

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Troy Buswell; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston

Division 55: Transport, \$142 265 000 —

Ms A.R. Mitchell, Chairman.

Mr T.R. Buswell, Minister for Transport.

Mr R.A. Waldock, Director General.

Ms S.J. McCarrey, Deputy Director General, Policy, Planning and Investment.

Mrs N. Lyhne, Managing Director, Transport Services.

Mr P.J. King, Acting Executive Director, Finance.

The CHAIRMAN: This estimates committee will be reported by Hansard staff. The daily proof *Hansard* will be published at 9.00 am tomorrow.

The estimates committee's consideration of the estimates will be restricted to discussion of those items for which a vote of money is proposed in the consolidated account. This is the prime focus of the committee. Although there is scope for members to examine many matters, questions need to be clearly related to a page number, item, program, or amount within the volumes. For example, members are free to pursue performance indicators that are included in the *Budget Statements* while there remains a clear link between the questions and the estimates.

It is the intention of the Chair to ensure that as many questions as possible are asked and answered and that both questions and answers are short and to the point.

The minister may agree to provide supplementary information to the committee rather than asking that the question be put on notice for the next sitting week. I ask the minister to clearly indicate what supplementary information he agrees to provide and I will then allocate a reference number. If supplementary information is to be provided, I seek the minister's cooperation in ensuring that it is delivered to the committee clerk by Friday, 10 June 2011, so that members may read it before the report and third reading stages. If the supplementary information cannot be provided within that time, written advice is required of the day by which the information will be made available. Details in relation to supplementary information have been provided to both members and advisers, and accordingly I ask the minister to cooperate with those requirements. I caution members that if a minister asks that a matter be put on notice, it is up to the member to lodge the question on notice with the Clerk's office. Only supplementary information that the minister agrees to provide will be sought by Friday, 10 June 2011.

It will greatly assist Hansard if, when referring to the program statements volumes or the consolidated account estimates, members give the page number, items, program and amount in preface to their question.

[Witnesses introduced.]

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Rockingham.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Considering that there will be hearings on a range of departments and authorities between now and 3.30 pm, I want to have a quick general discussion about the order and how long we might want to spend on each division. Obviously, from the opposition's point of view, the areas of transport and housing would take up the bulk of the time, with particular attention to the Commissioner of Main Roads, the Public Transport Authority and the Housing Authority divisions.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: Does the member want to put a rough time on that? I am happy to do that.

Mr M. McGOWAN: We have only one or two questions for Transport, but we have a number of questions about Main Roads, the Public Transport Authority and Housing. We do not have many questions for the other two divisions. We are pretty keen to get Transport done relatively quickly.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: What does the member reckon—11.30 am?

Mr M. McGOWAN: That sounds good.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: When will Main Roads be? I ask that so that I can make sure I have people available.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Main Roads can be from, say, 11.30 am until 12.15 pm or something like that. The Public Transport Authority can be from 12.15 to 1.00 pm. Housing can be from, say, 2.00 to 3.00 pm, and the other two divisions can be dealt with in the last half-hour.

[11.15 am]

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: We will do transport until 11.30 am; spend 45 minutes on Main Roads, from 11.30 am to 12.15 pm; 45 minutes on the PTA, through to 1.00 pm; one hour for the Housing Authority at 2.00 pm; and 30 minutes for the balance.

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Troy Buswell; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston

Mr M. McGOWAN: That sounds about right—roughly.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: Give or take, depending on my unruly colleagues!

Mr M. McGOWAN: I realise the minister has just finished the session on ports, but I refer to the third dot point on page 651 of budget paper No 2 relating to ports. I note the Anketell port proposal, which is a major proposal for a private-sector builder and operator of the Anketell port. Is that planned to be privately built and operated? How will that port be constructed and operated?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: The member is right; there is a strong desire to access private capital to build the facility. The overarching control and overall operation of the port, and I suspect overall responsibility for management of the channel, which, aside from the land-based infrastructure, is the most important part—I think we heard before that the Port Hedland Port Authority valued its channel at about \$2 billion—would sit with the Dampier Port Authority. The private sector would build and operate the bits it intends to use.

Mr M. McGOWAN: How does that fit with the Premier’s statement that ports should always be constructed by the public? That was the basis on which he intervened in the Oakajee proposal. It sounds as though the arrangement for the Anketell port is similar to what the Oakajee port arrangement was going to be. How does that line up with the Premier’s oft-repeated statements in that regard?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: This is not similar to Oakajee; the arrangements are somewhat different. I think the member for Rockingham will find the Premier’s comments were regarding “the control” of ports, not the construction of them. It is a fact that right around Western Australia a large number of privately constructed components of ports are controlled by the state. No-one would argue that the Dampier Port Authority is anything other than a public authority. The Dampier Port Authority, effectively, has three main components—maybe a few more, but let us say three. There is the Woodside facility, which was privately built and operated by Woodside. Woodside also provides the maintenance of the channel that leads into Woodside. There are the Rio facilities. There are two at Dampier, again, funded and operated by Rio, but controlled at an overarching level by the Dampier Port Authority. The Dampier Port Authority also has its own general carriage wharf operations at Dampier, and work is still going on around that. I suspect that the Anketell port will not be too different, although I do not have detail on the level to which the Dampier Port Authority will be anticipating general cargo facilities at Anketell. I am not aware that is in that plan at this stage.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Page 649 indicates that the total appropriations for transport have declined. Can the minister explain that reduction?

The CHAIRMAN: Is this another question?

Mr M. McGOWAN: It is, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry; there is another call before you.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: On page 649 under “Major Spending Changes”, one of the items I want to inquire about is the enhanced speed enforcement program. Can the minister explain what has gone on there? I am also interested in the major spending change for “Perth Parking Fund Central Area Transit (CAT) Services”. As part of that answer, can the minister explain whether the government has any plans to spend the money Perth parking fund has in reserve?

[11.20 am]

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: In relation to enhanced speed enforcement, the major spending additions are around \$2 million per annum. My understanding is that that is for approval for an increase of six full-time equivalents and for additional collection costs through Australia Post to assist the Department of Transport to collect the revenues that will be generated by the Western Australian police department’s enhanced speed enforcement program. I presume that has something to do with cameras. It is for the costs that the department will incur in managing the anticipated increase in infringements that the new cameras at intersections and other places around the state will generate.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Can I just clarify that? How many more people will need to be employed because a greater number of cameras are being put in place by police? Where will the revenue go? The Department of Transport is incurring more costs. What is happening by way of revenue?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: The revenues are just part of the administered funds that pass back through the department to government. The extra six staff will basically be required to administer and process the requirements of the transport executive and licensing information system, which manages speeding infringements. I know that police anticipate a significant increase in speeding fines, which I will be paying particular reference to because I do not want to be one of the people keeping these six people busy! To put some quantums on it, the anticipated revenues for speed and red-light camera fines are expected to be \$77 million in

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Troy Buswell; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston

2011–12; \$85 million in 2012–13; \$92.6 million in 2013–14; and plateauing out at \$92.6 million. The estimate in 2010–11 is \$51.5 million. Over a three-year period, that is a \$41 million increase off a \$51 million base in speed and red-light camera fines, which is a fairly large increase.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The second part of my question was about the Perth parking fund.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: The additional funding in the budget for CAT bus services, which starts at \$1.17 million next year and runs up to \$2 million in the out years, is basically to provide increased frequency and extended service times for CAT bus services. I have some details of what that would entail in the frequency of the different coloured CAT buses, if the member would like me to go through that.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I would rather hear how much is currently in the parking reserve and what the minister will do with that money and when?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: The value of the Perth parking levy fund is estimated to be \$36 million at 30 June 2011. Based on current spending patterns, it is anticipated to grow by about \$15 million from \$36 million in 2010–11 to \$51 million in 2011–12; by about \$18 million to \$71 million in 2012–13; and by just over \$18 million to \$89 million in 2013–14. But there will be some announcements in the not-too-distant future about the spending of that money.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Is the minister planning to amend the act to allow the money to be spent on purposes other than those it is currently allowed to be spent on?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: No. We are planning to spend the money within the framework of the act.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The first dot point on page 651 relates to policy initiatives surrounding congestion, the need for enhanced public transport and so forth. My question is about the planning by the department and whether the money that has been allocated in this year's budget is at all directed towards planning for a new stadium and whether the minister has examined what options are out there and how much the additional transport infrastructure and additional public infrastructure at a stadium at Burswood would cost as opposed to the other alternatives of Subiaco or East Perth. What planning has been done and what is the additional cost, if any, above and beyond the other options?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: The Department of Transport and the Public Transport Authority have done what I think has been a good job of work on assessing transport options for the different stadium options that are being considered by government. I am sure that the costs of those different options will be made public at the appropriate time by the person who will make that announcement—that is probably the person who normally sits in this seat. I will not reflect on those, but I will say that we have done a significant amount of work on looking at transport options for a variety of sites, and we have provided that advice to those involved in the decision-making process.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Bearing in mind that this is an estimates hearing and we are examining money that will be spent in the coming financial year and in the following years, would it be fair to say that Burswood is a more expensive option because of the requirement for transport infrastructure and public transport than the other options? Is it fair to say that the reasoning behind the Burswood option might be outweighed by the additional cost involved in the requirement for those transport options?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: I do not have the specific detail of that. The Burswood option that is being considered, along with others, provides some excellent public transport opportunities. Very good rail linkages into the metropolitan rail network could be provided at the Burswood site. I think the last time there was a big crowd in that area was when the Pope went to Belmont Park and people took the train. There was a bit of a crowd because there was only one train line there. At the end of a match, for example, four trains could effectively be lined up at Burswood station, which would be the stadium station. Those trains could pretty much work directly down most of the major Perth rail lines, with the exception of the Mandurah line, so people would need to transfer at Perth station. In addition, a number of trains could be held in the Carlisle area or further down the line, and those trains could move up quite quickly to move people away. We have done similar modelling at the other sites. The other part of the public transport solution for the stadium, wherever it might be located, will be buses. The stadium really needs to be emptied in about an hour. The stadium will not be emptied with trains alone; bus infrastructure will be needed. The existing bus infrastructure at Subiaco Oval, for example, requires Roberts Road to be blocked off, which makes it a bit of a “run for your life” scenario. That will not suffice with a bigger, better, improved stadium. People expect better. I think Suncorp Stadium in Brisbane has a purpose-built bus interchange adjacent to it to enable a proper, appropriate, safe and dry transition of people onto buses. Whatever the solution is, it will predominantly be around trains and supplemented by buses for the movement of the vast majority of people. A relatively minor number of people will drive and/or walk to the stadium. That applies across all sites.

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Troy Buswell; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston

[11.30 am]

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: In terms of transport policy, the minister talked about the urban infill programs and the growing population, and managing the transport system to cope with those issues. As part of that, is the minister doing any work with local government? I know that he has no responsibility for local government roads, but most of them were constructed 40 or 50 years ago. I am wondering whether there has been any work done on that front, because there are a lot of issues in my electorate with local roads and people being able to access the main arterial routes.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: That is an interesting expansion of the topic, which I will answer briefly! In relation to buses, we have done planning at different sites, and we have looked at where the members generally live. For example, the mighty high-flying West Coast Eagles members live in certain areas, so when a stadium is announced, the bus network that is servicing the stadium for Eagles games will have a high concentration of services into areas where Eagles supporters live.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: The western suburbs!

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: And vice versa for the other Western Australian team!

In relation to the broader transport planning, which that line item definitely refers to, a range of major planning works is being undertaken by the department. There is a major public transport plan, which will be released publicly at the appropriate time. That reflects a lot on the planning work done in Directions 2031. We are also working on a state regional freight strategy, which looks at ports and roads in regional Western Australia, and a Perth transport plan, which relates to cars, trucks and other non-public transport use in Perth. That is important; it really relates to our road networks and how they all fit together to service freight and passengers. On top of that, some of the planning money that the Department of Transport and the Public Transport Authority received this year is for advancing a number of key projects; I think they are discussed in budget paper No 3. Those key projects include the rapid bus transitway to Ellenbrook; the extension of the Perth heavy rail network to Yanchep; and exploration of light rail options, which will probably run into the central northern suburbs. There is also money there for looking at what else we can do for planning in and around busways and the like. There is a lot of effort going in to make sure that we have a well-planned public transport and broader transport response.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: My further question actually relates to the question asked by the member for Rockingham. I refer to planning for the Burswood precinct. Is the minister saying that two new stations will need to be built in the Burswood precinct? There is currently a station near the Burswood Entertainment Complex that is very old. The surrounding area is being rezoned as residential by the Town of Victoria Park; it is currently commercial. There will be six or seven new residential towers. We will need a new station for that development and the other towers that are going up in the Burswood precinct. The minister is saying that we will need a second station for the stadium, so we are going to have to have two new stations in the area.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: Member, let us break that into two bits. I do not have any advice on the provision of a station specifically for the towers in Burswood. We certainly are not doing any planning around that at the moment. The next stations we are looking at are probably on the north-south line. I do not have any information around that that I can provide to the member.

Irrespective of where the stadium goes, we will need a decent railway station and a decent bus station. If the stadium stays at Subiaco, the existing station at West Leederville will have to be completely rebuilt because it will not cater for the number of people we anticipate having to move in and out. If the stadium is at East Perth, we will need a station there, and if it goes to Burswood, we will need to upgrade that station.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: As I understand it, the costing for the station in Subiaco was part of the original Kitchener Park development costing. If we redevelop at Burswood, there will have to be a special events station or whatever for the oval, which means that there will still be a substandard station for the residents of Burswood, which is a growing area. The station that is there is very inferior.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: I anticipate that the cost of upgrading stations would be incorporated into the total cost of the project when those deliberations are made. I again stress that, irrespective of where the stadium goes, we will need better rail infrastructure than we currently have to get the number of people we are talking about away from the stadium in an acceptable period of time. One could argue that those costs could be more problematic at Subiaco because there is a quite limited reserve in which to operate around the railway line, but I do not have that detail. Similarly, if we are going to do it properly, we need to look at a decent bus interchange. The existing bus interchange in Subiaco, on Roberts Road, is not a “hail and ride”, it is a “hail and hope”. We have to improve that. There will be some variations, but I would imagine that those costs would be relatively consistent wherever the stadium ends up.

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Troy Buswell; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston

The member also raised the issue of how we service the residents of Burswood. That is a matter for a separate conversation.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The minister indicated earlier that he anticipated that clearing people away from Burswood would take roughly an hour or so under the new arrangements. Is it not currently the case at Subiaco that crowds are generally dispersed within a half an hour? Does the minister anticipate a doubling of the time it takes to disperse crowds?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: The advice I have is that one hour is the international standard that is applied to moving people out of a major sporting stadium. It often takes people a lot longer than one hour to exit the Subiaco area after a football match, depending on their mode of transport. If we were to have a 50 000 or 60 000-seat stadium at Subiaco, and it filled up because the Eagles were having a good season, one would anticipate that those delays would be longer. That is the standard that governs the planning for getting people out of sporting precincts. How are they going to move? The vast majority will be by rail. Irrespective of where the stadium goes, there will be other people who drive and/or walk. They might drive to somewhere around Subiaco and walk; they might drive to somewhere around East Perth and walk; or they might drive to Burswood and walk.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Is the minister saying that the current dispersal time is not half an hour?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: I do not know what the current dispersal time is. It is probably 30 to 40 minutes.

The appropriation was recommended.

[11.40 am]