

RAILWAY (FORRESTFIELD–AIRPORT LINK) BILL 2015

Second Reading

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

HON ALANNA CLOHESY (East Metropolitan) [5.07 pm]: Before the break for question time, I was talking about some of my concerns about the proposed Forrestfield rail project, but I said that I welcome the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015 because it indicates that we are getting one step closer to new public transport infrastructure. I also welcome it because Labor, as members will know, is committed to public transport, particularly rail infrastructure. Public transport is good for people, public transport is good for our local communities, public transport is good for our environment and public transport is good for our economy.

Hon Simon O’Brien: When did you last catch a bus?

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: About a week ago. When did Hon Simon O’Brien last catch a bus?

Hon Simon O’Brien: I wasn’t the one being sanctimonious.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: In summary, public transport is good for everyone, and that is why Labor has a strong track record in relation to public transport. I am sorry, pardon the pun; I could not find any other term to replace it with!

Hon Peter Collier: I get it!

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: It is better than the minister’s one at question time, honestly!

Here is Labor’s track record: Labor built 110 kilometres of rail track compared with the Liberal–National government’s seven kilometres of track. If I am being generous, and I want to be generous in that regard, the government will add 8.5 kilometres to its record when and if this Forrestfield rail line is completed, so by 2020 the total length of track delivered by the government will be 15.5 kilometres. Of course, in that equation we need to take into account the length of rail lines that have been closed by the Liberal–National government, which is 500 kilometres. So, by 2020, minus 484.5 kilometres will be the Liberal–National government’s track record, dare I say. I also talked about the extensive benefits of public transport and I then moved to concerns expressed about this project and had started to talk about the government’s lack of commitment to local content in not only this project, but also the purchase and construction of railcars generally across all of the rolling stock of the Public Transport Authority.

I now want to talk about some of my concerns about the capacity of this government to manage this project and also that I really hope that this project goes ahead and that by 2020 we will see a completed rail line to Forrestfield. However, on past performance, with the amount of track laid and its past management performance, that could be doubtful. What is the priority of this project in relation to a range of other public transport needs across metropolitan Perth? I am talking only about metropolitan Perth right now, although I could talk quite separately about outer metropolitan Perth—for example, Gidgegannup. We do not know what the government’s priority is because the “Draft Public Transport Plan for Perth 2031” that was put out by this government in July 2011 has never been completed. It was meant to provide us with a planning context for public transport development. It was meant to link with the planning documents “Directions 2031” and with “Perth and Peel@3.5million”. It was meant not only to do all of those things, but also to be completed by 2014. It would have provided a context for public transport in this state. In May 2014, Hon Ken Travers asked a question of the Minister for Transport about whether the government intended the plan to be released by mid-2014, which was just a couple of months away at that time; and, of course, the minister answered yes, but here we are in October 2015 and we still have not seen the finalised 2031 public transport plan from this government, so we do not know about the overall public transport context for this Forrestfield rail project. There was a problem with that draft plan that went out for consultation, because people actually read it and they looked at some of the figures in that draft. They found that some population figures might have been a little fluffed, including some passenger numbers that might have been wrong or fluffed. In the absence of that plan, what happens with this stand-alone, in-isolation rail line? What is motivating the government? Hon Samantha Rowe provided a pretty good indication of what might have been motivating the government in announcing this; there might have been some election copycatting.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order, members! Only one person has the call and that is Hon Alanna Clohesy.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: Hon Darren West asked a good question: is it in a marginal seat? I think it is, and maybe it was a big announcement for a marginal seat. The government does not have a public transport plan for metropolitan Perth, the Peel region or any of the outer metropolitan areas. Even though that plan was promised for delivery last year, it is not happening. That is one of the reasons I am concerned about this project.

The next reason I am concerned about this project is around money and whether there is any money in the coffers for this. We are told in the second reading speech that the cost to construct this new rail line will be \$2 billion. However, like all of the public transport announcements from this government—in the 2008 election campaign and more recently in the 2013 election campaign—we do not know whether there is any money in the government coffers to fund this. That is because this \$2 billion is not fully funded and not fully costed—FFFC, not! That is because the government expects or wants about half a billion dollars of that \$2 billion from the federal government, but this government forgot to or just did not put a bid into Infrastructure Australia, which was due by the end of September this year. Those bids were for public transport funding and other funding for infrastructure that this state wanted the federal government to contribute to. However, the Barnett government did not put in a bid to Infrastructure Australia for any money for any projects; so, here we are, with a total project cost of \$2 billion and we do not know if the money is there. But we certainly know that at least half a billion dollar is not there, because the Barnett government thought that the federal government could mind-read what it wanted. The Barnett government either forgot to or just did not bother to put in a submission. We do not know where the money will come from.

We know that in 2014–15, \$57 million was allocated in the budget for planning, and we look forward to seeing whether that has actually been expended. We also do not know whether the costing is accurate. Members will remember that when I talked about the “Directions 2031” document there were significant concerns about population projection figures and passenger numbers in that document. Is this government going to be able to get the costing right for this project? That is another concern. It is a legitimate concern given this government’s history—for example, the blowout in the estimated cost of the Metro Area Express light rail project. That cost blowout has seen the effective shelving of that project worth \$1.8 billion. I am legitimately concerned about the costing for this project and where the money will come from, given that state debt is rising exponentially to a level never before seen in this state. I therefore think there are genuine concerns.

The other concern that I alluded to was about passenger numbers. The government seemed a little confused about passenger numbers early on in the piece, and perhaps that is the case right now. The government said that 20 000 people will be using this airport rail link to Forrestfield by 2021. However, last year it was revealed that the government said 20 000 people when it might have meant 20 000 boardings rather than 20 000 passengers. I guess the question is whether the government knew it was confabulating that figure or whether it was a straightforward accident, mishap or bad calculation—I am not sure. Here is a quote from Hon Ken Travers on what he thinks it might have been —

“The Barnett government has clearly been dishonest and sought to mislead the people of Western Australia because they’ve presented the figures for the airport line completely differently to the way in which every other transport project patronage numbers are being presented.

“It concerns me that they have misused figures that are clearly intended to misrepresent people, because what I want to see is the best possible transport system.”

I have to agree with my learned colleague in that regard. Again, that gives me legitimate cause for concern about the government’s capacity to manage this project through to a successful completion. Therefore, passenger numbers, budget assumptions, planning assumptions and where they fit in the context of complete public transport infrastructure throughout Perth, and even Western Australia, are all legitimate questions.

Another assumption that the government has made about this project or this service is when people will travel. Remember that this is an airport line and a line to Forrestfield. One of the assumptions about this project is when people will travel with suitcases. I have travelled on rail lines from Heathrow Airport to London and Gatwick Airport to London, and on Narita International Airport and Sydney Airport rail lines. I have travelled to and from a number of large airports on dedicated lines. Those lines do not mix other passengers with passengers travelling to and from the airports because they are dedicated lines. I have travelled with large cases on those lines—I do not pack lightly, I admit—and with a number of other passengers with large cases, backpacks et cetera. The government has made assumptions that the majority of passengers with suitcases will travel in non-peak times. Passengers with large suitcases, backpacks and a lot of people like I am who tend to overpack may not leave much room for passengers making their daily commute. That may occur in this case because the government has made assumptions about travel in non-peak time. It would be good to hear from the government about the research on when people will travel, particularly passengers from the airport with large luggage; about the time considered to be peak time; about whether research has been done on landing times and the time it takes people to get through border controls; and about the volume of air traffic, the number of planes landing at a particular time, and the number of people trying to get through border checks at the same time. What research has been done, and have all of those issues been taken into account in that research? Has the research also taken into account the projected increase in air traffic? These are just some of the issues that lead to my concerns about this project.

Another of my concerns is about part 3 of the bill, which refers to the airport section of the railway. The proposed project will tunnel under a lot of the airport land, and this bill gives precedence to the railway. One of my concerns is whether it is safe for the security of the airport to tunnel a railway under a flight path. What are the potential risks in doing that? Is it safe from not only an engineering perspective, but also the safety perspective of people and the airport runways? I ask that because, as I said, this bill gives precedence to the railway.

Also the airport land is sacred land. It is sacred land for the Noongar people in particular. I know that the airport corporation is committed to and spends a lot of time on maintaining respectful relationships with the traditional owners of that land, and that it is very careful about the arrangements and negotiations that take place around changes to the airport. What negotiation with traditional owners has the government undertaken about tunnelling under the airport; what are the issues; and how will those issues be resolved? These are just a few concerns I have about this project.

My next concern is about the route of the project. The project spurs off the Midland line just after Bayswater. I am sorry that Hansard cannot see my arm movements here, but I know that it spurs off just after to the —

Hon Stephen Dawson: To the right.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: I thank Hon Stephen Dawson; it spurs to the right. It is just an unnatural way for me to go!

The project spurs off the Midland line just after Bayswater. That area has been in need of refurbishment for a long time and has been awaiting a government decision about what will happen with the Midland line. It is fair to say that a lot of work could be done around Bayswater station from the safety perspective, from the amenity perspective and from the perspective of enhancing that area to make it, as the locals look to it to be, a community hub, a village. That is because the area above King William Street is cut off effectively by the railway line and the station. What consultations have been undertaken about developing that area into a local townscape by sinking the railway line at that point, rather than having the spur come off after Bayswater railway station, and making a subway in the way that locals have been advocating so that the whole area could open up to a village-type atmosphere? Has the Public Transport Authority developed a plan for that? Has there been any consultation on that? These ideas come from a community group with a fantastic name—“Baysie Rollers”. That group talks particularly about revitalising the town centre and about the fantastic opportunity to do this during construction of the rail so that it will have economic and social benefits for the community. I think that is a fantastic idea.

One of my other concerns about this project is who will use this rail line. Last year, the government undertook some research with fly in, fly out—or FIFO—workers, because it anticipated that passenger numbers would be swelled by fly in, fly out workers. That was taxpayer-funded research. It seems that the government did not really want many people to see that research. In August last year, the ABC obtained a copy of that research. The research is dated March 2014. According to an ABC Online article by Jessica Strutt, the survey was commissioned by the Public Transport Authority, and it questioned about 1 700 FIFO workers. The survey showed that although the majority of those FIFO workers supported the project—that is, they liked the idea—they were not as committed to using it when it was up and running. Why? It is because the trains will not start to operate until 7.00 am, and most FIFO workers catch their flights between 5.00 am and 6.00 am. Therefore, there are concerns about passenger numbers, about the way in which this project has been conceived and planned, and about the way in which the government is forging ahead with this project with little reference to what the evidence is showing. Another concern is that the government’s passenger numbers are reliant on FIFO workers—1 700 of them—yet we are seeing a dramatic decrease in the number of FIFO workers. Therefore, what is the government doing about changing the times at which the trains will run, to encourage FIFO workers to use the trains; and has the government taken into account in its planning the dramatic decrease in the number of FIFO workers not only now but also into the future?

Hon Alyssa Hayden interjected.

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: I would love to hear an answer from the government to those questions. Those are just a few of the issues that I have identified in relation to this project. There are a number of other issues that I hope to explore further during Committee of the Whole. The government has a lot more work to do to improve the planning for public transport, particularly rail transport, in Western Australia. The government needs to stop making ad hoc decisions about priorities and about the way in which this project will be managed. The government also needs to improve its consultation with locals, as outlined by Hon Samantha Rowe in relation to Forrestfield, and as outlined by me in relation to Bayswater, and also in relation to FIFO workers.

Hon Alyssa Hayden interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order, members!

Hon ALANNA CLOHESY: There is a long way to go. Although this bill may be the indicator of the start of the project, there is room for significant improvement in this project and in the provision of public transport generally in Western Australia. The way to improve that is for the government to consult and to be open, transparent and accountable in the way this project will continue.

HON LYNN MacLAREN (South Metropolitan) [5.34 pm]: I have been listening intently to the debate on the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015 and I would like to put on the record some comments on behalf of the Greens and also express my support for the bill before us. It is clear that there are concerns about the bill, and I intend to raise some concerns as well. However, let us not lose sight of the fact that we are talking about building new rail. This is an exciting day. It was very exciting for me to be offered a briefing on this bill. It was a bit difficult to pin down a time at which I could get that briefing. It was also a bit late—it was urgent, because the bill was coming up, and I had to get the details now. I also was not privy, not being an East Metropolitan member, to the long consultation period that occurred, with the public meetings that I have read about in the materials.

Hon Jim Chown: But you were offered a briefing, though?

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: I was not offered a briefing until last week. As Hon Jim Chown knows, I am a member of several committees, and we are approaching the end of the year and there is a lot of extra work, so I had very little time available, and the minister's officers also appeared to be quite busy, so it was quite difficult to get a briefing. I would love to get more detail about this bill, and I think we are about to get more detail when we go into Committee of the Whole. I am merely pointing out that I have not had an opportunity to get a lot of detail on this bill.

In fact, this is not a big bill. It has only four parts. It is quite a simple bill. It is an act to authorise the construction of a railway from the east of Bayswater station to Forrestfield. It is easy for me to support this bill. In order for us to have a railway to the airport, we need to look at the powers of the commonwealth, and the existing powers under the metropolitan region scheme, and we need to find a way forward so that we can construct this rail line. When we look at the bill and what it does, it is clear that it deserves our support. There are some questions about how the bill has come about, about the route of the rail line, about the stations, and about the expense. There are quite a few questions that we have a right to ask, and this is a good opportunity to ask those questions. However, the essence of the bill is that Perth will finally get an airport rail. Therefore, this is an exciting day, and I want to put that tone into the debate.

I have listened to a few of the members who have spoken on this bill, and I can understand that there is a political motivation to differentiate between the party that is currently in government and the opposition party. That is fair enough. I can understand why that is the case. However, I would hope that we can look at a good thing when it is presented to us and put our energy behind it, criticise it constructively, and try to push it in the right direction. Honestly, we should celebrate the wins. We have just had a great win with the recognition of Aboriginal people in this state's Constitution. There was a great spirit of camaraderie and achievement in the chamber at that time. This, too, is a bill that both sides of this chamber support. We have not heard from the Nationals or from the Shooters and Fishers at this stage, but all the parties represented in this chamber that have listened to the constituents of Western Australia know full well that this is something that they want, and finally we have a state government that is prepared to do it. I commend the government for doing that.

Hon Jim Chown: Thank you for your unqualified support for the intention to construct this very important public transport infrastructure.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: You are quite welcome. Thank you.

Hon Stephen Dawson interjected.

Hon Jim Chown: Hon Stephen Dawson will get to say his bit shortly. Your address is most refreshing, Hon Lynn MacLaren.

Hon Lynn MacLaren: I am glad I can be refreshing at this late hour of the day!

I want to briefly touch on the purpose of the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015 and the mechanics of what we are trying to achieve today. It is important to reflect upon what we are debating. The Forrestfield–Airport Link will be constructed partly on or under Perth Airport land, which is freehold land owned by the commonwealth. Part 3 of the bill limits the exercise of rights and powers granted by state laws on that Perth Airport land and allows the bill to apply as a surrogate commonwealth law on Perth Airport land. I have often raised matters related to the metropolitan region scheme, the planning and environmental assessments, and all of the state laws that we have when looking at building a major project such as this. I was concerned to know what we are handing over to the commonwealth. It is exciting to have a public works bill. It is a matter that is relevant to the commonwealth. I believe that the commonwealth will have to adhere to its own environmental assessments and its own arrangements to build this railway. I was also fascinated to learn that the metropolitan region scheme does not extend underground. Tunnelling does not require a metropolitan region scheme amendment. That was

interesting to learn in light of the Perth Freight Link. I had previously asked whether the Perth Freight Link would require an amendment to the metropolitan region scheme because I was concerned about its route through Fremantle and whether it was already zoned for such a major freight route. I was advised that it would not require a metropolitan region scheme amendment. That really shocked me. I thought: how can the government possibly do this? If the railway is to tunnel underneath Fremantle or East Fremantle, in Hamilton Hill, it will not require an amendment to the metropolitan region scheme. It was interesting to learn, through this bill, a little more about how the government intends to build a freight link into the port of Fremantle.

This bill also stipulates that the powers cannot be exercised by the Public Transport Authority unconditionally when the railway is to be constructed or maintained on Perth Airport land. Looking at the bill, there is not much to it; it is very small. It came with an explanatory memorandum, which was helpful to me. I thought that was good. At the briefing we were provided with this coloured map that I am holding up. It shows where the railway is intended to go. It is a google map; it is not one of those maps that does not indicate the landscape and its features. Members can see that the rail line will cross the Swan River and they can see how close it is to Tonkin Highway. I noted from the material that was provided to me that there is quite a sharp bend in the curve as the line approaches the airport. The route goes underneath the airport, where the third runway is intended to be located, and then it travels in a southerly direction on that edge of the airport. That curve looks pretty tight to me. Again, I was interested because of the Leach Highway intersection upgrade; namely, where the Leach and Stirling Highways meet. Exactly what the curve is has been a bone of contention. When trucks are travelling at speed, they can take a curve of only a certain radius. I have asked the officers to provide me with further detail about the radius so that we can further ascertain whether this is an adequate amount of land to talk about tunnelling under. It is important to know not only the radius of that curve, but also the speed that the trains intend to travel at for that period. There is a 1.6-kilometre buffer. The line I am pointing to is indicative. I understand that it could be 1.6 kilometres in either direction. Even though this appears to be a map that is specific, it is only indicative of where this tunnel might go.

The actual bill before us is very specific about the planning powers of both the state of Western Australia and the commonwealth. It does not say very much at all about the exact route or the location of the stations or any of that. That information has to be resolved after this bill is passed. Whether or not we get this layout or another layout, the important thing is we establish that the PTA has a right to construct this piece of heavy rail.

It also came with this letter from Reece Waldock, the director general of Transport. Under section 18A of the Transport Co-ordination Act 1966, the director general is required to report on the planned construction of any new railway. He talks a little about the plans and about where the Airport West and Consolidated Airport stations will be along the line. He provided a project definition plan, which was also provided to me. I am holding it up so that members know what it looks like. I hope other members who received a briefing also got one of these. That provides a little more detail. It is actually the concept. It fleshes out some of the things that might happen. It could vary from this; this is just an indicative project definition. After all, the tender has not been granted to build this. We still do not know whether this is possible at the price that we have guessed. However, Reece Waldock provides some confidence because he states in the letter that he sent to us to commend the legislation —

The PDP substantiates the need to extend the Perth Urban Rail Network by providing passenger rail and bus services to Perth's eastern and foothill suburbs via a route through Perth Airport. The Plan incorporates conceptual designs to achieve the functional requirements, and the Capital costs involved. I am satisfied that the final cost of the works can be contained within the estimates provided.

We have this letter from the director general of Transport, who says he is satisfied that we can build it under the estimated costs. That is very important to put on the public record. Having been a member of Parliament for a little while, I know that costs escalate; costs very rarely go down. Hopefully, the department has budgeted an appropriate amount to deliver this project for the amount of money that we are looking at.

There is no question that an airport rail line is sorely needed and that this bill will put in place the infrastructure of planning rules and authority to deliver it on that mix of state and commonwealth land. It is important because the impetus for more public transport infrastructure has never been stronger. Political parties in this chamber have been putting forward their policy objectives in relation to public transport because this airport rail was identified by every single one of us in the lead-up to the last state election and most of us in the election prior to that. The reason is that public transport, and the lack of public transport, in Perth has caused severe congestion. As yet we have not provided the infrastructure to deal with that congestion and it continues to get worse.

I looked at the media in the lead-up to the last state election, which was pointing to the need for an airport rail line. I saw an article from Ken Acott in *The West Australian* on 21 November 2012. I wanted to remind us of some of the figures that we were talking about. This was three years ago. The article states —

In the first three months of this financial year, commuters took one million more train journeys (up 6.5 per cent) and 1.2 million more bus journeys (up 6.2 per cent) around Perth compared with the previous year.

The increase is nearly twice as big as the estimated growth rate that underpinned the State Government's forecasts in its 2031 Public Transport Strategy released last year. Based on an annual growth rate of 3.85 per cent, the strategy estimated that public transport patronage would double by 2031 and need 156 more railcars, 900 more buses and 29 light-rail vehicles.

Further down the article goes on to state —

The biggest patronage increases in the September quarter were on the Mandurah —

This is important —

(up 394,943 or 7.9 per cent) and Joondalup (up 318,511 or 7.8 per cent) lines.

Those two lines, the Mandurah and the Joondalup lines, are not the lines that we are talking about today. We are talking about the Midland line. We know that patronage is increasing at an enormous rate. This is important because in the lead-up to the state election, when people were putting their hand up to be in the minister's position to have that authority and to choose what public transport options we were going to build in this term of government, they were looking at these figures. The figures clearly state that the Mandurah and Joondalup lines are under pressure, and that the pressure is growing. What could the impetus for building an east–west link be? I intend to deal with that a bit later.

Another thing that Hon Stephen Dawson mentioned in his very thorough contribution to the second reading debate, and went into some detail questioning, was the car park spacing. Is there enough car park spacing? I heard members say in apparent agreement that we can never get enough car bays. I would beg to differ on that point. What we need most desperately is integration with buses and other future-built light rail systems so that we do not need more car bays. The whole point is to try to get us out of our cars. Every time we build a piece of the transport puzzle that requires us to get into our car to park somewhere to get onto another mode we are shooting ourselves in the foot, because it is an inefficient transport method. It also cuts out that ability for active transport, which is one of the key drivers in a modern healthy city. We have to have more active transport and more methods in which we can just walk out of our door, onto a tram or a central area transit bus or whatever and then get to the CBD or get to the airport, if necessary. Each one of us who has had that privilege to travel knows how convenient that is, because we do not then have to rent a car to get around, we are free to travel far and wide, and even short distances. Pedestrian-based transport is what makes a modern city vibrant and efficient. That is where we want to go, especially for this amount of money. For \$2 billion people want to see that we are moving closer to that modern city where we are able to leave our cars at home—or potentially never even own a car—so that we can get wherever we need to get to.

Hon Alanna Clohesy just spoke about the experience of travelling internationally and taking luggage on a train. I cannot say that I have had much of that experience—I have not been to London—but I can say that in cities on the Pacific Northwest of the United States, most of them have that option, so a person can just roll their luggage out of the terminal and often onto light rail, sometimes heavy rail, or often it could be a shuttle bus. A person can get to where they need to go without having to rent or hire a car, as is unfortunately often the case in Perth. The point I am making is that the integrated network is necessary. The Perth airport link is welcome, but it is only a part of the puzzle and it has to be integrated with the rest of our transport system in order to truly maximise the investment that we will be making in this critical piece of infrastructure to our city. This was acknowledged by the parties in the lead-up to the election, and I want to point to the Greens' own several transport strategies that we released in both federal and state elections, which pointed to this. One of the quotes from Scott Ludlam's "Perth Light Rail: True Progress" report states —

In 2007 we proposed an ambitious new Light Rail network for metropolitan Perth and consulted extensively with transport advocates, local government, town planners and local residents at a series of community meetings.

I participated in a lot of those meetings in my region; in the South Metropolitan Region, from Rockingham to South Perth. I even went up into the hills to hear what the hills people were wanting in public transport. That is a very important part of understanding what people's needs are. That is the nature of what Hon Alanna Clohesy just spoke about. Are we meeting the needs of people who want to get on public transport and need to get around the city? To have a bit more information from this government about the work that it has undertaken to identify why this is the most important thing that we need to build right now and what transports needs it is meeting is a critical part of this debate. I am just going to suggest that if, at any time in the future, a government wants to introduce a big, expensive, infrastructure project, such as the heavy rail to the airport, it might want to consider some extensive community consultations throughout the city that could give a bit more of the detail that we are raising now about

what trips the government is talking about and how the trains will accommodate luggage. Will it accommodate fly in, fly out workers? We are only a few members here raising these issues on behalf of our constituents. I can guarantee members that if we went out into the general public we would actually get a lot more detail and a lot more interesting facts about what people want in their transport.

One of the things that we have not raised yet is the ability to take a bicycle on public transport. Some of my dearest friends are cycle tourists. They pack up their bicycles and they have two pannier bags of the essentials and a credit card. They leave their place in Victoria Park and they are able to get to the airport, I am not sure how they get there; they might hire one of those Uber vans. They get themselves and their bikes to the airport, get on the airplane, they get off in France, unpack their bikes, assemble them, put the panniers on and they are off. They have a week in France cycle touring for their holidays. Are we jealous? I am jealous. The point I am making is that this is what is required in a modern city: for a person to have a bicycle, to be able to walk out their door and end up anywhere in the world without having to hire a car, but in our city sometimes a person would have to hire a car with a bike rack or a station wagon or something in order to get their bicycle around. Those are my friends.

Hon Peter Katsambanis: That flight leaves no carbon footprint, does it?

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Very good point, member.

There is no doubt that many women and families who have children also want to have their little pram, maybe they have a MacLaren pram, maybe they have three kids in tow, and maybe they do not want to have to pack up the car, take it to the airport, put it in storage for a week, unpack the kids and try to get them out. Maybe they just want to get the pram —

Hon Peter Katsambanis interjected.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Excuse me, member; I am trying to make my contribution to the second reading stage. I am sure the member will get an opportunity tomorrow.

Not everybody has unlimited resources and can hire a vehicle to get to the airport car park. What we hope we would deliver in a modern city is the ability for women and men—parents—to take their kids and the pram and walk out the door and go to grandma's house. Maybe grandma lives in Hopetoun and they want to hop on the commuter plane down to Hopetoun to visit grandma. They want to get there without the complexity of parking and getting in and out of their car and packing up their kids. They should have that ability. We are talking about introducing an airport rail, so let us talk about the ability of young families to get on it, get to the airport and get out of town. That is a modern transport system. One of the features in the Greens 2012 election platform, as it was in others, was that the transport choice of whether to get in a car or to get on light rail should be complemented by a strategic expansion of our heavy rail system, starting with the airport link. Indeed, in the consultations that I was involved in, the most important thing that people wanted was an airport link; they wanted to get to the airport on public transport, and it is great that we are delivering that today.

I have made the point that the government's highest priority should be to counteract congestion in our cities and make this a congestion-busting measure that will lead us into a future in which we have a vibrant, livable city.

People are using Perth's rail network more than ever before. The key demand by Perth's commuters on our rail system is for more trains more often, as some peak services have been at capacity for some time. A rail link to the airport is a matter of urgency. The proposed freeway to the airport will not ease the traffic snarl and will merely feed the gridlock around the airport more quickly. Again, that is a good reason to build this heavy rail sooner rather than later. I note that the government intends to have it completed by 2020. That was the policy of the Labor Party in the lead-up to the election, and that was similarly called for in our policy. The government is delivering on a policy that we all wanted, which was to have an airport railway by 2020.

Another one of the options in deciding how to spend the transport dollar is to expand the CAT services. That might be a way that we can link to this airport line. The parliamentary secretary might choose to expand on whether there are any plans to establish more CAT services. Perhaps CAT services could fill the gap if the trains are not going to run until seven in the morning, as I have just heard. Perhaps a frequent and reliable CAT service to the airport that runs along the Tonkin Highway alignment could be one way to ensure that commuters do not suffer. I hope that we will not deliver an airport line that commuters such as fly in, fly out workers do not use, because we really want to get those fly in, fly out workers on that train, and that would be good for everybody.

Hon Jim Chown: I am sure that once the line is commissioned, the PTA will ensure that as much patronage as possible is serviced by the train timetable, and that will be far cheaper than having an independent bus route running beside the railway line as such and picking up potential passengers at railway stations. I am sure that you are also aware that a new bus service from the CBD to the Perth Airport has already been announced by the minister. I think it is called the 380 bus service.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Yes. It will be interesting to hear the statistics about that bus service after it has been in use for a month or so, just to hear whether people are taking it up. I know that everybody welcomed the announcement of the airport bus.

Hon Jim Chown: The PTA is a very professional organisation and, as a public transport authority, is dedicated to serving the public's requirements from a transport perspective. When you initiate a new bus route such as the one we are discussing here, it will have some flexibility with timetables et cetera and it will be looking very closely at the patronage and how it is used and will make the necessary adjustments if required.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: I am sure that it will. I am sure that if any adjustments that are required are not made in a timely fashion, members in this chamber will bring it to the attention of the government and the PTA. That is something that is in constant adjustment. I think it is important at this stage to talk about the starting time of the service, because if the starting time is not aligned with the needs of fly in, fly out workers, that should be addressed sooner rather than later. I was surprised to hear that.

Hon Jim Chown: What I am trying to say is that I think we are getting a bit ahead of ourselves with the starting times. Let us get this thing built first so it can happen. Then, as we get down the line a bit further, members in this place, as you have already alluded to, can bring up the issue of starting times, if they are found to be inadequate.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Absolutely. I could not agree more with the parliamentary secretary. However, when we reflect on the service after 2020 when it is in place, there may need to be some adjustments; maybe a heavy rail spur line will be proposed or it will be extended to the Thornlie line, as we have heard. At that point, no doubt people will reflect on the debate that occurred today and highlight the issues that were raised and whether those issues were addressed in a timely and efficient manner.

I think it has been mentioned that there has been an ad hoc approach. In reflecting upon the wisdom of introducing one line to the airport from Forrestfield, I believe it has to be integrated, and I have touched on that before. The important thing is that we have enough rolling stock to ensure that the service is frequent and that we potentially have feeder bus services. In the briefing, we heard about parking, but perhaps we need to address more urgently how people can get there without getting in their cars, remembering that we need that 10-minute frequency in order for it to be a really effective service.

Previous speakers have talked about the Metronet policy that was announced as an election policy but was not delivered because the Labor Party did not get elected. Metronet was to connect Perth suburbs. I found this poster in my materials, because I collect things. I am sorry that I did not get the colour version, because the colour version is great. I expected opposition members to bring in the poster.

Hon Stephen Dawson: I might bring it in tomorrow.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Thank you member; I would appreciate that. This poster shows the Perth Airport station and the airport west-Redcliffe station. Was that an above-ground proposal for the heavy rail? We can find that out. It was a proposal that captured the public's imagination. We have all seen this; it has probably burnt a bit of people's retinas because we saw quite a bit of this poster in the lead-up to the state election. It captured the imagination.

I will briefly quote from Yolanda Zaw and Kate Bastians' article in *The West Australian* —

The plan includes new lines to Perth Airport and Ellenbrook and two new ring routes. The north route will connect the Joondalup and Ellenbrook lines—

Members may have noted that I drew attention to the fact that they are the most frequently used lines, and that their patronage is growing at a great and increased rate. They have the highest rate of patronage. The article continues —

and the south route will link the Mandurah, Armadale and Perth Airport lines.

Peter Newman, whose name I am sure has been mentioned before in this debate because he is a Curtin University sustainability expert who is oft-quoted in relation to transport proposals, is quoted in the article as having said that he was not opposed to light rail, but that an integrated heavy rail system was crucial to meeting future needs. The question is: is Peter Newman happy with this proposal? Perhaps we can hear a bit more about that tomorrow, but what I want to draw members' attention to today is that political analyst David Black said —

Hon Jim Chown: The government consults a lot wider than Mr Peter Newman.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: That is good; so do I. In fact, I consult my constituents —

Hon Jim Chown: Then why are you asking the question?

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: I was just going to —

Hon Jim Chown: Because I —

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon Simon O'Brien): Order! I think the honourable member is trying to address the Chair.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Thank you, Mr Acting President.

I was just going to bring to the parliamentary secretary's attention, if he is still engaged, an article entitled "Experts praise Labor heavy rail plan". The article includes a comment from the political analyst David Black, which reads —

... Metronet was configured to win votes in "highly marginal" seats. The Liberals hold the seat of Wanneroo by a one per cent margin and Ellenbrook, part of Swan Hills, by 3.5 per cent.

Opposition Leader Mark McGowan denied the plan was designed around marginal electorates.

However, it is fair to question why we are putting it in this place. I have highlighted that the Joondalup and Armadale lines are increasing in patronage, yet we have chosen to put in the Forrestfield–Airport Link. I still want an airport link, but it is relevant for Western Australians to question whether this is politically motivated and whether it is located to serve a marginal electorate to the benefit of either party or is it because we have transport planning that advises that this is the most important line to put in at \$2 billion at this stage of the development of our transport infrastructure? I would like to hear —

Hon Jim Chown: Do you know how many people went through Perth Airport in 2013-14?

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! The parliamentary secretary will get his opportunity to reply—hopefully fairly soon. Hon Lynn MacLaren has the call.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: I think it is important to recognise that an expenditure of this type and an infrastructure contribution to our city's development needs to be beyond party competition or marginal vote buying. It has to be because the city of Perth and the people of Perth need that service. We have already noted one important part of the constituency—FIFO workers—that really needs an airport rail that functions at a time when it can use it.

I return to the issue of car parks. When I learnt that the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015 was coming to the upper house, I contacted some of my constituents and asked them about their concerns. Many raised the cost–benefit ratio, which is interesting. That information is getting out to the public, unlike with the Perth Freight Link because we are still questioning its cost–benefit ratio. In addition, one of my constituents raised with me—this information goes back a bit—the number of car parking bays at Perth Airport and why Perth Airport might be concerned about that number. The constituent also advised me about the airport's 2012-13 financial report—it does go back a bit, and I am sure the parliamentary secretary has updated figures—and states —

The Airport's 2012/13 Financial Report states that Perth Airport has more than 17,000 car parking bays, (a large rise from 9,000 bays in 2008). The Australian Competition and Consumer Commission April 2014 report states that Perth Airport's 2012/13 car parking revenue was \$58.5 million. Clearly, Perth Airport has a massive financial vested interest to delay and oppose public transport.

The 2009 Perth Airport Master Plan claims, many times, "while rail will be an important future means of accessing Perth Airport, road transport will remain the predominant means of access to the airport for the long term".

That was not that long ago, so it is pretty exciting that we are able to put in heavy rail despite these quite damning accusations about the forces may prohibit having a nice rail system that does not require car parking. The constituent continues —

On page 71, it claims: "The airport peak periods are generally outside normal hours of operation of public transport and are regarded by travellers as unattractive times to be using public transport. This pattern of passenger traffic makes road transport the necessary dominant form of transport to and from Perth Airport."

That, of course, will all change. The constituent continues —

On page 77, it states that Perth only has one public transport bus service to the domestic terminal —

That, of course, has already changed. That was route 37 that had no access to the international terminal. The constituent continues —

On page 82, it states that multi-deck parking structures are expected at the Consolidated Terminal. (The West Australian of June 21–22, 2014 confirms that it is in the new Perth Airport Preliminary Draft Master Plan.)

I have that master plan, but I have not had an opportunity to check it. The parliamentary secretary may wish to update these figures. The constituent continues —

Page 77 also states: “Westralian Airports Corporation is assisting the Public Transport Authority in its planning for rail services connecting the airport into the urban rail system.”

The final point made by my constituent is —

Proposed airport multi-story car parks should not be approved until after rail access is operating, with adequate time to remove any impediments.

That is a very wise comment, if indeed it is a revenue stream for the airport.

I conclude my remarks with some comments regarding transport planning, and point to a couple of other sources of transport planning. This is not a new plan. It did not come out of the government’s last election’s strategies, policies or initiatives; it comes from many years of looking at how to deliver rail to the airport. I draw attention to a study conducted by Dr Jan Scheurer and Dr Carey Curtis from Curtin University for the then Department for Planning and Infrastructure. They looked at issues and routes similar to those identified in the Greens plan entitled “Perth Light Rail”. I might provide the exact name of the report for members tomorrow. The study investigated a number of different potential models for upgrading Perth’s public transport, with the most effective being a composite wishbone scenario. Maybe I will seek leave tomorrow to table a colour copy. The 2009 study shows the wishbone coming out to the airport. At the time, Dr Jan Scheurer and Dr Carey Curtis proposed that that might be phase 2 of the development of a Perth metropolitan transport strategy. It is definitely in almost the same alignment as the proposal that is before us today, so it is important to note the long history of transport planning that pointed to this as a good solution. I commend to members “Perth Light Rail”. That report contains this information and discusses a few of those transport plans, and it also contains the estimated costings provided by the federal Parliamentary Budget Office per kilometre of track. A little table gives an indication of the cost of the rolling stock and the cost per kilometre of track—that is, what we could build for our dollar. This is critical, because we are talking about \$2 billion. The cost of this project has blown out from \$300 million to \$2 billion, so it is fair enough for us to ask those questions about whether we are getting value for money, and whether the project is being delivered in a timely fashion.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to temporary orders.