

RAILWAY (METRONET) AMENDMENT BILL 2019

Second Reading

Resumed from 23 October.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport) [10.07 am] — in reply: I want to make some brief comments to finish the second reading stage of the Railway (METRONET) Amendment Bill 2019. I want to address a couple of the other issues that were raised. One of those was from the member for Cottesloe, who described what was said in the “Final Whiteman Park Strategic Plan 2017–2021”. He read a section that related to the Lord Street lands, as opposed to the Marshall Road lands. They are in the same proximity but what he tried to do was avoid the fact that the previous government had a plan to put a cemetery on that area, which was clearly demonstrated on page 16 of the Marshall Road lands section. He read the Lord Street lands section to try to not say the word “cemetery”, but it is clearly there for everyone to see.

The other issue I want to raise, but which I will not spend too much time on, is in relation to the Forrestfield–Airport Link. I think everyone looks back as if the project that is being delivered is something that was taken to the election, which it was not. In 2013 an alternative project was taken. Further work was done and the tunnel project emerged. Again, I think my commentary at the time was pretty bland on that and the original finishing date was 2018. That was the commitment given. At the time of the election, that moved to 2020, and, of course, that has now also been moved out. This whole idea that the project that was ultimately delivered was the same in both its form and time frame as was committed to at the election is completely wrong. But, again, I am glad that we are doing the project. It is a good project, and I cannot wait to finish it, frankly. This whole rewriting of the history of rail is something that we will not support or accept, and we will contest it at every point in time. I thank the opposition for its support for this bill, but I know it is out campaigning against it. The opposition has chosen a strategy to align with people on councils in that corridor who have opposed this project from day one. The opposition has a long and sad history on this project. I want to get on with it and we are getting on with it.

The project is really defined now in three parts—that is, the Bayswater station redevelopment, the Tonkin Highway gap project and the contract for the rest of the Ellenbrook rail line. It is a smart way to deliver the project and it will make sure that we can do it as quickly as possible. Again, there have been claims about when we should be building things. I think everyone recognises that, starting from scratch, there is a lot of work to get up a rail line. I will compare the time frame for this project with that of the Forrestfield–Airport Link. The former government committed to the FAL in early 2013 and we started construction in 2017. It was 4.5 years before construction started. Again, tunnel contracts are difficult. The contract was signed, but mobilising tunnel-boring machines is a big challenge. That is just the nature of big projects. I never really made an issue of those delays. Members opposite can say what they like but I know that we are working as fast as possible with Infrastructure Australia. I have to say that if anyone wants to shorten the IA process, I would be happy! We are talking to IA, as are other states, about the amount of work needed to progress a project, because it is becoming borderline ridiculous. The fact that we have to test dozens of options—we have tested over 100 different options—and bring it down to the different options means we have to spend a lot of money. The federal environmental approval process goes on for a while, and the agency is not properly staffed to assess our projects. We have a couple of road projects—for example, the Bindoon bypass—for which we have funding but we still do not have an understanding of the process the federal government will take. We are working within the federal processes, but it is getting to a point at which it is very difficult to tick all the boxes and get on with it, but we are working as fast as we can with those constraints.

I thank the opposition for the mixed response. I know it is a difficult project for opposition members to deal with; they have hated it for so long. Now they are trying to like it, but they cannot quite accept it yet. Let us go on that journey together. Let us all get on board and build this project. After 10 years of the “We like it; no, we don’t like it” approach, let us support this project. Let us make it happen for the people of Ellenbrook, Henley Brook, Brabham, Dayton, Kiara, Lockridge, Eden Hill, Noranda, Morley, Bayswater, Bedford, Ballajura, Alexander Heights, Lansdale and Girrawheen. Let us make it happen for people in that corridor, which has been poorly serviced by public transport for so many years. The rail line will transform not only the area, but also people’s ability to connect to universities, jobs and other opportunities. Of course, it will connect Malaga to the wider area. It is an absolutely incredible project that I am so proud to have brought to this Parliament. As I said, if we listen to the stories, it has been a long journey from that first story in *The West Australian* many years ago about that broken promise to now righting the wrongs of the past and delivering this magnificent project.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Leave denied to proceed forthwith to third reading.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

Consideration in Detail

Clause 1: Short title —

Ms L. METTAM: I would like to understand the consultation involved with this particular bill. What groups were spoken to?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is an amendment to existing legislation, so the consultation was through the Metronet team and the normal consultation when drafting a bill with the Parliamentary Counsel's Office and the State Solicitor's Office.

Ms L. METTAM: Can the minister spell out what that normal consultation is? What was involved in the consultation for this particular bill?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The normal process for drafting bills is that drafting instructions are developed by the key agency working with the Parliamentary Counsel's Office. It goes through the drafting process and then there is an approval to print. That approval is given and then we introduce the bill into the house.

Ms L. METTAM: What sort of community consultation was undertaken?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There were a couple of things. As was outlined by many speakers in this house, in the lead-up to the election we put forward a plan for Metronet. I think we undertook 23 community consultations, including a number of forums across that alignment into Ellenbrook. When we won the election, we sought to test, I suppose, the plan we took to the election through a proper rigorous business case process. We put our proposed route against other routes. There was feedback from councils. I had a lot of meetings with Bayswater council, and meetings are ongoing with the City of Swan. We are undertaking further community consultation now through both surveys and forums in shopping centres. I think there have been about a dozen forums across the alignment. We took the alignment to the election and we tested it with the IA process. We tested it in relation to other alignments for cost benefit and patronage, and this one came up the best. We now go through the next stages.

Ms L. METTAM: I understand there were 100 options; is that correct?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes; although that question does not relate to the short title of the bill.

Ms L. METTAM: In relation to the community consultation, can the minister provide details on the various groups spoken to, including the stakeholder groups and local governments?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We held a number of events that have all been made public through Facebook and other media. They are all on record about where the events were held. Regarding the names of all the individuals, I do not have that record and I do not think we kept that record.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I understand that every time we do a rail extension or a new rail line, a bill has to be brought before the house. I am a little surprised that the short title is Railway (METRONET) Amendment Bill 2019, not specific, with "Ellenbrook Line". I know that the government is working on the Cockburn-Thornlie line and will extend the Byford line, and it will amend the same bill, with the long title being different every time. I am just surprised that the government has not titled it "Ellenbrook". I am trying to understand the purpose of this title not being more descriptive about what it is.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Initially, a decision was made that we wanted to create a key bill, the Railway (METRONET) Bill, and then keep adding to it through different lines. We could have named it the "We Are Building the Ellenbrook Rail Line" —

Mr D.C. Nalder: That is what we tend to do, historically.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, but we have created a master bill, in a sense—there is probably a better legal name for it—and because we will continue to add to it, the idea was to create the Metronet bill and keep adding these projects to the master bill.

Ms L. METTAM: What other projects will come under this title?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We will seek further advice, but we do not think the Midland extension will require it. The Byford extension will definitely require it. As we continue to create new projects, Byford being the next key one for us, that will require legislation.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Have we done the Cockburn-Thornlie amendment bill?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes; Yanchep and Thornlie were part of the original Metronet bill.

Mr W.R. MARMION: The minister has raised consultation, which will come up under a later clause, but I would be interested to know whether there was a strong push for the alignment to go somewhere else. What was the

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

second option? The government finally agreed on this alignment; was there a lot of consultation with people strongly pushing it to go in a certain spot and it has not gone there? In other words, are there some disappointed people who would have liked the alignment to have gone closer to or further away from them; and, if so, where?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I can confirm that a group of stakeholders were involved in shortlisting and then the cost-benefit ratio was applied to determine the best route. As to who is disappointed and who is not, if we start from the top, I think Ellenbrook is very happy, because the station is being delivered exactly where it is meant to be. If we go down the line, there was always a discussion about exactly where the Whiteman Park station would be. For example, the Department of Communities was very keen to see where it would go, and some developers in that area were also very keen. But the decision was to put it to the west of the Lord Street alignment, at Drumpellier Drive, because it would minimise cost and impact on residential areas. Also, having it tie in with Whiteman Park was seen as a great opportunity to promote tourism and to feed into Whiteman Park. People at Bennett Springs are very keen to have access to a station, so in a sense Malaga station will service the Bennett Springs community, and of course Dayton and Brabham will access the Whiteman Park station. Going further down the line, Noranda residents were keen for a station in that area, and we made sure we delivered that.

There is no doubt that different groups put forward different ideas for Morley; namely, about its connection to Galleria Shopping Centre. We tested some of those costs. They were very costly and with marginal benefit, in a sense. I have studied this quite a bit, in both opposition and government, including the structure of Galleria and the roads around it. The Galleria site is a constrained site. It was not built at a major intersectional key part of the network and has always been a bit constrained. Managing traffic around there is a priority for us and we are working on some local road access, but if we look at the structure of Galleria and the activity centre, we believe the station adjacent to Broun Avenue will deliver benefits to not only the west but also the east of those suburbs. We will create connectivity, and the other thing is that we are able to work with the 950 bus route to make sure there are rapid connections. If we look at some of the master planning in the area, where some of the proposed density is, it is on the northern part of Galleria, not the southern part. The southern part is seen as more commercial, with other upgrades. We will continue to work on some key road connections relating to some of the density that will connect to the new train station, east and west.

With the connection to Bayswater, we tested a number of different connections, both to the east and west of Tonkin Highway, initially looking to the east of Tonkin Highway, looking operationally and also at land impacts. The connection to the west of Tonkin Highway was seen, again, as a best result, with limited impact on private land ownership. It is a better route and it also feeds into the ability to upgrade a new station at Bayswater to the west of those connections.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I thank the minister for that answer, as it ties in with the same consideration that was taken with Rockingham station on the Mandurah line, which is identical to the Galleria situation. Rockingham wanted the alignment to go underground at Rockingham Centre. Obviously, there would have been a lot of benefit to the shops and also commuters shopping from not only Rockingham but also other areas, including Mandurah. A lot of people from Mandurah go to Rockingham to shop as it is cheaper and it has better products. The issue was whether Rockingham Centre was willing to put its hand in its pocket and put in some money. That was one issue to look at, but we had to trade it off in that it would have changed the alignment, and obviously a tunnel was very expensive, so it never happened for the Mandurah line. The Morley line will be a little closer to Galleria Shopping Centre than the Mandurah line is to Rockingham Centre. Was the Galleria Shopping Centre willing to contribute towards that to incentivise the government to change the alignment for the benefit of its customers?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr R.S. Love): Members, we are dealing with the short title of the bill. This looks a little more like discussion on clause 8 to me. I will allow the question, but perhaps we might move on.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is right. We will have plenty of time to talk about the alignment in further detail at other clauses.

I think there were initially some discussions, but no offer was made. The cost of tunnelling for that particular section was significant. As I said, the issue with Galleria—I did study it quite a bit—is, first of all, for example, the permeability of Galleria in relation to the current bus station, a number of years ago, to where some of the housing is. If we look at Galleria, the car park and some of the density being proposed in the northern part of the activity centre, a walk to the bus station is over one kilometre. It is quite interesting when we look at the “walkability” involved with some of these designs. Wherever we put the station in relation to Galleria, there would have been issues of permeability because, in a sense, these centres are big, but they sometimes create walkability issues, particularly when they are not open. They are open a lot of the time now anyway; there is that issue. The other issue is car movements around Galleria. As I said, it is one of those areas—Westfield Carousel is probably up there too—in which traffic congestion and permeability through the area are constant issues. The station is proposed to be situated on Broun Avenue, and we believe that will lead to good connections both east and west. That is a benefit. Working with local businesses in that area will also be a benefit, and there is some potential further housing

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

development in that area. I think that east–west connection will work well and will allow people to have good connections to Galleria. It is a bit of a shorter distance to Rockingham. As I said, we are able to connect both sides, because it will be part of the Broun Avenue bridge area.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 2: Commencement —

Ms L. METTAM: This clause deals with the commencement of this legislation. What time line are we looking at from commencement to the start of construction?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There are actually three parts to the construction of the Ellenbrook rail line. One is the Bayswater station redevelopment. I will give the member some history, because I think it is quite an interesting part of getting this project underway. The member for Maylands is not here, but we had a commitment to upgrading the Bayswater train station and we allocated some funds to that. When we won the election, the initial months were spent looking at how Bayswater precinct could facilitate, in a sense, the Forrestfield connection and the future Ellenbrook connection. A lot of work was done. Working out the connection of the Ellenbrook rail line into Bayswater and exactly how that would work was probably one of the first key things that we had to get across before we finalised the route alignment. Initially, a lot of work was put in on the Bayswater station. As a result, the Bayswater station design and the tender that is out there now is the first stage of the Ellenbrook rail line, because it is being built to facilitate, in a sense, a third line, but really a second new line. That work will be underway later this year; for example, the forward works for Bayswater will commence probably in the next six to eight weeks.

The second component is the fact that we had funding as part of our negotiations with the commonwealth. We saw that the Tonkin Highway gap is a major issue for the community. Coming down from Muchea, three lanes turn into two lanes, then go back to three and then back to two—as we know, it is a bottleneck already, with the significant works that were done on the NorthLink WA and Gateway WA projects. Because the Tonkin gap project will involve working to expand Tonkin Highway, we believed it was the right decision to incorporate the Ellenbrook railway facilitation works—that means basically everything but laying the tracks and the overhead wires—into that project. That is what we are doing. That project will get off the ground fully in the first or second quarter of next year. The Bayswater part of the Ellenbrook works will start this year; the gap project will start in the first or second quarter of next year; then the final contract is subject to the federal environmental process, which we are going through. As soon as that process is finalised, we will get underway. Procurement for that will start early next year.

Ms L. METTAM: The minister is talking about the Tonkin Highway gap and the Bayswater upgrade, so she is including those in that project and the construction time line. Has the minister also included the cost of those works in the overall cost? When the minister referred to \$1 billion, does that include the Tonkin Highway gap and the Bayswater upgrade?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There are a couple of things. It is the marginal cost of those works. It is not the total cost; it is the marginal cost. That has been worked through with the contractors for both Bayswater and Tonkin. In these projects, we see the base cost, the Tonkin Highway base cost, and then the additional cost to facilitate the railway works. All that will be made very explicit when we announce the successful contractors.

Ms L. METTAM: When does the minister expect there to be an upgrade for Perth station as a result of the three lines going through Bayswater?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is not required as part of this project because there is a spare platform coming in from the east from the Midland area. There is already a spare, unutilised platform 9. It sounds like Harry Potter! What was the platform in Harry Potter?

Mr D.C. Nalder: Platform nine and three quarters.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, so if one were to go at the right time, one might be able to see it! There is a spare platform and we will be utilising the existing Ellenbrook line.

Ms L. METTAM: The minister would be aware of the Bayswater project slide on the Metronet website that showed that the Morley–Ellenbrook line would start construction in 2022. I note that that slide is no longer there. Can the minister confirm that that is the proposed time line for the construction of the Morley–Ellenbrook line?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Firstly, I understand that a presentation was done earlier this year, before we decided on a final route alignment. I want to be quite clear: we have done everything possible to get this project underway as soon as possible. I think that has been acknowledged. I think the member for Churchlands was saying the other night on television that we are obsessed with the Ellenbrook line.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: I said that the government needs to do more than just an Ellenbrook train line to get the economy moving!

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am glad the member for Churchlands says that we are obsessed with the Ellenbrook rail line, because I think he is probably right. I know I am!

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: The minister needs to be obsessed with a bit more than just that!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am obsessed with my projects, member for Churchlands.

Mr F.M. Logan: There is Cockburn as well!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That project is flying out.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: Why doesn't the minister lay some tracks so she can get some jobs going?

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! Member for Churchlands!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We have some students in the gallery from Margaret River. I apologise—we are not building a Margaret River train line. I am sorry about that. Okay, what was the question?

Ms L. METTAM: I will ask another; we can think about it. When does the minister expect to lay the first track of rail for this project?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We will start work on the project by the end of this year. Once the contract is finalised, we will give members the time frame for laying tracks and other works. Sorry, the question was about the slide. As I said, we needed to get the route alignment fixed and supported. That slide was made before the final route alignment definition was finalised. We went to the market with the Bayswater station as a key part, but with an option on the other; however, that could be actioned only when the route alignment was finalised. When the slide referred to “potential”, “preferred”, or whatever word was used, that was because the route alignment had not been fixed. The route alignment is now fixed; we know the plan, we know the contracts and we are getting on with it.

Ms L. METTAM: Does that mean the minister expects construction to start on the Ellenbrook rail line before 2022?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. I have just outlined the three parts of the project, in a lot of detail. I have outlined that a few times.

Ms L. METTAM: There is obviously some sensitivity around the timing of the project. In my second reading contribution, I said that I had been advised that some Public Transport Authority officers had been asked to sign non-disclosure statements on the timings. Is the minister able to provide some clarity on that?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is not true. Let us go through this again. In opposition I personally held about 23 forums out there, and in government we have been consulting. I talk to a lot of councils a lot of times about projects, and we engage with community groups—in Bayswater, for example. Our local members, such as the member for Swan Hills, are constantly engaging with local community groups and chambers of commerce. The member for Maylands, who is not here, is doing a great job as a coordinator of the on-the-ground effort and working with the Metronet team. I have personally met with the Bayswater community groups a number of times over recent years. I do not think anyone doubts our bona fides about this project. We are getting on with it. I think the member claimed that we committed to finish it in 2019, but we did not. Honestly, I think members opposite have to give us credit for getting on with this. We have a federal environmental process—that is, the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act—that takes a long time to get through. First, the route must be decided then given to the federal department. It takes forever, to be honest, because it does not have the resources. Members opposite can do whatever they like. I can counter with the federal government not putting enough resources into its federal environmental agencies, which it is not. That is a big factor. It took members opposite four and a half years to start building the Forrestfield–Airport Link.

Mr D.C. Nalder: It didn't stop you criticising it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I do not think I criticised it that much.

Mr W.R. Marmion: That much!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, I did not; honestly. Let us go through NorthLink. The previous government changed the route and I accepted it. As I said, it cut my whole electorate in half and I never criticised it. I thought it was a good project.

Mr D.C. Nalder: You got freeway access right through it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, but the previous government did not ever change the reservation to do it. The opposition can continue attacking the Ellenbrook rail line, but I think everyone is happy that we have the route alignment and will be starting in Bayswater by the end of this year. We have the Tonkin Highway gap and are going through the

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

federal process. We will start procurement for the third part of the Ellenbrook contract early next year. I will get my advisers to nod—in particular Owen. I do not think they have ever seen anything go this fast.

Ms L. METTAM: To be fair, we are very supportive of this project. I understand there is a lot of support in the community for it. As an opposition should, we are asking questions to get an understanding of where the project is and when the Ellenbrook community can expect to see rail delivered. I think that is fair enough—particularly when there is information stating that the construction will start in 2019. I have a question about the EPBC act. The minister has talked about delays with the federal environmental agency. Has this proposal gone to the federal Department of the Environment and Energy?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. We referred section 3 in September—that is the Malaga to Ellenbrook section. Just to be clear, to ensure that we can go as fast as possible, from an environmental point of view, we referred the Malaga to Ellenbrook section because that is not operating within an existing medium, whereas along Tonkin Highway it is all operating in an existing medium with previous environmental approvals and has already been cleared. We are operating in an existing corridor and are seeking approval for the Malaga to Ellenbrook area.

Ms L. METTAM: What is the approximate time line for the completion of this project? When will people be able to catch the first train on the Ellenbrook rail line?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I think our target date is the end of 2022–23.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Getting back to the operation of clause 2, which I am sure the Acting Speaker would like me to talk about, this is a fairly important clause because I am sure this is on the critical path. I know the minister mentioned that the commonwealth environmental protection is a hold-up, but without enacting clause 2 the government will not be able to build the railway line in places other than the middle of Tonkin Highway.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members on my right!

Mr W.R. MARMION: I am assuming clause 2 is on the government's critical path. What parts of the alignment will come into play because of clause 2? Is it the section between Bayswater and Tonkin Highway or the bit from Tonkin Highway down to Lord Street and all along Lord Street? I think that is the important aspect of this clause. Without this clause, the government cannot go ahead and do contracts. It knows it owns that bit along Tonkin Highway, but it cannot start construction anywhere else without clause 2 coming into operation.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member is right. He is referring specifically to the land acquisition. The private land acquisition is just Bennett Springs. Bayswater will be covered under the existing bills because it is in proximity to existing railways, as I understand it. It is really just Bennett Springs land. I call it Bennett Springs east or Bennett Springs north—north of Marshall Road. It is that corner area between Marshall Road and Lord Street.

Mr W.R. MARMION: When clause 2 comes into operation, the government will be able to start negotiating with those landowners. Has the government begun some preliminary discussions with those landowners? How long does it anticipate it will take to go through the resumption process, if it needs to? Some of the landowners, if they have already been spoken to, might be quite happy to sell their property. Are there any landowners who are not very happy about the possibility and will force the government to go through the resumption process?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There are two key points. First of all, the alignment impacts a limited number of landowners in that area. Letters were sent to them as soon as the route definition was released to inform them about the real or potential impact on landowners in that area. A number of them have come to community consultation sessions and there have been discussions with them. I think that most of the people who have come along and inquired will not be directly impacted by it—that is, the route will not go through their property. The second point is that in finalising the route through that area we are looking at environmental issues in the northern part and making sure that we miss Horse Swamp and do not hit the conservation category wetland in that area. We will go around it. A third point, which is probably the live issue for landowners, is the impact it will have on the planning scheme for that area. There are two parts to Bennett Springs north as I recall—one on which urban deferred has been lifted, and one component that is urban deferred. There are two parts—land within a buffer and land not within a buffer. Some planning has been undertaken by the City of Swan, including a developer contribution plan. All those discussions are being held. Because we now have the route alignment, the state government is looking at the planning implications for the rail line under the current planning for that area, because we believe we might need to re-look at that planning and work with the landowners. Many of the landowners are very keen to work with the state government on the potential for that area.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Just following on from that, I am homing in on the timing because when clause 2 comes into operation, it will give the government the power to start the resumption process, if it needs to. If there are problems with the resumption process, in my experience—things might have changed since 30 years ago—it can

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

delay the project. Clause 2 might not be the critical part at the moment in terms of getting approvals, but eventually it becomes the critical item and we cannot progress the whole project. Until we get rid of that critical element, it stays there and we cannot progress, so it actually stalls the whole project. That would be of concern if there is one landowner whose whole property has to be resumed because it is right on the alignment. What invariably can happen is that they say, “I retired here and I was happy with the noise from Tonkin Highway. I love living here and the last thing I want is to sell.” We then have the issue of going through the process of forcibly purchasing the property under the Public Works Act. I was told 30 years ago that that process could take two years. I would be interested to know whether it is only six months now, for example, and what the process might be if someone does not want to sell their property.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: First of all, we do not envisage that to be an issue at this stage. We have not seen any antagonistic reactions. Many of them knew that that corridor was being looked at. People are currently concerned about some of the planning issues. For example, there is a proposed developer contribution plan over that area, and that was prepared before the route alignment was finalised. Developers and landowners in that area are actually more concerned about the current developer contribution plan, and that is where we are trying to address their concerns. The fact is that the structure plan for that area has to change because the original plan did not have a rail line through it. I am getting a lot of feedback because this is in my electorate, so I know the area pretty well and have worked with a number of the landowners for a long time. It is really about the developer contribution plan because that DCP is currently probably the highest across the metropolitan area. That is what they are very concerned about. I also note that the developer contribution plan for north of Marshall Road relates to the plan for south of Marshall Road.

Ms L. METTAM: How many property owners are we talking about?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There are fewer than 30. Many of these are, in a sense, old rural landholdings. As I said, I know the area pretty well, and over the last three to four years there has been an exchange of properties of people wanting to move on and sell to land developers in the area. There have been a few transactions of that nature. There are about 20 or 30 property owners and, as I said, most of them are rural landholdings. Everyone loves living there but, of course, these places go through a transition. Many people want to stay, but there are also those who will want to redevelop. A lot of people have been waiting for redevelopment for a long time, and the feedback I have had is that people want to get on with redeveloping and selling their land, and then either downsizing in another community or moving into the Swan Valley or a bit further north east. There have already been a few land sales and some speculation in that area, as happens in rural landholdings across the metropolitan area where developers seek change over time. This is an area in which that has already happened.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Just a quick one on this clause, because obviously the timing is important. Presumably, this bill will go through this chamber in due course, but then it will go to the other place. It is my understanding that the other place has other legislation going through it at the moment, and I would be interested to know when the minister anticipates the legislation getting through the other house.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As soon as possible, is the answer. This is a priority bill, but the point is that we can do Bayswater and Tonkin Highway without this legislation. The Tonkin Highway works are basically all the roadworks that are required to build the rail line; that includes potential new bridges and other works. We will go ahead as scheduled and once this bill is passed, I suppose it will help with the finality, if we need it, for landowners. But, as I said, that is all being discussed. Once we get the exact alignment and know the impact the corridor will have on that area, and have the final plans for proposed station locations, we will be able to finalise all that.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3: Act amended —

Ms L. METTAM: Clause 3 states —

This Act amends the *Railway (METRONET) Act 2018*.

The minister has stated that that covers Yanchep and Thornlie–Cockburn. Can the minister give us an indication of when we are likely to see work completed on those two projects?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Again, the forward works on both projects will be happening by the end of this year. The contract finalisation is in its last weeks or months. Once we announce the preferred contractor, they will mobilise, according to their time frame—probably around Christmas, or post-Christmas, but the forward works for the projects will start by the end of this year. I might move an amendment to call this the “Ellenbrook Rail Line Bill”, because now I am quite irritated by the fact that we did not call it that! You guys should move an amendment; I will support it! Only kidding! These non-political titles are really throwing me!

Mr W.R. MARMION: Just on the topic of the Railway (METRONET) Act 2018, this clause actually raises another question about all the railway land being in one piece of legislation, if one wants to go to an act to find out

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

where everything is. Can the minister explain what parts of the rail network are included in the act, and whether other acts will include all the other rail projects?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is an interesting point, and one that has been raised by one of my colleagues. The fact is that we can build a road wherever, but we need enabling legislation to build a rail line. I think that is a quite interesting point.

Mr W.R. Marmion: Sounds reasonable to me, as a road engineer!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes! We built NorthLink WA, and I love that project, but it did not come before the Parliament, even though it was a big project and had a big impact. We tried to create a Metronet bill that would allow any government to come in and add to it with new lines. We have, in a sense, one bill that looks at the entire Metronet system. But the member is right; something we might do with Byford is bring all the others in and create one super-bill, but we have just been trying to get on with getting the projects done. The existing lines fall under the existing legislation but in the future there will be one Metronet railway bill with all those lines. It is not a bad idea. We have it for Metronet, in a sense; all the new lines will come under one bill, so people can look at it and see that it covers all the lines. It is one of those interesting things. As I said, one of my colleagues, who is not here, said, “Why don’t we create just one bill that lets us build rail lines wherever and whenever?” That is not a bad idea. We do that with roads, but we just wanted to get on with it. We know that parliamentary counsel is a bit short of time, so we just wanted to get this done.

MS L. METTAM: Just to follow up from my question before, the minister said that contract finalisation for Yanchep and Thornlie will be later this year. Does that mean that construction is set to start next year?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, the construction is in two parts. There is the main contract, and then there are forward works. The forward works will start this year and major construction will depend on the mobilisation of the companies. We will find out when we announce the main contractor when exactly they intend to mobilise and where, because it will be subject to how they build these two projects.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4: Long title amended —

Ms L. METTAM: Clause 4(2) has the words —

- a railway from Bayswater to Ellenbrook (known as the Morley–Ellenbrook Line),

Why is it known as the Morley–Ellenbrook line when, as I understand it, the alignment is two kilometres away from Morley?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The commitment we made was for the Morley–Ellenbrook line. That is the name we gave it. It goes through Morley and Ellenbrook. It is just the name has been known as from day one, and we have kept that name so everyone is aware of it going from Morley to Ellenbrook.

Ms L. METTAM: It does not go through Morley. Is calling it the Morley–Ellenbrook line misrepresenting what it actually is?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It does go through Morley, as opposed to the Forrestfield–Airport Link, which does not go through Forrestfield. I recall that the Forrestfield train station for the airport link station is actually in High Wycombe, and the Belmont train station is actually in Redcliffe. That is why we made that point last time. At least this train line goes through Morley.

Ms L. METTAM: There is a bit of community concern, which I am sure the minister would have heard, about the fact that the alignment misses the Morley activity centre. We talked about the consultation the government had earlier. What consideration was given to this name, and why has the government stuck with it despite the fact that the alignment is outside that area?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: First of all, Morley is not defined by the Morley Galleria Shopping Centre. A lot of people live in Morley. The train line is not called the Morley Galleria line, and we are not going to call it the Morley Galleria line. We will never name a station or a bill after a shopping centre. The train line does go through Morley and then it goes through to Ellenbrook. That is what our commitment was, and that is what it is.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5: Section 4A inserted —

Mr D.C. NALDER: I refer to proposed section 4A “Authority to construct Morley–Ellenbrook line”. I find it interesting that there is no mention in the bill at all about the stations being constructed as part of this process, and

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

I wanted to check on that. I wonder why we are giving authority, but there is no mention of the actual stations in this bill.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I understand that has always been the case with enabling legislation. It was the same with the Forrestfield–Airport Link—the High Wycombe station of the Forrestfield–Airport Link! It has always been the case with enabling legislation not to specify stations.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Fair enough. I think I should criticise the comment about the High Wycombe station. I think I should add to the record that yes, the station is in High Wycombe, but the land the station is on was called the Forrestfield railway yards. My second point is that the government criticises us a lot about the Belmont and Forrestfield stations, yet it is deeply sensitive about criticism of whether the train line is going to Morley or not. I want to pick up a point about something the minister said earlier in the debate on the short title, and I thought I would leave it until further in the bill. It has to do with the 100 different routes that the government considered. In the debate on the short title the minister mentioned that patronage was one of the determining factors of where the alignment was made. I can see no record of patronage, and I would like to know whether the minister can table the forecast patronage details for the relevant stations on this Morley–Ellenbrook line.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are finalising the business case, and when it is done, we will be able to table the stage 2 and stage 3 business case that is submitted. Once that is done, we will be able to table it. We have some estimates of patronage and they are between 12 000 and 18 000 people for the line. That is just between Morley and Ellenbrook.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Historically, the time frame of 2031 has always been used. Does the figure of 12 000 apply to when the line is commencing operation? What are the forecast dates for that sort of patronage?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: These are approximate numbers and we are still finalising them. In 2031, the figure will be approximately 18 000, and we are saying it will be between 12 000 and 18 000 when we open. By 2031, it should be about 18 000. As I said, that is just for Morley to Ellenbrook station.

Ms L. METTAM: Will the Ellenbrook line go straight to Perth or will passengers have to stop or get off at Bayswater station?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are finalising the operation plan, but the aim is to have it running right through. There will be two options. We are working through those. We have the capacity to do both—that is, the capacity for it to stop and change or to go through. The way the design has been structured allows us to do both.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Can I clarify why we are proceeding with the bill prior to understanding the operational aspects and finalising the business case. I am bit surprised that the business case has not been finalised and we are pushing a bill to authorise construction in advance of it. I would have thought it should have been done prior to this stage. I am just clarifying that point.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are working really hard to get this project underway. The point I will make, which I have made a number of times, is that we are challenging all previous ways of having done things to make sure we get this project done. The business case will be submitted to and assessed by Infrastructure Australia. This is the enabling legislation, so when the business case is supported, we will be able to get on with it.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Let us say the business case does not stack up. Is this bill then a waste of time? I assume the government will be guided by the business case, or is the minister telling me that the business case will be written in a predetermined manner so it delivers an outcome to make this look okay? My point is that we seem to be putting the cart in front of the horse. I would have thought that a process to establish the business case justifying the construction of this railway would be done and then a bill would be put through for the authorisation to construct it. Now I find that the government has not done the business case for the railway and does not have an understanding of whether it stacks up financially, but it is committing the state to proceeding with the construction of the railway in advance of that. I am a little bit confused about the process the government has adopted and why it has adopted it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Just to clarify, we have done the business case, but we are just in the process of submitting the final business case in the next month to IA. We submitted the stage 1 business case, and we go through its processes. As I said, we are doing everything possible to get the project underway as soon as possible. That means making sure that the business case development and legislation are underway to enable the line to happen. The environmental process is underway. We have been structuring the contracts to allow us to get it underway. I make no apologies for us wanting to get on with it. I would find it odd that the federal government would not support this project, given that some opposition members are saying that the federal government is actually building it. I do not believe the opposition can have it both ways. This is a project supported by the state and federal governments. We are going through the business case process, but we are also getting the legislation ready to make sure that we build the rail line as soon as possible.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

Mr D.C. NALDER: Just one further point: yes, the federal government is supporting the project, but it is subject to the Infrastructure Australia processes to ensure that the business case stacks up. Again, the federal government can provide the allocation of funding only if Infrastructure Australia, which is set up as an independent body to assess these projects, determines that the business case is justifiable. I am not saying that it is not justifiable; I am saying that we are jumping ahead, because what happens, then, if Infrastructure Australia—this is just a hypothetical scenario—turns around and says that it does not see the project as financially viable? Maybe the government has a lot of confidence that it will.

Mr P. Papalia: You nailed it—we've got a lot of confidence that it will.

Mr D.C. NALDER: But it is confidence only, in that the government is putting legislation through to get authority, when it does not have this approval. I would have thought that it is just standard practice that the government would achieve those approvals before submitting a bill to the house. I am a bit confused that the government has jumped ahead of the process, when it does not have approvals from independent bodies that this project stacks up. That is where the confusion lies.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: First of all, Infrastructure Australia is an advisory body, not a determining body. The federal government is the determining body for the release of funds. As I said, we are working fast to get this project underway, and as the member has demonstrated, we are challenging the orthodoxy of normal government processes to make sure that we get this project underway. The member cannot have it both ways. He cannot say that we are not doing enough, and then that we are doing it too fast. The other thing is that the member cannot stand up and say that the federal government is responsible for this, if he is telling me that federal government money is at risk. He cannot have it both ways. We have confidence in the federal government process, and I acknowledge the work done by the Public Transport Authority and the Metronet team sitting here—Anthony and Alan—in getting the business cases done and submitted. The other point is that we worked very well with Infrastructure Australia, making sure that our business cases crossed all their t's and dotted all their i's, and that we have done all the work so that when we submit it, we believe that we will get support.

Ms L. METTAM: I appreciate the length of time this process can take. What impact would an agency such as Infrastructure Western Australia have on a project such as this? Would it mean that the project would take even longer, and be an unnecessary process?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Another point is that we believe that we brought in the legislation for the Forrestfield–Airport Link before Infrastructure Australia gave its final tick. Although I said we were challenging the orthodoxy, maybe it is not as much as I thought.

Infrastructure Western Australia was established to develop a longer term plan for private and public sector infrastructure across the state. I have said on numerous occasions, and in numerous forums, that, because we have sought and received a lot of federal funding for our projects, we have been working through the IA process. Pretty much every project valued at more than \$100 million goes through the IA business case process, and every project valued at less than \$100 million goes through a summary process. We have worked through the requirements.

Discussions have been had through IWA and Infrastructure Australia—this issue is also being faced by other jurisdictions—about the issue of business case development, what the requirements are and who will be the advisory body, because nobody wants a duplication of effort. Infrastructure Victoria, Infrastructure New South Wales, and now the new Infrastructure WA board, are having those discussions. We understand, too, that the new CEO of Infrastructure Australia acknowledges the amount of work that is put in at the front end to get these projects through the business case process, and as a result we want to have, in a sense, a more streamlined process in the future. We are working with the current IA process and, as I said, because our projects are primarily jointly funded, we have to go through the IA process. The real impact for Infrastructure WA will be on some other agencies that do not get a lot of commonwealth funding, and so do not go through the rigorous business case process that we have to, because we are already subject to an IA process. Live discussions are happening now between IWA and Infrastructure Australia about the relationship between the two agencies in assessing or moderating the business case.

Ms L. METTAM: To clarify, would the Byford rail extension, for example, have to go through Infrastructure WA and Infrastructure Australia as well?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, it would go through just Infrastructure Australia, along with other current projects we have on our books. We have already embarked on the business case development for Byford. Basically, all the Metronet stage 1 projects have gone part way through business case development. Even those that are not currently under tender are all part of an existing process. As I said, most or all of them have joint funding, so we are going through the Infrastructure Australia process.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

Ms L. METTAM: Earlier, the minister touched on the fact that the proposed patronage numbers would be somewhere between 12 000 and 18 000 a day by 2031. As I understand it, the eight-kilometre Forrestfield–Airport Link is proposed to have 20 000 passengers a day, and has a proposed annual operating subsidy of about \$50 million. Is there an estimation of the operating subsidy for this line?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Not yet, but it is part of the business case, and also to be determined are the road and part of the bus connections. I want to make the point that the FAL act was passed in 2015, and IA listed FAL in 2016 as a priority project. The other point is that the operational costs of FAL were not determined at the time of the debate on that legislation.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Clause 5 is the one that actually allows the government to construct. Clause 2 must be passed to get the act going, but the actual operating section is proposed section 4A, which allows the railway to be constructed on this new alignment. The minister clarified that construction can be started straightaway within the Tonkin Highway reserve. Does the minister envisage the possibility, pulling out all stops but not having all the ducks in a row for the new northern section, that the government could let a contract to construct the rail line within the Tonkin Highway reserve and then, as things progressed, extend the contract to complete the job? The alternative would be breaking the contract into two sections if all the approvals were not in place.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is, in a sense, broken into two, in that all the enabling work civil construction—the barriers, drainage, bulk earthworks and bridgeworks—will be done as part of the Tonkin Highway gap project. The majority of the work done for the Ellenbrook railway down the Tonkin Highway will be part of the Tonkin Highway gap project. It is very similar to what was done on the Mandurah rail line, which was split into six or seven packages, as I recall. One of those packages of work was the road and enabling works along the freeway, and then there was a separate contract to lay the track and build some of the stations. The stations were different contracts. It was quite an interesting package at the time. That is how it would operate.

Mr W.R. MARMION: That sort of answers my question, minister, but I was not talking about the different types of construction—the civil versus rail—I was talking about breaking up the contract, because all the approvals may not have been done—for example, land acquisition. Once proposed section 4A comes into operation, construction can take place anywhere, but at the moment the first section can be constructed. The government could feasibly right now let a contract for works up to the end of the Tonkin Highway for civil and rail, and then another contract, when this amendment comes into operation. However, I would have thought that that would be inefficient, because the government would want to do, not necessarily the civil construction, but certainly the rail construction, as one contract.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Just to clarify: we are doing the enabling works right up to Malaga, as part of the Tonkin Highway gap. The laying of the rail line is not able to be done until the bill is facilitated. Was the member's question whether the style of the contract should include the rail laying as part of the Tonkin Highway gap project?

Mr W.R. Marmion: As a separate contract, yes.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We will examine that. We are examining the procurement methodology for the third part of Ellenbrook at the moment. We believe, for efficiency, that those civil constructors who are out there doing the Tonkin Highway gap and are already working on the median strip along Tonkin Highway will continue that work right through to Malaga. They have the same skill base, so they are out there basically doing all the civil construction works for the Ellenbrook rail line.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 6: Schedule 1 amended —

Mr W.R. MARMION: I would just like an explanation as to why “1994” will be inserted in schedule 1.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The reference is in schedule 1 of the act, “Line of Thornlie–Cockburn Link”. We require the insertion of “1994” after “Map Grid of Australia”. In each instance, on and from 30 June 2020 the Geocentric Datum of Australia 2020 will come into use. Since the implementation of the previous Geocentric Datum of Australia 1994, the Australian continental plate has moved approximately 1.6 metres and Australia's coordinates are no longer aligned with the global navigational satellite systems. To address this, in October 2017, the Australian government implemented a new datum known as the Geocentric Datum of Australia 2020—GDA2020. The Intergovernmental Committee on Surveying and Mapping has agreed on an adoption date of 30 June 2020 and a national initiative is currently underway to implement GDA2020 by this deadline. By inserting “1994” after “Map Grid of Australia” in each instance, it will be clear which Australian geocentric datum is in use.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price): I bet the member did not expect that as a response!

Mr W.R. MARMION: Actually, I did!

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

This is very important because the minister is saying—to put it into plain English; the minister can clarify whether I have it right—this will remove any shadow of doubt about what the coordinates currently are. The new system will have another name, with “2020” after it, to clarify that it is the new grid system. From the coordinates on this map in proposed schedule 3, it will be clear for someone in the future —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members to my right can either keep it down or take it outside, please.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Say, in 2025, someone accidentally uses the new Geocentric Datum of Australia 2020 and they come to a different spot —

Ms R. Saffioti: They’ll arrive at the wrong station!

Mr W.R. MARMION: They will be out a few centimetres. To confirm, this is basically future-proofing those coordinate locations?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is correct.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 7: Schedule 2 amended —

Mr W.R. MARMION: To clarify, this amends the other schedules of the act. In schedule 1, whatever the coordinates are—this now amends schedule 2, and when we move to clause 8, schedule 3 will already have “1994” inserted. Is that correct?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is correct, yes.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 8: Schedule 3 inserted —

Ms L. METTAM: With the proposed line, what impact will this have on the Midland line in particular? As I understand it, the Midland line at peak periods currently runs every eight to 10 minutes. Will that efficiency be maintained, and what impact will it have on current scheduling in general as a result of what is being proposed here?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are working through that for the operational plan and we will be able to release those details closer to the opening of the Ellenbrook rail line. We are working through all of that and looking at the costs over the whole network, including bus connections through the entire network. It is a very complex plan, and we are working through that at the moment.

Ms L. METTAM: I appreciate that it is a significant challenge. Can the minister provide any assurance to the passengers travelling on that busy Midland line that they will still have their current demands met with the addition of the proposed new line?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I have a couple of things: first, the whole dynamics of passenger movements in that area will change significantly. The Bayswater–Perth line will have a lot of trains an hour—the member for Geraldton will be very happy in his new Maylands abode! We will see an increase in frequency between Bayswater and Perth. I think that is a good thing as it will basically facilitate very rapid connections and increase capacity. The member talked about the businesses along the train lines. One factor is any potential impact on people using the Ellenbrook rail line rather than the Midland line. Someone mentioned Bassendean train station in their speech and the original two routes that were envisaged for the rail line—one leaving Bassendean and going north, as well as the Bayswater option. I suspect there will be a reduction in the number of people, which will take some pressure off some of those stations. I suspect that even out at Midland, probably in the valley, people will probably head mainly to Whiteman Park station, or potentially Ellenbrook or even Malaga—along Reid Highway and then up Marshall Road. All of that is being looked at, but I think that, in general, it is going to be a better experience for the fact that there will be less congestion on the Midland line. We are also committed to rebuilding that train station, so all-up I think it is going to be a much better experience for everyone in Midland, and between Midland and Bayswater, and from Bayswater into the city. They will see an increase in the frequency of trains.

Ms L. METTAM: For the so-called Morley station at Embleton, I understand there will be a shuttle bus required to bring people to the Morley centre.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are working on the number of additional buses that will be required. I understand the 950 bus currently terminates at the Morley Galleria, so it will probably keep going. We are also building a new bus interchange on Broun Avenue, which will facilitate better bus movements in that whole area. As I said, the exciting part—I know that if the member for Bassendean were in the chamber, he would be excited about —

Mr P. Papalia: He’s a ball of excitement.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: He is a ball of excitement; he is very excited. The member for Morley, who is in the chamber, is also very excited about this project and the connections on the eastern side of Tonkin Highway, because people will get access to rapid bus connections and a train. It will be a huge improvement for Beechboro and Bedford. I know a lot of people who live in that area. It will connect a lot of people, especially younger people who will be connecting to schools and universities. One of the issues in the north-east corridor is people's difficulty in accessing our major universities. The challenge we have over time with young suburbs like Ellenbrook, Brabham and Dayton is that a lot of people with young kids move in, the kids go through primary and high school and they then need to be connected. This rail line will connect young people to job opportunities and universities. This will also apply to everyone in Beechboro and the corridor east of Tonkin Highway.

Ms L. METTAM: How often does the minister anticipate this line will run?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are working on the operational plan. I think the Premier announced a 15-minute service when we announced the route alignment, but we are looking at how we will manage that and whether there will be increased frequency. We are working through that with the operational plan.

Ms L. METTAM: In terms of the times of day, obviously, there will be a connection with the Forrestfield–Airport Link for international visitors. Will this line meet the demands of people coming from overseas?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is planned to match the FAL and Midland lines. The issue of how the FAL rail line will cater for tourists was raised a lot in the past. I am quite interested in how it will fit with fly in, fly out programs. We are working on the operational plan. In particular, the Forrestfield–Airport Link will cater to travellers as much as it can, and particularly FIFO workers, but that is an operational challenge because of the way the network is configured. Currently, the operational plan is for the Ellenbrook line to match a similar pattern of hours of operation to the Midland and Forrestfield lines.

Ms L. METTAM: Can the minister clarify hours of operation of the Midland and other lines?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is roughly 5.00 am to midnight.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I appreciate the member for Vasse giving me the opportunity to ask a question; I was not going to jump in. If the minister has already answered this question, I apologise. Is there going to be an expansion of the number of platforms at Bayswater station? That is all, thank you.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There will be two platforms and four faces.

Dr D.J. HONEY: The members for Vasse and Nedlands have covered the various issues relating to this clause very well, but I am interested in the detail of exit from Tonkin Highway. Is it going to be a tunnel, similar to the southern line, or some other mechanism? I ask about that because I wonder how disruptive construction works will be to traffic on Tonkin Highway, or whether it will be disruptive.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Is the member talking about the Malaga exit from Tonkin Highway?

Dr D.J. Honey: It is the exit from the centre lane to the east.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. We will be doing cut and cover under the southbound line of the NorthLink project—overnight.

Dr D.J. HONEY: I was interested in how long it would disrupt traffic.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There will be some disruption to traffic in that area and traffic management will have to be in place. Ideally, this would have been futureproofed with an exit. One of the first things I did when we won government was to see whether I could change the contract to facilitate this work so that it could be done at the time of construction, but at the time we did not have enough certainty about the route definition to do that; I was very worried about building a tunnel that would never be used. Luckily, we are getting to use the other one we built 20 years ago. We did not have enough certainty to do that work. In a sense, we will have disruption from the Tonkin Highway works because we are doing the Tonkin Highway gap. We are trying to have all the disruption of Tonkin Highway occur in one contract, rather than doing the Tonkin Highway gap and then going back and doing some other bits.

Dr D.J. HONEY: The minister knows that I have a particular interest in the Marshall Road area. I know there was some discussion of that during the second reading debate on this bill. I took from that discussion that the government has no intention to change the use of the land south of the spur that will go through the Marshall Road area from that in the “Whiteman Park Strategic Plan 2017–2021” published in January 2017. I want to confirm that that is the case and that, in fact, based on the various discussions had, there is no particular intention to repurpose that land as urban land.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I want to make it clear so there is no confusion. Looking at the Marshall Road lands directly, we are investigating the concept of a sporting complex. The City of Swan and our agencies, particularly the

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

Department of Sport and Recreation, are very keen to create a major sporting complex in that corridor. My view is that the area will have good connection to public transport. I acknowledge the constraints for many sporting bodies, but I am not engaged in that direct discussion—I think there was a question about tennis—and I will leave that to DSR. DSR is looking at a number of state bodies that potentially want to find some headquarters. As I said, I do not remember exactly which ones, but there are bodies in discussions because this area will have incredible road links, with NorthLink, and incredible links by public transport. We think this is a pretty good area for that type of sporting complex.

We are having discussions and there are two live options—one for land in the Marshall Road area in the proximity of Malaga station and one for land identified in the strategic plan as the Lord Street lands in the proximity of Whiteman Park station. There are live discussions about those two areas. Malaga station will be to the east and west of that area on the other side of Beechboro Road and that is where we intend to have development, so that, in a sense, is across from the Marshall Road lands.

Ms L. METTAM: Further to the member for Cottesloe’s question and the minister’s response, the minister would be aware that the Marshall and Whiteman families, as I understand it, are concerned that this land be dedicated for community use. I have asked questions about this. If it is going to be a sporting complex for community use, I imagine there would be broad support for that, so why has the minister not been clear about that until now?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I think I have. I have said that we are bringing in legislation to build a rail line. We have to be careful about what land we are talking about because I do not want to mislead anybody. That urban front has Ellenbrook and west Ellenbrook, which the Department of Communities and the Minister for Housing are very excited about. He loves it. That is another area that has been identified. If we look at the urban front and, in a sense, the amount of land being made available as a result of this rail line, we get to operationalise west Ellenbrook. That is a long-term, 30 to 40-year plan. The Henley Brook urbanisation plan has come through, which is private land surrounding the Morgan Fields development north of Park Street. We also have the Bennet Springs urban deferred land. They will be the fronts of urbanisation, with potentially some other areas around Henley Brook. Our current focus is getting the line done. We also have the Malaga station area, which is about 33 hectares. These are the areas that we are concentrating and working on to get the planning studies done for the future. As I have said on numerous occasions, our plan is to get the sporting complex done and to facilitate that sporting complex in that area. I know that a lot of people are quite excited about the community benefits for that area. I remember someone was looking at youth attractions in that area. A lot of things are happening, and a lot of people are interested because it will be so well connected to public transport.

Ms L. METTAM: To be fair, although the Whiteman Park plan had the cemetery, which did not have any support, there was support for youth facilities and a sporting complex as well. Is this alignment, which goes through the Marshall Road lands, the alignment that the minister took to the election? I know that the minister said publicly that that is the case, but is it specifically that alignment? When the minister says that the station will be at Whiteman Park, there are many ways of interpreting that. For a point of clarity, was it through the Marshall Road lands and through Whiteman Park?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. We took the media on a bus ride one particular day.

Ms L. Mettam: Through Whiteman Park?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, along Marshall Road, and pointed out where the rail line was going to be. It was a good day. It was raining, as I recall.

Ms J.J. Shaw: We had to load them up with umbrellas; we had dozens of umbrellas.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I remember it well. I was a tour bus guide for a day. I have not done it since, and I do not think I will ever be asked to do it again. I probably was not as good as the former member for Vasse; I do not think my jokes were as crass! I was not very funny and I was pretty dry, but I told people where we were going to build that rail line. One area that has been clarified is Lord Street, because at that time we said it was going to be in what is known as the Perth–Darwin highway corridor, which is approximately 80 metres wide. That was where the bus rapid transit was going to go. We cancelled the BRT and created what we call new Lord Street, but it is now being called Drumpellier Drive.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: Drumpellier?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I was looking for “Saffioti Way”, but I did not get it.

That was probably the area that was a little more loose. We said Lord Street, but the work showed that west of Drumpellier Drive would facilitate a better entrance to Whiteman Park and minimise disruption to homes on the eastern side of Drumpellier Drive.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: Further to the sporting precinct, the minister spoke about state sporting associations. I understand that a business case is in the pipeline with the Department of Sport and Recreation for the State Tennis Centre to go to Whiteman Park. My understanding is that the board and so forth of Tennis West are not at all in favour of it. I am curious how this has evolved. We have a State Tennis Centre right next to Burswood, which is a central location. People try to bring in kids for training every day after school from the western suburbs, the southern suburbs or wherever; it is a very central location. I am curious to know how Whiteman Park can even be contemplated. I would appreciate the minister's comments on that.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: To be honest, I am not involved in those discussions whatsoever. I just want to build a rail line and facilitate a sporting complex for those who want to use it. I will not engage in the politics of tennis, which are probably worse than the politics of politics. I am not engaging in sport politics, because, as I said, it is tougher than what we do. I have not been directly involved. All I know is that the Department of Sport and Recreation is very keen to create a sporting complex and is talking to a number of state bodies. I will leave those discussions to other people; I will not even enter into that discussion.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Further to my previous question about Bayswater station and cyclepaths—I am sure the member for Gosnells will undoubtedly echo some sentiments —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thornlie.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Thornlie, thank you very much. It will always be Gosnells to me.

The cycle path that exists there at the moment is attached to the bridge in order to get to Bayswater station. As part of an expansion, that bridge will probably be displaced and there will have to be quite serious considerations for a very active cyclepath. Because of the existing tunnelling works along Whatley Crescent, the cycling traffic has been deferred onto Whatley after the station, which makes a lot of sense. At the moment it is a relatively low volume traffic road. The speed limit has been dropped to 30 kilometres an hour, and aside from the cyclepath entry back onto Whatley Crescent at the end near Guildford Road, where it is a bit precarious, it is relatively well managed. Has any work been forecast for the design of what will have to occur if that bridge is removed? I imagine that if people are pushed onto the streets, the Whatley Crescent–King William Street intersection will become very busy. If the lines and the station are being expanded, what cycle work attenuation or preparation might be done, and what will that look like? Is there any exposure of that?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There are some artist impressions, which I do not have with me now. The scope of the works at Bayswater is significant. We are creating two new platforms, lifting the rail bridge, and creating a whole new road and cycling infrastructure underneath. My understanding is that there will be a brand-new bridge for cyclists. We would not think about planning these new projects without considering them. Also, a key issue is disability access because of the curvature of the train line at Bayswater station. There have been issues about disability access, because when a train line has too big a curve, there is too big a gap onto the train from the platform. When designing new rail lines, we always have to make sure that the train station is not on a curve because of the gaps. That has all been taken into account. We could probably give the member some pictures or maps about Bayswater. One of the things we are trying to do with all our new stations and redevelopments is provide access for people who are cycling and walking, facilitating the situation for those who want to go past and those who want to go to the station.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I will ask a few questions on the mechanics of clause 8, starting with the way it has been worded. The wording clarifies that the railway line commences at that point, which is the point I have mentioned. It then refers to four other points, and I have roughly drawn them in a line to make an alignment. The minister could have had more points to define more precisely the way the alignment goes, but she has chosen a very simplistic set of five points. Can the minister explain the rationale behind the way it is presented in the bill?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This one is quite interesting. We are only required to provide the start and end points, which would make it a bit difficult to figure out where the line is going in this case. We put in the additional points, which were not required, to show the path of the rail line. We have provided additional points to make sure that people can understand the route. As I understand it, we are not required to provide the additional points, only a start and end, but it would have been a bit misleading if we had only provided the start and end points.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I am sure that could be the case in many alignments, but perhaps not this one, because if only the start and finish points were provided, my understanding is that it can only go one mile or 1.609 kilometres either side of a centre line. If the minister did that, she would not get the line in.

Ms R. Saffioti: That is a good point.

Mr W.R. MARMION: The plan has to include what I call points 3 and 4 to make sure that there is that flexibility. Can the minister clarify that?

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Good point; I take that. Yes, that is a good point. We would not be able to build the rail line if we only put the start and end points, so yes. The member got me!

Mr W.R. MARMION: It is only a minor point. The other interesting thing about the way it is worded is that what I call the mid-points are actually determined as a point near Map Grid of Australia 1994. I know we are being very precise about what these points are. It does not really matter, because there is a two-mile wide corridor to come in approximately where that point is. I guess the minister had no choice but to put the map grid 1994 in, although it does not really make any difference. The very first point—the start point—is probably a fairly important point. I assume there are two lines there. Is there an actual set position of where that point is on the current line in Bayswater?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is measured from the centre of the train tracks west of Bayswater station.

Mr W.R. MARMION: That is what I guessed—the centre of the two tracks, so in the middle there. That is logical. That is also a fairly important point to get precise, if there is a change to the datum system. That is useful to have in *Hansard* for people and engineers to know how that is done. The next thing engineers probably look at when designing the alignment is the speed at which the trains are likely to travel. I am guessing the trains will travel at about 110 kilometres an hour. When I am driving on the freeway and set my speed at 100 kilometres an hour, I have noticed that the trains zip past me, so I assume they are travelling at more than 100 kilometres an hour. I assume the design criteria for this alignment is 110 kilometres an hour. I have two questions, actually. The design may be 130 kilometres an hour to make it safe; there might be a safety margin, as we have with roads, so that it can do 110 kilometres an hour with some margin of error, if the train driver puts their foot down and goes a bit faster.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is correct. It is designed for up to 130 kilometres an hour, but we envisaged 110.

Mr W.R. MARMION: That was a guess!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member got it right!

Mr W.R. MARMION: Based on that, there are obviously three points on the alignment where the design would be challenging for a speed of 130 kilometres an hour. They are the points mentioned; they are obvious. The design radius of those three curves will be the criteria for the speed the train can achieve. Can the minister tell me what the design radius will be at those three points?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We will have to confirm the design radius. It will be no less than 300 metres. We also envisaged a reduction in speed around those curvatures to around 80 kilometres an hour.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Okay, because with a radius of that size, a train would not be able to travel at that speed. At those three points, the train will wisely reduce speed; the driver will be told to slow down to 80 at those three points. That impacts my next question, which is on the speed of the train. The minister has obviously worked out the passenger times to each of the stations. Can the minister advise or maybe give us a table later on what the anticipated travel times will be from Ellenbrook to Bayswater, and does she have a breakdown between the stations?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It will be approximately 18 minutes from Ellenbrook to Bayswater.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Does the minister have the timings between the stations?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am sorry, we do not have those here, but I can give them to the member later.

Ms L. METTAM: Earlier, the minister referred to the passenger numbers being 12 000 to 18 000. Can I get an understanding of the modelling involved? Has the rise of on-demand transport had any impact on these numbers?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No. Across the network, we are seeing some increases in patronage over the last year. One issue we are looking at is the combination of on-demand transport with mass transit such as rail lines. My view, and a view that has been picked up in other states—for example, in New South Wales—is that on-demand transport will combine with the arrival and departure points of key public transport nodes into the future. Over time, I think an increased way of travelling will be to use on-demand transport to a node such as a train and then use that train. As I said, we have seen some increases in our train and bus travel. In the past, we have seen that when new infrastructure is introduced—for example, the Joondalup and Mandurah lines—there are significant spikes in usage across the network as more people get onto the network. I think that the Ellenbrook line, similar to other train lines, will increase that general usage.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I have a question on the design of the alignment. When a new line is designed, there is obviously a need for more trains, and that need will depend on the frequency of the trains. What frequency of travel does the minister envisage? The peak time will require the most trains. What is the shortest frequency of travel times, and how many additional trains or sets—however the minister wants to present it—will need to be purchased to make sure the level of service on all other lines is maintained despite this additional capacity?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is something that we have answered before. The Premier announced that four trains an hour would run from Ellenbrook, but we are looking at increasing that and working through the operational plan.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

The number of trains is part of the contract for our rail procurement strategy. It is part of the 246 rail cars that we are procuring. Of those, 102 rail cars are for Metronet.

Ms L. METTAM: Can I confirm that the Ellenbrook to Perth route will take 30 minutes?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes.

Ms L. METTAM: Can I confirm that passengers will not have to get off at Bayswater Station to travel to Perth—that it will be a direct route?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I said, we are working through the operational plan. We might provide both options. We are working on a direct service, but we might also look at a terminating service. We are currently looking at both options. We are definitely looking at a through service.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Just following on, when the northern line was expanded north of Joondalup, extra shunting facilities or storage locations had to be built along the line to optimise the network so that some trains would be in certain locations in the mornings, ready to take off. This will be a spur of greater length. One assumes that a similar thing will have to happen here. Can the minister advise where trains for the morning peak period might be stored on this line?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are futureproofing for that storage, but we will not need it from day one; we will need it in a number of years' time. Under the plan for operation, I think they will be stored at Bellevue.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Bellevue is on the Midland line. To round off the question, will trains for the Ellenbrook line be stored at Bellevue near Midland rather than in Ellenbrook?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In the initial years, but that will change. As I said, it is all being futureproofed. Initially, it will not be needed in Ellenbrook, so the trains will be stored at Bellevue.

Mr W.R. MARMION: To futureproof it, the government will plan to store them somewhere else. Does the government have a rough idea of where it might want to put them? I can understand it if the government has not spoken to people and does not want them to know. I am happy if that is the answer. Bellevue is a fair way from Ellenbrook. Where along the line will the future storage location be?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It will be in Henley Brook, which is outside the Ellenbrook town centre.

Ms L. METTAM: The minister earlier mentioned that the proposed hours of operation are from 5.00 am until midnight. Will that fit in with the demands of fly in, fly out workers and the operations of Perth Airport?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We think so. When the Forrestfield–Airport Link starts operating, I think it will be very interesting to see who uses it and how we can encourage people to use it. I think Forrestfield is a good catchment area for the hills and foothills through Forrestfield, High Wycombe and the Kalamunda town centre. There are some good road connections, so I think Forrestfield will be a good attractor of people. I will be very keen to monitor the way the airport connections will work—who uses it, where from, and how we can encourage people to use it. I think we will monitor that very closely. We will also monitor how Ellenbrook interfaces with the airport, and with this route, passengers will be able to interface with the airport. Some patronage number of modelling was done for the Forrestfield–Airport Link. As I said, I think Forrestfield would be a good catchment area. I think Redcliffe will be a strong catchment area as well with the residential population. We will very much be monitoring the international airport station.

Ms L. METTAM: I imagine it could be quite desirable for people who live along the Morley–Ellenbrook line to utilise the connection with the airport in addition to visitors to Western Australia and FIFO operations that operate at all times of the night and morning. Will this line facilitate that demand?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I said, when the rail line starts, we will monitor how it is used and whether, for example, specific services in the morning need to be run that are limited from one point to another point. We will test all those assumptions when it is operating. The first test will be the operation of the Forrestfield–Airport Link—how many people we can get to use it, and the relationship between the stations and the aircraft that they use. Members opposite mocked the idea that people would get off at a train station and would have to use a bus. Given that the Qantas terminal is still where it is, that will have to happen anyway when people exit the Redcliffe station. We are talking to the airport about the connection between the Qantas airport and the Redcliffe train station. There are also special charter flights and a lot of FIFO workers use charters. Their relationship with particular airports—especially in Redcliffe—is something we will have to engage with. It may be something that we will have to talk to the mining companies about. This will be a watch-and-see situation. Some FIFO operators are at the international airport, some are at charter terminals, and some are at the Qantas terminal.

Mr W.J. Johnston: None of the charter people ever planned to use the trains when the last government did its planning.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is a good point about the planning.

As I said, there was some mocking of the idea of getting off at a train station and catching a shuttle bus, but the Qantas terminal is a fair distance from Redcliffe station and it is still a big operator in Western Australia. We will work through all that. There has also been discussion about whether we should use a different type of train or modify trains. When we start operations on the Forrestfield–Airport Link, we will see how it all goes—paint the trains different colours, for example! People have put to me issues about whether passengers will be able to put their suitcases on and so forth. Those are all things that we will monitor when we start operations.

Ms L. METTAM: I refer to passenger numbers. Through the modelling, did the government get an indication of how many FIFO workers or visitors might use the airport?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No. Member for Nedlands, the website has all the stations and the times between the stations.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to third reading.

Third Reading

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport) [12.09 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

DR D.J. HONEY (Cottesloe) [12.09 pm]: I would just like to clarify something. The minister made an interjection during my contribution to the second reading debate and some comments yesterday that I was reading from an incorrect section of the “Final Whiteman Park Strategic Plan 2017–2021”. I encourage the minister to look at *Hansard* of 22 October. Obviously, that is only an uncorrected proof at the moment. In fact, I read essentially directly from page 10 of that report, which spoke specifically —

Point of Order

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: This is a third reading speech, and the third reading debate is limited to matters that were discussed during the consideration in detail stage. He is raising an issue that he says was raised during the second reading debate; therefore, it is out of the scope of the third reading debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Hang on one minute and I will consult with the Clerk. My advice is that we will give a bit of latitude in the very first sections of the member’s contribution and we will see how it plays out from there. Thank you.

Debate Resumed

Dr D.J. HONEY: Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker. I thought it was important to clarify that because if the minister reads *Hansard* and compares it with the report, she will see that I faithfully reproduced that section of the report. I was not misreading any part of the report; I was referring directly to the correct part of the report.

I want to keep my contribution to the third reading debate fairly brief. Something that has very clearly come out of the consideration in detail stage and the discussions that took place before that is that this side of the house, the Liberal and National Parties—although I am obviously not speaking on the Nationals’ behalf—support this bill. Any contention that we do not support the Ellenbrook line is in fact completely untrue, and if people go about saying that, they are deliberately stating an untruth. We do have concerns around some aspects of this bill, and I want to go through them. Can I say to the minister that I really appreciate the direct way in which she has responded to our questions, and that we greatly appreciate the direct way in which she has handled the whole debate, which has been on the issues. Given what has been said before, I will not now go into the contributions made in the second reading debate, but some of them were an absolute disgrace. But I recognise that the minister has conducted herself entirely properly throughout this entire discussion.

As I said, any contention that we do not support the Railway (METRONET) Amendment Bill 2019 is simply untrue. We raised some issues, and I will not go through them in detail, but we do have some concerns about costs. I earlier outlined our concerns about the fact that even though this involves substantial expenditure, we do not quite yet know what it is going to cost because the business case has not been delivered. That was made clear during the consideration in detail stage, although the minister said that there were some reasonable preliminary numbers and that she was simply finalising those numbers. But it is of concern to us; it is a large amount of money, and the subsidy is a very large amount of money that will come out of recurrent expenditure.

People in the Marshall Road area in the northern suburbs are concerned about what that land will be used for. The minister has made it clear that the government is seriously looking at recreational use for that area. That use is

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

entirely consistent with the “Final Whiteman Park Strategic Plan 2017–2021”, and I believe the great majority of people in the northern suburbs support that. If that were to change to urban development, there would be some great concern.

There is also some concern on this side about the starting date. During the consideration in detail stage, the minister clarified that she believed construction would begin before 2022. I guess we will have an opportunity to hold the government to account on that. We are also concerned about the confluence of the Forrestfield–Airport Link and the Ellenbrook line into the Midland–Perth line. I appreciate the logic; a higher frequency of trains will be going from Bayswater through to Perth, but it is possible that the Midland–Bayswater section of the line could be confounded by that. The minister has indicated that that additional detail will come out.

Aside from that, as I said, the opposition supports this bill. I again thank the minister and her advisers for their assistance in the analysis of the bill.

MS L. METTAM (Vasse) [12.15 pm]: I would like to start my contribution to the third reading debate on the Railway (METRONET) Amendment Bill 2019 in much the same way as I started my contribution to the second reading debate, which was, first and foremost, to acknowledge the \$500 million investment that has been made thus far in the Ellenbrook line. I also mirror a lot of the comments made by the member for Cottesloe and express my appreciation for the amount of clarity that has been provided through the consideration in detail process. I have previously articulated concerns raised in the community about high-density urban development through the Whiteman Park corridor, so it was good to hear for the first time today a commitment by the government that there will be land dedicated to a sporting and community complex. I think that will be comforting to the people involved and I look forward to seeing it come to fruition.

There are outstanding concerns about whether the existing lines, particularly the Midland line, will be able to continue to operate at their current level of efficiency. The minister recognises the transport demands in Midland, given the upgrading and relocation of Midland station. We will be very keen to see how that develops going forward. There will be three lines going through Bayswater station—the Forrestfield–Airport Link, the Ellenbrook line and the Midland–Perth line—and we acknowledge that that represents a significant challenge. It has also been made clear today that the costs associated with the Ellenbrook line are multifaceted. The budget for this line has increased by 15 per cent since the election, but the Tonkin Highway gap and the Bayswater station shuttle service are included in the operating costs.

We certainly appreciate the minister’s indication of the patronage numbers and we look forward to seeing how the line will work in with the Forrestfield–Airport Link. This side of the house supports the Ellenbrook line, and I think all opposition speakers have indicated that support. We would like the government to back its support by matching the federal government’s investment in the Ellenbrook line; we look forward to that commitment. It is fair to say that there has been a solid commitment by the federal coalition government to Metronet; I think it has committed more than \$2.3 billion. We are yet to see the state government make a similar contribution. I touched on the costs of public transport. We want to see more and more people take public transport and support it with their patronage. That is very difficult when costs for public transport increase. There has been a 15 per cent increase in fares since the government has come to office. It costs \$4.90 either way to travel two zones. As the RAC states, this can be a significant disincentive for people to travel on public transport. We are always keen to understand why the government is putting additional costs on a very worthy way to travel, given it takes the pressure off our roads and provides so many social benefits.

The member for Perth talked much about the value of transit-orientated developments and connecting with activity centres. In my contribution to the second reading debate, I highlighted the concerns I had heard from the community about the fact that the Morley–Ellenbrook line misses the centre of Morley. This is not just about supporting the 200 businesses there; it is about encouraging walkability. The issue of Edith Cowan University has been raised with me as well, with its almost 4 500 students. It will require additional public transport. This side of the house is keen to see this area supported as much as reasonably possible with public transport opportunities. It is not just about buses. There is a growing number of ways of getting people moving faster and more cheaply.

I will just finish off by acknowledging and thanking the federal government for its commitment. We have seen \$500 million invested in this project so far. Members on the other side who say that there is no Liberal support for this project are quite misleading. We all want to see this project progress as quickly as possible. We know the government went through 100 different options only to come up with the option it took to the election. That is not necessarily a criticism of the alignment itself, although we have raised issues with it; it just raises the question of why it has taken so long to get to this point. There is a federal Liberal Party investment in this project. The member for Swan Hills has talked about the surveys she has conducted in the community about support for public transport. If everyone surveyed their electorate, we would find the same outcome. It is very clear that the alignment has not changed. The government went through 100 different options. There is federal government funding. We

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

would now like to see a state government funding commitment and the state government meet its original promise, which was to start construction this year—2019. There are no more excuses. We have the funding provided by the federal government. It is now time to see the state government meet that funding and start construction on the Morley–Ellenbrook line this year as promised.

MS J.J. SHAW (Swan Hills) [12.24 pm]: I rise for the third reading debate of this fantastic piece of legislation, the Railway (METRONET) Amendment Bill 2019, that is going to bring the train line to Ellenbrook, which I am sure the people of Ellenbrook and Swan Hills welcome in a heartfelt way.

I want to reflect on some of the debate on the community consultation process that was had in consideration in detail, which, as the member for Vasse has just stated, was very comprehensive as part of this project and continues to be very comprehensive. As any significant community infrastructure project is undertaken, it is vital that we listen to the people who will be most directly affected by it and make sure that whatever we are delivering reflects what the community needs and wants. I would like to give a bit of discussion to the community consultation process that we undertook with the people of Ellenbrook, Aveley and surrounds, and then have a bit of a discussion about other aspects of connectivity that will be facilitated by the delivery of this project.

In March 2018, the Minister for Transport came to Ellenbrook. We booked the performing arts centre in the heart of Ellenbrook at Ellenbrook Secondary College, the school I am very proud to be a board member of. It was standing room only. Hundreds of people turned up for it. It was also broadcast on Facebook Live. I think it was the first time that a community forum of that nature had been broadcast. The format for the evening was to provide feedback on the community survey that we had run and then to throw open the floor and allow the people of Ellenbrook to ask whatever questions they liked about the project and provide their feedback and views on what they thought would most add value to their community. The survey had near on 2 000 responses. It was a very engaged and engaging process. I sincerely thank all the people of Swan Hills who chose to participate in the Ellenbrook line consultation. It complements other forms of community consultation we have undertaken. The Metronet team has been absolutely fantastic. It held pop-up stores at Vicinity's Ellenbrook Central shopping centre. To the Metronet team in the Speaker's gallery: you have got some absolutely fabulous people working on your team. They provided as much information as they possibly could and they were helpful. I had quite a bit of feedback to my electorate office about the brilliant job the Metronet team did while it was parked at the Vicinity shopping centre. I also had the great pleasure of spending the next day with the Metronet team at the Aveley Community Festival, which is a fabulous event run by the Ellenbrook Community Collective. I again tip my hat to the Ellenbrook Community Collective for running some fantastic events. The Metronet team was there all day talking to people as they came through. There were flyers, diagrams and all sorts of stuff; it was just fantastic. The team has really gone above and beyond in engaging my community and explaining very clearly what the project looks like, how it is shaping up and listening very carefully about things my community would like to see happen. The community forum we held was part of that process. As I say, it was a bit of a double act between the minister and me. I did a bit of a warm-up. It was not entirely successful. As the minister was saying before, she is not a good bus tour director; I am not a good stand-up comedian. There were a few dead jokes that landed there, but nonetheless people engaged in good faith.

The first thing we explained as part of that session was that the Metronet project is about building communities and not just rail lines. That has been a feature of the development of the entire Ellenbrook area. Ellenbrook started in 1994. That is when the Ellenbrook project was announced. It started with a little village called Woodlake. In fact, I doorknocked only a little while ago the very first house that was built in Woodlake. The couple that first built there still live in the house. I had a long chat to them and they said when they first built there, there was a promise of rail and they were just so pleased that this project was now being delivered. Ellenbrook started with Woodlake. It is funny, Ellenbrook Primary School was a collection of houses in Ellenbrook before there was a critical mass of population justifying the construction of the first Ellenbrook Independent Primary School. Some of those little houses in Woodlake now are part of the original school. It started with Woodlake, then it delivered the Bridges, which is a Tuscan themed area; it is really quite pretty. To the north, the next village off the rank was Coolamon, which has fantastic playing fields, and at the top end of Coolamon is Ellen Stirling Primary School and Holy Cross College, and some absolutely great community facilities. Morgan Fields was the next village delivered as part of Ellenbrook, then Charlotte's Vineyard, then Malvern Springs, then Lexia, and then Annie's Landing. All these little villages have unique characteristics; the design of the buildings is different, reflecting the architectural style of the time. The community facilities provided in each of these individual villages are really quite diverse. It is fascinating to see how a community's built form also tells its story. As we move through these villages, we see these different forms of public art. Ellenbrook has won multiple awards for its planning and the ways in which those responsible for its evolution have adopted an approach towards place making. Metronet intends to complement that.

The final part of Ellenbrook, the final village that is for sale now, is the heart of the town of Ellenbrook. The region is called Hesperia, which was the original idea for the name of Perth. Perth was originally to be named Hesperia

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

but the name of Perth was decided on, and now the Ellenbrook town centre is called Hesperia. I was there a few weeks ago with the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Housing, launching that last development, which has been waiting for the delivery of this train station. I have seen all the concept plans. There is a train station in the very heart of it, with dense housing around it. There are micro lots, and some really exciting stuff happening around access to affordable housing. There is a dual-use commercial and retail precinct, and lots of beautiful public open space. It is all waiting for the delivery of the Morley–Ellenbrook railway line, recognising that this facility will help round out that whole area, complementing all this other community infrastructure. The Ellenbrook Arts headquarters sits on the corner of Main Street. It is an absolutely beautiful building, like a hallmark building, and absolutely gorgeous. The Ellenbrook Community Library and the Ellenbrook Secondary College are also located there.

I moved my office on to Main Street in Ellenbrook about two weeks ago, and I am absolutely thrilled to be right there, back in the heart of the community, below the offices of the Ellenbrook Chamber of Commerce and Community, which is absolutely fantastic, and next door to the Ellenbrook Youth and Community Services Hub, which we opened last year with the intent of delivering services into Ellenbrook. There are almost 50 000 people out that way now, but Ellenbrook has never actually had anywhere where community services can be provided in place. That really needed to be addressed to complete that village and build that community. Last year I was thrilled to be able to make that happen with a very generous contribution from Prime Projects, which has given us a huge retail space there for a peppercorn rent, to enable not-for-profits and community-based organisations to come in and start delivering support services for the people of Ellenbrook. Again, it is all about building communities, not just rail lines.

These things make places such as Ellenbrook fabulous places to live, and this project will complete the vision for Ellenbrook. In order to complete that vision well, we need to understand the community vision of the people who live there. This consultation process was a key part of doing that. It is part of what the Metronet team called the planning jigsaw, a fabulous graphic available from the Metronet team's website. I encourage people who have an interest in planning to take a look at it. It is all about creating liveable communities and affordable housing, making sure that we get community feedback, and respecting the local environment. We have an absolutely beautiful natural environment. The Ellen Brook runs next door to Ellenbrook—how about that? Living in the Ellen Brook is the last naturally occurring population of Australia's most critically endangered reptile species—the western swamp tortoise—right on our doorstep. As we put thousands of people next to this critical, natural and beautiful environment, it is imperative that we make sure that those environmental values are protected. We also have a mind to accessibility. A lot of people contact my electorate office who have access issues, and are seeking support to access the National Disability Insurance Scheme. Important aspects of engineering are making sure that we are getting value for money, that we meet the community's needs, and integrate transport forms. This is not necessarily just about bringing a train line into Ellenbrook. The whole planning jigsaw has to make sure that the feeder bus lanes into the Morley–Ellenbrook railway line and the Ellenbrook station will be delivering for the community.

Point of Order

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I just want to know how this is relevant to the third reading. I was giving the member some latitude —

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members, a member is on her feet. Can you not have an argument against that?

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I allowed her some latitude to do an introduction, but I believe this is way off track for the third reading.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Funny about that—we were just having a chat when you asked the question. I did not actually pull up the first speaker; I just offered a bit of advice. Member for Swan Hills, you need to keep this pretty tightly within the third reading parameters, so can you bring it back to that.

Debate Resumed

Ms J.J. SHAW: Sure, Madam Deputy Speaker. I will go straight to the consultation process; an extensive range of questions were asked during consideration in detail. As I go through and provide some more information on the questions asked by members opposite, we will see the absolute relevance of the things that I am talking about. The fact that I have had the relevance questioned goes to show how out of touch members opposite are with the needs and wants of my community, and why it is so important that we hear those voices and understand the community into which this infrastructure is going to be delivered. I am more than happy to elaborate on the consultation process itself, and tell members what the people of Ellenbrook have been telling me and the Metronet team about this process. The fact that members opposite want to shut this conversation down probably tells the people of

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Valder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

Ellenbrook everything that they need to know about the opposition's genuine lack of care and consideration for my community. I will happily talk about the consultation process.

As I said, there were 1 927 thank-yous in total. People were asked, in this consultation process that was so extensively questioned during the third reading phase, what the level of importance of the Morley–Ellenbrook line was to them personally. The mean score was eight out of 10—very important—and for the community of Perth and the local area, it was 8.3 out of 10. There was a high level of interest from the people of Ellenbrook in how important this project is in helping them to create a sense of community, and helping them finish that wonderful Ellenbrook town centre. People in particular suburbs were asked how important the project was to their suburb, and to creating the sense of space that I was so pleased to speak about, and I cannot wait to elaborate further on the more detailed responses to the community consultation provided by the people of Ellenbrook. The people of Brabham gave it a mean score of 9.3; the people of Dayton, 9.3; the people of Morley, 8.9 out of 10; the people of Aveley, 8.8 out of 10; Bennett Springs, 8.4; Beechboro, 8.7; Caversham, 8.5; Ellenbrook, 8.7; and then we get down to The Vines, also in my electorate, 8.1. The people of Ellenbrook and the surrounding suburbs absolutely appreciate how important this project is to the history of the development of Ellenbrook, and their future. They are excited to see it delivered. The questions that were often answered as part of the consultation process were about exactly where the rail line and the stations were going to be located. Obviously, the Minister for Transport, in consideration in detail, provided quite a bit of detail about that. It is very exciting that it is going to be starting in the heart of the Ellenbrook town centre. As I was saying before, it is just behind Charlie Gregorini Memorial Park and State Swim Ellenbrook. As part of this project, we have just cleared land in the area and moved the telecommunications tower that was preventing the development of that area. We were out there the other day talking about the Hesperia development, which is in association with this project, which has been developed in consultation with the community and responds to its needs. It is a 60-lot development, the single largest release of lots in Ellenbrook's history. When we were there, the people who were responsible for delivering Hesperia told us that in the last couple of months since the finalisation of the rail line route and the announcement of this project back in August, when the Premier, the minister and I were out there under the billboard where the station will now go, they have had more sales than in the previous 12 months. This project is injecting life and vitality, and stimulating local economic development, into the Ellenbrook town centre and it is responding to the community's needs. It is 100 per cent consistent with the feedback that the people of Ellenbrook provided us through these consultation processes.

As we have all been told, the Morley–Ellenbrook line's objectives are to provide integrated and effective public transport. That is what the people want. It is intended to change travel behaviours and decrease private vehicle use, and that again is what people told us they want. It is intended to improve housing diversity, with lots of different forms of housing. That is what people told us they want. A lot of people in big homes want to be able to downsize, but they do not want to move away from their kids or grandkids. It is really important that associated with the Metronet project in the Ellenbrook town centre, we ensure a diverse array of housing forms, so people can make the transition through the phases of their lives in their community, in the places they have lived for decades, with generations of their families and friends around them, and where they feel comfortable and welcomed. It is through these processes that they have contributed to the development of this area. These are the things that are so important.

The fact that I was criticised by members opposite for going through that history is testament to the fact that they just do not understand place making, they do not understand community building and they do not understand the significance of this project to the people of Ellenbrook. I say, shame on them! I can see why there was such an overwhelming endorsement of this project in the 2017 election in both the West Swan electorate and the Swan Hills electorate. I certainly look forward to working with the member for West Swan over the coming years in the community of Ellenbrook, and to continuing to listen to the people of Ellenbrook as we develop their community, support the aspirations of that community and deliver those aspirations through this project.

The design for the station and work around the area have been undertaken. We have moved the telecommunications tower. One of the other things that people said through the consultation process that they really wanted to see was the delivery of connecting public transport options. On 1 November, as part of the new Lord Street project, we will respond to those community concerns, as conveyed to us in the consultation process, by opening a Park 'n' Ride facility at the intersection of Lord Street and Gngara Road in the Henley Brook area, the Ellenbrook transfer facility. That is a core part of Metronet and a core part of providing the feeder links into the Ellenbrook train station. Again, that will be a significant boost to the people of Ellenbrook.

In terms of the survey response on how people intend to use this train line, we heard a lot about patronage and utilisation, and where people want to go. The key destinations that a lot of people in the Ellenbrook area said they wanted to utilise public transport to travel to were Wanneroo—unsurprisingly as it is quite a significant employment centre—Joondalup, Malaga, Morley, Osborne Park, West Perth, Perth, Belmont and Welshpool. The delivery of the Ellenbrook train line, in response to those community needs, will facilitate access to all

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

those areas, but we have not just stopped there. In August 2017, the minister and I were at the Ellenbrook bus depot where we announced the 355 bus service from Ellenbrook to Whitfords Station, which responds to this community's concern about access to Joondalup. The 355 bus service, which is a brand-new east-west bus service, has been running very successfully. It facilitates people's access to Edith Cowan University, the Joondalup Health Campus and the Joondalup train line while we wait for the delivery of the Morley–Ellenbrook line, so we really responded there.

The other destination that people like to get to from Ellenbrook is Midland. Previously, under the last government, there was one bus a day. If people needed to access community or commonwealth services, they had to go all the way to Midland on only one bus a day. That was not responding to the community's needs as communicated to us in this document. We added another four services on weekdays between Midland and Ellenbrook. Again, we were listening to the community, understanding what it is that it wanted and providing it with the services and facilities it needs and deserves.

For travelling to work, the Morley–Ellenbrook line will clearly facilitate people's access to employment opportunities. It will also generate local employment opportunities as we construct the railway line and with the finalisation of the Hesperia precinct and associated commercial development and ongoing retail jobs in the area. I should also say that the Morley–Ellenbrook line will be dropping off passengers at the beautiful tourism destination of Whitfords—sorry, Whiteman Park. Whitfords is up and coming! It is prospective. I am ambitious for Whitfords. I meant Whiteman Park, the jewel in the crown.

A member interjected.

Ms J.J. SHAW: There is a bus!

The long-term vision is a ring-road all the way around the Perth metropolitan area and the beautiful tourism destination that is Whiteman Park. Obviously, a train station will generate local jobs in tourism and hospitality, which is very welcome. That is exactly what people told us they wanted. In terms of where survey respondents travel for study, I mentioned ECU and the bus link that we have introduced to facilitate the access of people who live in Ellenbrook to educational opportunities in Joondalup. But people also want to get to the University of Western Australia, Curtin University and Murdoch University and, again, this project will respond to those concerns and facilitate their access. Some concerns were expressed—I think it is important to acknowledge those because we are not just all about listening to what we want to hear. There are also some things that people wanted us to respond to. A lot of people said, “Look, it won't really impact or benefit me.” I am at pains to emphasise—as I did in the second reading debate in response to an incredibly narrow-minded analysis of what the dollar value in the public subsidies for rail lines is, which was quite unimaginatively offered by the member for Cottesloe—that there are a range of project benefits —

Point of Order

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I would just like to reiterate the relevance to the third reading, and referring to another member's speech in the second reading is not part of the third reading debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Swan Hills, can you just keep this on the consideration in detail of the bill.

Debate Resumed

Ms J.J. SHAW: Sure. Actually, there was—if you review *Hansard*—I believe, quite some discussion in consideration in detail on the financial analysis associated with this project. I will accept your instruction, Deputy Speaker, but I would make the point that relevance is perhaps something that has been misunderstood by the other side. Again, those members just do not get it. I will move on.

In the consultation process, some concerns were raised, but, as I say, the benefits that will be delivered by this project are better connections, reduced road traffic, community development opportunities, and decreased congestion on roads, in particular, which saves people time and petrol money. When the price of petrol is up there at around \$1.65 a litre, that is really material to the people of Ellenbrook and, certainly, cost-of-living pressures are material, so this project is really going to help.

In terms of the comments on some less desirable social activity in the area, the idea is that integrating a train station into a community, rather than just plonking a train station somewhere and surrounding it with car parks, creates much more activity and life. We do all that place making that I was talking about at the beginning of my speech that, again, was so misunderstood by those opposite. It has been demonstrated around the world that place making and creating activity with people walking through and engaging in the community goes a considerable way towards controlling socially undesirable behaviour. On 24 July 2017, we also opened the Ellenbrook Police Station 24/7. The timing of that was interesting. The 24/7 police station, which is proving to be very effective, is intended to

Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Zak Kirkup; Dr David Honey; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Jessica Shaw; Mrs Alyssa Hayden

address any social impacts. There is also a plan in response to concerns raised in the consultation process about train noise, and some measures are being put in place to mitigate train noise.

In terms of the station features that people ranked as most important, safety was ranked as very important, along with access to parking and disability access. The point that ranked fourth is integration with the local area. I have been at pains to emphasise throughout the course of my speech that this is so important. The interface between the Ellenbrook transfer station, the bus station and the Ellenbrook train line was a key point. People raised making sure that the area is functional and that amenities are provided, with maybe toilets, showers, storage, bike storage and parking. Then there is the overall look; it has to fit in with the look and feel of the area.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

[Continued on page 8375.]