

Chairman; Hon Graham Giffard; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Adele Farina; Hon Jim Scott; Hon Murray Criddle; Hon Frank Hough

---

**Perth Urban Rail Development Project Office -**

Hon George Cash, Chairman.

Hon Graham Giffard, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure.

Mr R. Waldock, Acting Commissioner of Railways.

Mr M.P. Martinovich, Project Manager, Perth Urban Rail Development Project Office.

Mr A. Cartledge, Manager Project Coordination, Perth Urban Rail Development Project Office.

Mr J. Leaf, General Manager Finance, Western Australian Government Railways.

Mr R. Farrell, Policy Officer, Office of the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure.

The CHAIRMAN: At the conclusion of the questioning on Main Roads, I was asked if agreement could be reached to swap the hearing on the Western Australian Planning Commission with the Perth Urban Rail Development Project Office. The majority of members have agreed. I have indicated to the parliamentary secretary that the committee will now take that course of action. We will therefore be dealing with the Perth Urban Rail Development Project Office.

Hon GRAHAM GIFFARD: I thank members for agreeing to bring on the Perth urban rail development office at this point.

The CHAIRMAN: Have advisers completed the witness statement form and read and understood the content of that form?

WITNESSES: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: All witnesses have indicated that they have read and understood that form. I table questions from various members which will be distributed shortly. They are questions from Hon Simon O'Brien, Hon Peter Foss, Hon Norman Moore, Hon Derrick Tomlinson, Hon Robyn McSweeney, Hon Alan Cadby and Hon Bruce Donaldson.

Hon PETER FOSS: Were papers tabled also with those questions, because they were asked for?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, and they will be distributed shortly.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: The minister said last week that she could not release detailed information on the south metropolitan railway until Cabinet had made a decision. We know that there is some movement at the station in view of the front page announcements and details that have been given in this morning's *The West Australian*. I am aware that Cabinet is meeting, probably as we hold this hearing. I have also become aware that the Premier will address a press conference today at the conclusion of this hearing. My first question is in two parts: is the parliamentary secretary able to give details now in answer to the questions he would expect us to ask about the latest developments; and, if not, will he agree to returning to this Committee at a later stage in the week, if time can be found, to answer those questions that will obviously arise from the major imminent announcement?

Hon GRAHAM GIFFARD: It is difficult to answer those questions. The member asked whether I am in a position today to give details in answer to questions I would expect him to ask. I cannot definitely give him an answer to that until he asks those questions. I am, like Hon Simon O'Brien, aware of what was said on the radio this morning. The Government will be able to provide details as supplementary information that it is unable to provide during this morning's session.

Hon PETER FOSS: I have a point of order on privilege. This is a committee to which witnesses are obliged to answer questions. It appears that an announcement by the Government has been scheduled for this afternoon when the persons who would have otherwise been before the Committee will be engaged elsewhere. There is a clear understanding that chief executive officers are obliged to appear before the Parliament to answer those questions. It appears that the announcement has been set at a time which would cause some witnesses to be in contempt of the Parliament. It is even more contemptuous that we are now told that we cannot be told the answers to these questions. If the public can be told at half past one, the Parliament can be told now. I have read some of these questions on notice to which a similar attitude has been taken. The Opposition asked what was the present estimated cost of the new railway and was told that it would be told in due course. We want to know what the current estimated cost is, not what the Government will tell us finally. We are entitled to have some answers, and that question must be answered.

The CHAIRMAN: Hon Simon O'Brien asked the parliamentary secretary a number of questions about answers that may or may not be given. The parliamentary secretary replied, to which Hon Peter Foss has taken a point of order. I do not believe there is a point of order because the questioning has not begun in earnest. The fact is that

Chairman; Hon Graham Giffard; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Adele Farina; Hon Jim Scott; Hon Murray Criddle; Hon Frank Hough

---

witnesses before this Committee are required to answer questions truthfully and to their fullest knowledge. There are Acts of Parliament that bind witnesses, which is one of the reasons that witness information forms are signed. At this stage I raise those issues, not to sustain the point of order, but to indicate to members that we should begin the questioning. Whether a question of privilege arises in due course is a matter that will be determined in due course.

Hon PETER FOSS: I raise another point regarding questions on notice. For example, Hon Alan Cadby in question on notice No 2 asked -

What is the presently estimated cost of land acquisitions for these stations, for -

- (a) the station itself?
- (b) for parking for these stations?

The answer was that the Perth urban rail development supplementary master plan will contain information on land acquisition. The answer to the question is either there is no presently estimated cost or this is the estimated cost. An answer saying that it will tell us later is not an answer. I will continue working through these questions but I ask that that question on notice be answered either by telling us that there is no estimate and the Government does not know or it has an estimate and this is what it is.

Hon GRAHAM GIFFARD: I make it clear, as the Chairman did at the beginning of this session, that the Committee has rescheduled the session to accommodate the Government. I thanked members for agreeing to do that. Had that not been agreed to, Mr Waldock would have been required to appear at the Committee at the scheduled time and would not have been able to be at any other place. I do not want any member thinking that I suggested Mr Waldock would not otherwise be here, as implied by the point of order raised by Hon Peter Foss. That is not the case and I do not think anyone suggested that. I again thank members for agreeing to reschedule the session. However, it is the prerogative of the Government to schedule a press conference for later today.

The CHAIRMAN: In respect of the issues raised, Hon Peter Foss has referred to an answer that has been given to a question on notice. There is nothing in the Committee rules that restricts any member from referring further to an answer given to a question. I accept what the parliamentary secretary said about Mr Waldock's attendance at the Committee had the Committee not agreed to the change. He indicated that unless there were extenuating circumstances Mr Waldock intended to be here and he would have been here.

Let us move forward. Some of the issues being raised cannot be sustained at this stage because no contempt has been shown. When or if that occurs, it would be a matter for the House to consider in due course.

[11.00 am]

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: In view of the fact that an announcement is about to be made, can the parliamentary secretary please indicate the scope of the announcement and the impact it will have on the published budget papers in terms of any increase in expenditure?

Hon GRAHAM GIFFARD: I understand that today's announcement is the Government's response to the Hicks report, but I am not able to advise any further on what the government response might be. The honourable member has alluded to speculation from a radio program this morning. I too heard that program, but am not able to add anything further.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: The parliamentary secretary has advisers with him including the commissioner and a number of other people closely connected with these matters. Has the parliamentary secretary no adviser with him who is able to report to this Committee of the Parliament on any of the detail I am seeking?

Hon GRAHAM GIFFARD: I understand that the response from the Government will be given later today. I am sure the honourable member heard the minister say on a radio program this morning that she would raise the Hicks report in Cabinet today for discussion. I understand that the purpose of the press conference today is for the Government to respond to the Hicks report, having first discussed it in Cabinet. No-one at the Committee is able to advise the member on what has been and is being discussed in Cabinet.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Clearly we will not get any further than that during this hearing, but obviously *The West Australian* is privy to information that this Parliament is not. I can assure the Committee that I will follow that up when Parliament resumes, because that is not good enough.

I refer to the capital contribution for the Western Australian Government Railways Commission on page 893 of the *Budget Statements*. I note that the Government equity contribution for the current year and the next two out years totals \$244 million. Is that part of the \$300 million allocated as proceeds of the sale of AlintaGas? If so, and noting that the total amount for these years is \$244 million, where is the other \$56 million and what is proposed to be done with it?

Chairman; Hon Graham Giffard; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Adele Farina; Hon Jim Scott; Hon Murray Criddle; Hon Frank Hough

---

Mr WALDOCK: The equity contributions by the Government, including the contribution for 2000-01, balances out to \$300 million, which is again a balancing item for the AlintaGas sale. The \$300 million has been allocated. The budget papers outline contributions of \$67 million, \$94 million and \$83 million. I understand that what is not being shown there is in the previous -

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Can you clarify that point? Where is the \$56 million shown?

Mr WALDOCK: The budget papers show equity injections of \$67 million, \$94 million and \$83 million. The equity injections to make up the \$300 million were in the previous period and I think were shown in the budget of the Department for Planning and Infrastructure. It would have been shown under that budget because the Perth urban rail development project previously came under that budget. I ask our chief financial officer, John Leaf, to clarify where that is shown.

Mr LEAF: The capital expenditure of the Department for Planning and Infrastructure is shown on pages 813 and 814 of the *Budget Statements*. Page 814 shows expenditure of \$57.184 million under the Perth urban rail development.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: If this matter relates back to the Department for Planning and Infrastructure, it may need to be placed on notice during the next session. Fortunately, the parliamentary secretary is responsible for both sessions. The expenditure referred to on page 814 of the *Budget Statements* was \$57.184 million to 30 June 2002. Can we receive a breakdown of how that \$57.184 million was spent and, even more importantly, how it can be demonstrated that it was AlintaGas money. I think this House was advised a year ago that that money was still intact and sitting in a trust account somewhere. I would be interested to know how that \$57.184 million relates to the \$300 million, and what it was spent on.

The CHAIRMAN: If that information cannot be provided in the next session, it can be provided by way of supplementary information. The parliamentary secretary might deal with that in due course.

[*Supplementary Information No 9*]

Hon ADELE FARINA: With regard to the Perth urban rail development project, how was the originally announced \$1 017 million cost of the fast direct route calculated, how did that cost compare with the cost announced by the former Government for its Kenwick diversion route, and why is the cost of the entire Perth urban rail project now described as being \$1 403 million?

Hon GRAHAM GIFFARD: I ask Mr Waldock to answer that question.

[11.10 am]

Mr WALDOCK: The original plans of July 1998 for the south west master plan were costed at \$941 million. The northern suburbs master plan, which was also approved by Cabinet, was for \$81 million. The budget was finally approved with an additional \$18 million for six railcars to make up both the Greenwood station and growth in the system to 2003. The Rockingham loop was also approved in October 2000 for \$107 million. That figure adds up to \$1.147 billion of which the cost of infrastructure was \$749 million and railcars \$398 million. That was the original budget, made up of all the components. In July 2001 Cabinet approved a variation to the south west master plan, based on the direct route concept. The project was then revised from \$1.147 billion to \$1.217 billion. That was made up of an additional \$70 million, which was a transfer of borrowings from the Kwinana Freeway bus way program, which would not be required with the direct route. That finally produced the figure of \$1.217 billion. This figure has been used continually over the past 12 months, but Cabinet, as part of the budget round of 2002-03 approved a variation to the project. First of all, it placed a financial penalty of \$18.5 million on moving the Rockingham to Mandurah leg out by 12 months. Then Cabinet approved the estimated escalation costs associated with the project, based on future cash flows rather than the historical 1998-99 figures. This figure was estimated at \$168 million. If the \$1.217 billion is added to the financial penalty of \$18.5 million and the escalation of \$168 million, the resulting figure is \$1.4035 billion, which is reflected in these budget papers.

Hon ADELE FARINA: I refer to the second last item under the heading "Works in Progress" on page 892. Why do the budget papers show that the total cost of the Perth urban rail development railcars is \$299.976 million, when the Premier's announcement referred to a \$437 million railcar contract?

Mr WALDOCK: That reflects the difference between capital costs and maintenance. The \$437 million reported included both the capital and operating costs for the railcars, which includes maintenance over 15 years. It was a package contract with Bombardier. The capital cost for the railcars is still as shown, and the maintenance over 15 year is \$161 million.

Hon ADELE FARINA: The sixth dot point on page 892 refers to the building better stations program. What is involved in this program?

Chairman; Hon Graham Giffard; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Adele Farina; Hon Jim Scott; Hon Murray Criddle; Hon Frank Hough

---

Mr WALDOCK: This program was introduced by the new Government. The existing rail system has 57 stations, many of which, apart from those on the northern line, are antiquated and in need of major refurbishment. This refurbishment is for customers' amenity, but also picks up our statutory requirements under the Disability Services Act, to improve access to the stations, with graded overpasses and lifts, and access to trains with narrower gaps and higher platforms. We have a plan to continually improve stations over the next five years. Maylands has just been completed; Bassendean is being worked on, followed by Armadale, Gosnells and Midland; and Kelmscott is towards the end of the program. Over the next five years, stations will be either renewed or refurbished.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Has the Perth urban rail development project office undertaken any work investigating the optional rail routes into the city; that is William Street, city west or other options? What was the cost of that investigation?

Mr WALDOCK: The cost of investigations is made up both of the PURD team working on various aspects and, from November of last year, the Perth City Rail Advisory Committee. The costs have not been finalised yet. They were cost which would have been associated with the master plan anyway. An estimate of the total master plan costs can be provided by Mr Martinovich.

Mr MARTINOVICH: Currently the amount is either \$4.1 million or \$5.1 million. I will provide the exact figure.

Mr WALDOCK: My understanding is that it is \$4.1 million.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Did the office investigate the amount of tunnelling required for each route, or was it made aware of that amount? Did the office investigate the construction limitations of each route, and the estimated cost of tunnelling? Did it look at light rail options?

Mr WALDOCK: An enormous amount of work has been done. The Western Australian Government Railways Commission has been supporting the Perth City Rail Advisory Committee with secretarial services. That committee has done an enormous amount of work with the PURD office, particularly over the past six weeks, bringing together all the information about rail alignments through the city. The alignments are a function of not just the capital costs and the practicability but also the ongoing operational aspects. The WAGR was cognisant of the capital costs, but was also very interested in the ongoing operational cost, not just in terms of future recurrent budgets, but more importantly for the reliability of the system.

Members would be well aware that Perth has the best and most time-responsive system in Australia, with more than 98 per cent of services running on time. We were very concerned about having dead ends at the station, particularly for the north-south rapid transit rail. We believed that that would create a five to six per cent reduction in the on-time running, and would be worse at peak periods when people need it most. In examining all these issues, the independent committee was advised by the WAGR, but also took advice from Halliburton on behalf of the Perth City Council, and from BSD Consultants, which looked at railway operations and capital costs. Advice was taken from other major tunnelling experts. The report will include extremely detailed analysis of different alignment; the costs, both capital and operational of different alignment; and paint a fairly clear picture of the preferred option.

It was always envisaged that the Mandurah line would be a rapid transport system, rather than a light rail system. Time issues were critical. The Perth City Rail Advisory Committee has indicated there would be an opportunity for light rail in future planning in and around Perth, particularly in an east-west connection. That is something the Government would consider in the future.

[11.20 am]

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I am pleased to hear that last part. What amount of tunnelling is required for each option, and what is the estimated cost of each route?

Mr WALDOCK: The first report of the earlier Perth City Rail Advisory Committee - the one that was commissioned in November of last year - indicated that both options would require extensive tunnelling. It alluded to the issue that ideally we would need deep tunnel boring rather than cut and cover, mainly because of the disruption to William Street. In considering the preferred alignment - and that announcement is due shortly, as the member is well aware - it said that tunnelling is a major issue for either alignment. The two key criteria that are set down in its first report to government and that it has considered very seriously are foreshore amenity and the disruption to William Street.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: In making the decision, you have not worried about the difference in costs?

Chairman; Hon Graham Giffard; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Adele Farina; Hon Jim Scott; Hon Murray Criddle; Hon Frank Hough

---

Mr WALDOCK: In the recent study the costs have been clearly identified for both options. Those costs will be made available. The report detailed both the operating and capital costs based on the committee's preferred method of construction. As is reported in its first report, it looked keenly at the deep tunnel option for the central alignment.

The CHAIRMAN: Hon Jim Scott asked for some supplementary information about costs.

*[Supplementary Information No 10]*

Hon J.A. SCOTT: I have not received an answer about the length of tunnelling that will be required.

The CHAIRMAN: I realise the member asked that question, but I cannot govern the answer. Is an answer available now?

Mr WALDOCK: That will be part of the study report that will be released today. That report will be extensive and it will attempt to look at the whole foreshore issue in terms of tunnelling to overcome those problems.

Hon MURRAY CRIDDLE: We have had an extraordinary breach of executive responsibility in having an announcement made before Cabinet has met. I am amazed at the way the process has gone ahead, and I hope the Premier deals with that in the appropriate way. The first Hicks report gave a clear indication that no consideration would be given to the Kenwick link. How was that decision made? What were the reasons for completely neglecting the Kenwick route in comparison with the other routes?

Mr WALDOCK: The Government has made a clear statement that the direct route provides major advantages in meeting customer needs and patronage. It also, as has been reported on numerous occasions, wants a travel time saving that is competitive with motor vehicles. The Kenwick route is not competitive. The direct route is competitive and will take between 10.5 minutes and 14.5 minutes off the journey time, depending on whether it is peak or non-peak. On the basis of that, the Government has made a clear decision.

Hon MURRAY CRIDDLE: I thank the representative for that answer. That indicates clearly that there was only one reason for changing the decision of the previous Government. We have identified that the important thing is 12 minutes, not the patronage that will be carried on the train system. Having established that, I would like to have tabled any report or other information that justifies that decision. When will the master plan be finalised for what will apparently be announced this afternoon?

The CHAIRMAN: Two issues have been raised. The first is seeking supplementary information.

*[Supplementary Information No 11]*

Hon GRAHAM GIFFARD: May I have some clarification of what Hon Murray Criddle is asking for by way of supplementary information?

Hon MURRAY CRIDDLE: The Government made a decision not to have the Kenwick link. The Hicks report indicates that it would not be looking at the Kenwick link or the link down the Kwinana Freeway. What evidence was used to make that initial decision apart from the 12-minute saving in travelling time?

Mr WALDOCK: The PURD office needed to factor in the alignment through the city before it could finalise the master plan. That master plan will be finalised at the end of this month by the Western Australian Government Railways Commission and the PURD office.

Hon MURRAY CRIDDLE: I thought we would be making decisions based on a plan for the future. Given that there was a plan in 1992 for rail in metropolitan Perth and that further planning was put in place subsequently, is there such a plan for the future?

Mr WALDOCK: A lot of work has been done in the past six months to look at both current and future rail requirements, and there have been a number of discussions and workshops with the wider stakeholder community on rail requirements now and for the next 20 and 100 years. It is fair to say that while there have been some differing views, as we would expect, the general body of opinion is that the alignment through the city will meet our needs into the future in the next 50 years. Also, we do not think any decision we will make now will in any way compromise future planning for undergrounding and light rail and surface options. Technology will be offering so many opportunities and alternatives in the future, both surface and underground, for a more developed rail system that we certainly would not want to be developing, in the time frame we are talking about, any specific options now.

[11.30 am]

Chairman; Hon Graham Giffard; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Adele Farina; Hon Jim Scott; Hon Murray Criddle; Hon Frank Hough

---

Hon PETER FOSS: Reference continues to be made to the 12 minutes that will be saved, which is the justification for taking that particular route. I asked on what basis was an increase in passenger numbers on that line derived. I also asked for any documents supporting that information to be tabled. The answer was that studies carried out prior to construction of the northern suburbs railway show that in order to maximise patronage, journey times must be minimised. Is that the only basis on which the saving of 12 minutes travel time has been derived? Are there any papers we can have on that?

Mr WALDOCK: I think the statement was that there is a clear correlation between travel time and patronage, which is fairly well established.

Hon PETER FOSS: How?

Mr WALDOCK: Much research and empirical evidence on price, journey time and mode of transport is available on public transport. It is well established that there is an elasticity of demand of somewhere between 0.56 and 0.64 per cent, which means that if travel time can be improved by 10 per cent, somewhere around 5.6 to 6.4 per cent improvement in patronage will occur. That is an advantage. As has been pointed out, patronage also depends on catchment and functionality of stations, whether they are park 'n' ride stations, whether they have kiss 'n' ride drop-off areas or bus services to the transfer station. The measure of patronage and all the variables are extraordinarily complex. I think the point made in the responses to the questions was that there is a direct correlation between travel time and patronage. That is picked up in the elasticity of demand.

Hon PETER FOSS: We have been advised that 2 500 extra people will travel as a result of the 12 minutes saved on the changed route. Mr Waldock just said that it is difficult to decide what will affect anything by way of patronage. Does the parliamentary secretary have any information to justify the figure of 2 500? If so, will he table it? Why has it not been tabled before?

Mr WALDOCK: It is extremely complex, but it is in the master plan. Within the Department for Planning and Infrastructure a strategic transport model has been developed over the past 18 months. I understand that this model clearly highlights the increase in patronage.

Hon PETER FOSS: I asked what specific documents contained data that justified the minister's claim that 2 500 additional people would use the service if it were changed from the Kenwick route to the Como route. Nothing in Mr Waldock's answer provided that information. What, if anything, was before the minister when the decision was made? There might be something now and I would be interested to see it.

Mr WALDOCK: I understand that information was available from a strategic transport model.

Mr MARTINOVICH: At the time, basic modelling precepts and modelling laws were followed. When that decision was made - as with the decision with the previous south west metropolitan railway master plan, when very little data was available on the number of people who could be carried - it was made clear that it would take at least six months to produce a master plan for the route. That work has been done. The figures on the patronage show that the predictions made six months ago are correct and can even be bettered. The Commissioner for Railways said that the issue was complex. It is even more complex than some of the issues that were raised; for example, evidence shows that the settlement pattern of land use south of Thomsons Lake for the years 2006-29 will vary significantly from what was assumed two years ago when we did our first master plan. That reduction must be taken into account when the final patronage mix is considered. We needed to produce a supplementary master plan to develop concepts. That work has been done and it will be included in our master plan, which will go to the Government at the end of June.

Hon PETER FOSS: It seems to me from what Mr Waldock said and a number of other answers, that much of what I have asked for is available and is in the prepared plan, but it has not been given to us at this stage. Is that correct?

Mr MARTINOVICH: That is correct. A great deal of work has been done, but it has not been finalised. Some sensitivities must be considered in relation to that data, which we will spend the next few weeks examining. All the data will be available to the Government at the end of June.

Hon ADELE FARINA: I refer to the third dot point on page 892, which refers to significant design works for the south west metropolitan railway infrastructure between Perth and Mandurah. Will the parliamentary secretary expand on the design works to be undertaken in 2002-03 and whether it is expected that all design works will be completed in 2002-03?

Mr WALDOCK: Even after the master plan is presented to the Government, as can be expected, we will move into the detailed design and specification development phase. We are looking at six major packages of

Chairman; Hon Graham Giffard; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Adele Farina; Hon Jim Scott; Hon Murray Criddle; Hon Frank Hough

---

development for the south west. All of those package agreements will require significant design work. We will continue to roll out design work for the next few years as we move from early concept development to detailed specification setting. Design requirements will be ongoing and extensive for the next year or two.

[11.40 am]

Hon ADELE FARINA: I refer to page 893 and the *Australind* upgrade. Will the parliamentary secretary expand on the upgrade program?

Mr WALDOCK: Within the next 12 months the *Australind* will be the oldest train in the fleet. The *Prospector* and *AvonLink* are now being manufactured and will come on stream in the second half of next year. The *Australind* is 16 or 17 years old and we would like it replaced in the next five to seven years. Given that we are talking about substantial funding, we must manage that and the perception of the service provided to the public. We have undertaken a small but significant refurbishment program on the *Australind* - we have done a through-life overhaul that will hopefully take it to the end of its running life. We have done two cars to date and five cars will be finished by the end of this calendar year. I invite all members to look at the two cars that have been completed. We have refurbished the seats, carpets and curtains and the buffet area. I believe that passengers are happy with the standard. The Bunbury service is one of our major growth areas, and we must service those customers before we lose them.

Hon ADELE FARINA: I refer to page 892 and the purchase of new country passenger road coaches. Will the parliamentary secretary expand on the program? How many coaches will be purchased? Are they replacement coaches and what areas will they service?

Mr WALDOCK: We are in the final stages of negotiations to renew the entire road coach fleet, which comprises 21 vehicles. We now have both Volvo and Scania vehicles. We are negotiating with Scania Australia Pty Ltd through Volgren Australia, a local motor vehicle bodybuilding company, for the manufacture of new road coaches over the next two years. Those road coaches will be the most modern in Australia. They will incorporate the best technology and, where possible, will address disabled passengers' requirements. We are proud of those coaches. The WAGRC has always had a good reputation for meeting the needs of country users. This new generation of road coaches should keep it at the top of the market.

Hon FRANK HOUGH: I refer to page 892 and Perth urban rail development. I note that \$1.053 billion will be spent. About 12 or 18 months ago, that figure was \$780 million. It is suggested it could blow out another 33 per cent. Is that correct?

Mr WALDOCK: The \$1.053 billion plus the \$299.9 million takes us up to \$1.353 billion. As I said earlier, the approved budget is \$1.353 billion. That balances the Department for Planning and Infrastructure expenditure shown in previous years. The budget of \$1.353 billion is detailed in a number of cabinet minutes that were fully explained earlier.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: People have mentioned the previously proposed route via Kenwick and patronage. I expressed concern about that route and I am still concerned about the target patronage. In the past, the focus was Mandurah-Rockingham patronage because the service skirted the 120 000 patrons who commute up the freeway. Did the studies consider how to prevent the service being a long-distance commuter railway rather than one servicing the vast number of people living south of the river? When and where will the east-west link happen? Will the Rockingham light rail system still link into this system and, if so, when?

Mr WALDOCK: Extensive planning work has been done to ensure that the various stations on the direct route are full transit stations. We are looking to offer full bus connectivity. It will be similar to the northern line, which has feeder stations for bus services rather than bus services running parallel, which happens with other stations because of various constraints. These stations will be major feeders for the catchment areas and will be fed by regular, quality bus services, drop-offs similar to those seen at some major northern stations, and the provision of substantial car parking. We are using the extraordinarily successful northern model to provide a strong network. The circle bus route has also been very successful. That will be maintained and will complement the spider-web network rather than the hub and spoke radial system. No decision has been made about the Rockingham light rail service. A small group went to Europe recently to look at systems that might work in the Rockingham area. I understand the group's report should be available soon.

Hon J.A. SCOTT: Will the southern link be compatible with hybrid rail links?

Mr WALDOCK: The Rockingham service will involve total integration of whatever system is developed. Two models are being considered: a light rail system to feed the Rockingham centre and the beach resort area, and a bus-light rail system fully integrated with the stations.

Chairman; Hon Graham Giffard; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Adele Farina; Hon Jim Scott; Hon Murray Criddle; Hon Frank Hough

---

Mr MARTINOVICH: The ability to run light railcars on the tracks being built now depends on the train service required at any given time. For example, the northern suburbs railcars run at 110 kilometres an hour and provide a service every three or four minutes. It is very difficult to have a light rail vehicle doing 80 kilometres per hour without the same safety protection system as has a completely dedicated right-of-way suburban rail system. It depends on service levels and the compatibility of that mode with the mode that is running there at present. It is a very serious question and it must be looked at very carefully.

[11.50 am]

Hon MURRAY CRIDDLE: Earlier a tender was called for the private sector to be involved in the funding of this entire arrangement. I understand that that was terminated. There were five options in the previous master plan. Is the Government looking at the same sort of arrangement or has that been put on the backburner?

Mr WALDOCK: A great deal of work was done on the financing options for both the infrastructure and the rolling stock for the south west rail line. It is fair to say that for the rolling stock contract, which has been finalised, the private sector bids with financing options for design, build, finance and maintain as opposed to design, build and maintain did not come up to detailed scrutiny by both the Western Australian Government Railways Commission and Treasury. As has been reported, it was a traditional contract. Similarly, the early expressions of interests for the infrastructure were not very exciting. We were hopeful that the private sector would look at major opportunities for value-capture innovative solutions to both funding and costings. That did not eventuate. Our analysis has shown that if there were major opportunities for some form of private sector financing, it is more likely to be in the city alignment because it has enormous value to capture opportunities for both stations and areas around stations. Although private financing has not been embraced at this stage, it certainly could be an option in the future.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: In view of the fact that a number of people in Canning Vale, the City of Canning and Victoria Park in the south metropolitan region are upset that they will not get the railway services they thought they would get, and in view of the fact that a lot of people in the Mt Henry, Melville and South Perth areas are upset that they are getting a railway they do not want, has any of the money involved with this project been used to ask the people what they want? I do not believe it has, but the parliamentary secretary can confirm whether that is the case. If the people can express a will, is there any chance that the Government will reconsider what it is doing vis-a-vis the riverfront route versus the Kenwick route?

Hon GRAHAM GIFFARD: I am advised that there has been expenditure in the development of the supplementary master plan. As was indicated in answer to an earlier question, the master plan is due to be released later this month. That is the decision of the Government for the best possible route for the people living in the areas between Perth and Mandurah.

Hon PETER FOSS: As a result of the questions I have asked, it appears that certain information is available but has not been included in answers to questions on notice. I have made a list of the questions on notice for which information apparently is available but has not been provided. I table that list and ask that the answers to the questions on notice be provided, if the information is available, because this Committee is entitled to answers.

The CHAIRMAN: The member is asking for further information about answers that I tabled today on behalf of the Committee.

Hon PETER FOSS: The answers were given but they plainly were not adequate answers. They refer to a document that has not been tabled. The answers apparently are known but have not been provided.

The CHAIRMAN: Those additional questions will be communicated to the parliamentary secretary.

*[Supplementary Information No 12]*

Hon GRAHAM GIFFARD: I will refer those matters to the minister, and I will provide whatever information I am able to glean from the minister.

[12 noon]