

# **PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE**

**TRANSPORT PORTFOLIO'S RESPONSE TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED  
IN THE TWENTY-SECOND AUDIT REPORT OF 2015 ENTITLED  
"SAFE AND VIABLE CYCLING IN THE PERTH METROPOLITAN AREA"**



**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE  
TAKEN AT PERTH  
WEDNESDAY, 13 JUNE 2018**

## **SESSION TWO**

### **Members**

**Dr A.D. Buti (Chair)  
Mr D.C. Nalder (Deputy Chair)  
Mr V.A. Catania  
Mr S.A. Millman  
Mrs L.M. O'Malley**

---

**Hearing commenced at 10.37 am**

**Ms NINA LYHNE**

**Acting Director General, Department of Transport, examined:**

**Mr CRAIG JOHN WOOLDRIDGE**

**Acting Executive Director, Integrated Transport, Department of Transport, examined:**

**Mr STEVE BEYER**

**Acting Managing Director, Department of Transport, examined:**

**Mr PETER SEWELL**

**Director, Metropolitan Operations, Main Roads Western Australia, examined:**

**The CHAIRMAN:** Thank you for appearing today to discuss the transport portfolio's response to the recommendations contained in the twenty-second audit report of 2015, "Safe and Viable Cycling in the Perth Metropolitan Area". My name is Tony Buti, I am the committee Chair and the member for Armadale. To my left is Mr Dean Nalder, the committee's Deputy Chair and member for Bateman and a very keen cyclist; to his left is Mr Vince Catania, member for North West Central; to my right is Mr Simon Millman, member for Mount Lawley; and coming in for a grand entrance is Mrs Lisa O'Malley, member for Bicton. I would like to advise you that the committee has asked the new Auditor General, Ms Caroline Spencer, and her performance audit team to observe today's proceedings from the public gallery. Following the hearing, the committee may consult with the audit team for clarification of matters raised. I would also like to advise that today's hearings will be broadcast live on the Parliament House website. It is important that you understand that any deliberate misleading of this committee may be regarded as a contempt of Parliament. Your evidence is protected by parliamentary privilege; however, this privilege does not apply to anything you may say outside of today's proceedings.

Do you have any questions about your attendance here today?

**Mr SEWELL:** No.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I will offer you the chance to make a brief opening statement, if you wish. We do not have a lot of time so we will try and keep our questions succinct, and it would be lovely if you could keep your answers as succinct as possible, and we may have some follow-up questions if we run out of time. Do you want to make an opening statement?

**Ms LYHNE:** If I may, I would not mind just making a brief opening statement.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Yes.

**Ms LYHNE:** We would like to put on the record that we have taken the Office of the Auditor General's findings very seriously and we have taken a number of actions, which we will go through in as much detail as you want. I guess as a big-picture view, we have reviewed the functions related to cycling, as I said, across our portfolio. We have moved resources from different parts of the portfolio and increased our resourcing in this area since the Auditor General's findings. It is also important to note that the government budget announcements have been at record levels for cycling and that there have been significant increases in the budget that are now available for cycling for us to do the work there. This additional money has allowed us to plan for some of the key missing links which we are all very aware of: Mitchell Freeway, along the Fremantle line, and obviously other works as well. In

addition to that, we have improved the governance around cycling across the organisation and have put in place a structure that enables not only good cross-portfolio collaboration and decision-making but also inclusion of the relevant interest groups in consultation processes and so forth.

[10.40 am]

Specifically in relation to the Auditor General's recommendations, we did publish an update in July 2017 which I believe is publicly available and obviously available to you. So, just by very quick summary of that, we have done a lot of work in planning and delivery since the findings of the Auditor General. We have done a lot of work around data collection; we have still got a journey to go there but we are increasingly collecting data and using that data. We have been working increasingly with local government not only in terms of helping them with guidelines, but also in terms of routes. Incident data is an ongoing challenge but we have a number of strategies in place to collect and improve incident data collection. We have been working with the Road Safety Commission on various awareness campaigns, and also we have been doing a fair bit of promotion around things like safe active streets, bike boulevards and working with local governments on those sorts of things. There is a lot more to it, but just as an overview that is a brief statement.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. In regards to recommendation 3, there were many things that the Department of Transport and Main Roads were asked to do or consider. One was to identify demand for transport options to inform and finalise a transport planning framework for Perth which integrates all forms of transport. I believe you are preparing a central area transport plan for 2025 which will consider all forms of transport including active transport, but that has not been developed yet, is that right; and, if not, when will it be developed?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** That plan was just for the central area; it was not all of Perth. The plan that was developed is Perth@3.5, which is notionally around the 2050 time frame. So, we have developed a network for all of greater Perth, including the Peel region as well, which has all levels of cycling catered for. That was the most downloaded part of the long-term transport network plan, so very well received, and we are now working with local councils to go through and finalise that part of the plan over the next two years.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** What we are seeing around the world is this focus on the integration of cycling as a mode of transport, and in here about this central area transport plan. Are you able to share, just for the benefit of us, where you are at in your thinking of that and how far away it is before that becomes public? Because we are seeing in other parts, like London and all of that, clearly delineated cycleways taking up whole lanes of roads being converted to cycleways to get more and more traffic coming in through cycling. How are we thinking about that and what is the approach, and how far away would that plan be?

**Mr BEYER:** I think the first and foremost active principle we are working from is that people who do not cycle will start to cycle if they have got actually a safe cycling environment to ride in. The clear indication and the primary reason why people do not ride is they are uncomfortable riding on roads, and particularly busy roads and especially when you get into major centres. So, already in the CBD we have got protected bike lanes—well, not quite protected but actually dedicated bike lanes on Barrack Street, and obviously the principal shared path network feeding into the CBD. Within the CBD, there is still some work we have got to do with the City of Perth to actually start to move towards the next level of definition for the cycle network which actually crosses the CBD, north-south particularly, on roads like Milligan Street or Hill Street, and things like that. We will be revisiting that, particularly now that there is some stability in the City of Perth, over the next 12 months or so and putting a proposal to the government probably next year at some stage. There is a wider set of issues, with the City of Perth Act now encompassing all the way down to UWA and

QEII, as to how we integrate that area. There are a number of things we have actually got to do as part of that inner-city transport plan, but cycling obviously will be a key part of all of that one.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** What was that, next year sometime? Midyear next year?

**Mr BEYER:** It is probably 12 months of development work and we will get a proposal to the government and start to sort of fine-tune it from there.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** We recently held that cycling day with the parliamentarians and there were some more gaps that were identified; that is, connecting the Kwinana Freeway PSP, or as you come in across the Narrows, comes up by Parliament and then stops, and then you have got Mitchell Freeway coming in—so connecting those two. Is that the sort of thing that you are looking at doing?

**Mr BEYER:** Yes, they are the big, complex ones, when you are trying to integrate new cycling activity into a freeway environment. We are obviously doing that in the build phase with extending the Mitchell Freeway path up to Karrinyup Road. It is being constructed at the same time as Main Roads is widening the freeway as part of smart freeways for the southbound lanes. The delivery package makes some sense. Yes, we will be tackling those more complex proposals of how you get north-south linkages up and back from the Narrows Bridge through to the Mitchell Freeway path. There, it obviously requires not just lines on maps but a fair bit of complex design work to say how do you in fact do that in a fairly space-constrained environment anyway.

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** We do have a preliminary design for that. Main Roads has done detailed surveys through there and done a preliminary design. It still needs some refinement through there, but we are working away on that. It is a medium to long-term project but obviously scoping that out so it does fit in with the environment.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** If I look at Elizabeth Quay—this may have happened before some of the disciplines occurred and focusing on cycling—have we failed in the sense of we have got a PSP that comes up Riverside Drive to Elizabeth Quay on the east side and then you have to hop out on the road and go around because the cobblestones are too rough, or you can ride around over the bridge but you have got to watch out for a lot of pedestrians; it is very heavy pedestrian and it is not really ideal for thoroughfare cycling. Has that been a failure and is that something that we are now addressing through the better integrated planning on cycling?

**Ms LYHNE:** Just as a general comment there, obviously there are those very congested environments where there is significant competition for the space but, as a broader comment, as a part of all our future planning of cycling, NorthLink and all those projects incorporate cycling as a key component of the future. There are more challenging environments competing for space—it is challenging—but certainly planning for the future, cycling is a key component of the planning, yes.

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** I think if we are looking back at that project, one thing we did not have when Elizabeth Quay started was that long-term transport network plan for the whole of the metro area, so it was a piecemeal approach. There was the old WA bike network plan, but it did not really describe the needs. We have much more progressed in that area so when projects do come up now we can clearly demonstrate what our needs are, whether that is separated cycling facilities or shared space.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Yes. My question has been: has the process been developed, or matured, since Elizabeth Quay? If we go back to the planning, which goes back a few years, now you would not find that situation where cycling was left out of that planning process?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** No.

---

**Mr BEYER:** Yes. We have worked very actively with the Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority as part of Elizabeth Quay. I mean, I do not see what now is at Elizabeth Quay as a failure by any means. I think it simply reflects that sometimes you have got an opportunity, like with NorthLink and some of the outer urban major road projects, where you can create a perfect solution. In other cases we are actually having to optimise things around some difficult choices, and that requires some flexibility by motorists, for our public transport system, for our cyclists as well. I think Elizabeth Quay is exactly the same as a number of our suburban train stations where you have got PSP networks going through train stations and you cannot simply say, “Okay, we’ll build a four-metre path and it’s going to be separate, and if you’re actually in a peloton you can go through at 40 kilometres an hour.” You have to reflect that actually at some places you are going to have to slow down, and that will either require a behavioural response or it might require a more active response, where we put in some sort of slowdown facilities to get people to say you are actually in an environment where you have got people mixing and you actually have to respect that environment.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Yes, but you are doing things like updating stations like Bayswater station where you are actually separating the PSP away from the car park—it used to go through the middle of the car park—and creating its own PSP.

**Mr BEYER:** Yes.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I acknowledge you have to slow down. But if I look at Elizabeth Quay, there used to be a cycle path—yes, you would have to go through a couple of roads in —

**Mr S.A. MILLMAN:** Barrack Street Jetty.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** — the Barrack Street Jetty, but you could link up the two PSPs.

**Mr BEYER:** Sure.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Whereas now it does not, and you put them back on the road. There is a laneway that goes through the middle of Elizabeth Quay, but it has got cobblestones. It is too rough to be able to put the bikes on. To me, I think with some proper planning you would have actually created a cycle connection through to the other PSP, through that methodology, if you had your time again. That is what I would say, particularly in that. There is an element around connectivity of our PSP network, which is the broader connectivity to communities, but then you have got the connections within communities. The CBD area is that internal where people are worried about, and I am assuming this plan that will come out next year will put a greater spotlight on that that sits within, to make sure you not only get to the CBD but you can get to where you need to in the CBD.

[10:50 am]

**Ms LYHNE:** That is the intention, yes.

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Yes, so protected bike lanes are certainly what we would like to see and what the public would like to see in the CBD. That will have some impacts on probably parking, but as the city evolves to be more of a service-orientated industry, the need for parking on-street does diminish as well, so it is an opportunity to actually have a fresh look at what that cross-section is to have a better outcome for cycling as well.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** So is the state still looking at end-of-trip facilities to encourage and foster that environment? Is that something that is part of the consideration for the plan?

**Mr BEYER:** We are doing it through the planning system. We are not doing it through proposals to government to say, “Look, there is a role for government to go and invest in an end-of-trip facility and have that as a public facility”, so we have fairly significant end-of-trip facilities in public in commercial buildings in the CBD, and that, in the main, is serving the actual demand within the city.

---

There are, obviously, u-rails and other things for people who ride occasionally into the CBD. With big shopping centre proposals in recent years, we have actually likewise worked with the developers to actually build in end-of-trip facilities as part of their expansion of their shopping centres. So it is really a way of how we can actually get the private sector to deliver those as part of a commercial development, rather than the government sort of necessarily saying, "Look, hang on; we think there is a demand for a public facility in the middle of the CBD or elsewhere to cater for those that might want to ride in occasionally."

**Mr S.A. MILLMAN:** My question was further to that. Just in terms of those end-of-trip facilities, is there a role for government to play in promoting facilities that are provided by the private sector? Is that possible? Is it possible for government to promote those facilities that are provided by the private sector, or are they exclusive use?

**Mr BEYER:** Well, we promote them to the extent of encouraging the private sector to provide them, to the extent that there needs to be; is there a public website around to say where they are? In the main, the difficulty is that they are available for the tenants of buildings rather than for occasional use. So where we are wanting to cater for the general public is really working with the local authorities to actually provide some sort of way of securing your bike when you actually come into the city, whether it is on a u-rail or some type of other facility.

**Mr S.A. MILLMAN:** In terms of the difference of opinion between Mr Beyer and Mr Nalder on Elizabeth Quay, and whether or not you go around or you go through, Mr Wooldridge, in terms of the formulation of your plan, how effective is the public input aspect of that? Is there a consultation process? Is it advertised, and is it advertised through local councils as well, because a lot of cyclists go to their local councils for advice?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Yes, it goes through a number of phases. So the long-term plan that went out in 2016 had a consultation process, so we had feedback there. The next stage, where we go local government by local government area, again, we work with the local council and we work with the community, so we are drilling down at a more local level. There are multiple aspects where the public have an opportunity to get engaged. We still need to do a bit more work to actually get more public involved in that conversation, but certainly we do work at all levels across the community.

**Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY:** I would quite like to pick up on that issue at the local government level. We are able to identify greater connectiveness and greater health outcomes in our local communities when we get out and get active. In that, I see the local government plays an incredibly important role, and I guess I would like to understand a little bit more what the interplay is between what we are seeking here with this report outcome and what has been evidenced at the local government level. It may be something you will need to take away and get some more detailed information for us on, but I am interested in things like the development of those local bike networks and pathways at the local government level, boulevards, and give us a little bit more information on that.

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Yes. If we look at the safe active streets, the bike boulevards, there was a pilot program three years ago that has now evolved to be in a very good place. With those, we work very closely with the local community and the local council, so it is basically in people's front yards. We have three projects under construction at the moment, and others are well and truly in the planning phase. With that, we do develop a map which basically indicates where the local facilities are, so we try to encourage people, "There is an opportunity to actually get out of your car for those shorter trips or the medium trips", whether it be the library or the town centre, in a safer environment. We are finding people are actually cycling on the road more now than on the footpath, so that has freed up the footpath space for the pedestrians, which is a great outcome. Kids are playing out in the street again, which we probably have not seen since the 1960s or 1970s. So we are seeing some

fantastic outcomes. We are still early days, but the activation part of the projects is key as well. If we look back five years ago, we are just going, “Build the infrastructure and hope that people use it.” Now we are actively doing a lot more promotion to say, “Here’s your local infrastructure and amenity; here’s how you can use it”, and actually encourage people to give it a try, and people who try it as recreation first can actually migrate on to commuting as well, so there are multiple benefits. We are also working quite closely with people like the Heart Foundation and the LiveLighter campaign, so we are tapping into various sources to actually get that activation and get people more active out there as well.

**Mrs L.M. O’MALLEY:** Just to follow on from that, as far as the local government’s role in that, how do you gather the data as to how much engagement you are getting in your local governments and what they are doing on the ground to support?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Most of the local councils in Perth are very active in the cycling space, so they are very keen to update their bike plans. We probably have about five or six of those being reviewed at any given time, but as we go through that longer process where we get the agreed state local government plan, that will be our plan long-term going forward. That will remove some of that every five years, “Let us go and review the plan”, so we have an ultimate plan. And then we basically work through with them and work out where the priorities are for their high-priority projects, and gain agreement for a five-year program to roll out their plan. Some of that will involve seeking grants from state government; some of that will be just funded purely by local government, or they can seek other funding through the federal government or other parties as well.

We do encourage them to pick the strategic links—so, where we get the most benefits, get more people cycling, particularly connecting to the PSP network, town centres and employment et cetera. That is where our key focus is. So we are getting the longer links and better outcomes.

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** You mentioned at the start how your budget has increased. How much has it increased, and from what period has it increased?

**Ms LYHNE:** Overall, over the forward estimates, it is now a budget of \$134 million. Steve, you might just go into a bit more detail about where it has come from and where it is now?

**Mr BEYER:** In 2011–12, we had, in DOT, \$2.66 million per year, which was funding for about \$1 million for our principal shared path investment, and the balance split across grants to metropolitan local councils and regional councils—\$2.66 million—and then Main Roads had some major project investments. So where things like Forrest Highway was built, there would be a PSP built, but occasionally, it depended on major projects. We have gone now to \$134 million over four years within our portfolio.

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** Gone from what year? So is that the 2017–18 year onwards?

**Mr BEYER:** Sorry; \$134 million is the four-year forward estimates number. That is over the four-year investment. We have \$20 million per year for the PSP network compared with the \$1 million back in 2011–12. We are moving towards a program of \$5 million per year for local government investment for bike grants, and we have a rolling program of \$3 million a year for the bike boulevards program and then, on top of that, the major projects that Main Roads have.

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** In terms of Metronet and the networks that are going to be built there, are you providing any bike networks to the Metronet network?

**Mr BEYER:** It is a key part of the Metronet planning to how you connect local networks into those station facilities, and then the investment will become evident as the project development plans for Metronet are actually finalised.

---

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** So the \$134 million includes the planning for cycle paths for Metronet; is that correct?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** The \$134 million is basically the capital expenditure on projects, so the planning is a separate —

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** Including Metronet?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** No. The Metronets are future. We have people working closely with the Metronet team to actually make sure the cycle networks are built around those station precincts, but the funding may come from other sources either within Metronet or beyond Metronet as well.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** With NorthLink, which has a PSP going up to Ellenbrook–Mucka, do the numbers you talk about include that PSP, or is that PSP included in the road budget?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** No. Part of the \$134 million does include the cycle network within major projects like NorthLink, so for NorthLink, that was over about a three-year period. Obviously, stage 1 was opened up on the weekend, and I rode that this morning.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Stage 1 is open? The PSP is?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Yes, five or six kilometres of PSP is now open, and I have seen some good cyclists out there this morning, so it is getting some growth.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** That gets you out to Ellenbrook?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** No; to Benara Road. Stage 2 is Ellenbrook, which is about the middle of next year.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** That is right.

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** With this \$134 million over the next four years, or estimates, that policy has been driven by this government, by the minister; is that right?

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** No. NorthLink comes off what we put in.

**Ms LYHNE:** Yes, it is a program of capital works to develop the PSP to fill the gaps that I mentioned earlier and others. So it is a program of capital works.

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** So when was that program established?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** If you go back in time, year 2000, when Main Roads started including, as a mandatory exercise, if they are building a major project like a freeway or NorthLink, a PSP as part of that project. That has been in place for 18 years now. It is well and truly understood, and it is working very well.

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** So this funding is new funding that has come onstream over the next four years?

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** NorthLink funding has been there from the previous administration—NorthLink PSP.

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** But not the \$134 million, is it?

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Yes, that is —

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** There has been a significant increase in our principal shared path funding. We did have \$7.34 million previously. We are now \$23 million a year for the next two years.

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** Sorry; I just want to get this right. The \$134 million is from this budget that has just been handed down onwards; is that correct?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Yes; that is the next four years.

---



**Mr BEYER:** Four years.

**Ms LYHNE:** Yes, that is right.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** But it includes some infrastructure projects that the previous administration put in place, like NorthLink, and so the PSP funding is in that \$134 million for NorthLink, which comes from the previous administration.

**Mr BEYER:** Yes, the member is correct. I made a reference point of 2011–12 was a base of \$2.66 million, plus some occasional major project investment by Main Roads. That was the base, but there has been a progressive increase in funding over those years to the current government then coming in with an election commitment to step up the amount of funding available for the PSP network, as Craig has mentioned, as well as for grants and for the bike boulevards program.

**The CHAIRMAN:** In regards to the PSP and the local government involvement, there is a difference in quality of the one that you are having more control over and the one that local governments have control over. What do we do to try to improve the standards of local government control?

**Mr BEYER:** Let us firstly work back. Just reiterating what Craig was saying, part of the problem that came out of the Auditor General thing was there was a bit of a disconnect between what local government was trying to achieve and what state government was wanting to achieve. Firstly, before local government gets funding, it has to actually have a good integrated bike plan, not just for that local government area, but more widely, as to how it integrates with adjoining local governments, and then we will consider applications for longer lengths of path rather than just itty-bitty bits of path which end up showing some disconnections.

Peter can provide a bit more detail in terms of the advice Main Roads have been providing to local government from the point of view of engineering standards, but we are working down from a hierarchy within our future network where the PSPs will always be where the larger investment goes, because it involves structures like bridges across to provide full continuity, they are wider paths—effectively it is the bike freeway in most cases. Then we are moving down to a secondary network, which is the major parts of the local network, feeding in down to local roads, and then some of the bike boulevards as well. That is our model to actually get network connectivity and increasingly trying to work towards getting some more dedicated facilities for cycling. Pete, do you want to cover the engineering side of things?

[11.03 am]

**Mr SEWELL:** We work with most of the local governments in terms of ensuring standards, and they try to adapt, where possible, our standards. Our standards are quite high, and we do not want to impart all those standards on them, because it is not cost effective, but we try to marry it in as best as possible.

We are doing three sections this year. Talking to Cottesloe and Claremont, with those two links between Jarrad Street and Victoria Street station being built, we will go to tender next week or the week after. Mitchell Freeway southbound from Hutton through to Glendalough rail station, including a bridge over Scarborough Beach Road, which is I think part of the previous government's commitment anyway, starts in the next few months as well. So we are linking with those local governments associated with those legs to make sure that they are comfortable with how it is being done.

One further point is that Main Roads does a fair bit of work in the community perceptions area. Since 2015, where we had a score of sort of 75 out of 100, we have now gone to 91 from the community point of view. So we are steadily moving up and getting acceptance of what we are trying to do in the network, so that is a positive sign from both governments, from my view.

---

**The CHAIRMAN:** Does the department have reliable data on the status or the conditions of the 3 000 kilometres of recreational shared paths provided by local government authorities?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** No, local governments are responsible for maintaining that network, so that is purely a local government responsibility. We do encourage them to keep it up to a good standard. When they put in for Perth bike network grants or regional grants, they do specify the width and the type of material used, so if they do not provide a wide enough width, we will go back to them and ask them to provide a wider width. Basically, if it is a good width, they will score more highly than one that is narrow. So we do influence outcomes.

**The CHAIRMAN:** That is an interesting answer, because I have that problem when we look at what is under local government control, what is under Main Roads, et cetera. It is quite unsatisfactory, though, if the local government is not maintaining to a certain status.

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Yes.

**The CHAIRMAN:** So as the Department of Transport, what are you doing to ensure local government authorities are maintaining the bike paths to a suitable standard?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Well, with the ones that we do fund within our grant agreement, that specifies that they need to maintain the path in an ongoing manner beyond the initial instruction, but given it is a local government asset, our level of control to actually ensure that does happen is quite limited.

**Ms LYHNE:** I guess it is also linked to the data collection, which was a recommendation of the Auditor General, and all the people reporting things that are not as they should be, or incidents. I do not know whether Craig or Steve might just want to talk a little bit about what we are doing to improve that information flow, which would be a good source of that information.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Just on that, there are two different definitions. So we have a PSP, and I have a map of the PSPs in front of me, and I remember touching on this just before I left. You have these other shared paths, like the one that follows Canning River out to Roe Highway or beyond, through to Gosnells and so forth, but they are not a PSP. They are called something else.

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Recreational shared path.

**Mr BEYER:** RSP.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** RSP, yes, and I think that is where some of this falls down, because they are not really just within the local community; they are actually major thoroughfares. Why is it on Canning River—I have used that as an example—that you ride out there and all of a sudden you are going across a bridge that is only about three or four feet wide, and then you are thrown on a road, and then you ride a couple of hundred metres and you get on to a cement path that is not kept, it goes through some bush, and then you hop back on to a PSP standard red bitumen. Then you are forced across Nicholson Road and whatever the other street is to get back on to a path where all the tree roots are lifting things up this high, and so forth, which is not really convenient for riding. That is just some of those which fall outside your ambit, but in reality, they are thoroughfares that possibly should fall within, because they potentially sit in the river reserve or somewhere like that.

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Yes, still in local government control, but we find that most of those ones along the river now are strategic links, so rather than putting “PSP”—the public does not understand what a PSP or RSP is anyway; for all intents and purposes they look the same—it is a strategic link. Who maintains that strategic link depends on who owns the land, whether it be Main Roads, along the freeways and railways. The rest is local government.

---

**The CHAIRMAN:** True, but the Auditor General's report talks about data collection, et cetera. Does it really matter whose responsibility it is? Can you not collect the data?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** We do. We work very closely with local government, so there are a number of counters that are actually on the local government network. We funded quite a lot of those with the Perth bike network grants. Basically, the agreement is that a counter gets put in there, the council maintains that counter once it has been put in, but the data comes to DoT, and we have one central source for all that data.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** On these RSPs, there are these gaps at the moment, similar to PSP.

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Yes.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Are you collating that?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** We actually encourage the councils to fill in those gaps, and a good example is the link out on West Swan Road and Gnangara Road to Ellenbrook. For probably the best part of a decade, the path stopped well short of Ellenbrook. In the last two years they have built along West Swan Road and they are now building along Gnangara Road. We are actually targeting councils to say that where there is a strategic link missing, we will work with you and encourage you to put your application in for a Perth bike network grant to make sure the critical links of the network are built. Some do have environmental constraints and so forth, which will take a bit longer to work through, but we are certainly targeting that. For the work over the next two years, we are engaged with each of the councils. We will certainly target the high priorities that come out of that, so they can then target their applications for future grants as well.

**Mr S.A. MILLMAN:** It seems to me that there is an opportunity for the Department of Transport to leverage the money that it provides to the local councils in order to encourage better behaviour from the local councils in, (a) building the paths, (b) maintaining the paths, and (c) supplying you with the data that you need to make sure that the network is up to standard. Do you agree with that proposition; and, if you do, what can you do to implement it?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Data for cycling is a worldwide problem. On the roads you will generally have signals or counters that can collect that data. From a cycling point of view, all you have really is a counter on the path. They are \$15 000 apiece to install, so you cannot put them everywhere. So you have limitations on a local network. As we progress into the future with things like phone trace data, we will be able to separate the cyclists and pedestrian et cetera. It is not possible at the moment, but there are potential options to actually get better data so that we can understand the usage a lot better and work out where is a missing use and where we have picked up use. So for the Mitchell Freeway, for example, we are looking at more innovative methods with phone trace data track. For instance, where people are using their routes at the moment and, once the new path goes in, whether that has changed. We will pick up the data from where people start to where they finish so that we better understand people's travel patterns.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Is that Strava or something like that?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** No, it is just phone trace data, so it is just from mobile phones.

**Mr BEYER:** Craig has talked about usage. I think part of your question was also about asset condition.

**Mr S.A. MILLMAN:** Precisely, and money for that.

**Mr BEYER:** Yes. We are doing some work at the moment to digitise the entire cycling network, including the local network. Having a whole bunch of hard copy plans that people scribble notes on is actually not particularly useful. Digitising it means that we can also then make it available to the public through either a web portal or an app portal. The public can then inform us about where we

have some issues. I mean, all networks decay over time. Main Roads, as an asset owner, and obviously in working with local government, actually has a lot of experience in this space. Part of it is having some top down viewpoints. Part of it is around whether the member and I actually go cycling—not together necessarily, but we could; we have cycled together—and where we can provide information. We want a range of sources of information about how we can come back, and the best way for us is if we can digitise the entire network and then have a tool to actually capture that sort of information about declining asset condition. A lot of our money goes into new links rather than repairing old links. For instance, on the South Perth foreshore there has been an old RSP network, which is really a legacy network we inherited over time, and where there is pressure to separate where people want to walk and where people want to cycle, so they become largely two parallel networks. We are really trying to move away from that artificial distinction between a PSP and an RSP, and a something else P, or whatever, to simply saying: let us talk about primary routes and secondary routes, and then we will think about who is the responsible asset owner, and where the investment goes to actually achieve that.

**Mr S.A. MILLMAN:** I am just looking at local councils. I know you have mentioned Claremont, Cottesloe and South Perth. I mean, these are relatively prosperous local councils with good lines of income. They manage to take some accountability for making sure that they spend the money to maintain their part of the network.

**Mr BEYER:** Yes.

**Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY:** On the data collection and funding, can I clarify that the data collection is somehow linked to the funding? You have talked about the local governments that are currently accessing funding and you obviously have a lot more involvement and opportunity for data collection there, but what about the others that are not being funded?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Are you talking about the missing links?

**Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY:** Yes.

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Okay. I will start with the ones that have been funded, such as the Safety Bay Road connection to the train station. As part of that grant to the City of Rockingham we put in a counter, so we can actually pick up what the usage change is out there. For the areas that are missing a link the council can do manual counts to see where people are travelling at the moment. There are options there, and in surveys as well—you can actually stop a cyclist and ask them questions. That is an area DoT is starting to get into as well. The counter information gives you some basic information, but really you need that behavioural information as well to understand why people are cycling or are not cycling. It is much harder than car-based traffic, where basically travelling from point A to point B on a bitumen road is quite easy, whereas cyclists can take multiple options—whether they feel comfortable cycling on a road or not, what route they would like to take and where they want to stop. So it is a matter of collecting information over the coming years.

**Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY:** Do you have the same leverage and ability with the local governments that are not currently accessing funding?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** We do encourage all the councils, so we are actively working with the Perth councils. We are very active in the regional areas now as well. We are starting regionally with the largest areas in the south west of the state, to do the long-term planning and to work with them. So we are basically always available for councils, but we are also quite proactive as well—we go to the councils and work with them.

**Ms LYHNE:** I think also the point that Mr Beyer raised was that as we digitise the network and we give the consumer more ability to provide information, in a sense, it is not as much about leveraging

the local government but about getting people actively involved in reporting, which then gives us more information to go out and then use whatever leverage we might have to improve it. So I think that is the key; that is right.

**Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY:** Potentially, also putting that onus and power back in the hands of the consumer as well.

**Ms LYHNE:** They are the people who know what is going on out there. Not everybody is a cyclist.

**Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY:** Regarding opportunities to collect data on past condition, what mechanisms are currently in place for that?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** We have a hazard reporting application. It is fairly old, so it is a desktop-type application. It is not map-based, so we are actually working towards a map-based solution in the future. We basically realised that just getting on a computer and typing in where a hazard is is not the most ideal solution, so there is an opportunity to improve that as we go forward. That basically gets automatically reported to each of the councils; if they put their application in at the moment on the desktop version, it will automatically go to the relevant asset owner for their action.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Just looking at the consultation process, you are doing this planning, particularly focused on the CBD. When I was minister I witnessed the consultation, and I believed it was fantastic. I am just making sure that that is still occurring—that you are hooked into WestCycle and BWA and ensuring that you are getting the appropriate feedback from the cycling groups and the appropriate cycling groups.

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Yes, that has progressed. At the start of last year we changed the governance a little. Before, we had an implementation reference group that did operational and strategic. We now have two groups—one doing strategic and one doing operational—so we are covering all aspects of cycling. WestCycle is on there, as is Bicycling WA, the RAC, local government, the Western Australian Local Government Association, professional bodies and government departments. We have things very well covered in that space. Engagement is a key for moving forward, and we will continue that.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Okay. Just looking at extending that into the cycle boulevards, and just earlier in reference to some of Lisa's questioning, you talked about the three trial programs—there were three different programs to test which one would work better. Could you describe those three? Do we have a sense of how they are tracking and whether one is a favoured approach? We must be at a point where we know.

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Yes, so Vincent is our stage 2—that is under construction at the moment. We have before and afters for stage 1, and that is the information I was referencing before, where we are getting more people cycling on the road, people playing in the streets, et cetera.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Can you describe the difference between the different projects?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Yes, so the Vincent project is basically—we keep the kerb line with all of the projects; the kerb line does not change, but we redefine the space. We formalise the parking. With the Vincent project, we have parking clearly defined. It swaps sides of the road every 100 metres or so, so it has a lateral shift, and a slow point at that given point as well—raised plateaus at the intersections—so we are basically getting speeds down to about 30 kilometres an hour. The first stage was probably a little too wide. The next iteration was Bayswater. It was a similar theme to the Vincent one, but we have made that a bit narrower. The after study for that is ongoing at the moment. The Belmont project is quite different again, being medium density. The impact on parking there was a significant concern, so we basically kept the wide road. We have a series of slow

---

points where the cyclist can actually bypass the slow point, and then basically it is still a fairly wide road other than that.

So there are three quite different examples. There are other examples being developed with the other councils as well, so we are not saying that we have one solution and one solution only. It needs to accommodate the given conditions of the local council, and there are constraints. For example, parking may not be an issue in some locations and you can do something quite different.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** So it is not necessarily that there will be a favoured outcome moving forward from these three trials; it is likely that there is a combination that you will be taking forward?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Yes. We expect that there will be probably about five or six different solutions that will be applicable across Perth. That information is being supplied nationally as well. We had a national workshop last year—we brought everyone to Perth and shared information on what is happening around Australia. What is being done in WA is seen as nation-leading. We are working with Cycling and Walking Australia and New Zealand, which is a new group made up of state and territory agencies, the federal government, local governments and advocacy groups, which had its first meeting in May. We are basically having a much more coordinated approach across the nation as well.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** When this first started, some of the pushback was around slowing street speeds down to 30 kays an hour. There was pushback going, “Rah, rah, rah.” I was of the view at the time, and I think we were generally, that once they realised that quieter streets were actually better for the community, people would actually be attracted to quieter streets. Is that occurring at all? Has there been a change in attitudes?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** In most locations. I suppose when we first started we did not have an example that people could actually go and view, but now we have examples that people can understand and can see. This is a great benefit to their community and house prices will generally lift, based on overseas experience, so we are seeing the benefits there. Within two years we would expect the program to be normalised. We are now seeing councils warming to the schemes as well, whereas before, when it first started, it was quite difficult in the first 12 months. We have an ongoing funding program which, also helps the cause as well. This is certainly being seen as beneficial to the local streets, and we are actually seeing community groups, like the Five group in Nedlands, who are basically being the champions for the project. It is not just DoT pushing an agenda out there; it is community-led in most cases now as well.

**Mr S.A. MILLMAN:** What is the response from local councils to that? When you say, “We want to lower the speed limit on Clifton Crescent down to 40 kilometres an hour in order to improve accessibility”, and all the rest of it, how does the local council respond?

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Okay. Each council obviously has slightly different approaches, but it is not just a matter of putting a sign on the road and saying it is 40 kays an hour. You need to change the environment to actually get those speeds down. The bike boulevards or safe active street program actually re-engineers the road to get those speeds down. Otherwise, we are just living in hope that people obey the sign, which they generally do not; they basically follow the environment of the road.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Just on that, when we first started, there was a worry about whether we would be able to get local councils to support it. Therefore, we focused on a couple of the more proactive councils, like Vincent and so forth. But from what you said earlier, it sounds like more are coming on board now.

---

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** Yes, so we have Nedlands on board—that goes to council in the next week or so—Melville, we are working on a street in Kalgoorlie, and there is Bassendean, so we have quite a spread around the metro area. Wanneroo is also keen—a street up in Kingsway.

**The CHAIRMAN:** What about south-east metro? Anything down that way? All I hear is the western suburbs.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** That was not western; that was northern.

**Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY:** We are not western.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Inner city. Bayswater is inner city.

**Mr WOOLDRIDGE:** I suppose the initial focus has been that inner middle city, where you have the most ability to grow numbers, but there is no reason why it could not be elsewhere. We have also had discussions down in the greater Bunbury area with developers who are keen to have a look at that approach for new greenfield locations. That is really where we need to be, so that we are not going back and retrofitting suburbs in the future, but we are actually getting it built right in the first place.

**The CHAIRMAN:** It is interesting, though, because a lot of it is western suburbs and inner city, without a doubt, but all of these western suburbs' cyclists came out my way on the weekend. It is interesting.

Do we have any other questions?

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I just look forward to seeing that central plan for Perth next year.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Thank you for appearing before the committee today and providing evidence. We will forward a copy of this hearing to you for correction of transcript errors. Please make these corrections and return the transcript within 10 working days of receipt. If the transcript is not returned within this period, it will be deemed to be correct. New material cannot be introduced by these corrections and the sense of your evidence cannot be altered. Should you wish to provide additional information or elaborate on particular points, please include a supplementary submission for the committee's consideration when you return your corrected transcript of evidence. We may have some follow-up questions as well. Once again, thank you very much.

**Mr SEWELL:** Thank you.

**Hearing concluded at 11.22 am**

---