

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
ESTIMATES AND FINANCIAL OPERATIONS**

2012–13 BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARINGS

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE
TAKEN AT PERTH
TUESDAY, 3 JULY 2012**

**SESSION TWO
PUBLIC TRANSPORT AUTHORITY**

Members

**Hon Giz Watson (Chair)
Hon Philip Gardiner (Deputy Chair)
Hon Liz Behjat
Hon Ken Travers
Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich**

Hearing commenced at 1.07 pm

HON SIMON O'BRIEN

Minister for Finance representing the Minister for Transport, examined:

Mr REECE WALDOCK

Chief Executive Officer, sworn and examined:

Mr MARK BURGESS

Managing Director, sworn and examined:

Mr KEVIN KIRK

Executive Director, sworn and examined:

The CHAIR: On behalf of the Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations, I welcome you to the hearing this afternoon. Before we begin, I am required to ask the public servants to either take an oath or an affirmation.

[Witnesses took the oath or affirmation.]

The CHAIR: You will have all signed a document entitled "Information for Witnesses". Have you read and understood the document?

The Witnesses: Yes.

The CHAIR: The hearing is being held in public, although there is discretion available to the committee to take evidence in private either of its own motion or at the request of a witness. If for some reason you wish to make a confidential statement during today's proceedings, could you please request that the evidence be taken in closed session before answering that question.

Government agencies and departments have an important role and duty to assist Parliament to scrutinise the budget papers on behalf of the people of Western Australia. We value your assistance in this task. The proceedings are being recorded by Hansard this afternoon and a transcript of your evidence will be provided to you. It will greatly assist Hansard, members, if, when referring to the *Budget Statements* volumes or the consolidated account estimates, you please give the page number, the item, the program amount et cetera in preface to your question. If supplementary information is to be provided, I ask your cooperation in ensuring that it is delivered to the committee clerk within 10 working days of receipt of the questions. Should you be unable to meet this particular deadline, please advise the committee clerk immediately. The committee reminds agency representatives to respond to questions in a succinct manner and to limit the extent of their personal observations. Finally, for the benefit of members and Hansard, minister, if you would kindly introduce your advisers to the committee.

[Witnesses introduced.]

The CHAIR: Thanks very much. We have until three o'clock allocated for this hearing—a couple of hours. I suggest we will probably run straight through rather than taking a break, but if anybody is keen for a break, just let me know. I ask members to indicate if they have questions they are ready to start with.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: I do. There was a question I asked in the previous hearing, but I am trying to locate it.

Mr Waldock: There was a question about green CATs, I think.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: That was mine.

The CHAIR: Let us start with that while members are just collecting their thoughts on other questions.

Mr Waldock: Yes, the question was —

The CHAIR: It is great; you can ask your own questions and then provide the answers as well!

Mr Waldock: It is Kevin Rudd-like, is it not?

The question was, as I understood it, the green CAT service does run to Leederville station, which is outside the Perth parking boundary, and so the issues were there was a capital component to that where the bus is turned around, and there is a recurrent function of that as well. In terms of the capital, that will be funded out of the bus priority program, which is an ongoing program over the next four years for the PTA in terms of its capital budget. In terms of the recurrent ledger, it is not a significant sum, but that is being funded just through normal appropriations. Indeed there are significant, as you know, dollars attached to the bus contracts; over \$200 million is being funded through that particular program.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Just further to my question on notice about the expansion of the CAT network, I asked if there was consideration of a CAT to the airport and the answer was no. I was wondering what the public transport plans are to improve service to the airport.

Mr Waldock: I know Mr Burgess would love to talk to that, other than to suggest that this has been an ongoing issue for public transport for many years. Despite, I think, some good efforts in the Public Transport Authority to in fact consider the airport as a public transport service, it is clear that the requirements from customers that use the airport, by and large, it does not suit normal route bus services. That is very much why the airport, as you are well aware of, run their own operations and contract their own operations for bus coach services to the airport. So, we do not see significant changes there. But with the consolidation, Mark, did you want to talk about that at all?

Mr Burgess: Yes. I think in one of the other answers about major projects and so on that are currently being planned, so the context planning is being done for a branch of the Midland line to the airport sort of along the alignment of Tonkin Highway and through what would be the domestic airport now but which will be a consolidated sort of business park, I think by the designs of the airport. Then, the concept planning is to go under the runways, potentially with the site at the international airport when it is then the consolidated airport, and then possibly going out the other side so that we get a service to the hills. But, as I say, that is all sort of concept planning. But to some extent, you do need almost all of those things to come together. One of the observations in other cities where they have done these sorts of things is that unless you can get some other loading other than just the airport, the lines typically are not working as well, so you almost need that baseload of patronage that comes out of that consolidated business park and potentially that hills service as well so that the line is viable and justifies itself. If it was just the airport alone, observations from other cities are that quite often they are not terribly viable; the investment might be more questionable. You need those other attractions to build the overall patronage on the line.

[1.15 pm]

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: We know that the airport is under considerable reconstruction now and it is an opportunity, of course, to design the new airport facilities to incorporate a new station. Have you ascertained where a line would run so that the federal moneys that are now being spent in building the airport can potentially contribute to that by putting in the station where it will go at some point in the future when we build the line there?

Mr Burgess: At a concept level we know where it would go. We have met with the airport at various times and we need to keep—it is probably too early yet to say categorically exactly what footprint it would have —

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: When do you think that decision will be made? Because as I understand the design for the new terminals is already well down the track.

Mr Burgess: I think we have probably got the best part of a year to really consolidate that, you know, that is —

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: To decide where the station is going to go?

Mr Burgess: Yes.

Mr Waldock: We have been speaking to Westralia Airports Corporation and the issues will be exactly where it goes and I guess the commercial issues of who pays for what. So, they have still got to work their way through. But certainly there is a clear understanding that we, at this stage, would be looking at a car park just across from the entrance of the station—of the consolidated air terminal.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Further to the question around CAT facilities, Fremantle enjoys its own local CAT facility —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Sorry, can I just ask a question on the airport, before you go off the airport? Do you mind?

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Go for it.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: If it is in the location you were talking about, does that not actually require the construction to commence within the next 12 months, not just a decision to be made? They are going to build their multistorey car park in the area that you are talking about, so unless the box at least for the rail station is built as part of that construction, the ability to retrofit is non-existent.

Mr Burgess: It was not long ago that I met with the people at the airport. I think they were looking to head toward design in about 12 months and then construction thereafter. They were the time lines I heard from them, so we have got a while to go yet. I mean, if it is not at that location, there are a number of other locations potentially there, bearing in mind the intention is we will be underground in a box. So, there are probably some other locations nearby that would work as well.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: But, I mean, their design will be getting on to a point of actually saying it is not a concept design, it is about the physical design, so a decision will need to have been made about whether or not that design includes a box underneath it that allows for a railway station to be put into it at some point. If that is not done within that 12-month period, then their designs will not incorporate that, then you will have to get a—I hate this term, but I cannot think of a better word—sub-optimum location for your rail station in terms of maximising passenger numbers.

Mr Burgess: I guess that is why I say it is probably still early days, because we are not sure that is the optimal location; we are still working through that option. I know what you are saying, and if we are going to be underneath a multistorey car park then we need to fit in with their time lines. We understand that. That is a ways away yet from what they have told me. We are not sure that is the right location. There is an amount of room there along Horrie Miller Drive around the airport as to where we put the box.

Mr Waldock: Our decision will certainly be clarified within the next 12 months.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: If you move it away from that location under the car park, are you saying that you would put it in a location where it is more about capturing other passengers going to the airport rather than people who are flying into and out of the airport? In terms of maximising your opportunities to grab people who are flying, I would have thought being as close to the entrance of the terminal is the ideal location.

Mr Waldock: We agree.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: If you put it on the other side of the car park, you might pick up some of the workers at the Woolworths distribution centre.

Mr Waldock: No, from our point of view it will be an airport rail station. There will not be any transport penalty to move into a shuttle bus to go to the airport from where the station is; it will be integrated as best we can within easy walking distance from the consolidated airport. That will be part of our decision in terms of what options we have got.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: I just wondered if there was any consideration of expanding the CAT service in Fremantle. I know that it is quite a successful service; you have would have seen that. I know they only have three CAT buses and I wonder if there is any opportunity for the Public Transport Authority to assist us in dealing with our local transport needs by adding another bus.

Mr Waldock: I will ask Mr Burgess to respond in detail. There are lots of demands on us for CAT buses, as you might expect. The City of Fremantle is probably one of the better examples, where in fact they make a very substantial contribution to the cost of running those services. Any decision would always be based on their preparedness to also invest additional dollars on an expanded service. Do you want to say any more about that?

Mr Burgess: I can add on to what Reece has just said. We have situations in the city where obviously the Perth parking licence fee pays for the entire CAT network, which is the ideal. In the original days of the Perth CAT it was 50–50 arrangement, with 50 per cent paid by the Department of Transport and 50 per cent by the City of Perth. That moved when the Perth Parking Management Act was passed, with the licence fee paying for the entire CAT operation. In Joondalup it is the same sort of thing, and we pay for 34 per cent, I think it is, of the Joondalup CAT arrangement and other stakeholders pay the rest. At Fremantle, my recollection is it is 60–40 and we pay 40 per cent. The answer is that CAT in itself stands for central area transit, so we need a central area or a CBD–type area where the land values and the demand, if you like, are sufficient that they warrant a CAT system. The features of a CAT system are that it is free and frequent, and by virtue of the fact that it is free people get on board quickly; the interchange with the driver in terms of ticketing does not occur so we get great mobility and move a lot of people around a CBD area where there is high demand and we seek that sort of distribution function. Everything that was done at Fremantle was done totally in consultation with the city, obviously, because it had to pay for an amount of it. I have not heard of any positions put by the city seeking additional CAT buses. Certainly, the splitting of the route that occurred from one into two was largely driven more by the city. We did not object to it. I guess, if the city is paying a substantial amount of the bill, we give it a reasonable amount of control naturally enough, so the city sought that route change that saw the need to split it into two. I think the PTA/government is always willing to hear approaches from CAT partners, if I can put it that way, on expanding their CAT systems, subject to budget. I think we all accept that those CAT networks work in good ways in the places they are at, that is, Joondalup, Fremantle and Perth. I think most local governments in Perth have approached us at some point in time asking could they have a CAT system and we have to go through the explanation that I just gave of, “Really, you have not got the intensity anywhere in your local government area to warrant a CAT system”. We are happy to do the numbers and tell them what their share would be, and that usually ends the conversation when we mention how much it costs.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: But it is working well and Fremantle is a good example.

Mr Burgess: For now, it works great.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Are you able to tell us, during the half-hour peak in the mornings, what is the current actual patronage number versus capacity on the railway lines at the moment? I should preface that by congratulating you on your 20-millionth patron on the Mandurah line, your 60-millionth on the railways, and 80-millionth on the buses this financial year. Well done!

Mr Waldock: Thank you very much. Do you want to talk about the peak of the peak?

Mr Burgess: I do not know whether we have exact numbers. I do not know whether I could answer that question with the data I have with me.

Mr Waldock: Can we answer the question in another way by responding to how many we may leave behind on the rail system at the peak the peak? Would that be another way of answering the question?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: That would be one way of answering the question.

Mr Burgess: We have been getting reports for a period of time from our station staff, and it is difficult to say that there are people left behind because quite often, from our own observers, there are some people who choose not to board what is a busy train but there is room on it. Believe it or not, around the world they have come up with an industry standard term called pass ups. These are people who either cannot board because the train is too full or in some cases it could be argued did not board because they know there is a six-car set behind this three-car set or whatever it might be. In preparation for today I went through a number of reports in the last period of time, and on a typical week day it is in the order of 30 or 40 individual train services that leave people behind at some point in their trip—usually it will be the last station they are coming to towards the city in the morning. That is 30 or 40 individual trains, and we run 1 135 trains a day, so it is out of that number of services.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: They would all occur in the peak hour. How many trains would you run in the peak hour, during that period where you are leaving people behind?

[Supplementary Information No B1.]

Hon KEN TRAVERS: If I can still get as supplementary information the actual patronage versus capacity. I think you normally do it in March, because that is your busiest month. If that is when you do it, I am happy to have it based on March.

Mr Waldock: In some respects that is always open to some difference of view. Our capacity number, as you are well aware, I think is 1 140, and 1 160 for the B series, but people might argue that our capacity is not in keeping with what the community would perceive to be our capacity. We will certainly come back with that.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: You previously provided us figures, so please do not change what you describe as capacity. Based on the way you have recorded in the past, what is your current patronage as a percentage of the capacity?

Mr Burgess: When we reported to the committee previously, which we stated at the time, we underdid the patronage. I think we assumed 1 000 on a six-car set when the capacity is at least 1 120. We did that because we know some people are not prepared to get on a crowded train.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: On the pass ups, do you record how many times people pass up more than one train?

Mr Waldock: Yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Are you able to tell us whether there are sequences where people have to pass up more than one train?

Mr Waldock: Perhaps I will have a go at that initially, and to some extent it is very hard to get the numbers. Anecdotally, there are very few people who would ever wait for two trains; is that correct?

Mr Burgess: That is right. We do not say that we are watching the woman in purple —

Mr Waldock: No, but anecdotally very few people would ever have to pass up two trains.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: I was wondering if you had a key performance indicator relating to pass ups. Are you trying to get that down to zero?

Mr Burgess: We would seek to not have pass ups, I guess. Having said that, they exist around the world on train systems. It happens everywhere. If we were suddenly saying trains that trains are

only 75 per cent full in the peak, we would expect to be criticised by our government and minister, whoever they might be. We would want pretty full trains in a peak period, and that would be the expectation around the world that we have pretty full trains in a peak period otherwise we have bought too many trains and they are very expensive.

[1.30 pm]

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: But you would be aiming to get all passengers on, would you not?

Mr Burgess: Yes. I think the ideal would be that we would not have pass-ups, but you would have full trains.

Mr Waldock: There is no reason we could not log that as an operational KPL.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Yes, because for those 30 people, I am sure they would prefer to be on the train than at the station.

Mr Burgess: Yes. But you understand what I am saying about you would not want a hardly full train.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Yes. But maybe if you are one of those pass-ups, you tend to not have faith that you can get on the train so you end up finding another way. That is only a small —

Mr Burgess: My daughter is a pass-up every day because she understands the train patterns, and we actually have signage that says the next one is a six-car set; she reads it and chooses to get on the next one.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: She knows dad has put on a special train for her; just joking!

Have you done any modelling on what, in March 2016, which is the date you gave us last time, will be the predicted patronage versus capacity in light of what we have seen over the last 12 months? Maybe I should ask this question first: have you got a final figure for what the growth in the rail system was in the 2011-12 financial year? Certainly at the end of May, it looked like it was going to be hitting, sort of, 10 per cent on the Mandurah line, and probably seven per cent across the whole system.

Mr Burgess: I was just saying to Reece, I have not got the exact answer on me so I would prefer not to guess. I think we will have, obviously, a reasonable number of the new trains on order, and in fact we will probably have them all in commission—you said 2016, did you not?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Yes; you should have them all.

Mr Burgess: We should have them all in commission in 2016. The last arrive at the end of 2015, or it might dribble into January 2016.

Mr Waldock: I think the member is talking about the growth, though.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: What I am talking about is that by 2016 you will have had all the new carriages delivered, and based on what you told us last year, you were still expecting to have 95 per cent capacity on the Joondalup line and 96 per cent, if you round it up, on the Mandurah line and 94 per cent on the Midland line. That was based on 4.5 per cent growth on the Mandurah and Joondalup lines, and three per cent on the heritage lines.

Mr Burgess: Sure.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: In light of what we have seen over the last 12 months, which, alone, is the equivalent of two years' growth in that patronage, even if you maintain your 4.5 per cent and your three per cent for the rest of the period, it strikes me that your patronage in 2016 is going to be, potentially, above 100 per cent. Have you done that work yet?

Mr Burgess: We have certainly done it; I, unfortunately, do not have it in my head, and I do not have it with me. We have done work on future Transperth train—we have done some extrapolations

out a number of years now in terms of numbers we expect station by station and so on, so we would certainly be able to answer that. I do not have it with me, that is the unfortunate thing.

[Supplementary Information No B2.]

Mr Waldock: I think the important point is that the order we have with Bombardier now allows us to put on additional railcars subject to future government decisions on that, so we have not cut off our options for the future.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I guess my point is that we have already seen a situation where governments have not made decisions in a timely manner so that we reach a point of overcrowding, so what I am trying to work out is: by 2016, how many additional railcars we will require over and above the 15 already on order?

Mr Burgess: I think they accommodate what we need. That is going on my recollection, but I think they do accommodate what we need.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: But your figures last year showed us that to accommodate that, you had to go from, in 2011, 89 per cent capacity to 95 per cent on the Joondalup line, and then on top of that you have now had extraordinary growth—sort of two years' growth in one year; in fact, arguably more than two years' growth in one year—it struck me that you are going to be reaching a point of 100 per cent capacity, and surely that is not sustainable.

Mr Burgess: I guess the answer is multilayered. Firstly, everything we gave you last year was based on that lower number I mentioned—I think our number was 1 000; all our formulas are worked on 1 000 instead of 1 100, so to some extent there is a buffer in there. Then I am pretty sure last year's numbers—you will have them in front of you—did not take into account the four three-car sets that had been released. I do not think they were in there.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Our number says 15, so you are saying it is up to 19?

Mr Burgess: Four were released by the minister last year as well—four three-car sets were released.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: In addition to the 15 in the budget?

Mr Burgess: The Butler cars, if I can call them that.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: But this includes Butler, so they now accommodate the Butler?

Mr Burgess: Yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: So in the notes you had below it, Butler estimated 3 000 daily passengers, which is a peak-period figure derived from proportion of Clarkson daily passengers in 2011 who board during the period.

Mr Burgess: Yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: My assessment of that is that you would have calculated in the Butler cars being added in, whether they are part of the 15 or subsequent.

Mr Burgess: Yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: So, I think they were part of those figures.

Mr Burgess: I think the answer is that the train order will accommodate us, but it comes to the point that Reece made, which is that that does not mean that there will not be more train orders needed after that.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: But then I go to the railcar delivery option schedule that was done that I think I got under FOI that showed that by 2016 you actually, even back then, were predicting that you would need 20 railcars, not the 15 that were on order. Now you are telling us you are comfortable that the 15 is going to be enough, even though patronage is going through the roof.

Mr Waldock: But I am saying there is capacity on that current order to increase the order.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: By squeezing more people into the existing trains?

Mr Waldock: No; by increasing the order for addition railcars on the current order.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I understand your point. I am trying to understand how many more we will need by 2016.

Mr Waldock: Sure.

Mr Burgess: It may be better to —

Mr Waldock: We will take that as a supplementary question, if we may.

[Supplementary Information No B3.]

Hon KEN TRAVERS: You will give us an answer?

Mr Waldock: Promise.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Of course.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: That actually gives us a figure?

Mr Waldock: I promise I will give you an answer.

The CHAIR: Has anybody else got anything else on this particular topic?

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: What is what—train cars?

The CHAIR: Rail, yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Overcrowding.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Not on train cars, but I have a question on rail.

The CHAIR: We will go with that.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: I am just wondering if there was any update on the potential to put bicycles on trains in peak hour?

Mr Waldock: I think the discussion we have just had, if I may, member, highlights to us all that for the EMU-type—I spoke about this last year I remember, but I have very strong views on this—the nature of our train fleet, which are EMUs, which are not the hook-and-pull with lots of carriages you can add on, means that they are incredibly expensive per unit; they are \$11 million, are they not, Mark?

Mr Burgess: Per three-car set.

Mr Waldock: Of that order. We could not imagine the issue, I think, of squeezing in, for peak hour, cyclists alongside commuters. That is not in any way different than the vast majority of commuter mass transit railways in the world, so it is not as if we are, sort of, rednecks here or whatever; this is what best practice around the world is, with few exceptions. I know there are some exceptions, but there are few exceptions. If you look at the great efforts we are doing now—we are more than happy to have that as a question, too—we have secured bicycle storage on rail stations throughout the whole network, which are being smart card-enabled as well, and there is a whole range of other bicycle storage, not just these secured lockers. There are a number of other ways of actually putting your bicycle in the stations as well, but they are the better ones, we think. There is enormous capacity there. Nobody, we believe, misses out on actually have not a secured bicycle set-up. We think that is, and has to be, the future, and that is why we have put a lot of money as well into making sure we get the access to the railway stations right for cyclists so that it becomes part of their experience. But the idea of putting cyclists at peak times on our standard train services, particularly with the issues that the member raised, we just could not imagine it. It is just not going to happen, certainly in the foreseeable future.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I had two areas. Just going back to the railcars, once the final two-car sets that are currently operating on the Joondalup–Mandurah line going across to the heritage lines, where do we get extra capacity on those lines beyond that?

Mr Waldock: We will be looking to go, in future, for a world-class order of both the B and the A series, looking at, potentially, trains with different features. Those different features will probably be certainly more doors for faster loading and unloading, which is current best practice; and we will be looking at a whole range of whether we can get a standard train for both the heritage lines and the north–south line, or whether we just need to have differing trains for those. That is a work in progress that Mark’s people are already considering in terms of the new orders we will be going to in the future. This is clearly, in terms of funding, subject to government decisions, but in terms of the way we are thinking, we will be looking at a fresh approach to our trains in the future.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I am glad hear that because it strikes me that we are at that point where we need to be making that decision. I just wanted to confirm it because people say that although you can use the three-car sets on the heritage line, they do not work very well and is actually not good for them to use them on the heritage lines; they are not really built for the heritage lines. Is that correct?

Mr Burgess: That was a bit of an issue at the very early stages, but in a technology sense it was quickly resolved. So they can be used on the old lines.

Mr Waldock: There have been no issues at all.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Whether it is just that you cannot get four cars—you can only then have three.

Mr Burgess: That is it, yes. There is a whole range of considerations. We are buying a train that can obviously do 130 kilometres per hour, which is what the three and six cars—the B series—can do. Those speeds are not attainable on the heritage lines, so it is a question of whether they are the right train for that line. Depending on your door configurations and so on, we actually have all the tactiles on the platforms for obvious reasons—for people with vision impairment. If you have a multitude of different types of trains with different doors in different places, those things become very complicated.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Fair enough.

The other one is about cycling. You talked about the secure bike shelters at the stations. Looking at the answer you gave me to a question on notice, it would appear to me that they are all now virtually fully allocated. There are a couple of exceptions such as Wellard—I am not sure what Rockingham south versus Rockingham north means. Certainly everywhere bar Wellard, Rockingham and Mandurah are now fully allocated, and Whitfords and Clarkson are all the only other ones that are not fully allocated. Am I reading those figures correctly?

Mr Waldock: I asked the same question because it is a bit confusing, that. I will ask Mr Burgess to answer, but certainly my understanding is that if there is any confusion there, it is that last paragraph on the second page.

Mr Burgess: So the waiting list—I do not know whether you have a note at the end of your question. Unfortunately, that is a software/hardware issue; we do not expect it to hold us up for too long, but it is certainly holding us up. So we are currently limited in how many registrations we can have per site. I have to say that it is a complicated one though, because when people are asked, “Do you want to register for SmartRider access to this”, quite a few people say, “Yes, please”, but then it is a case of how often they use it. If they do not use it very often, you would rather see that who is going to use it often gets in there. So I am not sure we could actually have an unlimited number of people subscribe to it, because you could have the unfortunate day when we have a nice temperature—perfect sunny day—and they will all go down there, and then we will have the complaint of, “I couldn’t fit in.” We have to strike the right balance there.

Mr Waldock: It has not happened yet.

Mr Burgess: No.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: There has been no instance.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: That is my question. In terms of the note, you are saying that at this stage none of those bays have been fully—how close have we got to having all the spaces taken up?

Mr Waldock: My understanding is that we do monitor this regularly—Jim Krynen, in particular, this is one of his program areas—and certainly we are not even close. We hope to be close one day and we hope to be close so that we can actually build more. But certainly it is a bit like bicycle lockers; people want one, but you realise that they never use most of them because they just lock them away and do not come back. We will monitor it. We would like in the future to take out more car bays and put these in. It is not as if there is any lack of interest from us; it is a lack of interest from the market at this stage. But we are well placed to respond.

[1.45 pm]

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I was not suggesting there was any lack of interest. I think it is a great initiative. I am just trying to work out how do we work out at what point those existing shelters are at full occupancy.

Mr Waldock: The good news is when we get the SmartRider working as it should, we will actually get daily feed-in—how many people were tagged in and tagged out—so we will actually know.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Have all the teething problems been ironed out, because I know there were some problems with people not being able to get in and having to wait an hour and a half or whatever to get in? Again, that is going to discourage you if you get home and you cannot get your bike out for even 20 minutes after the train has left.

Mr Burgess: I should defend our SmartRider system. Any of the software and hardware issues are not SmartRider-contractor related. Part of it is also built on another system, which is where the actual interfaces are with the devices on the locks, as well as the registration field, which is another piece of software developed by another party. Our SmartRider —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Is there another state that has successfully implemented a SmartRider as well as us yet?

Mr Burgess: No.

Mr Waldock: Brisbane maybe.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I thought I would give you a plug then!

Mr Burgess: That is why I defend it—because it is so good.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I was not attacking the SmartRider, but I know there have been problems with the implementation of the bike shelters. I am just trying to work out whether that has been sorted out yet and whether or not we are still having problems with access to those shelters.

Mr Burgess: It has certainly been given a high priority to get fixed.

Mr Waldock: But nobody is missing out.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: So the answer is it may still be occurring and it is still not quite fixed yet—the access issues from time to time.

Mr Burgess: The access issues are fixed, but the other issue of the 100 limitation, we have not fixed as far as I know. As of a few days ago, we had not.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Can you give us, if there is one, another figure of —

Mr Burgess: Typical loadings.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Typical loadings, yes—how many bikes are actually using each of the shelters. Is it possible to get that as supplementary?

Mr Waldock: Yes; we can do an audit for you.

[Supplementary Information No B4.]

Mr Burgess: And almost just add another field to that table that we have given you on typical daily use.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Looking at some of them, like Canning Bridge, you would assume that if there are 58 on the waiting list, it gets added on. I think for that one there, the capacity is 12. You would imagine that if you put another 58 in, you would be getting very close to being at capacity.

Mr Burgess: Of course, this is just the SmartRider sheds or cages, as you want to call them. We have also got bike lockers, lots of U rails and so on that are also being used. So, presumably, those on the waiting list who choose to use it on a particular day are using the other bike storage devices.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: There are sheds and all sorts of various wonderful areas to park bikes.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Just on page 655, and really discussing modes of transport still, on the pass-ups issue, we are still kind of in that area, I think. One of the concerns I have always had is that you can pack people on a bit tighter if it is that people were a bit more considerate and moved on. It is the case with taxis at airports—shared passengers, for example. Both in Sydney and in Perth, I know they have almost wiped it, but if that was back in the system, you would move those queues much more quickly. It just requires a bit of initiative, because I have actually done it myself and got passengers to do it—clearing the line. This was some years ago when I was in a long queue. It comes also to the carriages being full in buses. Have you tested on the rail—for example, when your fellows are watching passengers who are passing up perhaps—whether there is space on those carriages where those pass ups are demonstrated to be not necessary?

Mr Waldock: I think Mark Burgess is far better placed than I am to respond, other than to suggest that one of the reasons we are going, we think, to the new three-door sets is because there is an enormous tendency for Perth people not to move down away from the doors. There is almost a terror, I think, that when the train stops at the station, they will not be able to get out again. You keep saying, and there are announcements all the time even in the trains, “Please move down. Please move down” and people refuse. When you have got three doors, you can imagine the catchment area around each door, they actually intersect like a Venn diagram. So you can imagine at that level, we are getting far better loading characteristics on the trains. I think we have almost got to work out perhaps not behavioural change, but physical layout change to get some of those loadings. But you might want to say more, Mark.

Mr Burgess: I know what you are saying. Our platform staff do encourage people to move down the train and so on. It becomes that fine balance between how long you want the train to dwell for, because the whole timetable is worked out about standard dwell times and so on—as much as you can have standard dwell times—and how much time do you invest in “Move down, move down, move down” versus trying to get the train going again if you are only going to add a few more people on? It becomes that balancing act. But our station staff do try to encourage people to move away from the door. In the case in the morning, most people are getting out in the CBD. If they are not, and, as Reece says, if someone is getting out at Glendalough, let us say, you can sort of understand them not wanting to move all the way down the aisle. We do not put the effort in you see in some of the famous videos of the systems in Asia where they have pushers. I hope we do not come to that.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: With white gloves, of course!

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: When you go on the subway in New York, you are holding on and you have almost got hands overlapping your hand with people holding on and it is probably not the kind

of pass-up rate you could possibly get there. From travelling there a little bit, they do pack on. So it is a behavioural thing as well, but you are trying to deal with it in a way that avoids —

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Western Australians cannot merge in any environment, whether it is on the roads or in train stations. We cannot merge; we like our space.

Mr Waldock: We like our physical space.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Main Roads can tell you about this when they come in afterwards. You have correctly identified it is a Western Australian trait. But it is something that our government agencies—whether we are building roads, and I am referring to how you allocate freeway space, or allocating passenger space—are allowing for because it takes a long time to change human nature, though I appreciate what you are saying.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Yes; fair enough. I guess a bus driver is in the best position because he can say, “Would you mind moving down?”

Mr Waldock: Of course, and he is there.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: I presume you have fewer pass ups as a result.

Mr Burgess: The train drivers have one of many pre-recorded announcements; they can press the button, and they regularly do. But you are right; it is not a physical presence in the carriage like it is on a bus.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I can recall as a schoolboy not so long ago observing on those buses with those drivers, or even conductors, saying, “Move to the back of the bus” and watching nobody halfway down taking any notice of them. So, it is an entrenched form of behaviour.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: And requiring half fares to stand, please.

Mr Waldock: That is it.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I was a St Louis boy. We were gentlemen and we did.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Also on page 655 are the outcomes and key effectiveness indicators for metropolitan bus services and metropolitan train services. Do you have with you the number for 2009–10 just so I can see what that trend is—whether the bus service passenger per service kilometre is falling while the metropolitan train service is improving?

Mr Waldock: I think Mr Kevin Kirk will have that number.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Even if you have got 2008–09 to start us off with just to see that trend.

Mr Kirk: I have got the 2009–10 actual. Which one was it?

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Metropolitan bus services, passengers per service kilometre.

Mr Kirk: Bus services was 1.43.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: And the train?

Mr Kirk: Train was 4.15.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Do you have 2008–09 there as well?

Mr Kirk: No, I do not; sorry.

Mr Burgess: It is one of those things, because the variables are how many service kays you are doing and how many buses you have got. It can be a bit of a loss leaver, if I can put it that way. If you put a new range of services into a new suite of suburbs, as we have been doing, you actually drop down your passengers per service kay whilst that patronage builds up on that new route and so on.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Just very quickly, I noticed that you gave us the response in percentages. I wonder whether you would have actual numbers for those percentages.

Mr Kirk: Not with us. That is 1.43 passengers per service kilometre.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Okay; Sorry.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: On page 657, again, it is point 1—the metropolitan and regional passenger services. I know there is a bit of an amalgam in the total cost of service because that includes it for both metropolitan and regional. I just wonder whether you have a break-up of what that is for the metropolitan services as opposed to the regional, because what I wanted to come down to at the end of the day is to look at this carbon tax we have got. This applies to bus and train operations. I would just like to know the proportions of that \$2.1 million in the carbon tax, which is the second-last dot point under note 1. Have you got it there? I would just like to know how much of that is applying to bus and how much is applying to rail. I know it gets a bit tricky again, because you have got regional and metropolitan. Ideally, break it up for metropolitan.

Mr Waldock: My understanding is it is all rail for two years. The policy is based on, for the first two years, heavy vehicles, as I understand it, including buses not being subject to carbon tax.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Okay; so it is only applying to rail at this stage. That answers my question.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Looking at the public transport services to regional areas, I was wondering if there was any consideration being given to the expansion of rail services to our regional centres, which are growing as Western Australia grows in population. We have got some key population centres that are growing—Bunbury, for example. I wondered if you were, in your planning for the public transport plan, also looking at expanding the regional train services.

Mr Waldock: Rail services to regions—still because we are very car friendly in this state—are always difficult. The good news is this year, for the first time in many years, the *Prospector* service has actually grown. So rather than riding a downhill wave, we have actually turned that around, which I must congratulate my public transport people for. Certainly, generally speaking, it is tough. The most likely one in the future would be to Bunbury, as you mentioned. As we mentioned last year, we still are continuing master planning for Bunbury, which would include two stations there, and we have actually outlined the corridor. That will be a government decision, and certainly it is very early days. But I guess the important thing is, though, we actually identify the corridors. We are working through that. The provision of a high-speed train service to Bunbury, as I say, my sense is we will take that to a position where government will make a considered opinion in years to come. Just to give you a guide, initial demand forecasts for Bunbury would be about 7 800 passengers a week in 2021. That is the sort of number we are thinking about. That is equal to just over 400 000 passengers a year. That is the only one at this stage we would potentially put to government as maybe a new initiative, but, quite frankly, we do not see that as probably one of our earlier priorities.

[2.00 pm]

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Can I ask specifically about Albany?

Mr Waldock: For a start, we would have to get a rail alignment down there. It is possible to run a train down to Albany now on the grain line but it will take about a week and a half.

The CHAIR: It only used to be overnight. I know, because I used to take it. It was very nice overnight.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Japan has some really fast trains now.

Mr Waldock: They are grain lines and they would be very restricted speeds. Again, there is a romantic notion to it, but I do not think Albany would stack up in terms of any real commuter service. It might be a boutique service, and there is no reason why in the future companies cannot come along with boutique services and seek access from Brookfield. I am sure Brookfield would

consider it where they have windows in their train parts. We are not saying no, but I do not think it would be a commuter-type service.

The CHAIR: There is nothing in regards to the existing rail line that would prevent passenger trains; they are just a slower service?

Mr Waldock: That is my understanding, yes.

Mr Burgess: They would have to work in among the other trains.

Mr Waldock: The grain and the alumina.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Are not the grain freight trains now rated to 90 kilometres an hour on the Albany to Avon line?

Mr Waldock: Yes, probably. That is still very slow when you look at getting down to Albany.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Yes, but that is freight, so for a passenger service you might be able to get it even a bit faster than that.

Mr Waldock: It is a very busy line too, particularly for the alumina path which is the Mundijong section.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Yes, but the Mundijong section does not connect to the Albany–Avon line.

Mr Waldock: That is true too; I am quite wrong there. That would be the other way around. It is just grain lines.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: The congestion point would be between Northam and Midland, I would have thought.

Mr Waldock: Yes, that is dual gauge out to Northam. You could do it. Our experience has been that whilst people talk about it, even the *Australind* now; that number has dropped on the *Australind* this year by four per cent. That has been continually running down over the years. Despite the issues, I think, there is a lot of interest whenever you talk about having other approaches. At one stage, you will remember talk about the Mandurah railway of running high-speed coach services to Mandurah. There was strong resistance from the Bunbury community and other communities. But the fact of the matter is it is just not being patronised. I would say the *Australind* has dropped every year over the past decade has it not Mark?

Mr Burgess: The extension of the freeway and Forrest Highway has put a big dent in it because coaches and private vehicles can move so quickly up from Bunbury now that it has dented the *Australind* patronage. I think that is the issue for even Albany; you have to look at how important time is to people. Every time we have experimented with something it is fascinating to see how much time is very valuable. They might do something once as a boutique experience. But time is the imperative. To do it frequently, time becomes very important. If coaches can come from Albany at a better speed than you are able to achieve on existing railway lines, coaches quickly become the preferred alternative.

The CHAIR: With the answer to questions regarding a Bunbury option, that is a new rail line rather than upgrading the —

Mr Waldock: It will be electric line down.

The CHAIR: The extension from Mandurah south?

Mr Burgess: That is right where the Anketell tunnel comes off, it would keep going down and then you can turn off once you get closer to Bunbury

The CHAIR: How does that compare in price using the existing railway line; is it the same issue as having too many other services running on that line such as the bauxite and whatever else is on that line?

Mr Burgess: Every week we identify why each of the country trains was disrupted, whether it was our fault, mechanical reason or a passenger loading reason—if a passenger is slow to get on board because sometimes there are people with mobility impairments.

Mr Waldock: It comes through Armadale as well, which is a slow section.

The CHAIR: For a quick train service to Bunbury you could not do anything with the existing line; you would have to go for a new line?

Mr Waldock: We believe so. That is why we call it a high-speed service. As Mark says, it is about time if you are going to get patronage. No matter what you did for the current *Australind* line, you really have nowhere to go.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Have you done studies for what a commuter high-speed train would be to regional areas, not just Bunbury but also Geraldton? Is there any thinking in this —

Mr Waldock: I can say with real high speed, the ARA, and certainly it has been front and centre even with the Labor federal government with minister Albanese looking at a high-speed rail service between Sydney and Canberra.

The CHAIR: Encouraging, I would imagine!

Mr Waldock: But the costs are just terrifying.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: You have looked at the costs?

Mr Waldock: They have. They have done a number of pre-feasibility studies and now they are doing a more detailed feasibility study. The latest I hear is that it is just a bridge too far, even for those centres. You can imagine if you are comparing those key centres on the east coast, particularly, again, because there are no real centres in between, it is almost, origin–destination, with very little movement in between.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: If you want to run high-speed trains, it is always a trade-off as to how many stops you have anyway.

Mr Waldock: Yes, but it would be nice to have a few stops probably to regional centres. If they cannot make it work on the east coast, I think it is a long shot for us.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: How does it compare then to the AvonLink? Is that a growing service or is it falling like *Australind*.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: The figures for the AvonLink show a decline in service. It has been trending downwards for some years, as I recall. I have just been provided with some information for the last fin year—that is, 2011–12—the AvonLink is down about 11 per cent. I do not know what the future of that service will be long term. I guess it is a case of passengers tending to vote with their feet. Whether we are contemplating passenger services from Albany, for example, the reality is that people will tend to look for their most effective and quickest mode of transport, in particular if they are taking repeat journeys. I think this has been the experience. This is why, as Mr Waldock said, if someone were of a mind to do so—some tourist group or other—to have a boutique service to go on an odd leisurely trip to Albany in a special rail car, they would probably get some takers for that. But if you wanted to run, say, an everyday commuter service, you just would not get the passengers because they would be seduced by the one-hour air travel or the four-hour car travel as opposed to the 12 to 15-hour train-travel option.

Mr Waldock: That is why we are looking at an-hour-and-a-half service to Bunbury. If we ever invest in Bunbury, at least we would be providing a very, very efficient service, even compared to the motor vehicle.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: I would have thought the AvonLink to Northam would have been a simpler thing. It works in the UK, as we all know. People travel 100 miles from Wiltshire to

London to work each day. I wonder whether the Northam super town concept is going to improve that. It will be interesting in any case.

Mr Waldock: It will be interesting. It depends, I suppose, on the demand or elasticity for more services. The AvonLink sometimes has only about 30 people per day on it. You could run a coach and still have some room left over. That is because they might argue—there is some credence to the fact—that we are running only limited services, morning and afternoon. Having said that, we need to fix that.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Yes, I know.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Do you have a figure for the cost of a fast train to Bunbury?

Mr Waldock: No. At this stage because we have only very early planning work, we have been spending a lot more time in patronage forecasting, route selection rather than costs. If you get the cost, you have to get down to some detailed design and certainly better understanding. Quite frankly, even moving it into the city and into the underground tunnel needs to be thought through. Whether you have an electric train or a diesel–electric train and then you have ventilation in the city, all these things would need to be considered further, but we have not gone that far.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Your ability to drop them off and then you have to take it out to Leederville to turn it back or something would you not?

Mr Waldock: Precisely. You would have to probably move them through to maybe Leederville station and turn them around there. There are logistical issues, because it will not be the old Perth station anymore; it will be on the north–south line, so, no.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: There is no costing, not even a ballpark figure, of what range we are looking at?

Mr Waldock: Not from me, no.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Fair enough. The actual rail carriage for the *Australind* service must be at the end of its economic life now is it not? If it is not, it is very close. What are the issues with replacement of that?

Mr Waldock: Trains do go on forever as long as you keep investing in refurbishment. We have given it a number of refurbishments.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: They are government owned.

Mr Waldock: Kevin, do you want to talk about that; you seem pretty excited about it!

Mr Kirk: I can try. It is on our unfunded list. I think the current train is about 30 years old.

Mr Burgess: Approaching, yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: 1985, was it not?

Mr Burgess: I think that is probably about right—approaching 30 years.

Mr Kirk: Typically, they have a life expectancy of 35 to 45 years. It is on our unfunded list, but we have not sought any funding for it.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: At some point it has to go through a fairly significant overhaul, I would have thought. In terms of its maintenance schedule, when is that next point you will have to get a new one or you have to spend big dollars on doing a major overhaul on it?

Mr Waldock: Four years ago we gave it an internal refurbishment and some work in terms of mechanicals, but I think there is a major bit of work due in the next three or four years is there not?

Mr Kirk: I think so, Reece, but I am not sure.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Is that budgeted for yet, then?

Mr Burgess: We have certainly put some special attention into the maintenance budget for the *Australind* for the past couple of years, but it has not required a massive injection; it has had a modest increase, as I recall, so it is okay for a while yet. I guess, largely, it is about the right time for government to make a decision on whether you replace that train or go on this new direct fast route—what is the timing of that?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: At this stage it does not need that major overhaul within the current forward estimate period?

Mr Waldock: Maybe.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: On the Avon arc, my understanding of last year was that there was a lot of flurry about an increase in services to Northam and Toodyay. Whatever happened to those?

Mr Waldock: It is my understanding that options have been put up and they will be considered by government in due course and probably part of the SuperTowns in due course.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Twelve months ago there was talk. I think Hon Max Trenorden announced it was happening. Whatever happened?

Mr Waldock: I think the government is still considering it, would that be right minister?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I have no idea.

The CHAIR: Do you want that on notice?

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Are you ready for a new topic?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I am; but can I start it?

The CHAIR: Do you want that on notice?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Yes, let us get it on notice about services into the Avon arc.

[Supplementary Information No B5.]

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I will take that on notice. I cannot answer it, but it will have to be referred to the minister.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: On page 680 of last year's Budget Papers it refers to —

Due to declining patronage on some regional routes combined with the high cost of providing these services, the Authority will review its regional services to ensure that it continues to provide fairly priced public transport services that link communities and provide access to health services and employment opportunities, including transport to schools.

Has that review been completed?

Mr Burgess: Is there a title for the review, again?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: It is on page 680 of last year's budget. I will read the whole bit —

The Authority provides a public transport service to regional Western Australia through a network of regional town and inter-town services, country coach and rail services and school bus services. Due to declining patronage on some regional routes combined with the high cost of providing these services, the Authority will review its regional services to ensure that it continues to provide fairly priced public transport services that link communities and provide access to health services and employment opportunities, including transport to schools.

[2.15 pm]

Mr Burgess: I guess my take on it, unless Reece knows something different, is that there was never any one single review; it was more just an analysis of each service, predominantly the train services

and just a general assessment of the coaches. The coaches are holding their own in terms of patronage. As we indicated before with some of those figures, the *AvonLink* and the *Australind* are going in the wrong direction, unfortunately, in terms of patronage. The *Prospector* is going in the right direction; it is experiencing some growth.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: No changes as a result of that?

Mr Waldock: I think it is status quo.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: On page 655, one of your outcomes and key effectiveness indicators is 85 per cent of street addresses within the Perth public transport area which are within 500 metres of a Transperth stop providing an acceptable level of service. When I go to the Department of Planning's key effectiveness indicators, they have an item listed there of people in the metropolitan area who live within 10 minutes of a major public transport route. The first one is within a 10-minute walk to a bus stop. They are saying that we only achieve 81.3 per cent of people living within that 10-minute walk, which I would have thought is pretty close to 500.

Mr Burgess: I think we probably beat them so I cannot account for theirs. They must have got it at some point in time and decided it was a good indicator. Ours was driven by the OAG some years ago, which sought an accessibility indicator. It is always a bit complex because people typically think of accessibility as an indicator relating to people with disabilities. This was an accessibility indicator in terms of access to a train station or a bus stop with that higher level of service. We started ours a number of years ago now—probably five or six years ago; it goes back a way—at the request of OAG and Treasury as they wanted an indicator of that type. We preferred a pure scientific one within 500 metres. I am not sure how you work out how fast someone can walk in 10 minutes. We would rather pure science. Ours is a layer within the Landgate slip program so it is actually layering the GIS system. We can plot all the bus stops that meet that level of service and then we just plot how many of the bus stops/train stations are within that 500 metres. I guess we prefer pure science. I cannot answer the question about —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I just wondered why there is a discrepancy between the two measures.

Mr Burgess: I reckon you walk faster than me, Ken, because you have longer legs.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I am probably a 10-minute walk from a railway station, so I am one of the 33 per cent.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: My question is related to the parking facilities at stations. I wanted to know if information is available or if you have considered the commuters who choose to use their car instead of the train because either there is not enough parking or the parking is too expensive if they are there for a long day. Do you have such information to be able to estimate how much parking to provide?

Mr Waldock: I think we know enough about our customers to be very clear that pricing is not in any way a barrier to our customers' parking. In fact, the peak of the parking is happening in so many stations as early as 7.30 am now so people are leaving earlier and earlier to gain access. One of the questions you raised was how many new car bays we have put in. The answer to that was 3 168 and we will be attempting to put in another 1 000 over the next 12 months. We are doing everything we can to maximise the number of car bays on the entire system but there is a limit and that limit is when we need to go multistorey. We believe there are opportunities for multistorey car bays at major TOD-type developments in major regional centres. Potentially, they may get closer to paying their way. There is no doubt that our view in public transport is that after we upgrade car bays, we then put a lot more of our investments into feeder bus services. We see that as the future because feeder bus services are far more sustainable, they will reduce issues of major congestion around railway stations and they will certainly provide better value for money in terms of the investment from the government versus how many passengers we can support. When you go with car bays in multistorey buildings, you are looking in the order of \$35 000 to \$40 000 per car bay. If

you look at the costs of billing, administering, maintenance, depreciation and the like, you are really looking at \$20 a day in terms of what you need to offer in a payback. The only PPP we have seen in this state in recent times that can do that is the one at QEII. QEII is a new car park going in now. They have 24/7 turnover in those car bays. Our stations are long term, one day, one customer. It is very hard to make them work. You can understand that we have to make some decisions. I am not suggesting that multistorey car bays will not have opportunities, maybe in the future with Murdoch and Stirling and others, but with the vast majority of stations, I just do not know how government could ever justify subsidising somebody the difference between \$20 a day and what we will charge.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: The tenor of my question is really the research that you are doing about these commuters and what their choices are—why they are choosing to drive and what can encourage them to not drive and take the very expensive option. It is not just the cost of building the bay; it is the opportunity cost of that land. My concern relates to what studies have been done and whether you have looked at incentives for carpooling. Maybe there is a cheaper car bay if you come in a car full of people or perhaps there are other incentives so that people walk to the station, thereby pedestrianising accessibility of the train stations. Hon Ken Travers did excellent research to identify that a lot of people who were parking at the stations were driving short distances from their homes because, for example, with Canning Bridge, there is no way to get there safely with your life. That is what I am asking. What research are you relying on to look at commuter behaviour to be able to reduce the cost of providing parking at train stations?

Mr Waldock: I will pass over shortly to Mark Burgess because we have had some major survey done by Painted Dog, our consultants. As you know, we are putting a lot of work into access to stations, both for pedestrians and cyclists. That will be a key bit of work. We agree that a number of our stations are quite hostile in terms of pedestrians and even cycling, and we need to improve that as best we can, noting that a lot of our stations are on major freeways so there are some limitations by their very nature. That is a bit of work. In terms of the wider issue, we should never forget that the issue with carpooling, especially when you have the peak at 7.30 am, is that, again, most Western Australians like their personal space, like their flexibility and like their ability to make their own choices. There will always be a niche market for carpooling but I am not sure it is very mature in Perth. Until the pain gets so much in terms of parking fees or discomfort or other barriers that make people change behaviours, I am not sure we are there yet.

In terms of our car bays generally, we are promoting feeder bus services as much as we can. The great thing about feeder bus services is that for the vast majority of our customers, it does not cost them any more. When you use your smart card, if you are in the zone, it is just a transfer at no cost. Again, you are talking about a set of disincentives. There is virtually no disincentive for catching a bus other than people prefer to have that freedom of their own motor car and their own personal space. That will change as life gets more difficult and there is less choice. We just cannot continue. If you think about the number of car bays we have now, we will have nearly 20 000 within a few months. We are the biggest car park owner in the state, private or public. We do know that when you are talking about many, many more commuters and growing very quickly, as the member pointed out, we cannot cater for every car and people will have to make that transition. The time is running out where we continue to pump the system full of car bays because they are getting very expensive. Do you want to talk about Painted Dog?

Mr Burgess: Painted Dog is a market research company that we use for various things. It is also doing our passenger satisfaction monitor; it has had that contract for a few years now. Both in the annual passenger satisfaction monitor and also a specific piece of work they did for us about two years ago interviewing lots of people who Park 'n' Ride, they asked, "Why do you do it and what would make you change? In other words, if we put on more feeder services, would you change?" A number of them were not well informed about their feeder bus opportunities and so on but for the vast majority it was reasonably clear that they did know about those things and they chose to Park 'n' Ride for a variety of reasons. Interestingly enough, I recollect in the most recent wave of PSM

results, because they drill down with a smaller question about why people Park 'n' Ride, the issue that we thought was more dominant, of trip changing—in other words, dropping kids at child care and then going to the Park 'n' Ride or going to the shops on the way home—is not as substantial as we had previously thought and had been led to believe it was. As Reece said, it is more about people choosing because it is convenient. The work that has been identified over the years indicates that a lot of those people are not travelling from very far away and many do have feeder bus opportunities within a reasonable catchment.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: We have had some other examples, too, which the PTA has moved to address, notably at Fremantle, Claremont and other places where people utilising our free or heavily subsidised car parks are not passengers. They are people going to work, locally, who perhaps park at the railway station and go to work in Fremantle or, in the case of Cottesloe, at the adjacent shopping centres in Bayview Terrace. We also had examples of this at one station on the Mandurah line. It was in the news in the last day or two. A goldmine in the hinterland had a lot of its staff parking there and then a bus would take them all down the bush to work on the mine, again restricting our passengers from getting access. The final one that I will mention now is that I remember we were releasing some new parking; we had just constructed a large number of bays at Murdoch, I think. Someone wanted a picture of it so two of the bays were roped off for an occasion to snip a ribbon. All the other bays in this new section were already full. There were these two bays. We duly snipped a ribbon for the odd work magazine or something and then they were promptly taken. We were thinking there is a lot of demand for this parking. With both of those cars that occupied those spaces, the person got out, was picked up by an associate in another vehicle and then drove off. Again, they were using it for free parking but excluding our potential customers. That is one of the challenges that we get.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: How are you going to deal with that?

Mr Waldock: We have some wonderful technology solutions for Fremantle and Claremont. Your smart card is able to test whether you validated from your car bay to the trains. If you do not, your smart card becomes inactive. Is that right, Mark?

[2.30 pm]

Mr Burgess: That is right. Down at Fremantle, we have implemented that a few years ago. The only way in that little bituminised area adjacent to the station that you can buy one of our tickets for your car, the \$2 ticket, is with your SmartRider. We do not have a cash slot. That is then doubled back. You can do it once. Then, if you are a local person, as the minister said, going to work, if you keep trying to do that, it will not work. Your SmartRider will be disabled until you have gone and taken a trip on our system. It puts a block on your SmartRider card until you go and use our system. As Reece said, we are planning to have probably a similar function at Claremont in the redevelopment of Claremont station and the parking there. We can apply that technology anywhere. Most of our passengers are pretty decent people and you do not want to antagonise them if you do not have to. To pick up what the minister is talking about, our car park people watch for that sort of behaviour. Where we have caught it happening before, we have engaged with the management. It was happening at Murdoch for a little while with construction workers for Fiona Stanley Hospital as well. We talked to the people who have that workforce, explained what the problem is, and usually they are very receptive and make other arrangements.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: You are saying it is \$35 000 to \$40 000 per car bay for multistorey; what is it to upgrade car bays?

Mr Waldock: I think that they average at around \$10 000.

Mr Burgess: Even to \$35 000 to \$40 000, it can go upwards, depending on the site conditions.

Mr Waldock: Mr Burgess is suggesting that \$35 000 to \$40 000 can go upwards, depending on site conditions. I think that is not a bad —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: The average for upgrade is about \$10 000?

Mr Waldock: Yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: And then land purchase on top of that?

Mr Burgess: That is just the construction.

The CHAIR: Per bay?

Mr Waldock: Per bay.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: You talked about you needed to charge \$20 a day for a multistorey. To cover the costs of the upgrade, what would you need to charge for that to cover your maintenance, depreciation and operating costs?

Mr Waldock: I think we did some numbers. If we charged \$4, it would be cost-neutral.

Mr Kirk: I understand there was some work done before my time, but I think it was about \$4, yes, to break even.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: With no value put on the land?

Mr Waldock: With no value.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: You have talked about the possibility of multistorey. At the Murdoch activity centre, is LandCorp not in the process of subdividing and giving away your major car park as we speak? I think they have expressions of interest out. If you do not build a multistorey car park there, how else will you maintain the number of bays at Murdoch?

Mr Waldock: Unless you know something I do not know about LandCorp, their plans at the present moment is stage 1—1A and 1B. That will not affect our car bays at all. Any future developments beyond those two stages would be at our car bays. The minister has made it very clear that we will maintain our car bays. Any move towards making those car bays for any other purposes, there would have to be some proposals put forward to maintain at least those car bays. At this stage it is not part of the LandCorp development, and any future proposals by LandCorp for development on the car bay side would also have to be accompanied with a proposal to maintain the car bays for commuters.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: It struck me that, based on those costs, even if someone else pays for the construction of the multistorey car parking, the cost of the parking will need to go up just to fund the maintenance and depreciation and all of those other costs. Is that correct? Even if LandCorp, as part of the deal, said, “We will build you a multistorey car park —

Mr Waldock: Yes, that would have to be factored into the whole development dollars, and have to wash its face or be part of a business case. But your point is well made. I think for car bays in significant redevelopment-type areas where land will be increasing in value, the days of free or \$2 car bays would be numbered. That is all in the future.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: The other problem I see with multistorey car parks is the intensity of activity in terms of the vehicles. At Murdoch, if you replace the current car bays with a whole range of activity that draws people to it and cars, and then you try to build a multistorey car park on a road system that is already at congestion point, how do you then fit in a multistorey car park as well?

Mr Waldock: If you were going to do it, you would be looking at probably the south east quadrant. You are quite right, it is not just the dollars of building the car bays, it is the dollars involved in securing good access for vehicles. That is all part of the equation.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: The land that you had up until Sunday at Cockburn, who owns that?

Mr Waldock: Mr Burgess.

The CHAIR: Congratulations!

Mr Burgess: The media has been chasing this. I am not sure if they are in the room. We said they should go and do—I am happy to tell the committee —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: They are here, but only one so give them an exclusive!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: They have been here all day.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: They are really nice, too, so give them an exclusive!

Mr Burgess: I think we would prefer not to because we said they should go and do their own property search. It is not the fault of the landowner at the end of the day. The landowner has their own reasons for wanting to build something with their own land. Could I tell you at an afternoon tea break or something?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: It is not LandCorp?

Mr Burgess: No. It is private land holders, but we do not want the media hounding them at the end of the day. That is their decision that they had other things to do with their land.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: That is fair enough. I am interested as to how far you negotiated. Is not the land immediately next door to it also owned by LandCorp?

Mr Burgess: We own some more land there. There is another stage potentially of another car park that we could develop, subject to future funding and budgets. We have obviously been expanding car parks at a substantial rate in the last couple of years.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Who paid for the tarmac at the car park that closed on the weekend?

Mr Waldock: It was already there.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: It was already there?

Mr Burgess: I am not absolutely sure.

Mr Waldock: If I am not mistaken, a significant percentage of it was a site office for the New MetroRail.

Mr Burgess: That is the bit that was in question, where the old site office was, the New MetroRail. I have a sense it might have all been there, if not a substantial proportion of it.

Mr Waldock: New MetroRail put in not just car parking, so dollars for its site office but also for the car parking and that is where it is.

Mr Burgess: That was the piece of land in question.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: What work have you done on—it goes by three different names—Success, Atwell or Aubin Grove station, but let us call it the Gibbs Road station. What work have you done on a new railway station at that location?

Mr Burgess: I think a limited amount. Most of those sites which were identified in the 2002 supplementary master plan, there was an amount of work done for each of them, down to concept plans or some level of detail, but fairly loose information. We have not done a great deal of work.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Has the track been laid in readiness for a station at those locations?

Mr Burgess: At that location yes, it has. It was one of the original sites identified as a future station in the —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Have you secured the land for the station, as in for car parking and access to the station?

Mr Burgess: PTA certainly does not own the land.

Mr Waldock: No.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Who owns the land then? Does the Department of Planning; has someone got that land secured?

Mr Burgess: I think it is all in private hands at the moment, as I recall.

Mr Waldock: A fair percentage of the land for the parking, as I understand it, would be within the Western Power transmission tower easements, but I think it is privately owned, yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: It is owned by Western Power?

Mr Waldock: No. I think it is within a Western Power easement area, but there is still private ownership of it.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Have you been given any instructions to commence work on Atwell station at all?

Mr Waldock: The minister is best placed to respond to that.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: The question does have some sensitivity about it because of steps in cabinet processes. I am going to have to decline to offer an answer in my capacity today because it is really something that needs to be considered by the Minister for Transport. The best I can do is to take that question on notice.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Based on that, I take it that there has been no decision of the government to commence an Atwell station?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I appreciate you are trying to tease out any information you can. With respect, can I just say that you may not take anything from my answer except that I defer to the Minister for Transport to make a response.

[Supplementary Information No B6.]

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: If there was an Atwell station, what would be the links to the public transport system? Would there be bus links or would there be light rail links perhaps?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: There is a very good heavy rail link immediately adjacent to it, but running up the middle of it.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: So there is a station there?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: If you were to have one; hypothetically. And you would have feeder bus services, as you do with all the others.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Would it have secure bike lockers there, and how many parking stations?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Not necessarily, minister. It is an interesting question in terms of the planning: does it have a bus interchange or is it just a Park 'n' Ride?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: This is getting into the detail in a hypotheticalal sense.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: No, it is not. It was part of the 2002 supplementary master plan. As part of that —

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: In that case, you would know all about it.

Mr Waldock: It was a dot, as I remember.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Yes.

Mr Waldock: The dot is still there!

Hon KEN TRAVERS: In the 20-year master plan, you also listed a station at Success—Mandogalup—was that envisaged as a Park 'n' Ride or a bus interchange and Park 'n' Ride?

Mr Waldock: It is part of that 20-year draft plan. It had elements of both, but particularly Park 'n' Ride.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Depending on whether it was at Mandogalup or —

Mr Waldock: No; both would suit Park 'n' Ride because both are —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: To Park 'n' Ride, yes, but the question is: to a bus interchange?

Mr Waldock: We would see elements—in fact most of our stations have elements—some big and some less big.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: I was intrigued by the last response to the questions I asked before about the carbon tax. That applies only to rail. That is a federal government decision. It does not apply to buses?

Mr Waldock: My understanding is for two years. Motor vehicles are excluded totally at this present moment, for review in—I could be wrong here—2015 or 2016. But heavy vehicles are excluded for two years. That includes buses.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Does that not give a pricing distortion between the mode of train and buses?

Mr Waldock: If I could argue that with Australasian Railway Association, they would argue heavily priced distortion in terms of, if you try to move people into more carbon friendly choices, why we would disadvantage motor cars—not disadvantage. That is a wider issue for federal government.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Fair enough. I understand the explanation. But of that \$2.1 million, which is only going to apply to trains, what do you envisage to be the fare increase as a result of that \$2.1 million?

Mr Waldock: We have done that work—it is 1.5 per cent.

Mr Kirk: It is 1.5 per cent, yes.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Train prices will go up 1.5 per cent but buses will stay the same, at least as far as the carbon tax is concerned?

Mr Burgess: Because we have an integrated ticketing system, the increase is just applied across the board.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Even though we are not paying carbon tax on buses?

Mr Waldock: We have spread the cost of carbon across all public transport.

Mr Burgess: In theory that hiatus for heavy vehicles is only for a finite period.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: I am trying to work it out. By spreading it across, you are taking out the distortion by not favouring one over the other by giving an average price across all fares?

Mr Burgess: Yes.

[2.45 pm]

Mr Burgess: As Reece said, the ARA would argue it still has that distortion because on the freight system, for example, they are arguing that rail freight is becoming disadvantaged.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Exactly. The mystery is when you have got something naturally which seems to be better placed is going to be distorted out of the system or, in a sense, trended out of the system through a price distortion. Can I take up page 658, on the bottom, freight program? This is back again, I am afraid, to our state grain freight network. As I recall, the federal government gave about \$135 million towards grain rail specifically originally; am I correct on that?

Mr Burgess: Yes.

Mr Waldock: That sounds about right.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: That was based on a dollar for dollar from the state originally?

Mr Waldock: Yes. I think that I have got the numbers in my transport—keep talking.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Which really would have meant that there is \$270 million combined if that agreement was in place. Can you tell me whether in the budget on page 659, “Works in Progress: Freight Program”, the \$81 million which is the budgeted estimate for 2012–13 plus the preceding years—how much of the \$270 million has been spent on that freight program and whether that freight program comprises just rail or whether that is in the rail infrastructure program, which is about five more lines down? Am I confusing you? If we go to page 659, “Works in Progress”, four lines down we have “Freight Program” and then about 10 lines down, “Rail Infrastructure Program”. The rail infrastructure program is about \$340 million; the freight program is \$171 million. When it comes to the grain freight network expenditure as an investment program, in which line item would that fall?

Mr Kirk: The budget for that shows in the “Works in Progress” under the “Freight Program”, which is the one you are talking about. If you are asking how much has been spent in 2011–12, the answer is about \$52 million has been expended.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: The estimated expenditure in 2011–12 is —

Mr Kirk: \$51.872 million.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: That is two—not in 2011–12, but to the end of 2011–12.

Mr Waldock: That is two. That picks up both years.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: That \$51.9 million would be out of the \$270 million if it was \$130 million from the feds and \$135 million from us?

Mr Waldock: I will just pick up what it was from the feds so we are clear. The state government committed \$171.3 million and it was a package, as Mr Burgess said, with road and rail. The federal government picked up \$135 million. So, the total through the Nation Building program was \$306.3 million and \$187.9 million was allocated to the re-sleeper project, which we are talking about now.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: One hundred and eighty-seven of that \$306 million is that sleeper project?

Mr Waldock: Yes.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Is the arrangement of the state spending a dollar for every dollar the federal government commits to the grain freight rail still in place?

Mr Waldock: I think what is still in place is those numbers there. In fact, as I understand it, the federal government’s dollars of \$135 million were mainly around the rail. They did not want to necessarily pick up a large component of the road program. That is not atypical, because if you look at the Perth City Link where we are sinking the railway station, whilst that is a \$609 million project, they are putting in their money in the rail, not in bus. So, they have that choice, how they wish to allocate their funds, and in both cases they wish to allocate their funds into rail rather than other—in this case the roads.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Okay. I think if I read you correctly, Reece, the \$171.3 million is not confined to having \$135 million of that from the state being committed to match dollar for dollar federal government money for the rail.

Mr Waldock: That is right.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: That part of the original agreement has been changed.

Mr Waldock: Yes.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: So, when it comes to expenditure on the tier 1, tier 2, I presume that that is referred to, as you mentioned, the \$51.9 million?

Mr Kirk: That is just the rail component.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: The rail component, which is the tier 1, tier 2 component. So, that is \$51.2 million and \$135 million; that is roughly \$84 million of federal funds roughly still to be spent on rail; is that correct?

Mr Kirk: Yes.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Okay. How much more of that \$84 million of the federal government's money alone—let us leave the states out of this for the time being—is going to be spent in the tier 1, tier 2 in this current fiscal year?

Mr Kirk: In 2012–13 we estimate we will spend \$81.2 million and in 2013–14 the balance, which will be \$38.3 million. That is in total, including the commonwealth and state.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Right.

Mr Kirk: Typically, the commonwealth money would be expended first; so most of that will be in 2012–13.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Of the \$171.3 million, which you said before would be provided by the state, that would suggest that \$84 million is coming—that is \$119 million is in the freight program you have got there in the 2012–13, 2013–14 years. So, that still leaves a lot of funds which is not being spent.

Mr Waldock: I think that expenditure is purely state government expenditure.

Mr Kirk: No, that is just rail. The issue is that some of the money is in Public Transport Authority's budget—i.e. the rail—and some of it is in Main Roads, being the roads component. That package the \$135 million was based on was the complete package, but as Mark or Reece said, the commonwealth's preference was for its contribution to be used on rail.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Can I suggest something here? I reckon your capital works program—you having aggregated up to make it a nonsense that no-one can understand what it entails. I would like to see for each of those categories of "Works in Progress" and all the subheadings, "Completed Works" and all the subheadings and "New Works" and all the subheadings, what exactly is included in each of those programs. "Bus Infrastructure Program"—is that new buses or is that bus depots; and, if so, what are they? The same sort of figures—what is the total cost of the project? How much of it has been spent? How much of it is getting spent this year?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Just before you get too carried away, these budget figures have been done in accordance with Treasury requirements. The way you referred to it could be open to misinterpretation about bundling it up so it does not make any sense. I also point out that you do have some explanatory material. In fact, on page 659, just above the bit you say you do not know what "Bus Replacement Program" refers to, is a paragraph on what the bus replacement program contains.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I said the bus infrastructure program. I started with the bus infrastructure program and it does not tell me what that is.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Nonetheless, there are ways that you can find out these things if they are not contained —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Yes, estimates.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: — and this is one of them. But it does not start with a preposition that we have been folding things up so you cannot understand. These are in accordance with the normal budget standards.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I am not suggesting they were not done in accordance with the practices, although I do note that many other agencies provide greater details than this one in terms of specific programs within the categories. The other point I was going to ask was that we also have—which does not occur in PTA's budget and I have never understood why. How much for each of those programs is commonwealth money? The freight program, there is a component of commonwealth money. Normally, that would appear in a line "funded by commonwealth contribution".

Mr Waldock: That is a Treasury requirement as well. The fact of the matter is that whilst it is different than Main Roads because the funds do go to Main Roads, the commonwealth, in this particular case of public transport, they moved through Treasury. It is an appropriation by the state government. We are constrained by the rules of Treasury.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I understand that in terms of the budget presentation, but in terms of assisting us as members of Parliament to understand the budget, it strikes me being able to get not just generic terms, like it is 640 old buses with 158 new ones. In that bus replacement program, how many buses is intended for that? What is included in each of those programs? Not down to the last dollar. But rail infrastructure program or rail station program—which stations are going to be upgraded? What is it going to cost for each of them? Is there any commonwealth money coming to Treasury towards that program? I think that would be very useful for "Works in Progress", "Completed Works" and "New works". I think that would make it a lot easier for you to understand what is going on.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Can we make that a question on notice asked by Hon Ken Travers?

The CHAIR: Just before we move from that, is that feasible to do a supplementary question?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: If the committee is of a mind to crusade on this matter, that is quite legitimate for you to do so, but you need to take it up, perhaps with the Treasurer, to indicate that—I suggest you do this, if you are of the mind, by formal report to indicate that you would like certain other presentation format or certain other details in future budgets. That is purely your prerogative, but if there are any questions you would like to ask of us now, that is why we are here.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: You can do it in a future report —

The CHAIR: I think we have been doing quite well up to now. I am not quite sure. I think it must be afternoon tea time very soon. There is a request for supplementary information.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: What is the question? We might be able to answer it right now.

The CHAIR: I am just going to clarify that.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: What I am asking for is each one of those subheadings, I want not just a list of what might be in there; I want an actual list of what specific items have been funded and the same sort of breakdown of what is the total cost of the project? How much has been spent to date? How much is expected to be spent in the 2012–13 year and then each year of the forward estimates? So that we get a better idea of what exactly is entailed in each of those subheadings of bus infrastructure, bus replacement, common infrastructure, freight program—each one of them—because in virtually every one of those with the exception of the Perth City Link, there will be multiple subprograms included and I want those subprograms.

The CHAIR: That is for works in progress? The whole lot?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: No, for "Works in Progress", "Completed Works" and "New works" and the contribution from the commonwealth for each one of those.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Perhaps the best way to make progress, again—I note you, Madam Chair, have just pointed out the time to us—is to take that question on notice, though I hope it can be communicated to us. Then the minister that I am representing, who is the substantive minister, will have to respond. However, I am aware that there are some elements here that although they appear

as line items may contain masses of information, possibly even hundreds of items. So a judgement might have to be made and correspondence entered into with you as to whether or not we can provide the information. I am sure we can come up with some information and I will certainly undertake to provide some further information to clarify what the things are. What about the commonwealth component? Can we respond to that?

Mr Waldock: We can do that. We will put that in the notes.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: We can do that as well.

[Supplementary Information No B7.]

[3.00 pm]

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Could I just then maybe come back to where I was at? As I understand how you responded earlier, we got to a total of \$306 million in relation to the commonwealth-committed spend on grain rail.

Mr Waldock: The \$306 million was the total.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: The \$306 million was the total —

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: State and federal.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Feds was \$135 million, I think, and the state \$171.3 million. If I could have a breakdown of how that has been appropriated so far or is expected to be appropriated in the forward estimates.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: That \$171.3 million includes the commonwealth money, though.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: No —

Mr Waldock: No, the —

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: We agreed there was \$306.3 million of which \$171.3 million was the state component only, as I understand it.

Mr Waldock: No, sorry; I think Mr Travers is right. If we just go back, for rail it is \$187.9 million—just to confuse you a little bit more! But if you just take away the Brookfield commitment of \$16.5 million, it comes down to \$171.4 million. The \$171.4 million is detailed in the *Budget Statements* on the bottom of page 658. So what we are saying there and what is quite clear there is that of that \$171.4 million, \$81.2 million has been expended in 2012–13. So, indeed, I think that is reasonably clear, but if you wanted to give us a question that perhaps that has not clarified, please do so.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: The only part now which I think is not clarified, Reece, is: how much of that \$171.4 million is commonwealth funds?

Mr Waldock: It is \$135 million.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: It is \$135 million.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: And that is a whole \$135 million?

Mr Waldock: That is where their money is going. As I said earlier, they want to put their money in rail.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Okay, and suggesting then that the original agreement, dollar for dollar of \$135 million, is no longer an understanding?

Mr Waldock: No. I mean, I think it was a package, and in fact the state, as I said earlier, is putting a great deal more into the total package.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: As we will find out in the Main Roads —

Mr Waldock: As you will find in Main Roads.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Okay. Right, I think then that would cover me. Just back to that freight program there, that is not just rail.

Mr Waldock: No. Do you just want to expand on that, if you would, again, please?

Mr Kirk: Sorry, the freight item in —

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: The freight item is the fourth line down under “Works in Progress”.

Mr Kirk: That is only rail.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: That is only rail?

Mr Kirk: As I said before, the roads is in Main Roads’ budget, and I think there were some subsidies in the transport space.

Mr Waldock: That is where the \$171.4 million comes from.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: So that is all Albany–Avon line and some tier 2s?

Hon SIMON O’BRIEN: No, the Albany–Avon line —

Mr Waldock: It is Avon to Albany—that is completed. Then it is going to be doing Kwinana north zone, which is January 2012 to June 2014. Then it is going to finish the Albany zone from November 2012 to November 2013. So, it is —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: What does that mean? “Finish the Albany zone”—what works is that?

Mr Waldock: Sorry, let me say it again. The Avon–Albany railway, GSR, has been completed, has it not, Kevin?

Mr Kirk: Yes, that is right.

Mr Waldock: So the two areas that still need to be completed are the Kwinana north zone and that is from January 2012 to June 2014, and the Albany zone from November 2012 to November 2013.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: What is the “Albany zone”? What railway does that involve?

Mr Waldock: If you wish, that can be a question. We have got it on a map, which we are more than happy to share with you over afternoon tea.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: All right.

The CHAIR: Can I just ask one question about that upgrade on the Avon–Albany line? What works did that entail?

Mr Waldock: I have not got the details of the—it is mostly re-sleepering.

The CHAIR: And were they all jarrah sleepers?

Mr Kirk: On that one there was a mix of jarrah and steel, I think.

The CHAIR: Could you give me details on what mix and how much jarrah was used?

Mr Kirk: I think they were one in three, but we would have to confirm that.

Mr Waldock: That would be a supplementary question.

[Supplementary Information No B8.]

The CHAIR: So the mix, how many jarrah sleepers and where they came from—who the suppliers were?

Mr Kirk: The jarrah sleepers came from about four or five suppliers—all approved by the Forest Products Commission.

The CHAIR: I know a lot about it; I have been making some very interesting inquiries about it.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Just on that same point, whether the work on the Avon–Albany line and any of the other two lines is within budget; and, if it is over or under, what is the relationship to budget?

Mr Waldock: My understanding is it is holding very well so far.

Mr Kirk: The Avon one was, I think, a matter of a couple of hundred dollars over budget; so effectively it was right on budget.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: And all the expenditure is close to budget—nothing well under budget?

Mr Kirk: Not on the works completed to date.

The CHAIR: Sorry; I have got inspired now! I have remembered a couple of other questions on this one. So, it is commonwealth money primarily.

Mr Waldock: For the rail—\$135 million.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: They have asked for their contribution to be designated as rail purely, so we have done that. But I mean a dollar is a dollar from our point of view.

The CHAIR: So in terms of the oversighting of that work and who is responsible for that, does that fall to —

Mr Waldock: It is the Public Transport Authority, yes. We have done this before —

The CHAIR: So you received the commonwealth funds, can you just talk me through how that works?

Mr Waldock: Sure, and it is not the first time. When we did some major passing loops five years ago on the east–west line, again, the commonwealth put a significant amount of funds into that. But they are happy for the Public Transport Authority to be the principal for those projects, so in fact we make sure that when it is contracted out—it is through WestNet or Brookfield now and they often use John Holland—that we audit all the way through, and it is our job to project manage that.

The CHAIR: So in terms of quality of materials used, whose responsibility is that?

Mr Waldock: Again, we would be keeping a very, very close eye on Brookfield and the contractors. As Mr Burgess just said, they do in fact go out to public tender for their contractors, not just John Holland, and that has been happening in more recent times. So we certainly do keep an overview in terms of all the issues that we think are important.

The CHAIR: And so has there been any investigation of allegations of a low-grade jarrah being used for the sleepers?

Mr Waldock: There has been significant investigations on that because it was a disgruntled person in the timber industry that made some strong allegations. Certainly, a great deal of work has gone into sort of working those allegations through, and we believe they have got no substance. Do you want to make any comments on that?

Mr Burgess: No, I would agree with that. We have had expert engineers go out and look at those particular spots that were raised and, indeed, the Office of Rail Safety has gone and looked at it as well.

Mr Waldock: And they are satisfied as well.

The CHAIR: Has there been a report written on that?

Mr Waldock: Yes, there was a report on that.

The CHAIR: Can we have the report?

Mr Waldock: We might have to cross out some of the names, but, yes, that is fine.

[Supplementary Information No B9.]

The CHAIR: If there is material you want to be kept confidential —

Mr Waldock: I think we probably would, yes.

The CHAIR: Perhaps you can provide it to us and we will decide what is confidential and what is not. That is the usual method.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: As part of that same question, would you be willing to give us a copy of the audits against what was planned to be spent on the tier 2, tier 3—the ones you ordered with Brookfield—and just what the audits have shown up and whether those reports can be tabled or given to the committee?

Mr Waldock: It is not an audit; as part of our project management, we just work with —

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Or the project management reports—I just would like to see, confirm, the relationship between what was budgeted and what was spent in relation to what Brookfield has done.

Mr Waldock: We could provide that.

[Supplementary Information No B10.]

The CHAIR: I am just mindful that we have gone a little bit over, but members are indicating to me that, as this series of hearings is all interrelated, we might just continue with this just for a few minutes longer and cut a little bit of time off Main Roads, so that we will still finish at the end time at the end of the day. There seems to be some enthusiasm for this section.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: Just a very short question, the Perth Waterfront project will obviously affect ferry services. I was wondering what the contingency plans are for that. What is happening?

Mr Waldock: Long term, of course, it will actually be a great positive as we are able to move ferries right into the cove or into the quay. But, Mark, do you want to talk about the transitional issues over the construction period?

Mr Burgess: We will keep our existing ferry berths. I think at some point we might have to change to a berth slightly more east, as I recall, but that is just going on recall. Our people have been involved with the designers of the facility and we will have two berths for Transperth ferries as part of the new development inside.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: So during the construction phase, the ferries are not going to be suspended for any length of time?

Mr Burgess: I think we have to move a couple of jetties down to the east, as I —

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: So it is not going to interrupt the ferry service?

Mr Waldock: No.

Mr Burgess: No, the ferry service will continue.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: And you are not looking at expanding the service after the waterfront is built; you are just going to keep the same—because I think the time is different, so I was just wondering if you were adding trips.

Mr Waldock: No, in fact, I think what we have got—and our customers think—is a very good schedule for ferry services at South Perth. The issue may be of course in years to come, particularly when the stadium and Burswood and the like are more advanced, whether we move additional services around there. That would be potentially a likely new service in the future.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: But currently as part of the waterfront redevelopment, you are not anticipating adding more ferries to cover all the tourists who are going to be down there?

Mr Waldock: Certainly not while it is being built, because hopefully there will not be too many tourists on-site while we are building it! But post-Elizabeth Quay, we will always look at those opportunities.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: So it was not considered as part of the total cost of the project?

Mr Waldock: No.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: And expansion of the ferry service was not considered?

Mr Waldock: No, not at all.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Can you tell me whether the security officers you get for the buses, the revenue protection officers and the transit officers that you have are considered part of your front-line services?

Mr Waldock: Yes, they are and Mark can —

Mr Burgess: Is there a definition of “front-line”?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I am asking you how you define “front-line”!

Mr Waldock: Certainly we think they are front-line!

Mr Burgess: We think they are, but there must be a reason for the question.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Because by telling me they are front-line, you have just guaranteed that there will not be any reduction in any of those areas as part of your efficiency dividend.

Mr Waldock: We are not certainly considering any reductions.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Good. Are there any operations, train or otherwise, that you are looking at over the next 12 months contracting out, privatising, getting private sector providers or in any way changing the way in which you currently operate those services?

Mr Burgess: Not that I am aware of—put it that way. Are you saying changes to those security services or the whole lot?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: This is to any of your operations, particularly rail operations. The drivers, whether you are looking at contracting those out to private —

Mr Burgess: Not that I am aware of; I am not aware of any changes.

Mr Waldock: There will not be any services contracted-out.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: That has not been under consideration.

The other one I am interested in is your fare revenue review. How much of that is from an increase in actual fares over the four years, as opposed to increasing patronage?

Mr Waldock: We have got a breakdown of both of those, so we have broken it down by the impact of both new capacity versus the impact of prices.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: So you are able to provide that.

Mr Waldock: Mr Kevin Kirk would have that at his fingertips, I would expect.

[3.15 pm]

Mr Kirk: I wish you had not said that!

The CHAIR: I was going to say, “The pressure is on”!

Mr Kirk: If you are talking about the dollar breakdown of it —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Yes.

Mr Kirk: — and how much of —

Mr Burgess: We answered it in the other house.

Mr Waldock: Yes, it was a question on notice that we answered in the lower house estimates.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Can we get the same answer? I am not necessarily sure it is same answer. What I want is how much is from patronage growth and what is your estimate in patronage growth, so not just the dollar terms but what you are expecting patronage to grow by to achieve that; and how much of it is actually from fare growth and what you expect fares to grow by to achieve that?

Mr Kirk: I can tell you what our patronage growth prediction was as a percentage in 2012-13, but not in terms of dollars; we would have to get that.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: What was it as a percentage?

Mr Kirk: It was 4.9 per cent for patronage growth for 2012-13.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Was that across the whole bus and rail network?

Mr Kirk: Yes, the whole network.

[Supplementary Information No B11.]

Hon KEN TRAVERS: My final question is: can you explain to me how many railcars in how many trains are required to move 35 500 people in an hour?

Mr Waldock: No.

The CHAIR: Your time starts now!

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Not that you have an hour to tell me; you have to move 35 500 people —

Mr Waldock: No, let me just understand. Actually, I did think about it over lunch—my comments before lunch—and I think I was probably a little on the high side with my railcar capacity as 600. I think I did qualify it by 300, and I think that is probably a better one. But coming back —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: This is the light rail?

Mr Waldock: Yes, that is right.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I was going to say that you were going to have some very long light rails there at one point.

Mr Waldock: If I could, member, it is not difficult to work out; you are talking 35 000 people in an hour?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Yes, 35 500 people in an hour.

Mr Waldock: We can just think it through. It depends on your train frequencies, but if you were working at 12 trains an hour, which is five-minute headways which is pretty much what we have now, and you get 1 100 people per train, you can actually start to think through how many people you can move through. In the future, of course, what we are looking at doing—this is for 2031—is getting frequencies down to the three to four-minute range, and we are potentially looking at nine-car sets rather than six-car sets. There are some issues there with technology, but we think that we should not exclude that. So we are looking at all the options as to how we are going to work these railway lines as best we can to meet the needs of the future.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: As I understand it, the plan is to move 35 500 people from the stadium in an hour —

Mr Waldock: Are you talking about the stadium?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I thought you were talking about the light rail.

Mr Waldock: Yes, I thought you were talking about the light rail. Now you have mentioned the stadium, we have already got very clear operational plans for that that we think are sustainable. The vast majority of them will be working through Burswood, and we will have a range of shuttle services to the city. Those shuttle services will be working on 2.5 minutes, as I understand it, and

that is very doable. We can move nine-car sets with some of that shuttle service already with the new station, so the vast majority of —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: The new station? The new city station?

Mr Waldock: With the platform, we are looking at the city to move the shuttle service that can take nine cars, yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: It is currently long —

Mr Waldock: It will be long enough to take nine cars. We can probably break that down for you as a supplementary question, but we are confident we can move 70 per cent of 60 000 people on public transport, both bus and rail.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I am sure you are confident, and I do not doubt that it is able to be done. What I am interested in is the number of railcars that you need to do it, and in the number of trains you would need. Now, if you are doing it nine-car sets, then that would be good to know that, but you still need to have three lots of three-car sets.

Mr Waldock: Sure.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: So, I am interested in a number.

Mr Waldock: Most of the events—we have to be quite clear here—will be off-peak, when we have fleet available. That is an underlying assumption.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Maybe that leads to my next question, which is: how many railcars do you need to operate your standard off-peak schedules at any given point in time? So on a standard weekend schedule, how many actual railcars are in operation just providing the regular services?

Mr Waldock: I could give you my views now —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: On peak, they are all—100 per cent.

Mr Waldock: Yes.

Mr Burgess: Off-peak during a weekday it 26As and 18Bs, so that will be more than on a weekend, for example, because obviously there will be a few extras. But it is similar, because you are talking about 15 minutes.

Mr Waldock: So there is a very large percentage of fleet not working.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: The final question, if you could tell me as part of the supplementary: to do that 35 500 people in an hour, how many additional railcars will you need over and above your existing fleet?

Mr Waldock: We can do that as a supplementary, yes.

[Supplementary Information No B12.]

The CHAIR: We might take a break. If members have further questions, they will have a chance to submit them.

The committee will forward any additional questions it has to you via the minister in writing in the next couple of days, together with the transcript of evidence, which includes questions taken on notice. Any unasked questions, members, please submit them to the committee clerk at the close of the hearing. Responses to these questions will be requested within 10 working days of receipt of the questions. Should you be unable to meet this due date, could you please advise the committee in writing as soon as possible before the due date, including specific reasons as to why the due date cannot be met.

Finally, on behalf of the committee thank you very much for your attendance in that hearing.

Hearing concluded at 3.20 pm
