Bayswater, but it is separate to this project.

Mr D.J. KELLY: If I can get back to the tunnel issue. I know that the minister has said the project has been put out to tender and the like, so he will not be able to give a specific cost, but can he give us any indication about what the cost of tunnelling is per 100 metres? I know with a project such as this that there are a lot of start-up costs and dive structures at either end, but what sort of costs are now being looked at just for tunnelling? I am seeking the marginal cost of tunnelling.

Mr D.C. NALDER: It gets a bit difficult. What I am sharing with the member is that the cost of building a bridge to get across the river, staying on Brearley Avenue, and then diving underground closer to the airport, would not be any different from the cost of staying underground, because once we are underground and the borer is going, we need to get started where the dive structures and the entrances are. We have a marginal cost benefit once we are in if we can keep it going. I do not want to get into the costs. There are things that we are looking at, and there are proponents to bring to the table, and they are all looking at it in different ways. We have to work out where to get across the river, and what is the optimal position here and there, and everything else. In a cost sense, it will not cost any more. We are talking about \$2 billion for the whole project and it will cost within \$10 million or \$20 million to come above ground for half of it, versus staying underground for the whole lot.

Mr D.J. KELLY: I was not looking for a comparison between the above ground and the below-ground option. What I was looking for is once we are underground and we are simply boring, what is the tunnelling cost on a per-kilometre basis? I understand that the minister cannot give me an exact cost, because it is out for tender. However, the department must have some idea of what it would expect to pay, given that this type of thing happens around the world. What sort of cost would it be per one kilometre or 100 metres of tunnel?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I am not going to give the member the details. I am sorry, but I am not going to do that. However, I remember that when Troy Buswell brought out the concept of exploring whether we could tunnel all the way, he was ridiculed, because he was told that it would cost 10 times as much as going above ground. What I have shared with the member is that because of some of the engineering difficulties of going above ground in this location, with the river and the roadworks and so forth, we can deliver this project for pretty much the same cost whether it is above ground or below ground. We know it is going to cost \$2 billion. That includes buses and rail stations and all sorts of different things. I do not want to get into that. I have always got my fingers crossed that we will come in well below budget, and we have been able to do that with a series of road projects. I am not claiming the credit for that, but given the current construction environment, we have found that the bidding price is a lot more competitive. This is unique. We want to be cautious in our process of establishing contracts. We know that potentially up to two different types of borers will be used in this process because of the different soil types on the way through. However, apart from that, with regard to the cost, we want to leave it to the proponents to get back to us, and we are out to tender at this point, so I do not want to get into that detail.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Given that the minister said that while they are down there, they might just as well keep tunnelling, or that type of approach, was any consideration given to taking a completely different route—that is, not using the Midland line and tunnelling under the river, but basically going in a direct line from Perth station to the airport; and, what would be the cost of doing that? One of the things that has always bothered me is that the government is spending all this money on the new Burswood stadium train station. If we look at this logically, the government probably could have built a station at the new Burswood stadium and built this on a separate line, if it had some sort of longer-term plan. It is a lot of money, and, frankly, I think the government could probably have combined the Burswood stadium project and this project so that they were one and the same.

Mr D.C. NALDER: On the Armadale line, there is a capacity opportunity for us to be able to run it off that line. I hear the member's point about trying to do other things. The advice that I have received through the PTA is that this is the best route to take. A lot of different things have been considered. However, once we have the borer going, let us just keep it going and digging as much as we can, where we can. This is a specific opportunity to link the airport and the eastern suburbs into the CBD. It connects to a line that has capacity now; therefore, leveraging off

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

that opportunity was seen as a favourable outcome. The Forrestfield station will be south of the airport, so it will come out and then head south. It would have to go up and then come back and become a bit of a loop.

Mr D.J. Kelly: Only if it had to go to Forrestfield.

Mr D.C. NALDER: No; High Wycombe and Forrestfield. We wanted to open it up. There is a blockage with the airport. We all know that. There is a natural barrier that makes it difficult for people in those eastern suburbs. This is about opening that up. As I said, a lot of things have been looked at. This was considered to be the best possible option. We have limited funds, and we need to stretch those funds as much as we can. My understanding is that we could go a bit further, but it would cost more—how much more I cannot specifically say. We also have other priorities that need to happen. Members opposite would understand what they are. They have been priorities for the PTA for quite some time. They are the Mandurah–Thornlie line, the Yanchep line, and Byford and Bellevue—all those things. It is about trying to maximise not just public transport, but expanding the road spend and the cycling spend. This was seen as the best possible route at this time.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I said, it is interesting, when we look at the route and at tunnelling, to see what alternatives could have been considered. One of my key concerns is that this will cost \$2 billion, including three stations, but the planning outcomes do not seem to be there. I know that the minister has not included in the catchment figures any of the precinct that is supposed to be developed around Forrestfield. The location of the station at airport west seems to be driven primarily by what Perth Airport does. The consolidated terminal will be a terminal station, and we have talked about some of the issues there. It does not seem, with that amount of infrastructure, that we will get the planning outcomes that we deserve for that \$2 billion.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I hear what the member is saying. I think we all agree, on both sides, that this is a priority to open up the eastern suburbs. I want to touch on a couple of things. One is that we have deliberately moved the airport west site further west because we want to centralise it, and also because we see huge potential for the urbanisation of Redcliffe. With regard to the Forrestfield site, yes, we have not built in a lot of the future planning, unlike what has been done in other projects, where the impacts are speculated, planned and modelled. I believe that over time, there will be a lot more upside for this line than what is currently projected. I think this will be a good outcome. We have been conservative. It is a strategic play in opening up an area, rather than have a retrospective fit into an already populous area. I believe it is a strategically important decision for the state to take. It is not cheap. I think we all acknowledge that. However, there is also another benefit. We talk about urbanisation and spreading east. We are leveraging an opportunity to create a world-class public transport solution to our airports. We are seeing the rapid growth of Perth and an increasing number of interstate and overseas visitors. Having a world-class public transport solution to our airports will only enhance Perth as a destination to come and visit. So, I think it is a responsible thing to do. Yes, I admit that it is expensive. However, like the member, we think that this is a strategically important thing to do.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I have a further question. How many rail carriages will be required for this new line, and are they still part of that \$2 billion or are they now part of the \$1.2 billion?

Mr D.C. NALDER: The budget for the railcars has been moved to the C-series, although the C-series does not actually go there. The C-series goes on the Mandurah–Joondalup line because it is set up for faster transition, higher density areas. The B-series trains will relocate to this. As to the number of railcars, it is eight three-car sets.

Mr D.J. KELLY: What time will the trains start on the new line? Will fly in, fly out workers, for example, be able to get to the airport in time to catch a flight?

Mr D.C. NALDER: At this stage all the trains run at a time that is not necessarily the best for the early FIFOs, so one of the commitments I have given is that closer to 2020, when we start, we can look to opening those lines an hour earlier so that we can provide that opportunity. Our modelling has not allowed for a large number of FIFOs to use the rail; I believe there is greater upside in that as well but that will mean that we need to get those lines operating an hour earlier than they do today. That is still under consideration, and I would like to ensure that we do that. That decision will be made by the government closer to 2020, but I believe that has to happen.

Mr D.J. KELLY: Has anything been budgeted for additional earlier trains in order to make that happen?

Mr D.C. NALDER: No, not at this point. The operating aspects of it have not been fully explored. At this stage I believe, as a principle, that it needs to be considered, irrespective of which side of politics is in. We deliberately modelled a very low number of FIFO workers to use this, so I believe there is a big upside in increasing the number of train passengers using the Forrestfield–Airport Link. There is an operating cost in starting the train service an hour earlier, but it has not been budgeted for at this point.

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

Mr D.J. KELLY: When the thing is up and running, if someone lives in, for example, Lockridge and needs to use public transport to get to the airport to catch a flight for a FIFO arrangement, how will they do it? What time would they have to catch the train if the flight leaves at 6.00 am or 5.30 am?

Mr D.C. NALDER: In looking at operating to get people there earlier, currently all trains on all lines commence at 5.00 am. I think we would potentially have to start them at 4.00 am to cater for when planes start heading off for FIFO workers. But that would mean we would have to consider having all lines operating at that point in time. We would have to see what the demand is and get that right. It depends on what time a person is planning on leaving. Currently, they work on the basis that the trains commence at 5.00 am on all lines. I do not know the timeslots between all the stations at this point and how long that would take. People on the Fremantle line can run straight through, people on the Mandurah line will have to change trains in the city and people on the Midland line have to make sure they are on the right train to go through. It is about getting those connections right, but we believe this will be a much more convenient way for a lot of people to travel out there, instead of having their cars in the car park at Perth Airport for a week or two. We believe that the Forrestfield–Airport Link will be a more convenient way for a lot of FIFO workers to access the airport.

Mr D.J. KELLY: The minister has obviously given some thought to trains operating from, potentially, 4.00 am, but a lot of people do not have direct access to a train station. For example, a person in Ellenbrook—sorry, Lockridge —

Ms R. Saffioti: Ellenbrook, definitely.

Mr D.J. KELLY: Ellenbrook, definitely.

Has the minister done any modelling insofar as an early start for buses, so that people can catch a bus to a train station in order to access the system out to the airport?

Mr D.C. NALDER: With this project we have modelled the FIFO impact to be small. There is a lot more room to increase the scope of that. A lot of work needs to go on into looking at more direct routes on our bus networks. We have done the 950 trial that I talk about, and I believe there is huge scope —

Mr D.J. Kelly: Does that come down Beaufort Street?

Mr D.C. NALDER: It comes down Beaufort Street, but I think we have to have more high-frequency bus services down a lot of major arterials to link up to those rail lines. I will answer the member's question in three parts. We have done the projections on this with a minimal number of FIFOs, and I think there is scope to increase the patronage by smarter transport solutions to pick up that time. But, with that, I think we need to also look at our bus routes. A lot of our suburban bus routes wind their way through and take a long time to get to their destination. To understand how we will be moving people—this is what I have tried to talk about a lot—it is not just the heavy lines we need to understand; it is the connections and how they feed in. We have learnt from the 950 that by creating a high-frequency, direct route we have had a 39 per cent lift in the patronage and customer satisfaction that is higher than on the trains. We know that we want to replicate that with a lot more direct routes. A lot more work will have to go on around the smarter use of the public transport system, and that work is underway. That will include thinking through the times public transport starts and stops. I have given the member a longer answer to try to give him more breadth on the consideration I am giving a transport solution for Perth. To get the maximum out of it, we need to look at how this is all integrated. I think we have a large opportunity to get a lot more people onto our existing system, like we experienced with the 950 bus service.

Mr D.J. KELLY: The minister said he thinks we might need to start the trains at 4.00 am to accommodate FIFO workers. If we were to start the trains on all lines an hour earlier today—I understand we are not going to do that today—what would be —

Mr T.K. Waldron interjected.

Mr D.J. KELLY: What side is the member for Wagin sitting on today?

What would be the additional cost of starting trains an hour earlier on all lines today, running at the normal frequency?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We have wandered a long way from the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015, but I do not have that specific information at hand. I will share a couple of things with the member. There is a huge demand right now for an earlier timeslot, but we know that when the third runway is built, we can bunch them up into a more concentrated time line so that we will not have as many going as early. We also need to understand some of the modelling around the airport that goes with that. I do not have the operating costs of running for an extra hour. I know the cost of operating trains for a whole day, so I can give some ballpark figures, but it is really not relevant to this bill and I do not have the numbers at hand.

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

Mr D.J. KELLY: I am sorry, but I do not see how the minister can say that this line of questioning is not relevant to the bill. We are going to spend \$2 billion building the train line outlined in schedule 1. A considerable amount of public discussion around the benefit of the train line outlined in schedule 1 is that it will assist employees of the resource industry—particularly FIFO workers—because it will allow people ease of transport to the airport, and that the whole of the economy will get a boost in productivity under this line.

The current starting time of five o'clock is simply not early enough to enable fly in, fly out workers to get to the airport for their flights. The rail service will need to open at least an hour earlier and the minister has indicated that is his thinking. In order to get value for money for building the line, as indicated in schedule 1, the minister must have some idea what it costs in today's dollars to operate the rest of the network for that additional hour in the morning.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I am trying to share with the member the broader thinking, because that is what it is. We have deliberately modelled a conservative level of FIFO worker activity on the line, so there is a lot of upside opportunity in that. Other aspects come into the cost of running the lines for an extra hour. It not only relates to running costs but also reduces the time for maintenance on the trains, because we clean and maintain the existing rail sets in that downtime. The third runway is under construction, and that will change all the time slots and percentages. A number of different factors will impact on whether we open the line one hour earlier. I have shared that we are considering that, but I need more information. For the time being, in the modelling we have limited the number of people who will use the line. The numbers have been based on a very conservative number of FIFO workers and with further work moving forward we can explore ways of getting more FIFOs to use rail; however, we need to understand the impacts of maintenance schedules and a third runway; it is not simply running the trains for an extra hour, although that is a cost. I do not have those costs at hand, but I see it as an upside. We have not modelled for a high number of FIFOs using the rail line to the airport at this point.

Mr D.J. KELLY: The minister said he has not modelled for a high number of FIFO workers. What percentage of FIFO workers has the minister used in the modelling?

Mr D.C. NALDER: It is about three per cent.

Mr D.J. KELLY: I press the minister again on the additional cost. I understand there will be variables if, in the future, we get a third runway, although it is my understanding that that is nowhere near certain; it is a possibility. With the existing arrangements at the airport, what would it cost to start the train system an hour earlier? I understand that revenue will depend on the patronage, so I am not asking about the revenue side but the cost side. What will the cost of the system be? I understand that potentially impacts on maintenance, but I assume that if the minister is going ahead with this project, he would have taken into account things such as disruption to the maintenance schedule. This is \$2 billion worth of expenditure and part of the assumption is that it will be there for FIFO workers, and everybody has assumed that when this is up and running, the trains will run at a time that is convenient for FIFO workers. I assume that as part of this project, the minister has done all this work. I ask the minister to put aside the third runway, and based on what the minister knows what will be the cost of running the service starting at four o'clock?

Mr D.C. NALDER: It is a bit hard to put aside the third runway. The reason is that the third runway is scheduled to be up and running before we have the first train running out there. I do not have the numbers at hand, but I am trying to remember what the cost is per day to run the whole rail system. It will be an extra hour five mornings a week.

Mr D.J. KELLY: Is the minister willing to provide the information before we finish debating the bill?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I do not know whether I will have it. We have allowed for three per cent of the patronage to be FIFO workers, so we have not really taken them into consideration. I believe that is an upside opportunity. The work needs to go on, but not as part of this bill. We have done our modelling on there being very few FIFO workers utilising this line. I personally believe it will be an upside opportunity with FIFO workers on the Forrestfield–Airport Link. We need to consider opening the line earlier, but with the third runway, they are going to concentrate more planes out at a more respectable hour, instead of having to spread them out. It will change fundamentally the modelling that suggests whether it is worthwhile or not. The member has to remember that if trains run on the Forrestfield–Airport Link earlier, every train line will open earlier. I am trying to think off the top of my head what it costs to run all the lines on a daily basis. On the Monday long weekend, we are running a free public transport day for the whole of Western Australia. It coincides with the Perth Royal Show, and the figures for that are available; it is part of our strategy to increase public transport usage and for people to become more familiar with it. We know there is a familiarisation issue. I did know the number and I am trying to remember it off the top of my head, but I have two numbers in my head and I will not give one, because I will be on record and be wrong. It is something that we will consider. We need to do the modelling on patronage and the cost-benefit of that. I think there is upside opportunity to get more people onto the Forrestfield–Airport Link. We

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

have not considered it now, so the estimated patronage numbers are very conservative. It has not taken into consideration the urbanisation of Redcliffe and developing that planning opportunity. It has not taken a lot of the concentrational planning potential that exists in High Wycombe and Forrestfield. There is massive opportunity for us to increase the patronage across the airport line that will make it a lot more successful than what we are promoting today. I acknowledge that more work needs to be done. By sharing with the member the information I have, the member knows that I am considering a number of issues and that I have been talking about them with the department. We have a few years to get that right and to understand what will happen with Perth Airport and whether the third runway will stay on track, and so forth. A lot of variables come into that. It is not a decision we have made. We do not have a specific number at this point in time. I acknowledge it is work that needs to be done moving forward

Mr D.J. KELLY: Is the three per cent modelling that has been done based on the trains starting at five o'clock as they currently do? The minister has done no modelling based on an earlier start?

Mr D.C. NALDER: No. It is based on the current system. I believe that is an upside opportunity, but we have to fully explore the cost benefits and, as I shared with the member, there are all those other variable impacts—the maintenance schedule on the trains, because that will start to squeeze the running times; and the third runway impact. All of those things have to be taken into consideration and modelled carefully. I believe that three per cent is a low number. Under our modelling, 97 per cent of FIFO workers will still be driving to the airport; I think we can do a lot better than that by providing a more convenient service. We need to understand all the variables, model them and do the cost–benefit analysis. At the right time, if it makes sense, there will be a cabinet decision. I will put a recommendation to cabinet if it makes economic sense that that should occur. That work has not been done. We have left it out and have kept the number of people using this line very conservative.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I have a follow-up question on the running of the airport line. When the Thornlie spur line was built the stopping patterns on the Armadale line were reconfigured. Has work been done on that for the Bayswater to Perth section and what impact will the Forrestfield spur have on the scheduling of the Midland trains?

Mr D.C. NALDER: This will be preliminary work that will look at the impact. There is capacity on the line to have more carriages than the Forrestfield and Midland line will take. Obviously, those lines are expected to grow and the more success we have on the Forrestfield line, the more capacity it will take up. I expect productivity on the Midland line to slowly increase also with the development opportunities for the universities, hospitals and other developments. As part of the process of bringing into operation the C-series railcar, the A-series trains that are hitting 25 to 30 years of age will be retired. They are only two-car sets and they are currently on what are called the heritage lines—the Midland and Fremantle lines.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: So when are we getting the new trains?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I am jumping around answering the questions. We currently have roughly one B-series train coming on every two months. That will continue until the end of 2016. We are just moving to the expressions of interest with the C-series, but that will commence around 2019. They are six-car sets but they will be predominantly designed for the Joondalup–Mandurah line, because we are going to have more and more people feeding from those.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: So we miss out yet again?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I think these brand-new B-series sets will be shifted onto the Midland line up until the end of next year. The six-car sets are not seen to be needed at this point in time for the Midland, Forrestfield–Airport, Armadale or Fremantle lines.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Thank you for that, but I also inquired about the stopping patterns. For example, will changes be made to the Midland line service, in particular between Bayswater and Perth, because the Forrestfield train will be coming online?

Mr D.C. NALDER: We may do. We have not finalised that yet. Obviously, with the developments going on in Midland with hospitals and universities, it could change some of the patterns. We will continue to model it. As I said, there is capacity; we can run 18 trains per hour. It is pretty tight at 18. This lifts us to 12, so it will be a higher frequency coming from Bayswater than what we have got further out from the other two lines. At this stage there is the capacity to run them straight through. With that said, it may pay to modify it slightly because of the different weightings of people using it.

Schedule put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to third reading.

Third Reading

MR D.C. NALDER (Alfred Cove — Minister for Transport) [4.23 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan) [4.23 pm]: I will not spend too much time on the third reading, because we have had a very constructive discussion on the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015. WA Labor supports this legislation 100 per cent, unlike the Liberal Party, which opposed the legislation for the railway line to Mandurah. WA Labor supports this and, as we said, it was Labor that made it happen. If Labor had not committed to this during the election campaign, the Liberal Party never would have. I was disappointed that the only amendment we put forward in the consideration in detail stage was not accepted by the government. The change of the name to “Metronet stage 1” was not accepted by the government.

Mr D.J. Kelly: Very childish by the government.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Very, very childish. As the Minister for Transport said, the two reasons this bill was given the name “Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015” was, firstly, because the minister liked the name and, secondly, because Forrestfield was the name given to the line by Labor during the election campaign. Given that the Liberal Party had embraced Labor’s policy and name, we thought that it should have gone to the next stage and embraced the entire policy and the entire name of Metronet. It was disappointing, though it was the only disappointment we had during the consideration in detail stage, that the Liberal Party did not embrace the full name, which was “Metronet stage 1”. Labor wholeheartedly supports this; as we have said, this is stage 1 of our Metronet plan.

From the information we were given during the consideration in detail stage, I am disappointed to learn that no funding has been given to works between Perth and Bayswater. This is a \$2 billion project and it is an opportunity to do some further upgrades. I do not think \$7 million will be enough for Bayswater—we all accept that. We could have taken on board issues for other stations and, of course, the level crossings remain. Unlike New MetroRail project, which was the extension to not only Mandurah, but also Clarkson and the Thornlie spur, New MetroRail also included other things such as the removal of some level crossings and some upgrades to stations. I am disappointed that the bill is not as comprehensive as we would have liked.

I am glad that the Minister for Planning is here, because the Minister for Transport put him in the firing line in relation to planning around these new stations.

Mr J.H.D. Day: That is appropriate. Planning is responsible for above ground, apart from the stations themselves.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I hope the minister gets across it and will do a better job, because I am concerned about Forrestfield station and the precinct. As I said, it should be the jewel in the crown. It should be spectacular. The government is spending \$2 billion and has the chance to build a brand-new station. I am concerned about the massive uncertainty that has been hanging over the heads of the landowners in the area. I am concerned also about the mix between the car parks, the location of the car parks in particular and the ability to get the density that this station deserves. I am deeply concerned about it because \$2 billion is a lot of money. We need to make sure we get the correct planning outcomes, because we cannot keep doing business as usual. Everyone accepts that, particularly when planning our suburbs. We need to take advantage of when we spend money on infrastructure, and in particular on rail lines, to get world’s best practice in our design and in the implementation of the precincts around the stations. We have to be very forward-thinking. Everyone accepts and understands that planning our suburbs like business as usual will not deliver housing for future generations. This bill gives us a huge opportunity, but we have to give certainty and opportunity to landowners.

One of the issues in the development process that I find interesting, and in particular around precincts, is what more we can do to ensure landowners can participate in the development process. I know that everyone is in a different situation—some landowners want to exit. The member for Murray–Wellington would be interested in this. Some landowners want to exit; there is no doubt about that. However, others want to participate, given the opportunity. I think our development is still skewed a bit to the bigger developers and not to the mid-size developers or landowners who want to participate in the process of the precinct planning. It is difficult because access to finance from banking institutions is limited for mid-size developers or even large landowners to enable them to participate in developing density.

However, where there is a lot of fragmented private land ownership, we need to see how we can get the owners to participate and be part of the process rather than, from day one, excluding them from participating in land development. Although the government going in all the time and aggregating will always be part of what we do,

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

particularly in regeneration, we need to get the planning system right so that landowners can also participate. This is a good test case. As I said, I am deeply disappointed in what I have seen transpire so far in relation to Bayswater station. The Minister for Planning is apparently the person responsible but I would like to see better leadership on this front to ensure, as I said, that we can leverage the \$2 billion of infrastructure to get a really good vibrant precinct that benefits the entire community.

Mr J.H.D. Day: That's why the Department of Planning is very actively engaged at the moment, together with the Shire of Kalamunda.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The minister says that, even though he has said some awful things to me in the past couple of days. I do not sense that and I do not see it. I know the Department of Planning has a lot of things on its plate. As a result, a level of distrust about this issue is being built in the community. That is not where we want to be. This could have been an exciting opportunity, but a situation is being created in which a lot of landowners do not trust a lot of agencies. As I said, the Public Transport Authority builds rail lines, and it is very good at it. It is an excellent agency and it did a great job of previous expansions, especially the Perth–Mandurah line and a number of other upgrades. It is very good at building rail lines but we should not expect the PTA to be developing precincts. That should be the realm of a land developer or a planning agency. That is where I have seen it fall down. The Shire of Kalamunda is doing its best but I think better coordination is definitely required.

Mr J.H.D. Day: You don't know everything that's happening behind the scenes. I can assure you a lot is being done.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I do not doubt that people are working away, but from what I have seen—I have seen some emails that I have not tabled today—there is a lot of disquiet on this issue, particularly from the government's agencies. A lot of work might be going on behind the scenes, but there is also a lot of frustration and a lot of confusion about who is doing what on this issue. As I said, we believe this is a huge opportunity to get a really vibrant metro hub for our metropolitan area.

Mr J.H.D. Day: Do you mean an activity centre?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I mean a metro hub.

Mr J.H.D. Day: You need to go for more than the marketing spin.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is coming from this government, which is built to market spin. How is Elizabeth Quay going?

Mr J.H.D. Day: Very well, actually.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: How are the paving and the grass going?

Mr D.J. Kelly: It's got water in it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It has got water! This is a government addicted to spin.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, the member for West Swan has the floor.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is a government addicted to spin. Just because the Premier has told everyone they cannot use the word Metronet, I suppose they are not allowed to use the word metro hub. Is that another directive?

Mr F.A. Alban: We can call it "mystery net" if you like, member. You don't know where it's going, do you?

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Let us get back to the third reading of this bill.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Does the member for Swan Hills remember that flyer in which he promised the Ellenbrook rail line?

Mr F.A. Alban interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is a big mystery, is it not, member for Swan Hills, how a flyer went out with the member for Swan Hills' name on it promising an Ellenbrook rail line that he did not know about? The mystery is how he promised a rail line that he cannot remember that he promised. The biggest mystery about the Ellenbrook rail line is how the member for Swan Hills forgot that he had promised the Ellenbrook rail line. I would be very happy to debate the Ellenbrook rail line anywhere, anytime in the electorate, member for Swan Hills.

Mr D.J. Kelly: And I'm sure we will.

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am sure we will. As I said, we support the bill. This was Labor's idea. We can go through all the false claims made during the election campaign about this. Do members remember the ads the Liberal Party ran about the location of the station—that its rail line would deliver passengers inside the terminal? It ran ads criticising Labor because Labor's plan was to deliver them outside the terminal. Is it doing that? No; it is not doing that. The government's rail line will be about 400 metres from the terminal. We could go through all the lies and the spin during the election campaign—the Liberal Party always has a lot more money to spend on ads, let us face it—when it dominated radio insulting our rail line and promoting its proposal, but now not delivering what it promised. We could go through that line by line, but I note the time of day and the fact that it was Labor's project to deliver the airport–Forrestfield rail line. The Liberal Party was dragged kicking and screaming and then spent more money on advertising—fair enough—criticising us and it came in here and did not deliver what it promised. As we said, this is Labor's project. The only reason the Liberal Party has brought in this legislation is because it was Labor's idea. As I said, I am deeply disappointed.

Mr F.A. Alban interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What is up with you, member for Swan Hills?

Mr C.J. Barnett: Richard Court built the Mandurah rail line. We don't claim that.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The government claims it all the time; it claimed it yesterday and the day before. The key difference is the Liberal Party opposed the legislation.

Mr D.J. Kelly: We always supported the Mandurah rail line and we always supported a rail line to the airport; you never did.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Liberal Party opposed it. Why did the Premier vote against the legislation?

Mr C.J. Barnett: You forget the one point about that construction.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Why did the Premier vote against the legislation?

Mr C.J. Barnett: That's not the point I'm making.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is not the point he is making! Of course it is not. The Premier is saying that the Perth–Mandurah rail line was all his idea. We brought in legislation and he voted against it. I do not understand how he can be consistent with that line of argument. He voted against it. He criticises it every day. His business mates said that six buses would be enough to cover Mandurah. Some guy drove down to Mandurah and said, "I don't see any houses; that place doesn't need a rail line". That was on the front page of *The West Australian*, supported by the Liberal Party. The Premier should not come into this place and say he supported the Mandurah rail line. The Premier attacked the former minister every day over that project.

Mr W.J. Johnston: He said the buildings would fall down.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. You name it; he said it about the Mandurah rail line, so he should not come in here and say he supported the Mandurah rail line, because he opposed it every day. He voted against the legislation, unlike Labor, which had the idea to build the airport rail line. The only reason that this legislation is in here today is that we announced it and the Liberal Party copied it. That is the only reason we are here today debating this. We support it and we are voting for this bill. We are not voting against it, as the Liberal Party voted against the Perth–Mandurah rail line. We are the party of rail.

Mr W.J. Johnston: We are not taking 22 hours in debate.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We could, but we support it. This is our rail line; it is part of our Metronet policy.

Mr C.J. Barnett: We will name it after you—"Rita's Rocket".

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Honestly!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! We have had a bit of fun; let us get back to the third reading debate.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As the member for Bassendean said, maybe we should call it the "bitter and twisted" rail line, to reflect the Premier. The Premier lives in his own little world in which he is right all the time and he can sledge anyone. He sledges everyone and never accepts the truth. He cannot accept the truth that the Liberal Party voted against the Mandurah rail line. Liberal Party members cannot accept that they voted against the Mandurah rail line. It is in *Hansard*; the Liberal Party voted against it.

Mr D.J. Kelly: You had no intention of building this rail line until we promised it, and you know it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, exactly.

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, the member for West Swan has the call, so let us give her the opportunity to speak.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We support the legislation. It is part of our Metronet plan. We call the legislation the “Metronet stage 1” bill. The Liberal Party should have adopted that name, because the minister said the government is calling it the Forrestfield rail line because that is what we called it. The minister acknowledged in consideration in detail that the government copied us.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! Member for Jandakot, come on.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Listen to that; that is bitterness.

Mr D.J. Kelly: They should be happy, but they are so depressed.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I know, but look at them, they are so angry because they do not like rail lines. They should be smiling and enjoying the debate, but they are bitter and angry because they have been forced to bring this legislation into this house. They cannot enjoy it because they are bitter and twisted. They do not want the rail line. It is not in their DNA; it is our DNA. They are uncomfortable in the chamber—listen to them. They cannot enjoy the moment, and they should be able to enjoy the moment —

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Our voices are not high-pitched and squeaky and stressed out.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I would not comment about people’s voices, member for Scarborough.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, one at a time, thank you.

Mr F.A. Alban interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Swan Hills!

Point of Order

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I am not quite sure what the member for Swan Hills was doing talking across the chamber to the Labor Party when the member for West Swan was on her feet. I notice —

Mr F.A. Alban: We are just showing how friendly we are.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz): Member for Swan Hills, I call you for the first time.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I was just wondering whether he was going to be called to order on that issue.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for West Swan, please return to the third reading debate, rather than respond to all the comments. I hope that the government side will now desist and allow you unfettered access to the floor.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I thank the Acting Speaker very much for having unfettered access to the floor.

As I said, government members should be happy but they are not. We can sense it, they are angry about the rail line. This rail line is part of Metronet and the government is doing it only because the opposition forced them into it. The government lied about the location of the stations and it should be doing much better on the development of the new precinct, but it is not doing that.

Mr J.H.D. Day: That is just plain wrong, wait to see the final development.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What is up with the Minister for Planning? He has been interjecting incessantly for the last three days. He has gone crazy.

Mr D.J. Kelly: We are having drinks afterwards to celebrate this legislation because it is our project. What are you guys going to do?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: They will be bitter and twisted about. They are never going to say the word “Metronet” because that is a directive. Government members cannot use the word “Metronet”. We moved an amendment on Metronet and the minister could not stand because he was not allowed to use the word “Metronet”. It is incredible that there is a government directive not to use the word “Metronet”.

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

Mr F.M. Logan interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Absolutely. The minister could not respond to the opposition's amendment because he is not allowed to use the word

Mr F.A. Alban: I was close with "mystery-net"; it still starts with M.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, member for Swan Hills!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Swan Hills still wonders who put out that flyer with his name on it stating he was going to deliver the Ellenbrook rail line. He did not do it. He had his name on the flyer and he went on radio the week after the election saying it was his idea, but he did not know that the government was committing to building the Ellenbrook rail line. Actually, he went on radio before the election.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member has never seen the original copy.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I love this. The member went on radio —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, members; I am on my feet! Member for Swan Hills, let us have a little decorum and focus on the third reading debate rather than regurgitate some very fascinating history. As fascinating as it may be, it is really not germane to the third reading debate.

Mr F.M. Logan interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am talking about the opposition's amendment we moved during the consideration in detail stage about Metronet, which includes the Ellenbrook line. It is very, very interesting that the member for Swan Hills said he did not know anything about the commitment, when, about three days before the election, he went on radio and talked about the Ellenbrook rail line. He said he was glad that Labor had adopted the rail line, because it was his idea. The member for Swan Hills went on radio and said that the Ellenbrook rail line was his idea.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, member; I am on my feet! Members, this is to be the third reading debate, as I indicated, and I encourage the member for West Swan to focus on the bill we are debating, as interesting as the other matters may be.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We support this legislation, but we are upset that the name "Metronet stage 1" has not been adopted. The only reason we are debating this legislation is that Labor put this issue on the agenda during the election campaign—it is the only reason we are doing it. Labor builds rail; Liberals shut rail. It is as simple as that. Look at the record. Labor is the party of rail. We support this legislation and we intend to ensure this is stage 1 of our Metronet plan.

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler) [4.46 pm]: I rise to speak on behalf of the constituents of Butler, an area that under the new electoral boundaries will extend from Quinns Rocks to Two Rocks.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, the member for Butler has the call.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: On behalf of my constituents, I come to this Parliament to speak confidently in support of the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015. As was described in this house earlier, the airport link was part of Labor's Metronet program going into the election. It was not the only part of Labor's program going into the election; the Yanchep rail line extension was also part of the Metronet program.

I want to briefly speak about the terms of this bill because it is relevant. We have a very large fly in, fly out population in my electorate and, lamentably, this extension—part 1 of Labor's proposed Metronet program—will be of little avail to them going to the airport, because there is not rail from Yanchep through those booming suburbs along the coast of Alkimos, Eglinton and Shorehaven to Butler station. A person going away to work for a week or to Bali for 10 days who drives 10 or 12 kilometres to Butler station is highly unlikely to choose to leave the family vehicle out in the open at Butler station for 10 or 12 days. That is not feasible. However, the residents of Butler will want me to vote in strong support of getting part of the job done—the Forrestfield–Airport Link.

Turning to the bill itself, I want to demonstrate to Parliament how easily this can be done. Do not forget that going into that election, there was a promise by Labor to build a link to not only the airport, but also Yanchep from Butler to keep the line going north. The Liberal government came out and promised a rail line to Yanchep by 2020, and that had a big impact on the election result in my electorate, knowing that the Liberal government had promised a fully funded, fully costed rail line to Yanchep by 2020. The people of the electorates of Belmont

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

and Forrestfield will be very pleased to see this rail going through—that is part of the government’s promise on rail coming to fruition—while the people of Yanchep have been punted into the long grass, as it were. How does it come to be? How do we get this to happen? It happens with this piece of legislation that is now before the chamber. This is what could be done. I promise that when the vote is called, I will support this bill not on my behalf, but on behalf of the people of Butler. I want to show the legislation to those people of Butler who get to read the transcript or see the video of this speech, so I will hold it up for the video camera. This is page 1 of the legislation, which has about 15 words on it, and they state —

An Act to authorise the construction of a railway from Bayswater to Forrestfield (known as the Forrestfield–Airport Link).

We support that. I stand here formally on behalf of the people of Butler and say, “Quickly, bring in a bill that is an act to authorise the construction of a railway from Butler to Yanchep, known as the Yanchep link.” What would it entail for the government to bring such a bill before Parliament? If I may hold it up for the people of my electorate who will see it, there are only two pages to the bill, or 217 words. There are only four clauses in the bill, in 217 words. There is a schedule to the bill that describes the route, but the legislative authority to give effect to the government’s pre-election commitment to build a line to the airport is contained in just over one page, or 217 words. To redeem itself and to keep faith with the people of Yanchep, I now formally demand of the government that it bring in a bill to this Parliament in this session —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Butler, this is not a second reading contribution; this is a third reading contribution.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: This is how easily it can be done. This is how easily the government keeps its promise on the airport rail link. I realise that I am not allowed to talk about the Yanchep rail link at the third reading stage, so I will sit down. However, I formally call for the introduction of such a bill for the Yanchep rail link, and I formally call on the government to get on with it and get one built by 2020 with legislative authority.

MS L.L. BAKER (Maylands) [4.53 pm]: I will not take up too much of the house’s time. The airport rail link provides a great opportunity for the residents of Bayswater. The development of the airport rail link is a great opportunity for Perth. I will call it the Bayswater rail link, but that is just me. The opportunities for my electorate that have been lost are very clear, and I think I went through them in quite a bit of detail during the second reading debate of the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015, but there are a number of things that I would like to say after having had the benefit of consideration in detail.

Firstly, I again put on the record that we welcome this rail line. This is a much-needed piece of infrastructure. My residents are concerned that they were told by the state government and the City of Bayswater that the airport rail link project would bring the redevelopment of what has the potential to be a real metropolitan activity centre. It is already part of the urban planning design for Perth. With an extra 10 000-odd families moving into this neck of the woods over the next few years, it is really important that the tired, old, less-than-adequate precinct of Bayswater take advantage of this new tunnel and the additional rail line that will come in just above the Bayswater train station. The things that concern us is that all there is in this plan is a disabled access ramp and, as I am now hearing, a toilet. There is no doubt that both those things are needed, but we should think about the additional capacity involved with 12 extra trains an hour on the line. We have heard that there will be a 100 per cent increase in the time that the Caledonian Avenue crossover will be shut to traffic. We have heard that no development has been planned around the precinct of Bayswater. It is good that the layout of the cyclepaths might be changed, but it will hardly cope with what the future holds for the Bayswater village with this new link.

The Bayswater township needs the rail line to be sunk—that would be nice—but there has been no discussion about that. That would certainly be the vision of the people I have spoken to in Bayswater. The two halves of Bayswater also desperately need to be connected. This part of the city cannot grow. We have talked about WA Labor’s commitment to the marriage between planning and infrastructure projects such as this. This is the first opportunity we have had to explain to both the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Planning that a very big opportunity appears to have been missed. It would be criminal to allow this work to go on without the activity centre of Bayswater being correctly brought into this century and for the future. I think I saw the Minister for Transport at the train station during the election in 2013.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Which train station?

Ms L.L. BAKER: Bayswater.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Not during the election, no.

Ms L.L. BAKER: I thought he had been there. Has he been to Bayswater train station yet?

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

Mr D.C. Nalder: Yes.

Ms L.L. BAKER: That is good, so he knows about the lack of practicality in what is happening and he knows about the limitations. There is a good opportunity to do some very appropriate infill around the train line. On one side of it, there is public and private housing. There is the very big Halliday Park reserve. The shopping precincts are split down the middle; both are tired and sad. The community of Bayswater wants to take this opportunity to activate this urban centre, and it can do it with the help of this government.

Mr J.H.D. Day: Has the City of Bayswater put forward proposals or is it planning work around the area? I agree that there is a big opportunity, and that will not disappear; the opportunity will remain there for some time, I am sure.

Ms L.L. BAKER: I think that is a very good point and it is one that I asked the minister about during consideration in detail. Somewhat surprisingly, the Shire of Kalamunda and the City of Belmont have been very actively involved. I am dismayed that the City of Bayswater has not seen fit to take the opportunity to step forward and say, “What about us?” Certainly, I will write with that intent to both the Minister for Planning and the City of Bayswater. I do not think the residents are aware of that; in fact, I am quite sure they are not aware of that. I do not know whether that is because the Department of Planning or the Public Transport Authority failed to ask them or whether they just did not see fit to take the bull by the horns and approach the two ministers involved. I went to see the Planning Commission earlier in the year with my colleague the federal member for Perth, because both of us were very concerned about not wanting to miss this opportunity. We were told at the time that the City of Bayswater did not have an activity plan for this area, so I will be writing to clarify all of this, because my residents deserve to know what will happen. I will certainly encourage the City of Bayswater to step forward and get actively involved in what is a great opportunity for my residents. We do not just want a disabled ramp and a toilet; we would like both of them, but we do not just want them. I know \$7 million has been put into this redevelopment.

A member interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: You are out of your seat, member; you cannot comment. Member for Maylands, please continue.

A member interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Keep your voice down then.

Ms L.L. BAKER: I know this is a great opportunity for the residents of the City of Bayswater and I will make sure they stand up and be counted. I suspect that the minister will be invited to come to talk to my residents. No, do not point at the Minister for Planning. We are not at school now; the minister cannot point at the other minister and say it is his fault.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

Ms L.L. BAKER: I think there is a very, very good case for having both ministers involved in a discussion about the future of this part of Western Australia. It is part of the metropolitan redevelopment scheme and it should be an activity centre. It is a prime location. It is a beautiful part of Perth and it would be a waste of government investment of \$2 billion, or \$7 million particularly in my precinct, if we did not look at other options at the same time.

MR N.W. MORTON (Forrestfield) [5.02 pm]: I will be very brief in my comments on the third reading of the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015 because I am very aware of the time. I have to say that regardless of what people may or may not say in this chamber, this is an outstanding project. This is a transformational project for the people of my community and the people of Forrestfield. I just want to further outline what it will deliver to the residents in my community: a 20-minute commute by train to the city, car parks, a major bus interchange and, of course, the associated development that will ensue around that precinct. It will be a world-class rail project and it will be a world-class development when it is completed. This will be completed and delivered by this Liberal–National government. It is an outstanding project. I know it is an outstanding project because I am the local member and, funnily enough, I actually get out into my community and wherever I go, members of my community are so excited about this train station and this project; they cannot wait for it to be delivered. They know who is delivering it, they know when it will be delivered and they cannot wait. They know the benefits it will bring to them, whether it is the land and house prices, the amenity that will grow or the capacity to connect to the city like they never have before. I want to make it clear to this house that my community cannot wait for this project to occur and I cannot wait for it to occur. I look forward to joining the Premier and the minister later this year to turn the sod on this very, very transformational project for the community of Forrestfield. I thank this Liberal–National government, I thank this cabinet and I thank this Premier for delivering this to my community.

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn) [5.04 pm]: I will be relatively brief on this third reading of the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015. There are just three things I want to refer to.

First of all, I raised the matter of the extra train car sets that would be needed overall for this line with the Minister for Transport and he did not respond. When I put the issue of the manufacture of those railcar sets —

Mr D.C. Nalder: Rail cars?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Yes, exactly!

When I put the issue of the manufacture of those railcar sets and where they were to be manufactured, I asked the minister to give a commitment —

Mr W.J. Johnston: They're coming from the Punjab!

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I did josh about the fact that they could have been coming from the Punjab if the member for Morley had been the Minister for Transport. On a serious note, the proposition that was put to the minister was for him to answer the question about where those extra train car sets would be manufactured, because Western Australia has the capacity and we certainly have the need for more manufacturing jobs, and jobs per se, given the downturn in the resources sector and all the allied service industries. The minister has not given me a response, but he will not get away from me. As with the issue of the Swan River bridge, I will continue to ask question after question.

Mr D.C. Nalder: The Swan River bridge?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I have been asking the minister questions about the bridge to Perth Stadium.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Pedestrian?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Yes, questions about the pedestrian bridge to the stadium and where that will be manufactured. I have asked the minister only six questions so far, some on notice and some without notice. We have got to the point at which the minister now advises me he will tell me in November where the bridge will be manufactured. That seems to be an awfully long time, given that the minister announced it in April. An awful lot of people are watching to see what the minister's decision will be. Similarly, we will be chasing down the minister on the issue of where those extra railcars that will be needed will be manufactured.

I have a second issue I want to raise. As the second reading debate went on and I had a good look at what will be the direction of the railway to the airport, I honestly was unaware, member for Cannington—I did not go to the briefing—that one of the options is for the line from Perth to the airport to go under the river. One of the propositions is to tunnel under the river; I saw that in the plan for the rail line from Perth to the airport. I question why that could not be by bridge, given the expense.

A member interjected.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: It is not cheaper. The member for South Perth just said that it is cheaper to build a tunnel; no, it is not. Fabricating construction off-site for a two-lane railway line and installation into the river is much cheaper. Why in God's name would a tunnel be put under it? It is unbelievable. No wonder it will cost \$2 billion—the government will be lucky if it costs \$2 billion. I just cannot believe that in this day and age there would be a tunnel under the river. I understand that there was a proposition to tunnel through the airport. I can understand that, but why would a bridge not be built from the Bayswater line across to the other side of the river? No wonder this is costing so much money.

Thirdly and finally, I want to reiterate something, particularly for the member for Forrestfield, who just gave his heartfelt speech about how great this project will be for Forrestfield and how he wants to be not only at the sod turning, but also at the opening. I remind members of what I said in my contribution to the second reading debate; that is, have a look at the *Hansard* of previous sittings of Parliament when railways such as the transformational one we are dealing with were debated, member for Forrestfield. Particularly look at the speeches given in 2000 in the lead-up to the 2001 election about how transformational the train route through Kenwick was going to be and how really, as I put in *Hansard* earlier, that whole proposition for that railway in 1999–2000 was basically to try to hold on to marginal seats in the southern suburbs. Here we are again: same speeches, same direction—trying to hang onto the marginal seats of Belmont and Forrestfield. It did not work in 2001 and this will not work either. The member for Forrestfield might be at the sod turning, but I can guarantee he will not be at the opening.

Mr N.W. Morton: I'm shaking!

Mr F.M. LOGAN: So you should be!

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

I say this to the member for Jandakot: hopefully we will get onto stage 2 of Metronet and will be putting our electrification all the way along the line and through the middle of his new seat, and we will be looking very, very closely at him—18 per cent or not! We will be taking him on, and no railway is going to save him! In 2000, when we had the same speeches in this house, it did not save the sitting government of the day, and I can assure members that this bill and the aspirations of this government will not be saved by this railway line. This government will fall on 9 March 2017.

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington) [5.10 pm]: I rise to make a contribution to the third reading debate on the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill. I want to refer to the discussion that we had about the precinct around the proposed High Wycombe train station. It was a big surprise to find that the government has not done the planning for what will be around that train station. Normally what happens with these types of projects is that we work out the details before we spend the money. However, apparently the government is spending the money, and it will then work out the details. The Minister for Transport has said on a number of occasions that that is the job of the Minister for Planning. Even during the third reading of this bill, he has been pointing at the member for Kalamunda, the Minister for Planning, and saying that.

Mr D.C. Nalder: You're taking it out of context.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: No. That is what the minister was saying.

Mr D.C. Nalder: I was being invited to have a discussion with the City of Bayswater.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: It is the same thing, minister. It is the same point.

Mr D.C. Nalder: You're taking it out of context.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: No. The minister is missing the point. If we do a logical planning process, the government, whether that is the Minister for Transport or the Minister for Planning, will know what is happening. If the minister were to stand up and say in respect of Bayswater station or High Wycombe station, "Look, that's not my responsibility, but here's the planning that the government has done", I would say, "Okay; that's fair enough; you're not the Minister for Planning and I do not necessarily expect you personally to have done the planning." The fact that no-one in government has done the planning is what has shocked me. I would have thought that before the government decided to spend \$2 billion on this project, it would plan something. I would have thought that rather than just have a press release and a sod turning, it would know what it is trying to achieve. It is a very long and well understood principle of public policy that if we do not know what we are trying to achieve, we will not be able to achieve it. That is the fundamental problem. Anybody can build a piece of infrastructure. I am sure that the engineers and the workmen and the tradesmen who will build this rail line will build a magnificent rail line. Australian workers are among the best and most hardworking people in the world. They are very clever people, and they will deliver a magnificent piece of infrastructure from Bayswater to High Wycombe, which is what we are authorising the government to do today. Of course they will do that. However, the real trick is what we do around the train stations. If we look at the Armadale line, of course we can see there are a lot of problems with the areas around that train station. That station was built during the Depression as a make-work scheme to overcome the enormous problems at that time. For example, that rail line did not follow the route that was generally accepted as being the best path to the eastern suburbs. It followed the vacant land out that way, during a time of high unemployment. Therefore, naturally it ended up being not exactly in the right spot.

However, the government is now proposing to spend \$2 billion, in a modern society, with every advantage that we can imagine. Western Australia is the richest state in a very rich country. We would expect that the government would have done the work. I point out that it is only seven years and 11 days since the government came to office. It is not as though the government has rushed to today. It is not as though the government has not had any time to think about what it is doing. It is over two years since the last election, when the government made the promise to build this rail line. Therefore, it is natural that we are all surprised that the government does not know what it is doing at High Wycombe or even at the Bayswater end of the line. It is inconceivable that the government does not know. We had a discussion in the consideration in detail stage about what happened in Joondalup and the fact that things were built after the train station had been built. However, the precincts, the layout and the arrangements were all understood in advance. Why do we not have that knowledge now? I accept that this is not the Minister for Transport's specific job. However, I imagine it would be something that the cabinet of Western Australia would have considered. I do not understand why the government is against planning. What makes the government not like the idea of considering what it is going to do before it does it and coming up with a plan so that when a project is finished, it has achieved something?

We also had a discussion about what happened in Sydney. At the time I was having this discussion with the minister, I did not have the map, but I now have the map. I point out that the train line to Sydney airport goes through Green Square and Mascot stations; it then goes to the two airport stations; it then goes to Wolli Creek

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

station, where it interchanges with the eastern suburbs and Illawarra line; and it then continues out through the southern suburbs and the inner western area of Sydney. It is not a line that goes just to the airport. It is a line that runs to other suburbs. As we discussed with the minister, Sydney Airport Corporation was made to pay for part of the infrastructure for that line, and private investors also paid for part of the infrastructure. In the case of this line, Perth Airport, which will get an immense benefit out of this piece of infrastructure, has not been asked to make any contribution. We found out during consideration in detail that Perth Airport has significant landholdings immediately adjacent to the proposed Redcliffe station. Perth Airport will apparently be able to do its own developments on that site—which is not airport land, on which it is restricted in what it is able to do, but its own significant landholdings—and it will be able to benefit from those developments. However, Perth Airport has not been asked to make any contribution to the taxpayers for this \$2 billion piece of infrastructure for the airport. That is a surprise. I do not understand why that is the case. My understanding of the minister's answer is that Perth Airport has not been asked to make any contribution towards the capital cost that the taxpayers of this state will be contributing to help its future operations.

I make the point also that Perth Airport was not asked to contribute to the cost of the Gateway WA project. Almost \$1 billion worth of federal and state government taxpayers' money went into the Gateway project. Perth Airport told me that it could not do its expansion—not that it would not do it; it could not do it—if the Gateway project was not built. Nearly \$3 billion worth of taxpayers' money is being contributed to infrastructure to support the business operations of Perth Airport, yet Perth Airport has never been asked to pay one cent towards the cost of that infrastructure. That is extraordinary. If I were a mining company, I would be aghast. Mining companies are asked to pay for their own infrastructure, yet a multibillion-dollar company at the airport is not being asked to contribute anything to the infrastructure that the taxpayers are putting in for it. I do not understand how that has been allowed to occur. As I have said, I had no knowledge that Perth Airport owns freehold land around one of the proposed stations, and it will obviously benefit from that, because, as the minister explained, there will be planning—even though it has not been done yet—to enable a new precinct to be built around Redcliffe station. Those were all big surprises to me.

The final item that I want to cover is the location of the consolidated airport terminal. I make the point that despite the fact that the government went to the election and put out advertisements saying that the great thing about its plan for the airport rail line was that the train stations would be underneath the two existing terminals, the consolidated train station will actually be closer to what was proposed in the 2013 Metronet plan.

Because, of course, as the minister explained—just as Hon Ken Travers said at the time of the 2013 election—new facilities are being built at the airport, and so the existing what the airport calls T1, but all of us would probably think of calling the international terminal, is not the whole extent of the facilities at that airport. In fact, there will be a whole horseshoe of facilities around the end of that precinct. The government now acknowledges that putting the airport train station under the terminal building was not a good idea. What was seen, in its advertising at the time of the election, as being a virtue of its train plan is now said by the government to be suboptimal. The criticism of the 2013 Metronet plan in television and radio advertisements was that the train station would be a distance away from the airport terminal—do members remember ads going on about that?—but it is now the virtue of this proposal. I love the plan provided in respect of the schedule to the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015. It has a little note that reads —

FORRESTFIELD — AIRPORT LINK
RAILWAY ENABLING ACT
BAYSWATER TO FORRESTFIELD

As we pointed out during consideration in detail, this is the first time we have had an act of Parliament to create a railway line that does not state where the rail line starts and finishes. That is extraordinary.

The Labor Party, of course, supports this because it is our plan. This is the line that the government stated would not be built until 2035. It said there was no demand for it until 2035. Now, because the Labor Party said that the people of Western Australia expect better, we are getting better. We will continue to campaign for good rail services, we will campaign for the fine work of Australian workers that will be demonstrated when this project is finished. It will be hardworking Australians who do the work on this project and they can be proud of the work they achieve, just as they have been about other rail projects that the Labor Party supported in the past.

MR D.C. NALDER (Alfred Cove — Minister for Transport) [5.22 pm] — in reply: I would like to close by thanking everybody for their contribution to the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015. There has been much lengthy debate on a couple of points. All in all, both sides of the house are in support of creating the Forrestfield-Airport link, but it is the Liberal-National government that is getting on and making sure it is happening. I really look forward to construction starting next year, and now that this bill has been through the

Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Dean Nalder; Ms Lisa Baker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Nathan Morton; Mr Fran Logan

lower house we are a step closer to bringing that to a reality. I look forward to supporting the members for Forrestfield and Belmont in their electorates and working through the exciting opportunities that will present themselves as we continue to work towards construction.

With that, I would like to acknowledge the member for Maylands —

Ms L.L. Baker: You will work with me, too, won't you?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I have Bayswater and Maylands in my head too much today!

I thank the member for Maylands for her contribution, along with other members opposite. I am very proud of what we have been able to put together, and very proud of what this opportunity will bring for the people of Western Australia. We will bring a world-class public transport solution to the airport, and open up access for the very first time to those who have been locked out of gaining easy access to the Perth CBD. With that, I commend this bill to the house.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.