

**RAILWAY (METRONET) AMENDMENT BILL 2022**

*Second Reading*

Resumed from 16 June.

**HON SUE ELLERY (South Metropolitan — Leader of the House)** [8.13 pm] — in reply: I want to thank members for their contributions to the debate and provide a response to some of the issues that were raised. Hon Tjorn Sibma went into the Armadale line shutdown. That 18-month shutdown is required to facilitate critical rail works for the Victoria Park–Canning level crossing removal project and the Byford rail extension. Although it is not strictly within the subject of the bill, it is important to address some of the points raised about the shutdown. The shutdown of up to 18 months is required to tie in the Thornlie–Cockburn Link and to do the level crossing removal project and the Byford rail extension. The government made the decision to announce the closure 12 months in advance in order to allow for extensive consultation to be undertaken with the community. Some \$16 million has been allocated in the 2022–23 budget for Armadale line replacement bus services. A number of different shutdown options were considered; however, it was determined that shorter and more frequent shutdowns over a longer period would be more disruptive to the community over that longer term. A single extended shutdown is the least disruptive over the longer term, providing certainty for passengers and, importantly, a safer working environment for Metronet construction workers. It should be noted that after the initial announcement by the commonwealth government to fund the initial level crossing removals in Victoria Park, the Minister for Transport met with the relevant councils. Both the City of Canning and the City of Armadale requested that their councils be considered for Metronet projects and funding, and the minister subsequently took this up with the commonwealth and was successful.

The Byford rail extension and the Victoria Park and Canning level crossing removal projects are key election commitments. Those level crossings removals are particularly important due to the future increased frequency of trains from the Thornlie–Cockburn Link. The Minister for Transport and the government have acknowledged that this transformation of the Armadale line will bring significant disruption. We do understand that a long-term rail shutdown will be inconvenient for many people, businesses and the broader community, and we apologise in advance for this. Our government has a strong track record of working with the commonwealth to secure funding for transport projects, with a record amount of funding confirmed for road and rail projects throughout Western Australia.

There was some contribution on benefit–cost ratios and Infrastructure WA, and it was suggested that Infrastructure WA did not assess our Metronet projects. Infrastructure WA is required to review infrastructure proposals valued at \$100 million or more and to provide a report to the Premier prior to an investment decision being made. This function only commenced on 1 January 2022. The business cases for all Metronet projects were completed before this date and submitted to Infrastructure Australia where required. Reports on the respective projects and benefit–cost ratios were published by Infrastructure Australia. The state government respects and understands the Infrastructure Australia evaluation process; however, assessing the Byford rail extension solely on the basis of quantifiable economic outcomes is, in fact, a narrow focus to take. Rail line extension projects offer a multitude of benefits over and above traditional transport outcomes. The Infrastructure Australia evaluation process does not incorporate the wide-reaching land use and community benefits that are not quantified in traditional economic analysis, such as the market certainty for development that a new station brings and, therefore, the economic growth and community building opportunities around the upgraded Armadale station and future Byford station precincts acting as a catalyst for investment in Armadale and Byford to offer more local housing choice, create employment hubs and making it easier to access nearby community assets, significantly improve access to jobs and local amenities in Armadale and Byford, and improving community cohesion and social inclusion.

Similarly, the Infrastructure Australia evaluation does not reflect many of the long-term positive outcomes that the removal of level crossings through Victoria Park and Canning will provide. I am a resident of Victoria Park and I can tell members that the contribution to my mental health makes these projects worthwhile. The project will unlock significant areas of urban land for public use, positively influencing the way that people live, work and interact with the local community, including facilitating development of civic centres, integrating community assets and the activation of station precincts, facilitating land use development, encouraging investment in economic growth, improving the access to jobs, health and social services in the Town of Victoria Park and the City of Canning, and enhancing those connections I talked about before. The government is committed to constructing the Byford rail extension and the Victoria Park and Canning level crossing removal projects in accordance with Metronet objectives to deliver those wide-reaching benefits to the local community, providing more transport, employment and housing choice in the areas they choose to live.

Comments were made about transferred patronage. Around the world, COVID-19 has impacted public transport usage. However, our government’s safe and sensible approach to COVID-19 meant that Perth was able to sustain patronage greater than the vast majority of public transport networks interstate and internationally. In January 2022, public transport fares were capped at the cost of a two-zone fare. Notwithstanding the impacts of the latest wave of the pandemic, outer stations on Transperth’s network have experienced higher passenger numbers than the network

average, suggesting real growth in passenger numbers. Our two-zone fare cap is a cost-of-living improvement for people as well, and people are taking advantage of it.

Hon Dr Brad Pettitt, who is out of the house on urgent parliamentary business, raised some issues around precinct development. It has repeatedly been said that Metronet is more than just a rail project. Investment in rail will work as a catalyst for land use change in over 8 000 hectares of land within walkable catchments around Metronet stations. To contribute to the sustainable growth of Perth, Metronet station precincts are being designed and developed as inviting, active, safe and inclusive places for their local communities, also offering housing services, employment and recreation opportunities, which will benefit from access to a high-quality public transport.

The *Metronet Station Precincts Gateway* document provides a high-level assessment and future scenario of how planning and development around Metronet stations can contribute towards meeting the objectives of *Perth and Peel@3.5 million* and other state government policies. That document will inform a basis for further engagement with key stakeholders on how station precincts can develop over time.

Metronet is progressing well, with a number of projects completed and a record number underway. Stage 1 of the Bellevue Railcar Manufacturing and Assembly Facility is completed, with the first locally manufactured railcar to be on our tracks for testing soon—they said we could not do that! We have recreated the railcar manufacturing industry in Western Australia in just a few years.

The Denny Avenue level crossing removal has also been completed, together with the new Mandurah multistorey car park. A record number of projects are underway, and we are transforming the public transport network across Perth and the suburbs. Of course it has been, and is, a challenging environment to deliver infrastructure. We are delivering these projects during a global pandemic and now in a very tight construction market, facing significant cost pressures. But we are proud of what has been achieved by the workers on this project. Currently, over 10 000 workers are employed on our Metronet projects.

Members made the point that this bill is an enabling bill. It does not go beyond granting a head of power. Although I appreciate that people had views, questions and comments that they wanted to make about Metronet and how we are progressing, the bill is a very simple bill that will provide for a head of power. It is an enabling bill. I am happy to commend the bill to the house.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *Committee*

The Deputy Chair of Committees (Hon Dr Brian Walker) in the chair; Hon Sue Ellery (Leader of the House) in charge of the bill.

#### **Clause 1: Short title —**

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** Minister, thank you for your second reading reply speech. Behind the chair, I have given an undertaking to the minister to try to wrap this up by the adjournment tonight. I think the hardworking advisory staff deserve to get home at a suitable hour on a very wild and woolly evening. I have some questions to ask. They are reasonably predictable questions. If they are answered, that would be wonderful and I will continue along those lines.

In the minister's second reading reply speech just given then, she referred to the 18-month planned shutdown that will be a consequence of this bill passing. It is important to note that this is enabling legislation and the minister is being quite generous in opening up for further examination some of the consequences of the passage of this bill. This chamber has been told on a number of occasions that a number of shutdown options were considered prior to government making the determination that an 18-month shutdown, all things considered, was optimal and would cause the least disruption overall. How many shutdown options were considered and when were they provided to the minister for consideration?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Effectively, we are looking backwards at that. The honourable member will appreciate that I am a representative minister, not the minister. I know the member has asked a series of questions. Essentially, as I understand it, the choices made were whether to do a series of shorter shutdowns or one longer one and provide a period of certainty across that time, as opposed to providing less certainty if there were shorter shutdowns that might not be as short as the period prescribed—then the short shutdowns would start to add up, as they might not be as short as originally thought. I probably cannot take it any further than that. I am happy to raise the member's concerns with the relevant minister but that question is looking backwards and I am the representative minister so I am not sure I can give the member much more than that.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** I look forward to the minister undertaking those kinds of consultations. I will reiterate the point that the minister and the government have been quite consistent in articulating the line, or at least creating the impression, that this determination to shut down the line for 18 months was part of a longer term deliberative decision and that options—plural—were considered prior to the final decision being made. I think they were announced in

February this year. I will continue that course of action to understand what options were considered, but I might put this question: would information regarding those options be considered discoverable through a question on notice or freedom-of-information process? I want to save my time and go through the appropriate avenue. I am taking on trust that options were considered. I am just trying to understand what options there were. That is not subject to cabinet-in-confidence or commercial-in-confidence considerations. I just want to try to get an understanding of why there is a reluctance to provide the information.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** I do not think I could answer the question whether it is discoverable through FOI, and I am not sure that anyone at the table could tell me. The member has asked a series of questions and I have had to give him those answers. I am happy to raise his concerns again and I understand why he is asking the question but it is looking backwards. As a representative minister, I am not able to add anything further.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** I thank the minister. Would the minister be in a position to outline when this particular decision was made, and whether it was made by the minister or was a cabinet decision?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** The best advice that I can give the member is late last year, but I am not able to take it much beyond that.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** I thank the minister. I acknowledge that, although some members and stakeholders may have been confronted by the announcement, the government has actually done the right thing in providing quite extensive forewarning about the fact that it will be shut down. I will probably have some questions about the economic impact of that shutdown and how bus services or otherwise might be provided. We have been acting on the assumption that, all things being equal, the shutdown will commence in very early 2023, so next year. Might I ask what preconditions are required to initiate the shutdown at that time, and what degree of slippage is embedded in that forecast?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** I cannot give the member a precise date. With regard to what needs to happen beforehand, I can tell the member that the government expects to announce the contract details shortly; the member can take “shortly” and define it however what he wants to define it. Once that is done, there will need to be consultation with the proponents. They need to secure plant and material, including the precast beams, and then do all the prep work that needs to happen. We have a broad outline of when we think that work can be done, when it can start and therefore when it can finish, but a whole lot of preparatory work has to happen once that contract is awarded.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** I thank the minister for that. I might get to the contract dimension subsequently. Would it be fair to assume that preparatory work might be contingent upon labour force availability and supply availability? I am not going to hold the government to a firm start date; presumably, though, the government is operating within windows of contingency. Is it fair to assume that the government intends to effectively commence the shutdown—although that is a weird way to phrase it—within the first quarter of 2023, or might it slip beyond that? Are there risk factors that might push the commencement of the shutdown, and obviously the completion of the project, further to the right?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** It is fair to say that, from the assessment work that has been done already, we think it is achievable to start early next year. The clock starts ticking on the 18 months from there. In terms of the contract, it is probably less about labour, because those putting in for the contract would already have an understanding of their workforce. But it might be around some of those other elements of materials and plans. So the best advice is that we believe it is achievable. Once the contract is awarded and those consultations occur, it might be that there is some slippage; I cannot predict whether there will or will not be, but the best advice is that the time frame announced is achievable.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** I might pick up on a reference to the finalisation of the contract. I appreciate that the government will make an announcement when it is appropriate to do so, when it is consistent with other planning. When this matter was raised in the other place in the course of debate—possibly in March or April, from memory—the Minister for Transport gave an indication that the contract negotiations were approaching their final end point. Might I reasonably assume from the advice provided today that there has been a contractual outcome and that parties have signed?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** The best I can tell the honourable member is that an announcement will be made shortly.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** Thank you, minister—I had to try. I seek some advice. This is a very short bill in terms of clauses. Where I do not see a natural fit, my tendency is to put matters into the debate on clause 1. The intention here is to refer to a document that is also attached to the bill.

**Hon Sue Ellery:** Is this what you’re referring to?

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** No, it is not the plan. It is a report from the Director General of Transport on the plan of construction. I think this is a required element under the Transport Coordination Act. Is clause 1 the best place?

**Hon Sue Ellery:** Yes. I’m relaxed about that.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** Okay. I raise this due to the obvious fact, which the minister referenced in her second reading speech, that a business case of some sort was provided to Infrastructure Australia for evaluation. We might have different views on methodology, but the project was funded in part by the commonwealth. In a previous, similar bill—the Railway (Forrestfield-Airport Link) Bill 2015—the report that we are referring to also included quite explicit reference to a project definition plan:

“A project Definition Plan (PDP) has been produced following extensive consultation with the relevant stakeholders including the Department of Planning; Main Roads Western Australia; the City of Belmont; the Shire of Kalamunda; the Department of Transport; the Department of Aboriginal Affairs; Perth Airport Pty Ltd and the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development.”

In relation to the Railway (METRONET) Amendment Bill 2022, has a PDP been prepared for the Armadale line railway projects? If that document—or documents—exists, can it be tabled?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** The PDP exists. I am advised that the intention is to release that when the announcement is made, and the announcement will be made shortly.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** The minister has me on tenterhooks! Might I ask a question about the PDP? Given the limited opportunity, I might as well try. A dimension of this project involves the elevated rail through Victoria Park. I think the Leader of the House said that she puts a lot of store in her own mental health on the completion of the project, and I wish her well in that respect!

**Hon Sue Ellery:** My mental health is important for everyone here!

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** Least of all for us humble types labouring in opposition.

That dimension of the project—the elevated rail component—was probably not, I think, in the initial concept. If I might put it this way: were different versions of project definition plans drafted and devised over the course of the last five years as they relate to the Armadale line? If so, how many versions are there and when was the most current version, which is about to be released, developed?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** I am told that no, only one was ever created for that purpose.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** That was quite a definitive answer. Might I ask when the drafting of that PDP commenced and when it was finalised?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** I do not have a date. I do not have that information available. I am advised that before the PDP was done, a range of options and analysis was done and there were a few variations of that which resulted in one PDP. I am also advised—I think I need to say this for completeness—that a summary of the PDP is what will be released when an announcement is made.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** Over the course of the next two or three minutes, I will ascertain the process of the decision-making. Did the PDP, or a version of it, form part of the business case that was provided to Infrastructure Australia? I presume that if they are not exactly the same documents, there is a degree of commonality between the business case, as proposed on an economic basis, and what the government proposes to do. Was the PDP provided to Infrastructure Australia, or was a summary or executive summary of it provided?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** A lot of lingo is being thrown around tonight. For Infrastructure Australia’s purpose, as I understand it, the options analysis work that I described before is what constitutes a business case in its terminology. The PDP is the final decision document that goes to Infrastructure Australia, but I think the member might find that the expressions “PDP business case” and “options analysis work” et cetera are probably interchangeable in different jurisdictions. But for this purpose, I understand that the business case and the options analysis is the work that was done at the beginning of the process, and that the final document that is delivered to Infrastructure Australia is the PDP.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** I thank the minister. For the purposes of the state government making its decision to approve expenditure, is it the options analysis work or the project development plan more mature that forms the basis for the minister or the government more broadly to approve the project and its funding requirements?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** I am not sure what the member is seeking, but I put it to him this way: the PDP is the final product. It is the normal process by which the state government makes decisions. There may well be an Expenditure Review Committee consideration. That may well then go to a cabinet decision. The development of the PDP and all that work occurs after the decision to invest has been made.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** I suppose the question was: is the consideration of the PDP the body of work that the minister relies upon to take to the Expenditure Review Committee for cabinet approval?

**Hon Sue Ellery:** The PDP is the very end product that goes beyond state government, in this case, to Infrastructure Australia.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** It is the end of the line. Has it occurred in relation to Metronet projects or is it foreseeable that the state, the ERC and then cabinet might approve a version of a project that differed from the PDP that is produced at the end? Is there a degree of integrity between the documents? I suppose what I am asking here is: is there a possibility for a PDP for this or some other project to expand or contract in scope or in scale or in the phasing and differ from what the state government thought it was signing up to at the initial point?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** The broad, simplest answer is yes. In this case, for example, there has been a change of government. Obviously, we go through the process of making sure that the new government commits to the things that the previous government had committed to. But in a more general sense, I am a member of ERC as well and, from time to time, whether it is this project or other projects, if there is a significant shift in scope or something happens of some significance, it goes back to ERC or cabinet. Things frequently do, particularly in the current environment.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** I suppose I will wait to see the summary of the PDP that comes out with the announcement that the contract has been awarded.

Moving on, might now be an appropriate time to ask about the relationship between this bill, its implications for the build out of this Metronet component and the overall railway growth plan that is worked on by the Public Transport Authority? Can I do that on clause 1?

**Hon Sue Ellery:** You can. To what extent I am able to answer it, we will see, but I am relaxed about when you ask it.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** I might dovetail them all into clause 1. It might expedite the process if there is no objection moving forward. Can I ask, first and foremost, whether this bill aligns with the Public Transport Authority's rail growth plan?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Yes.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** That is comforting to know. The last I checked, that rail growth plan was not publicly available on the Public Transport Authority website, so unless I am navigating cyberspace inexpertly, would it be possible to ask for a copy of the rail growth plan to be tabled?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** That is a good try. I am told it never has been made public. It is an internal working document that the agency relies on, so no.

**Hon Peter Collier:** Be a trailblazer!

**Hon Sue Ellery:** You don't be a trailblazer when you're a representative minister. It is a career-shortening exercise.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** They are certainly words from the wise; I will bear that in mind if my political career takes me anywhere.

I am bringing this up because I think the rail growth plan is actually explicitly referred to in the course of budget paper No 2, which piqued my interest in the issue. I might take this up at another opportunity, but I think that, in the absence of there being any commercially sensitive information—I doubt that—having an insight into longer term agency or PTA strategic asset management framework planning is actually to the benefit of everybody. I suppose the particular dimension I am interested in is how often that particular core strategic document, which I am understanding it to be, is rewritten, and how it is rewritten in the light of government funding priorities and the like. I assume that I am not going to be satisfied by that document being tabled tonight; I will ask for it elsewhere and I will seek some clarity via the minister in the usual format for why that document is guarded so secretly. But I am also interested in that document because I would presume—I can only proceed on the basis of some presumption, equal parts guesswork and the other being reliably informed—that a rail growth plan, by sheer title, would give an indication of forecast patronage pools, presumably including future population models, because I could not understand why the department would make long-term infrastructure decisions that are dependent on receiving some fares without having a sensible understanding of population movements and densities. I mention it because the absence of that information would be a dereliction of planning if it does not exist. Has there been a forecast of boardings over, say, a five-year period as a result of the works that the government is going to undertake? I will leave it there for now.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** I am advised that when the summary of the project definition plan is released when the announcement is made, the member will see within that projected patronage at opening, and then the general year that is used beyond that is 2031. The member will see those when that material is released.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** I might just get into the timing and phasing. Because a number of projects are incorporated in this, including the rebuilding of stations, the removal of level crossings and the elevated rail component as we have discussed, is the Leader of the House able to provide, in her representative capacity, any indication of when the project's subcomponents might be delivered? I might start with the easiest bit first. For example, will work on the Byford extension happen concurrently with the works on the elevated rail component through Victoria Park or will

those be broken apart? Is it more sensible for the government to do the level crossing removal first? If the Leader of the House could provide any insight into the easier to deliver bits and the longer term bits, that would be great.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** I am advised that there will be two separate contractors for each project. They will generally occur concurrently. I do not have any more information on how they will be sequenced within each project. I guess they will need to work that out themselves inside those projects.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** I thank the Leader of the House for that; I appreciate that. I am also interested in the potential impact of work on this Metronet component, broadly speaking, on other elements of Metronet project delivery. Is there a relationship between the scheduling of these works and their impact, for example, on the Thornlie–Cockburn Link being delivered; and, if so, what might that be?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Some of the works around the Thornlie–Cockburn Link and the Armadale line extension are being reconfigured so that they can take advantage of that 18-month shutdown, so as to minimise disruption outside that period.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** From my layperson's understanding of the reconfiguring of the works, I assume that the principal body of works relating to the Thornlie–Cockburn Link can be accomplished within the 18-month shutdown window. Is that how I should understand that or have I got that wrong?

**Hon Sue Ellery:** The advice I have been given is that to the extent that they overlap, the timing has been reconfigured to bring that overlap within the 18-month period.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** I thank the Leader of the House. Moving along—I actually do not have too many subthemes—I want to focus a little on the elevated railway component at the northern end of the line. Reflecting on the nature of this jurisdiction and the need to bring forward bespoke pieces of legislation to enable any railway construction to occur, I might ask the obvious question. We are principally talking about grade-level rail, except for this elevated component. Am I right to assume that no further legislative requirements are needed to enable the elevated rail component through the inner city?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Yes, that is correct.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** Would it be a different scenario if the government had chosen to tunnel, for example, or would that option be covered by this bill? It is a slightly hypothetical question. I am just trying to understand how it works.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** The methodology, whether it is above or below ground or at ground level, does not matter. It is an enabling bill, which can enable any methodology.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** The need for legislation is modelled as independent or agnostic on delivery options.

I am interested to get a further insight because presumably any body of significant works in a dense urban environment will, by its very nature, be disruptive, irrespective of how those works are delivered, as the sheer fact of the 18-month shutdown attests to. Can I get an understanding of the economic base case which preferences above ground or elevated rail delivery over a tunnelling option? I am agnostic on these issues. I am just trying to understand the economic drivers of this because I think the government has made a claim that yes, it has conceded that, overall, if we adopted a strictly dry economic analysis to this particular venture, it is not cash flow positive, there is no positive MPV, we get 36¢ back for every dollar delivered. The government has made a case for why that is, which I will leave where it is. Obviously, if economic considerations are not the only consideration, is there a significant difference in the cost of delivery between tunnelling and elevated rail? I would like to know what that is.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** At grade level is the cheapest, but that does not get rid of the level crossings. The next is to elevate. The most expensive option is to tunnel. There are variations of how a tunnel is done but that is the most expensive option.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** The minister may not be in a position to provide this information now but I will probably ask it through the usual process. If a dollar amount is available, that would be fabulous. Obviously, this is dependent on the geotechnical realities of the location with which we are dealing. I appreciate those variables. Is there a cost per track kilometre comparative between at-grade versus elevated versus tunnelling options for something like the Victoria Park precinct?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** There is not a dollar matrix, if you like; that is a kind of standard that we can apply across the board. It depends on all the things that we might imagine it would depend on, including the topography. We do not have those numbers here for this project.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** There is a confluence of themes and interests here. I might move to the issue of consultation, in a way distinct from consultation with affected local governments, commuters, Main Roads and the Public Transport Authority over the 18-month shutdown, but more specifically with the degree of consultation undertaken thus far and ongoing and planned around the particular land use dimensions and outcomes that an elevated rail line will

present. Would the minister be able to provide some sort of insight into who is included in those stakeholder consultations and where they are directed at? For example, is there a degree of a finer definition of “project imprint” and the utilisation of what I will inexpertly call “dead space” underneath? If the minister could provide some insight into that, I would be most appreciative.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** I am advised that activation underneath the elevation is subject to consultation obviously with local government, so at officer level those discussions are ongoing. Briefings have been provided to councillors. Community reference groups have been set up, and that is how that consultation is occurring. The final concepts for what that will look like is a fair way off from now.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** I have one or two further questions on this line. I might just ask a basic question. How high off the ground is the elevation likely to be and what will that present in physical constraints and opportunities?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** All will be revealed in the project definition plan summary that is released, and an announcement will happen shortly.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** I am going to apply that answer somewhat pre-emptively to my next five planned questions. I think the minister has demonstrated what experience and a very senior executive decision-making role in the government brings to these proceedings, and she has saved herself and her hardworking staff some time as well, which is a lovely way to start our first sitting day back after the winter recess.

**Hon Sue Ellery:** I’ve been doing it for 21 years.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** There you go. I am in the minister’s debt. I might do this to a future Labor opposition member!

**Hon Sue Ellery:** And I’ll be long gone when that happens—the year 2075!

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** I can tell the minister that hope dies last!

I might ask about some of the impacts of the passage of this bill and the build-out of Metronet on some existing infrastructure just to understand the full impact of the passage of this legislation. I understand that there was an upgrade to Beckenham train station or it opened in 2014 and that station will be affected by this upgrade to some degree. Can the minister quantify the monetary value of what the government is doing there? Can she explain that, because I am interested to know how this work will affect infrastructure delivered within, say, the last 10 years.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** I am advised that the 2014 upgrade was less than \$10 million. It went to making the station accessible and providing some additional shelter. What is proposed, essentially, is a new station, so a significantly higher investment.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** Does that assume the demolition or significant remodelling of the existing station to build a new one?

**Hon Sue Ellery:** Yes.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** Is there any other similar infrastructure that has been remodelled or opened in the last 10 years that will have to be demolished or reconfigured in a substantial way?

**Hon Sue Ellery:** As part of these two projects?

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** Yes.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** We do not have that information here. We think there were probably a range of minor works that occurred since 2010–11. I am happy to take that on notice and, if the minister agrees, we can provide the member with that.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** I appreciate that. My next area of interest, substantially, is the very welcome dimension of this project that involves level crossing removal in the metropolitan area. It might not actually to some degree pass muster with the bean counters at Infrastructure Australia, but from a road transport user perspective it makes a lot of sense. To clarify, are there four or six level crossings that will be removed as part of this? I am trying to get my bearings right.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** There are 14 level crossing removals across these two projects and 17 removals in total across Metronet to date.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** That is excellent. How does this compare with the government’s other level crossing removal projects that are in train? I picked this up from budgets past, unrelated to Metronet. If it is possible to provide those figures in both the urban and regional context, that would be appreciated.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** I am not sure I properly understood the member’s question, but there are 17 in total. We have recently closed Caledonian Avenue, Maylands. Denny Avenue, Kelmscott, was closed in 2020–21. There are six Victoria Park–Canning level crossings. The Byford extension includes the removal of eight. There is the crossing at Morrison Road on the Midland line.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** The community statewide obviously takes an interest in level crossing issues. I am trying to ascertain, if possible, the number of existing level crossings, even in the metropolitan area, that will be untouched by these Metronet projects, and how many there are overall that will be remediated in time.

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** In the metropolitan area, 18 will not be impacted by Metronet. In regional Western Australia, there are hundreds.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clauses 2 and 3 put and passed.**

**Clause 4: Long title amended —**

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** My interest concerns the destination of Mundijong or whether it is, indeed, a destination. I think the current bill provides permission for the Byford rail extension to a location just north of Mundijong. I want to understand whether I have this right; would this bill enable a decision to extend to Mundijong proper, or would that require another piece of enabling legislation?

**Hon SUE ELLERY:** Section 96 of the act is required to get Parliament to enable a special act authorising construction of each new railway. The legislation prescribes that each act shall state as nearly as may be the line of the railway and the two termini thereof. Over the last 20 years, new acts have been progressed only once a project has been planned to an extent that the general alignment and station locations are known based on an approved project. Although a potential extension of the electrified passenger line to Mundijong has been identified in the future, there is no certainty around the timing or design of that line, including where it might terminate. The Public Transport Authority sought to include only the extent of the current approved works. I am not sure whether I can take it much beyond there.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clauses 5 and 6 put and passed.**

**Title put and passed.**

*Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by **Hon Sue Ellery (Leader of the House)**, and passed.