

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
ESTIMATES AND FINANCIAL OPERATIONS**

BUDGET STATEMENTS

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE
TAKEN AT PERTH
TUESDAY, 28 JULY 2009**

SESSION TWO

Members

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

Hearing commenced at 12.55 pm

O'BRIEN, HON SIMON
Minister for Transport,
sworn and examined:

JOHNSON, MR IAN
Commissioner, Department of Corrective Services,
sworn and examined:

KUZMINSKI, MR MARK
Acting Assistant Commissioner, Corporate Support, Department of Corrective Services,
sworn and examined:

TANG, MS JACQUELINE THERESE
Deputy Commissioner, Offender Management and Professional Development,
Department of Corrective Services,
sworn and examined:

HARKER, MS HEATHER
Deputy Commissioner, Community and Youth Justice, Department of Corrective Services,
sworn and examined:

GILES, MR IAN
Deputy Commissioner, Adult Custodial, Department of Corrective Services,
sworn and examined:

The CHAIR: On behalf of the committee, I would like to welcome you to this afternoon's hearing. Before we begin, I am required to ask you to take either an oath or an affirmation. If the witnesses could indicate whether any of them would prefer to take the oath, we have a copy of the Bible if they wish to avail themselves of that.

[Witnesses took the oath or affirmation.]

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I am here in my capacity as minister representing the Minister for Corrective Services.

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

The Witnesses: Yes.

The CHAIR: These proceedings are being recorded by Hansard. A transcript of your evidence will be provided to you. To assist the committee and Hansard, please quote the full title of any document you refer to during the course of the hearing, and please be aware of the microphones and try to talk directly into them. I remind you that your transcript will become a matter for the public record. If for some reason you wish to make a confidential statement during today's proceedings, you should request that the evidence be taken in closed session. If the committee grants your request, any public and media in attendance will be excluded from the hearing. Please note that until such time as the transcript of your public evidence is finalised, it should not be made public. I advise you that premature publication or disclosure of the uncorrected transcript may constitute a contempt of

Parliament and may mean that the material published or disclosed is not subject to parliamentary privilege.

Members, it would assist Hansard if when referring to the *Budget Statements* volumes or the consolidated account estimates, you give the page number, the item, the program, the amount and so on in preface to your questions.

Hon KATE DOUST: I suppose my questions go to some of the recent changes that have happened with the creation of the new hubs for juvenile justice offenders and adult offenders. I attended a meeting last week that Ms Harker also spoke at. My questions really go to the types of changes that are occurring. I suppose if I link them back into the budget papers, they would come under quite possibly the service summary listed on page 758. I listened to Ms Harker the other day and also had a very quick perusal through the Price report, which was presented in March of this year. For those members who have not seen it, the title of the report is "A Review of Structure and Service Delivery for the Community and Juvenile Justice Division". There are quite a number of very clear messages that come out of that report, and a lot of them go to the resourcing issue. There are some very clear messages that there are significant gaps in the service for resourcing. There are concerns about the changes that were proposed at that time but have now commenced, I understand, as of Monday with the initial creation of the first set of hubs, and about how these hubs would be staffed. There is also concern about the potential loss of clients due to access these new facilities. I am not sure whether it will be Ms Harker or somebody else who will respond. Has the department undertaken a thorough assessment of current resources in the highlighted areas, as recommended by the Price report?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I will ask Ms Harker to answer that, please.

Ms Harker: If I can start by giving a little bit of context really. Prior to the current realignment that we are actually now implementing as of this week, adults and young people were traditionally both supervised from the same office, so we had youngsters and adults reporting to the same centres. One of the things that the Price report identified was actually how difficult that was proving to be, in particular in terms of the amount of time and, if you like, attention that young people were receiving as a result of being mixed up in the one office. What we have undertaken to do is first of all realign the current structures that we have got in line with having dedicated adult offices and dedicated youth justice offices, predominantly to start with in the metro area. We will be opening seven adult community justice centres and four youth justice centres. The first of the moves along that road actually took place on Friday, and the first offices became operational on Monday of this week. It is fair to say that the Price report concentrated predominantly on youth justice services. What it commented on was that we could only go so far with the existing resources that we had in terms of the model of service delivery that we wanted to introduce. As a result of that, what we are doing at the moment is, as I say, realigning from within the existing resources to start with, and then in terms of the full model of service delivery for youth justice, we have business cases ready to go and ready for the next budget round. I want to acknowledge that we are realigning within for the moment. As I say, in terms of the new model, when it eventually becomes fully operational, then clearly we will be putting in additional budget bids. But as far as the existing staffing resource is concerned, those staff are not being expected to do any more now under the new structure than they were doing under the old structure. That still remains the same. As I say, the business cases are about the additional services that we actually want to deliver, which are very much about early intervention and diversion of young people out of the criminal justice system.

[1.00 pm]

Hon KATE DOUST: I understand all of that. Have you done an assessment based on the recommendations of the Price report?

Ms Harker: We have as far as justice is concerned, and, as I say, they are the business cases that are ready to go.

Hon KATE DOUST: I do not think there was any complaint from the meeting I attended last week that you attended, about changing into hubs. There was concern about the loss of some staff in some areas and about access. I do not know how you have dealt with those issues. You said you would follow-up on those matters, particularly the Victoria Park site and, I think, Maddington, which were both catering to adults.

Ms Harker: That is right, yes.

Hon KATE DOUST: What has happened to the staffing levels at those two sites?

Ms Harker: Basically, staffing levels have been aligned in terms of the number of adult offenders in those offices and the number of young people in Belmont, which is the first youth justice hub. Youth justice staff from Maddington and Victoria Park have moved into Belmont, so we have the first youth justice centre in Belmont. The adult community corrective staff from Belmont have relocated. They have been split, basically, between Victoria Park and Maddington. I reiterate that there is no change in staffing numbers or, indeed, the overall workloads they are dealing with at this point in time. We have essentially just reconfigured where they will deliver those services from.

Hon KATE DOUST: I am pleased to see that the minister is here today because my next question goes to his portfolio of transport. Given that young offenders will now have to travel to Belmont to see their juvenile justice officer—I assume that is from a variety of places throughout the south metropolitan region—I understand there are difficulties sometimes accessing Belmont on public transport, be it timeliness or connecting with trains or buses, and it may take some time. I think the example given last week was that if someone has to come from Manning to Belmont, it may take 90 minutes or more. My understanding is, particularly with young people, that if we put too many barriers in their way, they will say, “This is too hard”, and they will not bother turning up. What research did you do before making the decision that Belmont would be the site for young people in terms of how you would facilitate their access so they would not lose the capacity to appear for appointments?

Ms Harker: Probably the additional thing to add is that, not only do we have four youth justice hubs, we also have four youth justice outreach centres, one of which is in Maddington. It is not correct that all youngsters from Maddington would have to travel to Belmont to report. As I say, there will be an outreach centre at Maddington and they will be able to report there. The other thing to emphasise as far as youth justice is concerned is that the principle is that supervising officers will actually be out and about a lot more rather than being office based. As you say, one of the things that is quite off-putting for young people is coming to offices. So, it is very much about staff going out to where the young people are, as opposed to them formally coming into an office, which was one of the problems when they were co-located with adults. They were being treated as adults in a similar kind of process, so the whole principle of what we want to deliver as far as youth justice is concerned is about doing it differently from how it was traditionally done.

Hon KATE DOUST: Regarding those young people not turning up for their appointments, last week someone said to me, I think on Wednesday, about 130 or 132 young people were unaccounted for. You have a particular terminology for that.

Ms Harker: Inactive.

Hon KATE DOUST: Thank you. I know from reading the press, the union is saying that under your new system, particularly for young people, that figure will increase substantially. I think it had a figure of something like 280. What measures will you put in place to deal with those inactive young people? What will happen when they do not appear and they simply disappear through the cracks because they cannot get there?

Ms Harker: There is no reason why those numbers should increase as a result of the realignment. The only reason they might increase—there are no indications at the moment that they are—is as a result of increased overall workloads, and that is not a phenomenon that we are experiencing at the

moment, to be frank. They will continue to be managed in the way they have been over the past 12 months since the Industrial Relations Commission ruling, which is that those cases are regularly reviewed by the senior staff to make sure there are not any significant issues that we need to pick up on, and then bring them back into the case load. Assessment is done in terms of prioritisation, and that is how they are getting to the inactive case load. Obviously, a significantly greater proportion are in the very active case load and have case managers.

Hon KATE DOUST: If the figure of 130 or 132 of inactive young people was correct last week, what steps are you taking to get those young people back into the system?

Ms Harker: As much as we possibly can, bearing in mind that, as I say, at the moment workloads do not appear to be increasing. As workloads are dipping, those cases are coming back into the mainstream case load. It is constantly under review.

Hon KATE DOUST: I understand the site in Belmont is in Abernethy Road, which is not necessarily an easy access point for public transport. Why was that selected? Was that already an office you had?

Ms Harker: It was, yes. It was a community corrections office. We had both adults and young people reporting there.

Hon KATE DOUST: I am surprised you did not select an office that is on a main bus or train route such as Victoria Park or even Maddington, in terms of access for young people. It is very difficult if they are too young to drive. I imagine that most of those cases would not be able to afford to drive. If they are not in a situation where they can easily access an office to report to, they will not show up. I am surprised you selected Belmont. What was the reasoning behind that selection?

Ms Harker: We looked at the geographical spread of offices in terms of the separation of adult and youth justice, and the decision was made that Belmont was the most appropriate, given, as I say, the geographical spread that we had to cater for. I repeat that we have outreach centres as well. It is not that young people will be able to report only to that one main centre. The whole point about what we are doing is to avoid making it any more difficult than it needs to be. The reality is that youngsters are spread all over the place and it will be more difficult for some but it will be easy for others.

Hon KATE DOUST: Will you have a review process to see how that works for young people, particular in Belmont?

Ms Harker: Absolutely; we will be reviewing the whole situation in terms of the realignment. The second of the moves will take place in October and the final one will be in December. We will certainly be reviewing both the process we have just gone through in terms of lessons to be learnt for the next move, and a full review, if you like, of that completed phase to December.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Mr Johnson also might have some useful advice if you would like to hear from him.

Mr Johnson: We are very much about continuous improvement. In backing up what Heather said in terms of reviewing the new methodology, these are not tablets of stone. We will assess the impact. If there is a negative impact, we will make changes to accommodate that. The other important thing to point out is that, traditionally, groups of offenders—children or whoever they may be—are dealt with in a certain way, and we are looking to do things differently. In that sense, we have engaged with the judiciary, particularly Denis Reynolds, the judge of the Children's Court; Magistrate, Stephen Vose and other members of the judiciary whom we meet regularly to see what are the options they want to see coming out of Corrective Services. We are looking at not just models whereby people turn up to a centre and report in, but as Heather pointed out, getting out and about and speaking to them in their own territory, so to speak. We are also looking at setting up establishments whereby people can have a nice combination of reporting requirements, but also reporting and then doing some meaningful activity whether it be education, programs, learning

practical skills that will obviously lead them to employment. We are looking at a model that is not dissimilar to I suppose the Caversham model where kids are rewarded for attending education classes with activities during the afternoon that are very much linked to skills. They may be welding, bricklaying or whatever. This is part of an overall model; it is not the model. There are many aspects to that model. I want to reassure the committee that whatever we are doing, we will see what the impact has been. If there is a negative impact we will look at making some changes.

[1.15 pm]

The other thing I would like to add is that, for far too long families have been getting spoon fed in this society. One of the reasons offenders commit the offences they do is because they do not take responsibility for their actions. They do not take responsibility for getting themselves organised in relation to turning up for a meeting or doing something they are told to do. So, there is going to be some pain, but people have to start living up to expectations. If they have an appointment on a Wednesday, they have to plan how they are going to get there. That is what life is about—planning what you are doing, and doing what you are told, basically. There is a real combination here. I understand what the impact may be, but it is not something that we are going to ignore.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I want to take you to the performance outcomes. I am actually referring to your annual report here, but there are effectiveness indicators in the budget papers themselves. The first issue I would like to have a quick look at is absconding and escape rates. I understand that you have put in a lot of effort and those rates are trending downwards, which is good. Your report says 28 adults and one juvenile had unlawful absences from regional minimum-security prisons and work camps. How many of those escapes were from prisoner transport vehicles?

Mr Johnson: That is a good question.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: How frequent is that?

Mr Johnson: It is very infrequent. As you have pointed out, rightly, the prison population has been going up and the number of escapes has been going down. That is for a variety of reasons. It is about not just physical security but also dynamic security and staff interaction. For the number of escapes specifically from a transport vehicle, I do not have that figure in front of me, and we can certainly provide that figure, but my recollection is that there has been one escape from a transport vehicle, and there has been one escape from a hospital, which was under guard by a private company.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Within what length of time are these offenders usually recaptured?

Mr Johnson: That varies, but, typically, because more times than not it is an impulsive action, they tend to be captured reasonably quickly. There are, of course, some that are outstanding for some time, but my recollection is that most people are caught in a relatively short space of time.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Do you keep records on how long it takes you to recapture them?

Mr Johnson: Sure.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Is it possible to take that on notice and provide us with additional categories of absconding and escape, and from which areas—whether they are from custody, transport vehicles or whatever—and also the length of time it has taken you to recapture those people?

[Supplementary Information No B1.]

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I just want to define exactly what the question is. I think it was for the most recent 12-month period, and the question relates to unlawful absences or other escapes from custody, by category, including from a transport vehicle, from a hospital, from a work camp, from an excursion and from a cell, or whatever, and also the period from the time of absconding to the time of recapture. Is that the question?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: That is the question. I am not asking you to change the way in which you gather the data. I am suggesting that you would have the respective categories already as part of your database. I am asking you to extrapolate from your existing database and to provide that information. In relation to the effectiveness outcome for rate of offender return, which is on page 6 of the annual report, I see that the actual for 2007-08 was 36.39 per cent. Do you have the figure for 2008-09?

Mr Johnson: Yes, we do. From my reading of that, it is 37 per cent.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I refer now to the rate of offender return; that is, the percentage of adults who within two years of release from prison or completion of a community order return to corrective services. That number seems incredibly high. That probably demonstrates that the same people are moving through the prison system. Can you elaborate on that?

Mr Johnson: Sure. By comparison, we are the fourth lowest in Australia. However, it is very difficult to make a comparison with other jurisdictions

Hon KEN TRAVERS: When you say the fourth lowest —

Mr Johnson: That is the way the statistical people report it—as the fourth lowest. I agree it does not sound —

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I am not trying to be funny, but is that on a state basis or a territory basis?

Mr Johnson: State and territory.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: So does that make us the second highest?

Mr Johnson: No. We are in the middle. The rate of return is a complex issue, in that when people return to corrective services, it typically involves either employment or health or their offending history. Can I just make a couple of points? I am not trying to grandstand here, but corrective services tends to be held up as being able to treat all the ailments of society. People expect that people who are third-generation unemployed come from a dysfunctional community, have a mental illness or some form of disability, or have been substance abusers, can come to us for two or three years and expect to be cured, but that is just never going to happen. We are very much committed to making a positive difference to people who come into the care of the department. We do that in a number of ways in terms of their initial induction, their education, their skills and employment, providing them with a constructive day, treating them according to their health and their culture, providing specific programs to address their offending behaviour, and looking at re-entry services in terms of their housing and transport and the like. So basically what we would like to say is that we look at them coming in with a report card full of Ds, and we would like to see them leave with Cs and Bs. Whether that actually prevents them from returning to us is very much determined by where they go back to and what type of lifestyle they adopt. If they go back to the same sort of lifestyle and the same sort of dysfunctional community, with the same sorts of mates, then typically they are going to end up back with us. But we can do our bit both in custody and in the community with education and with the prisoner employment programs and the offender management. There is a whole raft of things we do. We would love to see this figure come down, but the reality is that there are so many other complex issues associated with this figure and we are just one part of the jigsaw. It is very much linked to the economy. We have seen research that says that society becomes far more punitive when society is doing it tough. I think we are seeing that at the moment.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: How much is that 37 per cent in real numbers?

Mr Johnson: I cannot give you the exact number, but at any given time there are over 10 000 people either in custody or in the community—so about 4 500 in prison, and just under 7 000 in the community. It would be a percentage of that total figure.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Is that adults and juveniles?

Mr Johnson: Yes.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I want to touch now on the successful completion of community service orders. The actual for 2007-08 was 58.83 per cent, and the target was 64 per cent, so there was a shortfall there. Do you have an actual for 2008-09?

Mr Johnson: The estimated actual for 2008-09 was 62 per cent. But there is some positive news on that front in terms of the successful completion of community-based orders. I will ask Ms Harker to talk about that.

Ms Harker: Just by way of explanation, when we talk about the successful completion of community-based orders, it is not just community work. Community work is just one element of that. As the commissioner has said, a significant amount of work has been done, certainly in the past 12 months, in terms of increasing that completion rate. If we look just at community work as an example, since January this year we have doubled the completion rate for community work from a fairly low, I have to say, 25 or 24 per cent to where we are now running at 56 per cent. Obviously the same kind of emphasis is going into other community-based orders as well. Having said that, that kind of figure can also be a bit contradictory, because the other thing that we are charged with doing as far as managing offenders in the community is concerned is making them comply with their orders. All too often many of the people who we deal with very easily fall out of compliance. We have to make sure that we hold them within the standards and procedure that we have got. If we are going to be tough on compliance and on enforcing the orders, that can have a contradictory effect on completion rates. So, again, it is a complex target. It does not necessarily mean that we are being soft on offenders just because it looks as though we are being less successful. It could be that we are actually being tougher on offenders and we are making them comply with the orders more and they are going into breach more.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: What happens if they simply refuse? You must have some clients who just refuse to comply with the order. What happens to them?

Ms Harker: That is taken back to court for breach, and invariably in that kind of instance, the offender would get a custodial sentence.

The CHAIR: I refer to page 759 of the budget papers. The second last dot point on that page states —

A tragic death in custody involving prisoner transport in January 2008 led to a comprehensive overhaul of duty of care operating procedures, vehicle safety standards, performance measurement and monitoring arrangements for the contracted services. Progressive replacement of the entire secure vehicle fleet designed in accordance with the new safety standards will be completed by 2010.

I note that on the previous page, 758, the budget allocation for that vehicle replacement is outlined. I acknowledge that this government has finally realised that that money must be allocated. Why has only \$465 000 been allocated for this financial year if the vehicle replacement is targeted for completion in 2010? Perhaps you could provide some detail about the allocation of these funds over that five-year period. It seems to me that if you are trying to complete that program by 2010, you will need to be spending more money sooner.

Mr Johnson: Sure. The funding was made available—I am not trying to be political—by both the previous government and this government. The funding was actually made available during the term of the previous government as well.

The CHAIR: Was it?

Mr Johnson: It was, yes.

The CHAIR: But it was not spent.

Mr Johnson: That is when the funding started. The reason it is a lower amount is because it is leasing funding. It is not actually purchasing a vehicle outright. The low amounts really relate to the

lease costs. The firm that has been engaged to construct the vehicles can only manage a certain number in a certain amount of time. So it is not necessarily a matter of throwing more money at it. We have actually met with them in person and said, “Can you bring this back from December 2010 and try to make a more aggressive date mid-year—around June 2010?” The building of the vehicles is one thing, and the delivery is another. You would have seen in recent times that the government has made a decision, particularly with the long-haul transport, to engage a private company and to use what people would term a luxury coach—it is not, but, regardless—to look at different ways of providing the transport. We have traditionally been locked into a heavily secured vehicle, which is appropriate in some circumstances but not in all. We are doing a combination of things with prisoner transport. One of those is looking at trying to reduce the demand. The Chief Justice is very much leading the way in terms of using videoconferencing and video courts and thereby reducing the demand and the need for transport from one part of the country to another.

Looking at the different types of vehicles, yes, we need a fleet of secure vehicles, but we are also looking to supplement them by 22-seater coach-type transport and to look at doing this differently. The lease costs are what you see in here, unless there is anything to add from the Director of Finance.

[1.30 pm]

Mr Kuzminski: There is, thank you, Mr Johnson. The information disclosed in the budget papers is not misleading but is incomplete. As Ian alluded to, the approval of the funding for the replacement of the secure vehicle fleet occurred in two stages. The initial approval occurred in the 2008-09 budget process. At that stage the ERC in its decision noted that a further submission may be required to support changes that might be required to the prototype vehicles. The initial approval for prototype vehicles was based on the number, specification and type of vehicle that we were prototyping at the time. Subsequent changes to that meant that an additional funding approval was required. The total funding available in 2009-10 is not the \$465 000 shown in the budget papers; it is actually \$1.548 million. That may help to illustrate or bring back into expectation the amount of money the committee would have expected to see, as opposed to the \$465 000 that appears in the budget papers

The CHAIR: I have another question for clarification, perhaps for Mr Johnson. Am I correct in understanding that the vehicles are not owned by the Department of Corrective Services?

Mr Johnson: Yes, they are; they are leased by us. We actually manage our own fleet, as such.

The CHAIR: Yes, okay. In terms of the vehicles that are being constructed, your information is that they are all being constructed by one company. Is that the same company that constructed the existing vehicle fleet?

Mr Johnson: No, my information is that that is not the case.

Mr Kuzminski: No, it is not.

Mr Johnson: No, it is not.

The CHAIR: As I understand it, it is not so much a construction as a modification of a vehicle.

Mr Johnson: It is very much about the process we went through after the tragic death, and we were looking at consulting with the Aboriginal Legal Service and obviously the inspector. We were looking at what the functionality was that was required in the specifications. We got an agreed model and we went forward with that.

The CHAIR: Is what is being constructed by this company a purpose-built vehicle from scratch?

Mr Johnson: Correct.

Mr Kuzminski: We have the chassis.

The CHAIR: Not as was with the previous vehicles that were modified from commercial vehicles to transport vehicles?

Mr Johnson: We have got the chassis of the vehicle, whether it be —

The CHAIR: A chassis is not too much, either way; it is the rest of the vehicle.

Mr Johnson: The pod that sits on the vehicle is a specifically designed pod for our purposes.

The CHAIR: So it is a complete redesign from what you had before?

Mr Johnson: Correct. The other important thing is that, again, it is not just about the vehicle or the hardware; it is about the other aspects of looking after prisoners. It is about the interaction between staff and the prisoners; it is about occupational safety and health, the emergency type responses, their training, regular breaks, duress alarms, temperature monitors, adequate food and stopovers. A whole raft of things have been implemented and whilst it is obviously a very tragic thing that has happened, back in August 2008 we held the very first prisoner transport forum in Western Australia, which was attended by people from around Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, both police and corrective services staff, very much looking at the design of vehicles and very much looking at other jurisdictions in terms of what their problems were and basically there, but for the grace of God, went many of those jurisdictions. We were looking at amending the standing guidelines for corrections in Australia to enhance and improve custodial transport. We had the death and that was a tragic event, but an awful lot has happened since that time.

The CHAIR: Yes, I have read the Coroner's report, which found the department culpable.

Mr Johnson: Yes. I do not walk away from that; that is why I met with Mr Ward's family.

The CHAIR: It concerns me that if there is a bottleneck in terms of there being only one supplier, what happens in the meantime? Can you guarantee that there are no prisoners being transported in the vehicles that have been found to be inadequate?

Mr Johnson: The particular vehicle that was involved with Mr Ward, the Mazda vehicles, the ones in the country, have all been taken off the road. Other vehicles that were not the same type of vehicle that I was not satisfied with have been taken off the road and replaced by coaches. We have engaged new service providers in terms of looking at the constant mechanical checks, certainly in relation to the airconditioning. A whole raft of things have been done on that front. There is a time lag and I think that to date we have had nine new vehicles delivered. As I say, we are trying to progressively move forward the end date to June next year. The fact is that there is one supplier and one of the delays in the past was that we went out to tender, and the successful tenderer at that time then went out of business, so it is a closed market.

The CHAIR: So that is nine out of how many that need replacing?

Mr Johnson: Nine new ones have been delivered. The total fleet will be 40 or thereabouts, but having said that, depending on the outcomes of some of the current processes with the coaches, we will learn from that process as well, so we may well change the 40 vehicles to include more of that type of vehicle as well. We need to do some analysis here and think outside the box.

The CHAIR: What is the cost of providing alternative means of transport in the interim period before the fleet is fully replaced, and has that been budgeted?

Mr Johnson: I cannot give the exact cost, but my instruction to staff was that I am not prepared to be commissioner of this department and have another person die in custody in the back of a van, so do what it takes to make sure that does not happen again. In relation to the coaches, there obviously will be a cost. The cost is not readily available to me, but it is not a secret. It will cost what it costs, and if that means we have to make savings elsewhere to pay for that, then again, so be it.

The CHAIR: Has any consideration been given to transport by aircraft?

Mr Johnson: Sure. There is actually transporting being done by aircraft. Sometimes there are not enough people to actually make it viable to use a coach, for example. We are certainly in discussions with police in relation to how we can utilise the aircraft they have, and we have utilised their aircraft in the past.

The CHAIR: Thank you. With regard to the incident that occurred in January 2008 and the subsequent Coroner's findings, the issue of the contract between the Department of Corrective Services and the service provider seems to be a serious part of the disconnect that meant that there was culpability on both sides, to put it that way. Is that a matter that is being addressed either by Department of Corrective Services taking the service back in-house, or by some overhaul of the contract? I guess either of those options have budgetary implications. Could you indicate whether those have been considered and what the budgetary implications are?

Mr Johnson: The answer to that is that the current contract is up for tender in July 2011, so the process of actually looking at what the procurement is going to be has actually commenced. That is a three-way process involving the Department of Corrective Services, Western Australia Police, and the courts, all three of whom use that contract.

The CHAIR: So the tenders have been called for that?

Mr Johnson: Not yet. We are actually now looking at what the business model is going to be.

The CHAIR: So you are reviewing the nature of it? I am very glad to hear that.

Mr Johnson: This is a contract that has been around for a long time, so now is an opportunity—

The CHAIR: And arguably has probably never worked.

Mr Johnson: That could be argued. There is an opportunity now for the three main users of that contract to look at what we need and it may well be, without pre-empting any outcome, that the regional model may be different from the state model. That may be an outcome; we are working through that process now. We have a large team assigned to this from the police, courts and corrective services and it will be done. In July 2011 the new model, whatever it will be, will come into operation.

The CHAIR: Is one of the considerations in the mix that the provision of transport services might come back to the Department of Corrective Services rather than remaining contracted out?

Mr Johnson: That is one of the options that will be considered, yes.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I understand that the police commissioner is fairly keen to transfer responsibility for prisoner transport to the Department of the Attorney General; I think that has been put on the public record. Has there been any progress on this matter at a departmental level? I understand that you said earlier that you had been in discussions with the Commissioner of Police on some matters; is this one of those matters?

Mr Johnson: I have met with Karl on a couple of occasions and my executive team meets with the police executive team on a quarterly basis. One of the issues we obviously discuss is prisoner transport. There are three parts to it: the point of arrest, the lock-up and court, which is a police function and will remain a police function. Once prisoners have been given a judicial order it obviously becomes a corrective services problem in terms of the offender, but that is in relation to the adult offenders; we also have the issue of juveniles. I have spoken to Karl about adult offenders and he is represented at the tender process by an assistant commissioner, very much representing the way the police would like to see the contract for offender transport operate in the future. He is comfortable with that side of things. In relation to juvenile transport, Karl has been vocal in saying that he wants to be out of that business because it goes beyond the point of arrest to lock-up; it actually goes from the courts down to Perth. The Department of Corrective Services carries out the transporting of juveniles in the metropolitan area, but police do it in the regional areas. He has certainly made that point clear. Again, Heather Harker has been working closely with the police to

ask, "Right, what other model can we come up with in relation to young offenders and juveniles?" Typically, I think the figure is around 140 that go from, say, Perth to a court, and about 340 that come in from various areas to either Rangeview or Banksia. So, yes, we are.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Have you gone as far as to have a look at what may be the cost impost, if you like, of the transfer of the prisoner transport function from police to your agency? If so, do you have some global figures to wrap around that?

Mr Johnson: The ballpark figure is about \$1.6 million, and that is a combination of travel by air and travel by vehicle or some other appropriate type of transport.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: So you could do it transferring the resources that the police currently have plus add an additional \$1.6 million on top of that recurrent?

Mr Johnson: No, \$1.6 million looks to be the picture; we need some vehicles, obviously, to do that. It would very much be a partnership approach with the police because they have a presence in places where we do not have a presence. We would certainly be looking to use their aircraft on a regular basis, because it is difficult to get charter planes. We are not necessarily looking to replicate what the police have been doing, because we do not agree that that is a great way of doing things. We are looking, again from a demand perspective, to see whether we can reduce demand, and that is why we have things like regional youth justice in Kalgoorlie and Geraldton, and we are certainly keen, maybe, to expand that further. That then looks at responsible adults, other types of bail options, juvenile justice teams and interventions with families at earlier stages. We are reducing the travel requirement in the first place because the reality is that many of the offenders who end up in detention or on remand do not necessarily end up with a custodial sentence.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Related to that, I want to go back to the Chairperson's point about the expiry of the contract in 2011. I understand that there was some legal advice being sought in relation to a termination clause in the contract, to see in fact whether you could get out of the contract prior to 2011. I would appreciate it if we could get a bit of a rundown on whether that advice has been received and whether, in fact, you make any comments in respect of that. I also understand that the GSL prisoner transport contract is blowing out. Could we get a current figure for the blowout of that contract? That would also seem to be a good reason to perhaps review the contract very seriously. Anyway, I ask you to make some comments in respect of those two matters.

[1.45 pm]

Mr Johnson: The first question relates to the legal advice. I have not seen the legal advice, so I cannot comment on that. I can give you a broad comment. There is always a way to get out of a contract but it is what it costs you in the end to get out of it. There is a risk with any breach or termination of a contract.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: What if the contractor has not done the right thing in terms of the contract?

Mr Johnson: Certainly there are penalties there in terms of—deaths in custody obviously being one of the needs to meet the key performance requirements of the contract, and there are appropriate financial penalties for the contractor.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: What about in this case where there was a death in custody. If that is written into the contract, why has this contract not just been ceased?

Mr Johnson: The outcome of the coroner's inquest was only recent. It was obviously due and proper to await those outcomes. Now a decision will be made as to what is the penalty for G4S.

In relation to the costs blow-outs, it is a cost-plus contract. Depending on the demand from the courts, police and corrective services, it is a figure that is hard to determine. Roughly \$24 million is the extent of the contract and that is split up between the three agencies, with the big users being corrective services and the courts.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: And that is likely to increase, I suppose, over time.

Mr Johnson: It will increase if the prison population increases and the movements increase and there is no reduction in terms of the demand, particularly in relation to videoconferencing and the like. We make approximately 50 000 prisoner movements per annum. I consider a prisoner movement to be to a court and back. That is one movement. Other states will count that as two. We travel around about 1.7 million kilometres a year in transport.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Can I just ask you whether, in your view, has the contracting out of prisoner transport, is that a successful way to go, or when you compare it to the olden days when all this was done in-house?

Mr Johnson: Why do you not ask me an easy one! That is a really complex question. I was not around when it was done in-house. I understand that was probably 10 years ago.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: It was probably a bit unfair, unless you want to make some comments.

Mr Johnson: I have no comparison.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: I have a question about details of controlled grants and subsidies. I go back to the point in relation to juvenile offenders. I understand that what you are saying is that these kids have to step up and take responsibility for their own actions at some stage.

Mr Johnson: And their parents have to step us as well.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: That is actually my question. My experience is that, I suppose a lot of these kids are from families where that mum and dad will not do that; they will not step up. Is that part of the program that you might have in place that we would step in—in loco parentis, as it would be—to give these kids those skills and then there would be an expectation further down the track with that program? The other thing is could you give me details of the four hubs and the four outreach centres? I am just not aware of where they are. For interest, I would like to know that.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Ms Harker can attend to that question while we consider the other one.

Ms Harker: The four youth justice hubs are at Joondalup-Warwick, Mt Lawley, Belmont and Cockburn. The Cockburn office is a brand new one. That is an additional office, which obviously recognises the expansion in the southern corridor. The outreach centres are at Thornlie, Fremantle, Rockingham and Midland. There will be a joint outreach centre at Wangara and Clarkson as well. "Joint" meaning that both adults and young people will have that as an outreach centre.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: At Wangara and Clarkson?

Ms Harker: Wangara and Clarkson, yes.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: They are nowhere near each other geographically. I am not sure how that works. That is my region.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: What do you mean by a hub at Joondalup-Warwick? That has got me a bit confused. That is a very long hub.

Ms Harker: It will be at Joondalup. Some young people may well report at Warwick on occasions, but we are not expecting that there will be significant numbers there. The main centre will be at Joondalup.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: So there will be one at Joondalup and Warwick?

Ms Harker: Yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Warwick is an adult facility?

Ms Harker: It is, yes.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: In some cases they may be and they might be able to report to the adult centre?

Ms Harker: There might be occasions when it is possible for them to do that, yes.

The second question in terms of, I suppose, if you like the philosophy of the model we are wanting to implement, I think it is fair to say, much like the commissioner said at the beginning really, that corrective services, and particularly as far as working with young people is concerned, tends to try and do absolutely everything for them, when in reality other agencies should actually step up to that mark, particularly DCP, Education, Health and agencies like that. All too often, what has happened is that when young people have actually hit the justice system, or come into the justice system, what we have found is that other agencies actually tend to take a back seat. I am pleased to say that that is beginning to improve and that is partly beginning to improve because what we are developing is a youth justice strategy for Western Australia. It is a multi-agency strategy; it is not just about corrective services doing everything. As far as corrective services is concerned, as I say, it is very much about working closely with other agencies. It is about an emphasis on early intervention and diversion. It is about working with children or young people and their families and their surrounding influences, if you like, as opposed to just concentrating on the individuals themselves. If I can just give you the example of what we have done in Kalgoorlie and Geraldton. The regional youth justice services in both those centres are very much the basic model of what we want to expand right across the state. That applies to the metro as it does to the other regional areas of WA. What we have in there is a whole raft of services, as I say, juvenile justice teams, early intervention, bail facilities and working with the families. Really, it is a more holistic approach to working with young people. We also have other agency staff co-located in those centres. I think that is really quite important for us to remember because it is one of the things that we are very keen to push because what that does is actually encourage other agencies to do the bit that they should be doing. We do have police officers located in both those centres working with the juvenile just teams and, in one instance, we have a DCP worker and somebody from Strong Families in Geraldton. That, in essence, is the kind of model that we are actually wanting to replicate.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: You are piloting it?

Ms Harker: It is not really a pilot; that is the service delivery model for both those areas. It is not a pilot. That is happening in Geraldton and Kalgoorlie.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: In the city?

Ms Harker: The move that we have done in the metropolitan area is beginning to take us down that route. The youth justice centres in the metropolitan area, again, will have multidisciplinary staff there. We are bringing together both the early intervention staff with the statutory staff and we are also looking to try and get the likes of DCP and Education and Health involved in those centres as well. At the operational level, that is very much the model we are wanting to develop. The responsibility, if you like, I guess is at the senior management level to try to make that happen, and that is very much what is taking place at the moment.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: It sounds promising. My other question refers to page 765 “Details of Controlled Grants and Subsidies” and prisoner gratuities payments. Firstly, if you could perhaps expand and explain to me exactly what that is. I notice—it may just be a timing issue, I am not sure—that it is budgeted in 2009-09, the figure is \$3.259 million, but the estimated actual is \$6.276 million. There seems to be a big difference in those figures. I am not that familiar are with reading these budget papers but I want to know why there is such a big discrepancy and what are the prisoner gratuity payments?

Mr Johnson: I will answer the question on prisoner gratuities first. Basically, depending on what level of employment and activities prisoners do, they get gratuities as a payment for that. I think that there are four levels, from memory—five, sorry, plus a new one for work camps. There are

various levels. Mr Giles has the breakdown of those levels. A prison is very much run on a hierarchical system in terms of reward for good behaviour and moving through the system. Obviously we want to encourage people to work and the harder they work and the more responsible the job is, the better the gratuity. That is linked to CPI, which is a requirement under the act in relation to making sure that it is linked to CPI. As I said, Mr Giles can provide the actual breakdown of the gratuities.

Maybe I can ask Mr Kuzminski to answer your question about the leap in the amounts. I can take a stab at it in relation to prisoner population. Obviously it has gone up considerably, so this amount would go up accordingly. Do you wish to know the gratuities?

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: That would be good.

Mr Giles: There are six levels of gratuity. The gratuity levels are from 1 to 5 plus work camps. The highest level gratuity is level 1 at \$8.26 per day. I just need to check though and qualify. I think these have recently been indexed to CPI. Level 2 is \$6.32 a day, level 3 is \$4.96, level 4 is \$3.51 and level 5 is \$2.60. We have recently introduced a new gratuity level, which is titled "work camps" to incentivise prisoners to go out to work camps to undertake work out there. That is, on a weekly basis, \$20 above the level 1 gratuity.

The CHAIR: Hon Philip Gardiner.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Sorry, are we going to get an answer to the increase?

The CHAIR: Sorry, you are right.

Mr Kuzminski: We need to be guided by the comparison with the 2007-08 figure, which shows a figure of \$5.989 million. What you will find in the difference between 2008-09 budget and the 2008-09 estimated actual is that the cost allocation for that year across the budget has shifted between the beginning of the year and later in the year. Another significant contributor to that figure will, as the commissioner outlined, be the increase that we have had in the prison population.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: What do you mean the "shift across"? I do not understand that.

Mr Kuzminski: It is the way the dollars have been allocated across the cost lines.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Is that a timing issue?

Mr Kuzminski: No, it is not a timing issue. A timing issue would be across the years; this is an issue up and down the cost lines within the department's budget.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: From one category to another?

Mr Kuzminski: Yes, that is right.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: So it could be difference in one of the other lines of the rough amount?

Mr Kuzminski: Exactly. That has been adjusted from the beginning of the year to during the year. For example, these figures can be readjusted in either the budget process or in the mid-year review. An anomaly that has been picked up earlier in the year is adjusted during the course of the year. As you can see, what that has resulted in is a number that is much more consistent with the general trend.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I can understand following the general trend, and 2008-09 seems to be a bit of an aberration in that for some reason it has decreased. You then have for the last year \$6.276 million but you then have it actually in this year dropping. In light of the arguments about prisoner numbers, unless you are expecting a drop in prisoner numbers over the next 12 months, why would you then have a decrease in this financial year?

Mr Kuzminski: The prisoner numbers are pegged at the moment. They are flatlined in the out years. Our opportunity to revisit those is during the mid-year review and during the budget process.

The department will be submitting a bid during the mid-year review to adjust its funding in line with the current population level, which at the moment is sitting at around 4 500.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: That is in the forward estimate years, but in terms of—sorry to do this; I just could not understand it—between the 2009-10 and your estimated actual in 2008-09, was there any adjustment there, or is your prisoner population based on a figure taken at some point in 2008-09?

Mr Kuzminski: The population figure in 2008-09 and 2009-10 is 3 900. It is the same. It is a daily average for the year of 3 900, which is significantly below the number of offenders that we are managing at this point in time.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Can I take it from that then—what are you currently operating at?

Mr Johnson: Just over 4 500.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: So there are about 600 prisoners that you do not have funding for in this financial year at this stage? If you hold at that 4 500 for the rest of this year, you will need the funding for 600 additional prisoners before the end of the financial year.

Mr Kuzminski: That is correct.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: What figure would that be in dollar terms?

Mr Johnson: He has a mind like a calculator and is just working it out.

Mr Kuzminski: If only I had a calculator like a calculator.

The CHAIR: Perhaps you could just give us what it is per head and we could figure it out.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I have a calculator. I am a good Girl Scout!

[2.00 pm]

Hon KEN TRAVERS: It is good to see! A lot of agencies just think of the first number that they thought of.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: And double it!

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Yes!

Mr Kuzminski: That is about \$32 million—\$32.3 million.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Thirty-two point three million—thank you.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: I must say that I am delighted to hear about your youth justice strategy. I have a number of questions as it is a very deep interest of mine. To what age are you going down when having that youth justice strategy? Are you really beginning almost at the time a child is born in dysfunctional families? Taking up the commissioner's point, that is where a lot of the issue is, and we hear about all the dysfunction that we have but that you cannot do it.

Ms Harker: I mean there is early intervention from the point of view of corrective services, but there is also early intervention from the point of view of other human services.

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: You mean prison?

Ms Harker: The point I would make is that from Corrective Services' point of view, our responsibility start at age 10, basically. Having said that, there will be many families who juvenile justice officers now and diversion staff now work with who have obviously got children a lot younger than that, and there will no doubt be earmarked to come into our kind of system. So, I would not want to say that 10 is the hard and fast cut-off. Having said that, the point I was making about other agencies actually doing more, particularly with that pre-10-year-old group, and really almost from the point of birth, cannot be overestimated and overemphasised. That has been very much the subject of discussions within the steering group that I chair in terms of developing this strategy. So, the intervention, particularly by health and by education, in terms of preschool and

nurseries and all the kinds of initiatives that need to take place there with some of the most dysfunctional families that we have, again, is part of the considerations that we are looking at. Certainly, the Auditor General's report that looked into juvenile justice last year made very significant reference to those kinds of issues: that, again, it is not just about Corrective Services being responsible for everything that should be happening with young people.

Mr Johnson: Could I perhaps just add there that Heather is also representative on the Pathways project with Fiona Stanley and quite a few other agencies, including education, health and others. So, we are certainly represented on that body, which looks very much at the early days and beyond.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: You are up against it because we are all formed by the time we get to 10 years of age.

Ms Harker: Absolutely, yes; by the time they get to us it is usually a bit too late, but —

Hon KATE DOUST: Seven.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Seven years of age is the answer. At least that is a beginning. It is an amelioration process which is beginning. The second thing in terms of juveniles, I know in Geraldton when I happened to be doorknocking up there, I came across a white person, a Caucasian person, who had a difficult child and had not known where to send that child. They finally found a place in Victoria. The child came back after a couple of years and now is just terrific. I did not go into the details of what happened in Victoria. Are the juvenile facilities referred to—I am sorry; it was somewhere in here that I saw it—such as Banksia Downs the places where, if you have a difficult child, that you can volunteer to send that child?

Ms Tang: No, we have got enough there as it is!

Hon KATE DOUST: We wish!

The CHAIR: I do not think that you would want to!

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: It looks like we all have difficult children around this end of the table! How about you?

Ms Harker: Definitely not!

Hon LIZ BEHJAT: I am sending mine to camp tomorrow, but that is only for two days!

Ms Harker: I mean, Banksia Hill is a detention centre and that is exactly what it is: it is for young people who have committed sometimes very serious offences, sometimes not so serious—hence all the effort that is going on to try to keep the numbers down as far as Banksia Hill and Rangeview are concerned—but, no, they do not. But I would hope that if that young person was somebody who was in the criminal justice system, that as a result of the initiative in Geraldton, we would be able to pick up and work with that child in their community, offering greater support to the parents, and, if need be, some kind of respite. We do have limited accommodation provision in both Geraldton and Kalgoorlie linked to those services. So, we are approaching it in a very different way and beginning to offer a different range of services that would, hopefully, meet the needs of somebody in that kind of circumstance.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Okay; terrific. In the same direction, at the top of page 761 there is a table under the heading “Juvenile Offender Services”. Also, on the previous page there is a table under the heading “Adult Offender Services”. The cost per day of managing an offender through community supervision of adults is budgeted in the current year to be about \$34 and for juveniles \$101. Is that difference of cost following on from what you are saying or implying that the cost of managing a juvenile through community supervision is just that much more difficult?

Ms Harker: I would not say that it is more difficult. It is a lot less costly than —

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Here it is more costly.

Ms Harker: Sorry.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Is that \$101 —

Mr Johnson: You are correct. It is a numbers game: in terms of the numbers of juvenile offenders compared to the number of adult offenders in the community.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: So it is a scale affected by fixed costs, is it?

Ms Harker: Sorry; it is a scale.

Mr Kuzminski: Significantly.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Okay. Since we finally got through that question so quickly, Madam Chair, I will ask one more question.

The CHAIR: Of course; one more question for Hon Philip Gardiner.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Just back to the issue about the contract that was raised by our Chairman and also Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich. Is the reason you cannot fire the people who caused the problem—I am sorry to refer back to this issue again—because the contract was not tight enough in being drawn up?

Mr Johnson: I am sorry; I missed the first part of the question.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Sorry. Was the contract sufficiently tight when being drawn up to be able to exercise your right, if you like, given the neglect and whatever else took place in those circumstances to fire the company? I mean, is it a contractual drafting and a contractual design issue or is it something else?

Mr Johnson: I think the way that I will answer this is: is this the contract that we would ideally want in the way that it is drawn up? The answer is no. But, no, I do not think it prevents you actually from taking that action. That is a matter of legal opinion.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Is it a matter of costs, as you said before?

Mr Johnson: It is a whole raft of things in terms of: how do you actually replace that service, what is the cost of taking that action, is it legally required, will you get tied-up in the courts for the next five years? So, there is a whole raft of considerations there. Again, I reiterate that if I was to be asked whether this was the contract that I want, I would say no, it is not.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Yes; fair enough. Okay. No more questions, thank you.

The CHAIR: I might just also ask a couple of question because I want to follow up on that issue, then I will come to Hon Kate Doust. You were talking, when we were earlier dealing with the issue of prison transport, about the consideration of various models and various options for going forward. What consultation processes are being incorporated in that reconsideration of what is obviously a matter of very high public interest? Who is being consulted? What is the consultation?

Mr Johnson: There has certainly been a broad range of people consulted including, obviously, Corrective Services, police, the courts and the Aboriginal Legal Service. The Aboriginal Legal Service accompanied us on a trip to Victoria and South Australia to look at the models there and to look at the specifications there and what can be done. They were certainly a key part of the forum in August 2008 that I spoke about earlier. The office of the inspector has been involved in relation to what we are looking to design and the specifications of that. So, quite a broad base in terms of the people that we have consulted with. We have also sat down with community members in Warburton as recently as two weeks ago in relation to how we can actually look at doing things differently, particularly in that community but also other communities in terms of maybe looking at people not being transported for a remand case. Now, that is not really that simple in many instances because risks are associated with that, depending on the assessment of the individual prisoner. But looking at the development of that work camp up there, maybe there could be a secure component of that

work camp that would accommodate people who would otherwise be transported from, say, Warburton to Kalgoorlie or further afield.

The CHAIR: In that consultation, has any evidence been taken from people who have been transported?

Mr Johnson: Sure.

The CHAIR: Because, obviously, there is a big disconnect, in my experience, for people who have been in custody and who have either directly or very closely experience of issues with prisoner transport. I appreciate that you are consulting organisations like the Aboriginal Legal Service who get to hear about some of these issues, but they do not bother to report a because it happens so frequently. That is according to my evidence. So, are you speaking with the actual prisoners?

Mr Johnson: Two things. Prisoners have written to me and given me a blow-by-blow description of what the journey is like and what the conditions were like. I have a very vivid recollection of that. Secondly, superintendents at respective prisons are obviously sitting down with their prisoners. However, a process that I embark upon when I visit a prison, I have a specific meeting with Aboriginal prisoners without anybody else being there, and again talk about issues that come to the surface. Typically, as you would be well aware, they are not necessarily ones to complain, and you actually have to extract, if you like, the information. Yes, I have certainly had blow-by-blow descriptions of what it was like to undertake a journey from Broome to Perth, and that is why you now see the coaches and not the vans that were being used.

The CHAIR: Is any consideration being given to the fact that prisoners might actually provide full and frank information to somebody who was not from Corrective Services?

Mr Johnson: Sure. I mean, we have got the Aboriginal visitors scheme, and we have various people at the inspector's office who go into prisons whenever they want to go. We have the Ombudsman. A prisoner can write to or speak with seven or eight different sorts of groups without going through Corrective Services. They can write directly to me, to the minister, to the Ombudsman or the office of the inspector.

The CHAIR: So, those, I guess, advocacy groups are also part of that consultation?

Mr Johnson: Sure. As you would be well aware, the inspector is not backward in coming forward in terms of engaging with us.

The CHAIR: When will a decision be made on choice of model?

Mr Johnson: The actual —

The CHAIR: You said you were considering a range of options in terms of future prisoner transport.

Mr Johnson: Sure.

The CHAIR: When would the decision be made as to what the new model will be or what options will be put to the government? I guess, when will your part of the process be complete?

Mr Johnson: Sure. The vehicle has been designed and specified and is now being constructed. There are various vehicles, both long haul and short haul, underway. The other aspect that I was really referring to was in terms of this experiment—well, not experiment, that is the wrong word; it is an inappropriate word—of the actual uses of coaches for the long haul. We are looking at some of the learnings coming from that. We intend to lease a couple of 22-seater vehicles and use them for transport. We also will be looking at air transport, and part of the look at redesigning the contract or the way that we will do business will be to ask: is it going to be more economical to use air transport rather than vehicle transport. My answer would be that the process is an ever-changing process, because as we learn new things, as we get feedback, as we have some lessons learnt, then

we will make the changes as it unfolds. So, it is going to be multiple approaches. It is not just going to be: here is a truck and that is the way that it is going to be done.

The CHAIR: Perhaps I was misunderstanding your previous answer then. I understood you were saying that there was a reappraisal and a review of whether the service would remain in-house or out, and I guess the detail under that is also being reviewed.

Mr Johnson: Sure.

The CHAIR: I guess my question is in relation to the overarching model: when will that decision be made, or perhaps it will be a recommendation to government rather than a decision?

Mr Johnson: It certainly will be a recommendation through the minister to cabinet. I am just trying to work back from the date July 2011 as to when we would have to go onto the market.

Mr Kuzminski: That is for the contract, but do not forget that we are working on the business case at the moment.

Mr Johnson: Yes, but I am just trying to figure the timing as to when you would actually have to decide what your business case is before you then try to procure it.

The CHAIR: That is right—before you put your tenders out.

Mr Johnson: I cannot give you a date. Could I undertake to give you —

The CHAIR: Could I put that as a supplementary question?

Mr Johnson: Yes.

[Supplementary Information No B2.]

The CHAIR: This is my final question in this area, I think—unless I think of another one before we finish! Part of this process of reappraising the provision of this service is a cost comparison between continuing with the situation as we have it; that is, trying to transition from the existing vehicle fleet, including trialling other options, and the other option which is to terminate the contract with the private provider. Has that cost comparison been done?

Mr Johnson: That cost will be part of that case that you speak of. But from my perspective, I am not going to be driven by cost. It will be about the quality of the service.

The CHAIR: I think what we did not quite get to, and perhaps it is because you said that you could not provide the figure. Obviously, I support the fact that alternative transport is being provided—clearly I support that—but it is unclear what that is actually going to cost because you are still trialling it.

[2.15 pm]

Mr Johnson: It is a relatively short term, because in the meantime we are looking to get 22-seater coaches of our own that we can lease, so it is a relatively short-term cost.

The CHAIR: G4S would take on using those coaches as an alternative.

Mr Johnson: Correct, and may well be involving our staff as well, depending on the security classification. It is very much about safety and security, so we cannot put the community at risk to start with. Some prisoners are not suitable to transport in a coach. It is just as simple as that.

The CHAIR: In relation to the use of coaches, one of the things that came out of the coroner's report was that the training that was provided to the G4S staff was inadequate in terms of prisoner management. Is that being addressed and is that the responsibility of Corrective Services?

Mr Johnson: It is. The fact that G4S have the contract does not mean that we can abdicate our responsibilities, and training has been a big part of that revamp of the entire contract; so emergency response, training, hardware in terms of equipment, right across, and monitoring as well. We have increased our monitoring of that contract and our presence in regional centres.

The CHAIR: What is the cost of providing that additional training to those staff, because what I understood from the coroner's report is that he said the training was clearly inadequate and basically the priority was on prisoner restraint, not on anything to do with duty of care? In terms of provision of what is best practice and duty of care to the person in custody, what is the cost to Corrective Services of providing that additional training? Is that happening, what is the time frame and what is it costing?

Mr Johnson: The training is happening. With all due respect to the coroner, we did not wait until the coroner gave us his recommendations to get on with stuff. We could see from our analysis of what took place that there was a need to make some changes. Those changes were made back in 2008 after Mr Ward died. The minister at the time ordered an inquiry. An inquiry was carried out, and a review with recommendations, all of which have been implemented. So the training has been ongoing for quite some time now. As for the cost factor, I am not aware of any significant cost coming out of that training, because training does not necessarily have to have a huge cost associated with it. There is expertise throughout the department and throughout the various companies that engage in this contract. They can deliver that training. Really what we are talking about is interpersonal communication, having contact with the families, a regular break, asking how they are going and monitoring their welfare. In terms of training, some of it is not rocket science.

Hon KATE DOUST: Just coming back to the point that Hon Liz Behjat raised, and it is one I am interesting in, given the age of some of these young offenders you have talked about is as young as 10 years, and given that their family circumstances may not be as supportive or as financial to enable them to access, say, the Belmont site—I just keep using Belmont as an example—if they miss an appointment, how many times would they miss an appointment because of not being able to afford to get there or not being able to get there through access or not have a supportive family? What constitutes a breach? How many non-attendances constitute a breach?

Ms Harker: It can vary. It is very different in the youth justice world from the adult world.

Hon KATE DOUST: That is why I am asking about young people.

Ms Harker: It can be as simple as just not attending and refusing to attend, and that obviously is a direct breach. If it was an order from court, then clearly they would be taken back to court and dealt with in the Children's Court. In some of the other interventions that we have got, it may well be nonattendance. It could be a whole raft of things, not necessarily related to the distance they have to travel in terms of reporting.

Hon KATE DOUST: The question I am asking I think is fairly simple. If they cannot get there because they do not have the money to pay for public transport or if they cannot get there because they do not have the support, how many appointments would they miss, not because they do not want to be there?

Ms Harker: I would expect staff to be going out to them, not necessarily expecting them to come into the centre all the time. I go back to really what I was saying at the beginning. That is the premise that we are building the youth justice model on. It is about going out to the young people, dealing with them in their environment and with their families.

Hon KATE DOUST: Do your staff phone if they do not turn up?

Ms Harker: Yes, absolutely.

Hon KATE DOUST: I was just interested in what would constitute a breach, because I look on page 760 at the rate of return to detention of juveniles. In 2008-09 it is 53 per cent, and the actual estimated is 51 per cent. They are very high figures. What I would be interested to know, and I appreciate you will not have it today, is how many of those return-to-detentions are because they have actually committed a further offence and how many are because they may have breached an order simply because they did not attend, for example, an appointment or a series of appointments,

not because they did not want to but because they were not able to because other barriers were in their way?

Ms Harker: The last part of your question I think will be exceptionally difficult to actually ascertain.

Hon KATE DOUST: But there must be a way of determining. If the courts send them back into detention, there must be a reason listed as to whether it is an offence, like a break and enter, or whether it is a breach for not attending a meeting.

Ms Harker: Reoffending or straight nonattendance, yes, we could probably ascertain that.

Hon KATE DOUST: That is fine.

Ms Harker: But if it is about nonattendance due to not having the money to get there, that is another story. I do not know that we would have that information.

Hon KATE DOUST: I think, Chair, I would be interested in finding out how many are returned to detention. I would like to know the difference between those returned to detention for a further offence and those for a breach.

Mr Johnson: We can certainly provide that information, and that is quite clear, on whether they have reoffended or committed a breach. If Johnny says that he cannot get there because he has not got any money, we cannot say that is the reason. We would have to go through manually every breach that has ever been done to see whether that is the case.

Hon KATE DOUST: I appreciate that.

Mr Johnson: Secondly, just because Johnny says he has not got any money, it does not mean that is the reason either, because there may be other factors that he is not actually telling us about, or he is not telling us the truth, or it is his family or whatever. The other aspect is that once they front the court on a breach—and there is a recent example of this where the judge took a particularly interest—a judge uses a fair bit of discretion in actually working with the family. In this instance you would have typically thought that this person would have been returned to custody, but the judge really took a deep interest—and we had a lot of interest with DCP and ourselves—and he really worked with the family. He actually ordered the parents to come to court and said, “Next time front up.” The child in this particular instance, who has been a prolific offender, ended up back with the parents, and today, touch wood, has not reoffended, which has been a tremendous achievement for the Children’s Court and those involved. Sometimes it is a bit fluid. In terms of when they breach do they automatically go back to detention, no, they do not; they get given a couple of chances by the judiciary as well depending on their circumstances.

[Supplementary Information No B3.]

Hon KATE DOUST: Thank you. I just want to come back again and talk about the Price report, which is obviously a report that was commissioned by the department. It is the result of a fairly intensive look at how the department should construct this new model. I understand that the report that has been presented is only stage 1 and that stage 2 will only occur once the recommendations in stage 1 have been accepted by the department. Has stage 1’s recommendations been accepted and followed through on?

Ms Harker: Yes, fully.

Hon KATE DOUST: When I asked you earlier on whether or not you had undertaken a thorough assessment that was recommended in the report, you did not respond to that. Has that actually happened?

Ms Harker: Yes. I did say that that assessment has taken place.

Hon SIMON O’BRIEN: Yes, I believe that was the case.

Hon KATE DOUST: Given that the report has identified a range of gaps and areas that need to be improved, and obviously to make those improvements you would need additional funding, before you moved into this new model of the different types of hubs, did you actually seek additional funding through Treasury or through the minister?

Ms Harker: Not at that stage, because we had the resources that we have currently got. In my view it was about reconfiguring those resources to begin to build a different model of service delivery, so using what we have currently got but using it differently, and also doing an assessment, as we have said, about what are the additional services that we actually want to provide and what would the cost of that be. As I said earlier, it is about reconfiguring what we have already got. We are not asking staff to do any more than they were previously doing under the old model, but we are asking them to do it in a different location and, if you like, with a different kind of focus. In terms of workload and different approaches, at this stage they have not changed. The service delivery model is very much the one that we have traditionally been using.

Hon KATE DOUST: I think you talked about Cockburn being a new site.

Ms Harker: Yes.

Hon KATE DOUST: Which other sites are new, in addition to what you have already got?

Ms Harker: Cockburn is the only new site.

Hon KATE DOUST: What about some of these other places that you mentioned that were outreach centres?

Ms Harker: Previously they have been used by community justice. Juvenile justice teams may have been located there—Killara—some of the diversion services that we have already had in operation. Again, they are actually being reconfigured, and they are being put into the actual youth justice centres, so that is freeing up those other centres that there were for us to use them as outreach centres.

Hon KATE DOUST: You have not had to seek any additional funding for these changes?

Ms Harker: Not to do this first stage of changes, no.

Hon KATE DOUST: So you will be seeking additional funding for the second stage?

Ms Harker: Yes, we will.

Hon KATE DOUST: What sort of ballpark figure will that be?

Ms Harker: The business cases we have currently got are around the \$10 million to \$12 million mark.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Commissioner, I note that an aspiration of the Attorney General is to reduce the overcrowding in prisons. I notice from an answer that your colleague gave to Hon Ken Travers that we currently have 4 500 prisoners, which is 600 above quota. I am just wondering whether you could give us a breakdown of each of the prisons; the capacity and the current population in each of those institutions, if that information is available.

Mr Johnson: I can do that. I will probably just pass it to Mr Giles, who can give an up-to-date account. I can tell you that 4 524 is the population today.

Mr Giles: Acacia Prison has 898; Albany has 247; Bandyup has 232; Boronia has 68; Broome has 106; Bunbury has 313; Casuarina has 682; Eastern Goldfields has 102; Greenough has 274; Hakea has 812; Karnet has 220; Roebourne has 175; and Wooroloo has 277. That adds up to 4 406, which is the prison population. The total number taking it to 4 524 is 11 in police lockups, five in hospital and 102 presently in work camps throughout the state.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: In terms of all the prisons that you have identified and the numbers, what was the ideal number that should be in those institutions—the capacity benchmark—

because clearly the Attorney General has admitted himself publicly that there is an issue in respect of overcrowding. We just want to know by how much over the capacity benchmark we are at in terms of prisoner numbers.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: You want to know what the capacity of the prison system is.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Yes, I do, on a prison-by-prison basis.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: In contrast to the figures you have just been given.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Yes.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: We can do that easily.

Mr Johnson: There are probably two parts to it. There is the original designed capacity, so when the prison was built or modified to some certain extent, and then there is a modified capacity, which obviously includes double bunks. The figure we go from is the modified capacity, because otherwise you are going back 10 years to a designed capacity. If we could quote the modified capacity, that would give you a picture.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Could you give us both?

Mr Johnson: Sure.

[2.30 pm]

The CHAIR: I was just going to say, is the other information available?

The design capacity of the system is 3 472. The modified capacity of the system as it stands today is 4 376. That modification might be different tomorrow because, as we roll out the double bunks and other strategies, that increases the modified capacity. That will change because we are making them and deploying them on a daily basis, so we will have a change in that figure. That is the figure as we stand today.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Can we get that breakdown because obviously the over-the-benchmark figure will be higher in certain institutions than it will be in others.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Do the global figures include beds at work camps?

Mr Johnson: Yes. That figure I am just quoted included an in-facility and a work camps one.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Does the modified total capacity of 4 376 include work camps?

Mr Johnson: No. Without being cute about this, the figures are as at 22 July, so it is not really the exact figure as of today.

The CHAIR: I think the committee is asking for the original design capacity and the modified capacity. You have already given us the current population.

Mr Johnson: Yes.

Mr Giles: As at 22 July the modified design capacities are as follows: Acacia, 900; Albany, 234; Bandyup, 185; Boronia, 70; Broome, 96; Bunbury, 307; Casuarina, 700; Eastern Goldfields, 100; Greenough, 229; Hakea, 781; Karnet, 214; Roebourne, 163; and Wooroloo, 273. That is a total of 4 252 as at 22 July.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Do you have a percentage growth rate for prisoner population? It seems to me there has been quite a drastic increase I guess over the nine months. I am surmising this and I am wondering what the rate of prisoner population increase over the past six months might be. I am wondering from that whether we can extrapolate what it might be in the next 12 months and what sort of new prisoner facility demand might there be in the immediate, medium and longer term.

Mr Johnson: As you well know, with statistics, there are statistics! Certainly, we have done some modelling right through to June 2014 when, as part of the \$655 million capital infrastructure

program, the last prison will come on line. Many different factors must be considered here in terms of police numbers, how the Prisoner Review Board deals with prisoners and how truth in sentencing, mandatory sentencing and a range of other factors impact. We feel that the build process we have embarked on will accommodate the prisoners. But that is subject to change. If anyone decides to go out and commit a crime, obviously that will go up. In June 2010 we are anticipating a population of between 4 500 and 4 714. We expect to have an in-facility capacity of 5 037. We hope to have a buffer there. If you take it one year on, to June 2011, we anticipate between 4 809 and 5 009 with an in-capacity of around about 5 087. It keeps going on. That is a 12 to 18-month snapshot. Will that change? We hope it changes so that there are fewer people in prison. That would be our desire. That is one of the reasons with community corrections we are bumping up the monitoring of the orders, the availability of community work and a raft of other aspects to try to reduce that population, not increase it.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Is the building of a new prison, as opposed to double bunking and adding to existing prisons, a potential reality? If so, within what sort of time frame, driven by demand?

Mr Johnson: If it is not, I will get a job at Broome beach because we need some new prisons. The Derby prison is projected to be finished in 2011. That will give us 150 beds. The Eastern Goldfields Regional Prison will give us 350 beds, which is a net gain of 250 beds. Expansion to Acacia will give us 387 beds. Work camps in Warburton and Wyndham will increase by about 60. The number at Pardalup is being taken from 20 to 18. The young offenders prison for 18 to 22-year-olds will be on line quite quickly. That will give us 80 beds in a young offender prison. I have probably missed a couple, but pretty much as a total we are looking over the next four years to bring on line about 1 600 beds to add to the system.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Can you accommodate by adding to your existing infrastructure rather than building, once again, a brand-new prison such as Acacia somewhere?

Mr Johnson: Sure. The new prison will obviously be in Derby, with 150 beds and the Eastern Goldfields. But Acacia is an existing prison so it is a matter of dropping in some units, although it is not that simple. Pardalup is an existing facility. We have some work to do to bring the infrastructure up to scratch. That is basically immediate.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: What are the limitations to and risks involved in expanding Acacia?

Mr Johnson: The risk of building in any prison is the security aspect. Acacia was designed with the expansion in mind so the in-ground services are there. The master plan of Acacia was planned to take it well over the 1 000 mark. The location of the new units will mean that the fence will be redesigned. We will bring the fence in, build the new accommodation units and put the fence back out. A temporary fence will keep them there but the additions will be built outside the fence and then contained within it. The master plan was already there for that. We have been doing the consultation work on the Eastern Goldfields Regional Prison for some time. We are ready to go. The schematics have been done and we are ready to go. The same goes for the Wyndham and Warburton work camps. We got permission from the community last week to get cracking with it in terms of native title issues and the like. We are already doing work at Pardalup. Double bunks are being made in prison industries and being rolled out every day as we speak.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Is it fair to say that the state prison population will probably increase by 25 per cent over the next four years?

Mr Johnson: I hope not. Having said that, having spent 30 years as a police officer I never thought I would have said that. We are looking at a base to June 2014 to be about 5 500. If we base that on today's figure of 4 500, my human calculator here might do the maths.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Take it back six months for a fair assessment!

Mr Johnson: Again, so many factors come into the prison population that make it difficult to predict.

The CHAIR: Mr Giles, if you do not have the figures here, I would like the figures—you can take it on notice—of the design capacity of the prisons. We had the figures for the modified capacity and we have the figures for the existing population. Do you have the figures for the design capacities as well?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: They can be read into the record now if you wish.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Before you start reading them out, when you first read them out, you did not include Pardalup but you kept talking about there being 20 prisoners in Pardalup. I might need to add something to my list here.

Mr Johnson: Pardalup is a work camp.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: So that comes under the 102 in work camps.

Mr Johnson: Correct.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: It used to be a prison, did it not?

Mr Johnson: It did, some years ago—before my time.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: It fits under that figure of 102.

Mr Johnson: That is why it is a good facility to bring back up.

Mr Giles: The original design capacities are as follows: Acacia, 750; Albany, 186; Bandyup, 183; Boronia, 70; Broome, 66; Bunbury, 223; Casuarina, 397; Eastern Goldfields, 100; Greenough, 219; Hakea, 617; Karnet, 174; Roebourne, 116; and Wooroloo, 249. That is a total of 3 350.

The CHAIR: Thank you very much. I refer to Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich's question on the increased prison population. In order to do the sums and work out the budget implications, we need to know the per capita cost and the projected per capita cost. Can you give us those figures? That way we can work out the cost to the budget of those additional prisoners.

Mr Johnson: We actually work on the prisoner population funding model based on a daily average population. As Mr Kuzminski pointed out, it is calculated at 3 900. That is sort of flat-lined across the years. It is revisited mid-year to see what it is looking like.

The CHAIR: What is the current cost per prisoner in custody?

Mr Johnson: The cost per prisoner is \$272 a day.

Mr Kuzminski: The department is not funded on the basis of the full cost per prisoner per day. The department is funded on the basis of an incremental cost per prisoner per day, given that, as Mr Gardiner pointed out earlier, some costs are fixed and some are variable. The current rate for funding for 2009-10 is \$147.52 per prisoner per day.

The CHAIR: For a juvenile?

Mr Kuzminski: The juvenile estate is not funded on a demand basis; only the adult estate is.

The CHAIR: What is the per capita cost of detaining a juvenile?

Mr Johnson: The estimated actual for 2008-09 is \$713 a day for juveniles. The budget target is \$626.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Is it possible for us to get a copy of your costing model for adults and juveniles?

Mr Johnson: Is that the cost per day or the costing model?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Is there a costing model as such in terms of the inputs formulating that output.

Mr Kuzminski: We can provide information on that.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: That would be great.

The CHAIR: We will take that as supplementary information.

[Supplementary Information No B4.]

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Those figures you mentioned come under the heading “Services and Key Efficiency Indicators”. If numbers we talked about before—the \$34 for the cost per day for an adult and the \$101 for the juvenile—are affected by fixed costs, can we break that out so we can see what the direct costs are for adults versus juveniles and have the fixed costs separate so there is a separate efficiency indicator of how well we are doing on a direct-cost basis. Otherwise I cannot see how it measures the efficiency when it is confused with the overheads and how many there are and all that kind of stuff.

The CHAIR: Is that possible?

Mr Kuzminski: Do I understand correctly that you would like to see a breakdown between variable costs and fixed costs? For what categories of cost?

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: I am referring to key efficiency indicators. It appears that the overheads influence the numbers. There is a trail of numbers there from 2007-08—\$24 for adults and \$31 for 2008-09 and \$34. To try to get an efficiency measure, compared to the juveniles, it is all affected by the fixed costs.

[2.45 pm]

Mr Kuzminski: It is, but the main reason for that is that the efficiency indicators, as they are called in the budget papers, are based on the total cost of services.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: I understand.

Mr Kuzminski: If you look at the total cost of services, that brings in all of those costs.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: I guess what I am a bit uncertain about is whether that is a real measure of the efficiency, given that it is related to how many juveniles and how many adults you have.

Mr Kuzminski: It can be.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: I know it can be, but that does not give me an indicator of the efficiency with which you are dealing with it on a direct-cost basis. It seems to me to be distorted by having the fixed costs there, and then dividing that by the number of juveniles and the number of adults. It is hard to identify what your efficiency really is.

Mr Kuzminski: With that number, I agree.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Good. Perhaps you could look at changing the number, or whatever you might think is the best way to do it, to better indicate what the efficiency measure really is.

Mr Johnson: One example is that when Kalgoorlie regional youth justice and Geraldton regional youth justice came on line, there was about \$6 million per annum for those two services. Now that will take some time to kick in and add real value, but all of a sudden that increases the cost per day significantly.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: Exactly, and that distorts the number, does it not?

Mr Johnson: It does, because you are talking about a small number of juveniles.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: I want to find a way of getting away from that.

Mr Johnson: Yes. There is a big jump up when you change the numbers.

The CHAIR: I think it is understood that if the figures could be presented in a way that would address that concern, that would be useful.

Hon PHILIP GARDINER: It is just a suggestion.

The CHAIR: Okay. It is quarter to three, and we need to conclude this hearing. I just want to let the witnesses know that there may be some further questions, and they will be provided shortly. Do any members have any further questions at this time?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Yes, please. I refer to page 757. Vehicle management is listed as one of your three per cent efficiency savings. What exactly does that involve?

Mr Kuzminski: What that involves is the department reducing the size of its vehicle fleet, and accordingly reducing the cost of its car parking.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: By how much?

Mr Kuzminski: Our target is to reduce that by 10 per cent.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Is that over and above the instruction from the Premier to reduce your car fleet by 10 per cent? Is that 10 per cent on top of that?

Mr Kuzminski: I had a discussion on this matter with Treasury last week, and I have sought an exemption for the department on that additional request, seeing as our 10 per cent saving was built into the department's original efficiency dividend submission.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Right. When did you receive the notification from Treasury of the 10 per cent reduction requirement?

Mr Kuzminski: It just so happens that I have that here! It was on 14 July.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: So at this stage you do not know whether you have been granted that exemption?

Mr Kuzminski: No, I do not, but my view is that while that 10 per cent target is achievable, having to do that again will be a bit of a stretch for the department.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: My next question is about the Acacia increased population. How much were you intending to increase the Acacia population by to get the saving—which I assume now is no longer a saving anyway?

Mr Kuzminski: It was another 100.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: From what to what?

Mr Johnson: From 900 to 1 000.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Will you achieve that saving in this financial year?

Mr Johnson: We have sat down with Acacia to try to get these additional figures in there, so the sooner we can get them in there, the sooner we will make the saving.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: But with the increase in the general prison population —

Mr Kuzminski: The money that is saved in Acacia may well be offset by increases in the general prison population. I think the point you are trying to make, Mr Travers, is that if the population keeps growing, will we bring the department's budget down overall? No, we will not. But it will not go up by as much as it would have if all the prisoners were housed in the public population compared with that increase in Acacia.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Thank you.

The CHAIR: Thank you very much for your attendance today.

Hearing concluded at 2.49 pm