

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES AND  
FINANCIAL OPERATIONS**

**2014–15 BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARINGS**

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE  
TAKEN AT PERTH  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2014**

**SESSION ONE  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT**

**Members**

**Hon Ken Travers (Chair)  
Hon Peter Katsambanis (Deputy Chair)  
Hon Martin Aldridge  
Hon Alanna Clohesy  
Hon Rick Mazza**

---

**Hearing commenced at 9.33 am**

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN**

**Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Transport, examined:**

**Mr REECE WALDOCK**

**Director General, examined:**

**Ms SUSAN McCARREY**

**Deputy Director General, examined:**

**Ms NINA LYHNE**

**Managing Director, examined:**

**Mr GRAEME DOYLE**

**Executive Director, Investment and Finance Coordination, examined:**

[Hon Rick Mazza took the chair.]

**The ACTING CHAIR:** On behalf of the Legislative Council Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations, I would like to welcome you to today's hearing. Firstly, if I can ask the witnesses if they have read, understood and signed a document headed "Information for Witnesses"?

**The Witnesses:** Yes.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** For Hansard, I note that all witnesses responded in the positive.

Witnesses need to be aware of the severe penalties that apply to persons providing false or misleading testimony to a parliamentary committee. It is essential that all your testimony before the committee is complete and truthful to the best of your knowledge. This hearing is being recorded by Hansard and a transcript of your evidence will be provided to you. The hearing is being held in public, although there is discretion available to the committee to hear evidence in private, either of its own motion or at a witness's request. 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 before answering the question. Government agencies and departments have an important role and duty in assisting Parliament to scrutinise the budget papers on behalf of the people of Western Australia. The committee values your assistance with this.

[Witnesses introduced.]

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Do any of the witnesses wish to make an opening statement? As there are no opening statements, we will move along and I will seek any questions from members.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I refer to page 794 of budget paper No 2. There appears to be an ongoing contribution towards Port Geographe coastal management of \$1.3 million this year, and then \$1.6 million and \$1.7 million. Can the parliamentary secretary explain to us what that amount of money is actually for?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Mr Reece Waldock will answer the member's question.

---

**Mr Waldock:** That will be for ongoing coastal management works for Port Geographe. It will be for ongoing sand bypassing and sea wrack bypassing, as required, to maintain the channel and the beaches.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** My understanding is that we just spent \$28 million on capital works down there. Are you indicating that, on top of that \$28 million, there is now an ongoing annual expenditure of around \$1.5 million?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Mr Graeme Doyle will expand on that.

**Mr Doyle:** The components of the \$1.35 million are, as Mr Waldock said, made up of mainly maintenance, channel harbour dredging maintenance, and dredging around the channel. That is \$880 000. There is also provision for ongoing minor works of \$30 000, and for the rest of the expenditure, there are provisions for the ongoing legal issues associated with finalising the entire Port Geographe estate, because the capital works were just for the groyne et cetera, but there is still the deed of management that the state is responsible for and it still needs to do ongoing work regarding that, and that is approximately \$400 000 of that \$1.35 million for the 2014–15 budget.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So what is the ongoing annual contribution towards coastal management issues at Port Geographe?

**Mr Waldock:** If I may, the project will not be finished until January next year. We have spent years designing the new groyne structures and having them peer reviewed. We are extraordinarily confident that the benefits of this new groyne system will create far less in terms of particularly beach build-up of sea wrack issues, and also improvements in terms of requirements for bypassing. It is fair to say that coastal management is not a precise science; it takes a lot of understanding. As I say, we are confident that we will certainly have a far better system with far less build-up of both sea wrack and sand, but it will require sums to relieve and dredge the channel on occasions. We have allowed for money in the future and, of course, we will see how it works post January next year.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** In terms of those figures on page 794, how much will the annual contribution be going forward towards maintenance at that location? There is clearly an ongoing allocation; what is that ongoing allocation in those figures?

**Mr Waldock:** Mr Doyle gave that figure.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So what is that figure?

**Mr Doyle:** The figure in 2014–15 is \$880 000. That is an ongoing figure.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So \$880 000 annually?

**Mr Doyle:** Yes, \$880 000 per annum is the ongoing figure for maintenance. There will also be, in two years' time, a \$450 000 provision for some scheduled maintenance for two to three years after the completion of the capital works.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So \$880 000 and then \$450 000.

**Mr Doyle:** It is \$450 000 in 2016–17, and the intention is that a review will be conducted in 2017 of what the ongoing needs are of the maintenance and management of the facility.

[9.40 am]

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Did the state have a legal obligation to do that work, or was it a policy decision of government to do that work?

**Mr Waldock:** The state, following many years of concerns from the local residents, responded by going forward with a solution, particularly in the light of the developer moving into administration. To answer your question, the state did not have a legal obligation; the state responded as it felt it should, in terms of improving the amenity and safety for both residents and boating.

---

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** On page 795, the last dot point states —

In addition to addressing environmental issues, the project will improve amenity and the viability of the currently stalled Port Geographe development.

Does that mean the government expects that there will be future development at Port Geographe, and who will undertake that development?

**Mr Waldock:** The state looked at a number of options for how that might proceed. One of the options put forward was a state LandCorp development to move forward from, I think, stage 3 all the way out to stage 8, which has been given full environmental and planning approvals, but the government, I think sensibly, decided that, whilst we can now establish and improve the system in terms of flushing, water quality, and safety and security of the beaches, it would be best left to the private sector, so the bank is continuing to work with the private sector and the administrators to find a new developer, and that is proceeding.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** If there is value now, because of that improved amenity and viability, does the government have any capacity to capture any of that value to repay the cost that it is incurring, or does all of that go back to the banks that hold a mortgage over the land?

**Mr Waldock:** All those issues were fully pursued. In fact, as it has turned out, the banks had a major writedown.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I am sure that they have. The land should be worth nothing, because no-one is going to live there. What I am trying to understand is, we are spending \$28 million on a project that will, by your own words, add to the viability of the project. Do we as a state have any recourse to capture that money back?

**Mr Waldock:** I was just about to say that this project will not wash its face; it is very marginal. As it is, the bank has been negotiating with private developers even in the light of the government decision, and is still finding it extremely difficult to attract any private developers. It is a marginal case. There is no wonderful windfall gain for anybody. What we have allowed to happen by our particular works is hopefully a future for that development if and when a developer steps forward. There is no opportunity for government, but we believe it will be very difficult, and we are working through it to find a developer in the short term.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** If that is the case, and we have done the work, why would we then not take that land and hold it as a state asset, pending finding that commercial developer? Because if someone does find they can make it viable commercially, surely the state should be entitled to that money and not anyone else, if we have paid to fix up the problem and make that land actually saleable in the future.

**Mr Waldock:** We do not own the asset. The asset is in the hands of the administrator. We have no rights over it. What we are allowing to happen is potentially the vision of that project happening one day. You could argue that there might be some value but, quite frankly, in terms of the risks et cetera, it is not a place that the government wants to be.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Who owns the land at the moment, or who has control of the land?

**Mr Waldock:** It is in the hands of the administrator, because as I understand, the developers have actually not been able to meet their debts.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** What bank has a charge over it?

**Mr Waldock:** The bank that has a charge over it is the St George Bank.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Was that work required to go through any process? You have an annual tender process for coastal erosion. Was it required to go through any of those processes, or was it done separately from the normal processes of government for coastal erosion?

---

**Mr Waldock:** We have a panel contract—an ongoing relationship that we go to the market on, so we have actually done it for that.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I am talking about the decision to spend the money, not who did the work—the decision to commit to an ongoing \$880 00 a year. Was that done as a submission as part of the coastal management funding, which I think is about \$3 million a year?

**Mr Waldock:** It was put in as a submission both in the cabinet minutes in terms of the original \$28 million, and then a submission following that up to clarify the arrangements for the coastal works. It has been two cabinet minutes, but jointly linked in terms of how the government responds.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** When we committed to the \$28 million, were we aware that it would have an ongoing cost as well?

**Mr Waldock:** Yes, we were, and we advised government at the time and they asked us to come back and better clarify those ongoing costs.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Why was the figure not included in the budget papers at the time that the original decision was taken to do the capital works down there?

**Mr Waldock:** As I remember—maybe Mr Doyle might have a better memory—I think we were doing far more analysis in better understanding how it might happen, and what the implications are. We are doing still more modelling. It is a difficult modelling exercise, because whilst sand bypassing is common, the issues we have to see rectified down there are very uncommon, subject to winter storms and all the rest, so it was ongoing analysis before we came back.

**Mr Doyle:** That is correct. The first decision was to undertake the capital works, and to come back once those works were well advanced to request the additional ongoing maintenance funding that would be required, and we did that in the 2014–15 budget process.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** When the decision was taken to spend the \$28 million, was it expected that there would be an ongoing recurrent cost?

**Mr Doyle:** Yes, that is correct. It was expected that that would be the case, but it was also noted in that advice that it was less than the annual maintenance costs, which was about \$2 million, prior to actually doing those works. So it is a lower figure than what the annual cost had been prior to these works being undertaken, but because there was still some uncertainty and some refinement required, the decision was just to provide the funding for the capital works in the first instance, and then ask the department to come back to government with a refined figure for the ongoing recurrent requirements.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Thank you. I now want to swing north of the city to Quinns Rocks. The coastal erosion at Quinns Rocks Beach would have had significant implications for the state government, particularly the infrastructure owned by many state agencies, including the road. Why is the City of Wanneroo not able to get a standing grant from the government, as was provided at Port Geographe? As I understand it, they were encouraged to go through a tender process by the minister to seek \$1 million, and that has now been knocked back. Why can they not get a direct grant from the government? Why do they have to go through a tender process and have it knocked back, when the work that they have done—some \$3 million worth—is actually protecting state government assets?

**Mr Waldock:** The issues of coastal management are very complex. Just to pick up the issue, it is not just Quinns beach. We have actually also got Quinns beach, Seabird, the Beresford foreshore up in Geraldton, and Emu Point in Albany That has been an ongoing issue for many years.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I was just going to do them one at a time, but I am glad that you have read out the list for us, Mr Waldock!

[9.50 am]

---

**Mr Waldock:** There are always funding request submissions, and enormously high expectations from local governments and the like. In fact, 30 hotspots have been identified around the state, so it is not as if it is purely Quinns Rocks. The reality is that while, in a coastal management sense, the Department of Transport does have some capability that it uses for its wider duties, resources and dollars are enormously limited. In fact, we have a program called the coastal protection grants program that provides \$1 million a year. So it is in the light of limited funds that we actually find this very difficult to respond to all the needs. In terms of Quinns, the local government has come forward to us and we have provided some assistance for its first stage. What I would potentially like to do, through the member, is perhaps ask Ms Nina Lyhne to give a little bit more detail on what is happening at Quinns and expand on just how we are approaching it but also talk about the limitations of state government funding at the present moment.

**Ms Lyhne:** As Mr Waldock has said, the Western Australian coastline presents a number of challenges in terms of management. We have had a number of significant storm events in the state, particularly towards the end of last year, which has created a number of erosion hotspots; Quinns was one of those. As Mr Waldock has said, we have a coastal grants program that we can use to assist local governments in managing their particular coastal issues. That grants program has a total of \$1 million per annum in it, and grants are usually provided to assist with collecting data and doing research to enable the local governments to develop the best possible strategies. As we all know, kneejerk reactions to these sorts of things, like building groynes and generally sort of short-term solutions, often create more significant problems for the coastal environment, so we are encouraging local governments to do the research and the work to be able to plan for the long-term protection of the coastline. The City of Wanneroo was awarded a grant of \$123 000 in the last process to do just that. These grants are only awarded to projects that have not already commenced, and where there is also a contribution from the city or the local government as well.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I appreciate all of that, but we have spent \$28 million—there is an \$880 000 ongoing commitment, plus \$400 000 at least in two years' time, and potentially more regularly—and that was done as a cabinet decision. How are these other local governments going to be able to fund their coastal erosion and adaptation plans without state government assistance? Local governments just simply are not going to be able to afford it. In the case of Quinns Rocks, if the City of Wanneroo just left it, the state government has significant assets at stake up there, so what are the options for these councils? What you are telling me is that that \$1 million a year is not going to be sufficient to meet the demand at Quinns, let alone anywhere else, but Port Geographe seems to get a special deal that goes through cabinet. What is available to those other councils that have the problems that we are discussing?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** I think, Hon Ken Travers, the issue of how local government funds works that they are responsible for is not really under the portfolio of transport. Yes, they have assisted in areas that they can, but, again, government is not here to actually prop up every local government authority to make sure the works required under their authority is taken.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So, parliamentary secretary, can I be clear: are you saying that coastal erosion is singularly the responsibility of local government, and that it is not a role for the state?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** I said that local coastal typically comes under local governments, and if Wanneroo has that coastal line that they are responsible for, then, yes, they need to find ways to make sure they can manage that. If the state government can assist at the time, the state government will, as they have done.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Why were we able to find \$28 million, plus an ongoing contribution of \$880 000 for Port Geographe, but not \$1 million for the City of Wanneroo?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** That was also a community health issue that ticked other boxes that they needed that money for. At the time the money was able to be found and the government assisted.

---

As I said, government can assist when they can, and they cannot always come to the rescue when required.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I guess the question I have, though, is that it is clear that local governments do not have the capacity. The City of Wanneroo is a large local government by any measure and it simply cannot afford it; there are a lot smaller local governments that also will have the same problems. Is it an issue that the state government sees that they need to be assisting and addressing and finding additional funding to support local government in this area?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** As we have already elaborated on just now, Hon Ken Travers, government will help where they can. The City of Wanneroo came up with \$3 million when they needed to, to get assistance. The state government would love to be able to help all the way along the coastline, if possible, but as you well know, our finances are constrained and we cannot just go out there and help everybody.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** But, parliamentary secretary, I think you missed my point earlier. Has the department done any work on what the cost to state-owned infrastructure will be if the coastal erosion is not dealt with? In the case of Quinns, for instance, there is a number of services that run underneath Quinns Drive there along the foreshore at Quinns; it is state government-owned infrastructure. Have we identified what the cost would be if the erosion was allowed to wipe that out?

**Mr Waldock:** We had a good look at it, because we have some technical capability at Quinns Rocks. We think certainly there were some real issues, particularly with the previous winter storms. We certainly see, potentially, a playground being under threat, but we do not think there is any imminent danger. Certainly the approach they are doing with the geotextile lining is appropriate. I guess if there were any major costs there, if you ever saw catastrophic failure, it would be more with some private housing. So, to answer your question, we had a sense of that and we do not think it is imminent, but more importantly it is just a matter of budget priorities. We would all like to have a larger coastal management approach, but it is a matter of budget priorities. There has never been a program, if I could point out, that I am aware of where there has been an ongoing program for these types of eventualities. While we have done things in the past at Esperance, Albany and Busselton, there has never been, as long as I have been in Transport, an ongoing program.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Have you done any work on what the likely impact is of rising sea levels on an increase in the amount of coastal erosion?

**Mr Waldock:** I was going to say that rising sea levels is mainly part of Planning, and particularly the WA Planning Commission. The planning commission spends most of their work, of course, in new developments and determining where new developments go and what could be the implications —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I understand that, but I am asking whether you as an agency who is responsible for coastal management, have done any work on the impact of rising sea levels on coastal erosion along the coast of Western Australia?

**Mr Waldock:** No; as I say, the WA Planning Commission coordinates that across government. So we have done a little bit of work, and certainly the general view of the WA Planning Commission is that over the next 100 years we could expect up to a maximum 0.9 of a metre, and that is work that has been done. But in terms of detail —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I understand that —

**Mr Waldock:** I was going to say that in terms of detailed analysis around the coastline, the Department of Transport have not done detailed analysis.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Is it something we need to be doing?

---

**Mr Waldock:** We are doing it in terms of new developments. In terms of existing developments, it is something we can look at, and we have looked at a little bit of modelling around there, but we do not see any imminent threat.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** How can you say you do not see any imminent threat if you have done no modelling?

**Mr Waldock:** No, I just said we have done a little bit of modelling around there; we actually have a coastal group that have done a little bit of modelling. But, as I say, we are not spending a lot of extra money and time because we do not have the resources and we do not see an imminent threat.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Can we get a copy of the documentation that you used to make that claim; the modelling that you have done that supports your claim that the rising sea levels will not have an impact?

**Mr Waldock:** I did not say that; I said “an imminent impact”.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** An imminent impact?

**Mr Waldock:** That is right. In fact, you are most welcome because indeed the Department of Transport did put a paper up for the WA Planning Commission in terms of the 0.09 metres.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** If we can have that as supplementary information.

*[Supplementary Information No A1.]*

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Can we also get the list of the hotspots that you were reading out earlier as supplementary information—where you have current issues with coastal erosion and, in each case, what is the nature of the coastal erosion problems and whether it is threatening houses or state-owned infrastructure?

[10.00 am]

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Yes, certainly.

*[Supplementary Information No A2.]*

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** I am just wondering how much in the budget has been set aside for the implementation of the disability access and inclusion plan.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** What page are you referring to?

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** I am wondering how much in the budget has been set aside for the disability access and inclusion plan because I cannot identify it in the budget.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Mr Graeme Doyle will be able to address that for you.

**Mr Doyle:** The department does have a disability access and inclusion plan but there is no specific budget allocation for it. So the costs associated with implementing that plan are just costs that are managed within the various business area budgets of the department for whatever the activity is that is required to be done in accordance with that plan, so we do not have a specific budget allocation for the plan per se.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** So it is absorbed within the general business units?

**Mr Doyle:** That is correct, yes.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** In which case, how do you measure the implementation of the plan if budget is not a measure?

**Mr Doyle:** I can start but perhaps others can add a little more. Reece, I probably should let you go first. There are measurements in the plan. Again, I do not have a copy of it.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** There are time frames?

---



**Mr Doyle:** There are time frames and there are performance indicators. This is how you measure whether you have achieved that particular initiative or action. It is in the plan. It does have measurement capabilities. I am not sure if anyone else can add to anything along those lines.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** There are KPIs in the plan?

**Mr Waldock:** Yes, there are KPIs in the plan but we obviously review that plan and how we are going on an ongoing basis. A lot of our programs are inherently aimed at the disability service. An example of that is the TUSS scheme—the taxi user support scheme—for taxis and the like. That is in the budget, in fact, where we actually put an ongoing funding stream to assist. Across the transport portfolio more broadly, we see ourselves as pretty much the leaders in some of this work. There is no doubt that in the world of public transport, we lead the nation in terms of accessibility at all levels, both in terms of our mobile fleets, our gaps on our trains and buses but, more importantly, the universal access to our railway stations and our bus stations. There is always a challenge. It is always an ongoing difficulty in trying to meet the national standards as well. We do pretty well in that space. Ms Nina Lyhne may be able to talk about transport services in more detail.

**Ms Lyhne:** I guess I cannot really add a great deal.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** Perhaps I could ask more specific questions, in particular, the implementation of the railway station upgrade plan and how much has been achieved in that in the past 12 months and how much has been set aside for the next 12 months.

**Mr Waldock:** We are happy to feed that back. We have been through that in the upper house in terms of the Public Transport Authority. If you wanted me to and if it is allowable, I am more than happy to give you an update of how we are going in the Public Transport Authority over the years, what we are doing and what are some of the milestones. That is the clearest manifestation of some of the good work we are doing in disability services.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Did the member want to take that as a supplementary question?

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** Yes, please.

*[Supplementary Information No A3.]*

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** It is a different department from the one that is sitting here today. Obviously, Mr Waldock is happy to supply that information.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** The disability access and inclusion plan administered by the Department of Transport is what I am asking and within that there are a range of things, which also includes the upgrade of railway stations to ensure their accessibility.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** We will provide that but I am just saying that it is under public transport. We are happy to provide that.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** I wish to ask a question on disability access. Is the Department of Transport responsible for disability platforms, like the Dawesville Cut fishing platforms? Is that something that you guys are involved in?

**Mr Waldock:** We are putting one in at Onslow very shortly. We do invest in fishing platforms at Hillarys and around the coast. That is part of our disability access.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** So that is part of the plan that you have currently.

**Mr Waldock:** Yes.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** Did you ask for that as supplementary information?

**The ACTING CHAIR:** No, it was just a question I asked in general.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** Is that information readily accessible?

**Mr Waldock:** Sure. We will include that in the response.

---

**The ACTING CHAIR:** That will be included in A3.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I refer to the expenditure in the 2012–13 financial year. I understand, director general, that your office coordinated a number of pre-caretaker announcements and the preparation of material for the government. Is that correct?

**Mr Waldock:** Could you be a little more specific?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Prior to the 2013 election, I assume that included in your total expenditure for that year would have been the cost of coordinating a number of pre-caretaker announcements. You have a portfolio coordinator in your office of director general, do you not?

**Mr Waldock:** Not for those purposes—for a totally different reason.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Who is Marion Heavens? Is she in your office?

**Mr Waldock:** Yes, but she does not coordinate pre-election commitments.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** “Pre-caretaker” I said.

**Mr Waldock:** Sorry; I misheard.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I guess it is all about language, is it not?

**Mr Waldock:** I must have misunderstood you.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Is that correct? Did you arrange a number of animations and prepared materials for pre-caretaker announcements prior to the 2013 election?

**Mr Waldock:** Perhaps you could be more specific. As I remember, whatever the animations were, they were based on projects which we were running on and so a part of our ongoing deliberations and development of those projects. Could you be more specific, please?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Absolutely; I am happy to. I believe you prepared material on an Ellenbrook bus rapid transit.

**Mr Waldock:** Yes. Again, that was certainly for us working through a stated project—the BRT for Ellenbrook. We did a lot of work on that, both in terms of the PDP, the costings. Part of that is clarifying and showing the animation of how it would work.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Had the government taken the decision to proceed with that project at the time that you prepared the animations?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** What time period are you talking about now?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I am talking about when they prepared the animations and provided them to the government back in January 2013. Had the government taken a decision to proceed with the Ellenbrook bus rapid transit at that stage?

**Mr Waldock:** We were certainly developing the project on the basis that we would in fact seek a formal government decision based on the PDP.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Why were you preparing animations for an announcement if you did not have a formal government decision to announce it? Do you do that regularly—prepare animations for things that the government has not taken the decision to proceed with?

**Mr Waldock:** My understanding—I might ask Sue McCarrey to add to this—is that a lot of it was to demonstrate how it would work rather than an announcement. We do that regularly. There would not be too many projects that government does of a large scale over \$100 million where you do not give a very clear sense of how it would work. Maybe Ms McCarrey would like to expand. That is part of her divisional responsibilities.

[10.10 am]

---

**Ms McCarrey:** Thank you. Yes, we were asked to put that material together, and we were asked to put it together from the work that we had done around the business case for a BRT. What would it actually look like? So the animations and the mapping to show the actual route of the BRT were a part of the information we provided on request of the government as to what then fed into the cost of that particular project. A final decision had not yet been taken by government, but it was part of the process of putting the information to government for them ultimately to make a decision.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** But the emails were very clear that it was about pre-caretaker announcements.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** What emails are you referring to?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** The emails between the director general's office and the minister's office.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** I do not have those emails in front of me, Hon Ken Travers.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I can assure you they do. I am happy to send one across if someone wants to take a photocopy, and you can see that it makes it very clear from Marion Heavens to Vivienne Ryan and Kate Wang—subject: “pre-caretaker announcements”. That suggests that it was more. In fact, in the case of Ellenbrook, they were expecting an announcement the next day. So, was cabinet going to meet on 1 February to take the announcement?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** But obviously the department and myself cannot comment on what cabinet discusses and decides on, but at the time the department were asked to get some information together for them to consider and to make a decision on, which they did.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** But the department did not tell me what the status of the project was at the time they prepared that material.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** And they are telling you that. Their answer was quite clear; they were preparing information and evidence to enable the minister and for government consideration.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So, you prepare material for announcements prior to the government actually taking a decision to commit to that project; is that my understanding?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Member, Mr Reece Waddock just said to you in his last sentence that it was not for an announcement. He prepares information and the department prepares information on many projects when they are spending that much money —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** And I am telling you that the email trail suggests otherwise, parliamentary secretary.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** That is fine, but you have asked the question —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So I am trying to clarify it with the department.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** — has the department prepared information for an announcement, and he has already answered that question by saying they prepared information for the government to make a decision.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Why would the email then be headed “pre-caretaker announcements”, parliamentary secretary?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** I would not know, member.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** No, so maybe you will let the director general explain to us how often he prepares announcements where government has not actually taken the decision.

**Mr Waddock:** Look, I do not intend to go too much further. I did indicate all the work is done typically as part of a business case PDP for government. If government wishes to have some of that information early, that is the government's choice. I am saying the animations were for a project which we would put to government for full consideration. It is a standard process. I really do not think I can say much more, member.

---

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So you can assure us that on 31 January, government had not at that stage taken a decision to proceed with the Ellenbrook bus rapid transit.

**Mr Waldock:** I can assure you in none of the projects which we do—there are a number of them, as you would be well aware. We would never expect that to be done until it is a budgeted project, and it is never a budgeted project until it is agreed by government. So, we were certainly encouraged and optimistic about it becoming a funded project, but I would never anticipate a project as being signed off until it is approved.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I understand that, but I am asking: on 31 January, had government taken the decision to proceed with it?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** No.

**Mr Waldock:** No.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** The answer has been “no” twice.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I am just wanting to make sure that you are clear about that.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Yes. I am making sure that you can understand that no.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Things pop up in the future that might suggest otherwise, so you always want to be clear on these things and that people are sure about their answers.

One of the other projects was the Thornlie–Mandurah rail connection. You provided documentation animations for that; is that correct?

**Mr Waldock:** Yes.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** What was the purpose of those animations?

**Mr Waldock:** Again, that was a planning exercise being conducted. I am not sure about how much I can say because that is actually a PTA project, and these questions did come up in the lower house for the PTA. But I would say again we were hoping that we would see that particular development go ahead. We were doing a business case for it again. It was part of the business case and it was a significant project—well over \$100 million—so we were pursuing that as well. We put a number of them. Not all projects get considered and supported by government. This was one of those projects which we were again optimistic that in fact may be approved by government. It was never approved, but it was part of the process.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So what was the material that you provided then as part of the package for the Thornlie–Mandurah rail connection in terms of animations and other material? What did you actually provide to the government?

**Mr Waldock:** I honestly do not know. It would have been through the PTA directly.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** My understanding is it went through your portfolio coordinator.

**Mr Waldock:** I did not know that, so that is interesting. But whatever it is, it would have been in a similar vein as what we have just talked about. It was actually giving government the opportunity to see the work that we had done.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So it was not a cabinet submission?

**Mr Waldock:** It would have been a cabinet minute, but it never got that far. The Thornlie extension never got to a cabinet minute. As I mentioned in the lower house, one of the reasons the Public Transport Authority were very keen about the Thornlie connection is it could have been a good adjunct to the stadium project in terms of the challenges of access and egress post football matches. But it will be a project for another day, we hope.

---

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Going back to that time, at that point when you were providing those materials for pre-caretaker announcements, what advice had you received from Infrastructure Australia regarding any of those projects in respect to your NB2 submission?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** I will ask Graeme Doyle to answer that, but before I do, they are not announcements; it was information. You keep using the word “announcements”. It is information they were providing.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I just rely on the documentation, parliamentary secretary.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** You can rely on that email, but I am saying it is information provided by the department.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** With all due respect, I will rely on documentation written by people at the time rather than your interpretations at this point.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** It is not an interpretation, member; it is what the department does—provide government with information. You should be well aware of that, as you have been on this side as well. But that is what the department does.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** When I see a document headed “pre-caretaker announcements”, I assume that that was what they were as well.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** You can assume all you like.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So the department sends emails back and forth with wrong subject headings on them, do they? Is that what you are saying?

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Sorry; can I just interrupt there, member. You keep referring to those emails; did you want to table those papers?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I will at the end.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** It would be helpful if you did it now, if you keep referring to them.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** All right, if someone wants to take a photocopy of that one.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** You will table those papers.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** In the meantime, I am happy for Mr Graeme Doyle to answer further on that question.

**Mr Doyle:** In terms of the NB2 submission, as it was referred to back then, we did put up some proposals to Infrastructure Australia for their assessment as part of that process. If you are talking around the time of January 2013, my recollection is at that point in time, we had not yet had any confirmation from Infrastructure Australia, or, for that matter, the Department of Infrastructure and Transport, as it was then called, to which —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** No; understand my question. My question was not whether you had confirmation; my question was had you received any feedback from Infrastructure Australia about those proposals.

**Mr Doyle:** So the process that we go through once we make a submission is they will put some questions back to us and we will respond to those questions about particular projects. They will not necessarily ask about every particular project that we put up, but they do ask some questions and we would have responded sometimes verbally and sometimes otherwise to those particular questions.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** But my understanding is that, as part of that, that includes feedback because they give each of the projects different classifications such as real potential, early stage or not recommended.

**Mr Doyle:** Yes. At that point in time—again, this is my recollection—as of January they had not yet classified any of those projects that we submitted as to whether they would be early stage.

---

Sometime shortly after that—it may have been February—the public transport projects, light rail and the airport rail, were classified as early stage. Back in about February, I think the IA board agreed to those being put on the early stage list. Some other road projects were also put on either “early stage” or “real potential”. Again, I do not have that information in front of me, but some of them were funded subsequently.

[10.20 am]

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Can we have taken on notice on what day you formally received notification from Infrastructure Australia about which projects and what ranking they have been given?

*[Supplementary Information No A4.]*

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I imagine in terms of some of the dialogue that goes on in preparation for that, there would be a range of discussions that would give a clear indication of which direction Infrastructure Australia was heading. It is an organic process, so they would be coming to you with questions; you would be going back with answers and they would be giving a clear indication, even though they may not be at an officer-to-officer level, that “this one is likely to be a real potential”, “this one’s likely to be an early stage”, “this one we are unlikely to recommend it”. Have those sorts of conversations occurred between the department and IA?

**Mr Doyle:** We have certainly had discussions with them. We certainly had an indication as to which ones they were looking at favourably for putting onto the list, but there was no explicit communication as to, “Yes, this one will be early stage”, “this one will be real potential” et cetera.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** You may not have it now, but can you give us as supplementary which ones at that point in January they had, right up until the caretaker provisions took over, which projects they indicated were likely or they had a positive view about and which ones they had a negative view about?

**Mr Waldock:** All we can do, of course, is give you the formal position rather than whatever happened in some oral conversations, so it will be the formal position as at that date, most definitely.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** No; we have just had advice that there would have been conversations, and I suspect emails, that would have indicated whether or not they were positive or negative towards the projects.

**Mr Waldock:** Yes, but I do not think they would have represented in any way the thoughts of IA. They were just officer-to-officer in early stages; we would not normally table those.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Did the department provide any verbal or written advice to the minister about the feedback they were receiving from IA?

**Mr Waldock:** Again, we are happy to check whether there was any formal advice which we gave to the minister, but certainly —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** No, no; that is not what I am asking.

**Mr Waldock:** I do not want to go on conversations from junior officers going backwards and forwards because it is not the position of either organisation.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** What I am asking though is—not formal positions—whether or not you gave any feedback or advice to the minister or the minister’s office about the response you received from Infrastructure Australia with respect to the NB2 submissions.

**Mr Waldock:** Yes. I said we can do that if it is formal advice from this office. We can include that.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** No; I am asking whether or not you have provided any feedback to the minister’s office.

---

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** That is what they regard as formal advice.

**Mr Waldock:** That would be part of the formal advice.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Any other conversation done by phone between lower ranking officers in each department is a conversation. If any information has gone back to the minister, it will be a formal piece of information.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** How many low-ranking officers speak regularly to the minister's office?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** I did not say to the minister's office; I said "to and fro between departments". Any information that will go from there to the minister's office would be a formal piece of information and that is what we are happy to provide you.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I am asking whether there was any written or verbal advice to the minister's office, which I would imagine would be at a director or director general level. I cannot imagine the officers at a junior level —

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Absolutely, and that would be written advice and that is what we are happy to provide you.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So there is never any communication between the minister's office and the director general's office that is verbal; it is all put in writing—is it?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** I am sure there is, but how do they record their discussions they may have while walking along a hallway, member?

**Mr Waldock:** I just could not recall any.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** You cannot recall any?

**Mr Waldock:** Seriously, I cannot, no. Maybe it is the issue of my age but I cannot recall any of them.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Does the member want that written advice included in supplementary information A4?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Yes, please.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Before we proceed, Hon Ken Travers, the committee has been circulated with the email that has been tabled; are you all happy to make that public?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Yes. Can we get a copy?

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Yes, it is on its way.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** You will see there from the project coordinator, parliamentary secretary.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** I do, but it does not mean it makes it an announcement, member.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** "Are you able to provide an update on any of the announcements below?"

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** That is right and that is the terminology they have used, but it was not an announcement information. That is the terminology they use, I agree; it is there in black and white but the department has sat here and told you they provide the minister's office with information on a regular basis at this level and that is what they were providing. The fact that these two individuals have chosen the word "announcements" is their choice.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** That is very funny!

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Glad I could lighten up the moment for you!

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** You do when it is written in black and white that it is an announcement —

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** It is.

---

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** — that clearly the department understood it to be an announcement, but you have made the decision that it is not an announcement. That is fine.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** There is no date of announcements; there is no further information on that.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Members, can you just go one at a time; Hansard is having some trouble.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Certainly.

As the honourable member is well aware, departments put forward information in the hope there will be announcements, in preparation that there may be an announcement, but to actually go by this email and claim that it is an actual announcement I think is going just a little bit too far.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Even though it was written that way.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** I will let you have the last say.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Can we have that formal advice taken as supplementary information about Infrastructure Australia and any correspondence that the department had received from Infrastructure Australia?

*[Supplementary Information No A5.]*

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Was that for January?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** From August 2012 through to the election date.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Caretaker mode?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** No, through to the election date. The two things I want are whether they got any written correspondence from Infrastructure Australia, and copies of it, and, secondly, any written advice they then provided to the minister, including during the caretaker period.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** He has expanded the request, but we are happy with that.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Can we also as supplementary information —

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Supplementary information A4 is the initial list of projects and A5 is the correspondence through to the election from August.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Supplementary information A5 is any correspondence they received from Infrastructure Australia regarding the transport projects that were submitted to IA in August 2012 for NB2, so any correspondence they received from Infrastructure Australia up to the date of the election and any advice they then provided to the minister's office regarding that.

Can I also ask for a copy of all the animations, including in electronic form, that were provided to the minister's office as, termed by the department, "pre-caretaker announcements". So that relates to Ellenbrook BRT, CBD roadworks, airport link, Thornlie–Mandurah rail connection, Swan Valley bypass and MAX light rail.

*[Supplementary Information No A6.]*

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** The material that was provided —

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** You can request, yes.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Are there any questions from any other members at this point?

[10.30 am]

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** I refer to the MPT vehicle modification grants on page 805. How many modifications are anticipated under the MPT vehicle modification grants program this financial year and how many were undertaken last financial year? Multipurpose taxi vehicle modification grants; sorry, I used the acronym. It is on page 805. There has been a reduction of



\$120 000 on the 2012–13 actual expenditure, so how many modifications are anticipated in this financial year?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Thanks, honourable member. For the multipurpose taxi, the grant is currently \$15 000 in the metropolitan region —

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** Is it 15 000 grants?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** The value is \$15 000, and the budget is split between \$225 000 for the metro area and \$120 000 for the country.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** So the grants are up to \$15 000?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** So \$15 000 per grant and the funding is split into \$225 000 for the metro region and \$120 000 for the country. It took us a while to find that one!

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** Is that the budget estimate for 2014–15?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Yes.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** What is the estimated actual for 2013–14?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Mr Graeme Doyle will be able to expand on that.

**Mr Doyle:** All the actuals are still preliminary because they are subject to audit, but the actual is \$225 000 for the 2013–14 year and is split into \$180 000 for the metro and \$45 000 in the country. That was three country grants and 12 metro grants.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** Did the figures that you gave me just prior for the 2014–15 budget include the actual numbers of vehicle modifications or the actual number of grants?

**Mr Doyle:** That is what the provision is; that is what the budget is for 2014–15. So the budget is \$345 000—\$225 000 for metro, which is based on 15 grants being made, and \$120 000 for country, which is based on eight grants being made. That is the estimate for 2014–15 and each subsequent year as well, by the way.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** Is that your estimate for the total expansion of the fleet for that financial year?

**Mr Doyle:** That is just the budget we have for grants for that particular purpose.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** But you are anticipating that the fleet will increase by that number over that financial year?

**Ms Lyhne:** We are always trying to ensure that we have enough MPT vehicles available and we have in recent times increased the number of those. These estimates would be what we consider to be a realistic, I guess, target for MPTs and associated modifications. So in 2012–13 we had 96 leased MPTs and the objective is to keep the fleet at that level.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** To keep it at 96?

**Ms Lyhne:** At 96, yes. Sorry, that was what was actually operational. We have a number that are not necessarily taken up as well, so I can give you some total numbers for the fleet. The maximum capacity is 132 for MPT leases and it is a question of how many new vehicles come in to the fleet that determines the budget that is required to do the vehicle modifications.

**Mr Waldock:** As Ms Nina Lyhne indicated, we are not only providing grants to modify the vehicles, but we actually understand that the MPTs are a very important area and one we have actually had difficulty, in fact, in achieving the numbers we would like. So in terms of the grants as well, just as an adjunct while we are talking about this, we have in fact now got a lifting subsidy per trip. It is sort of locked to the TUSS scheme, but it is an additional lifting subsidy we now provide to people when they do lift wheelchairs, because it takes longer. We need to continue to promote and not put any barriers in the way for this particular area of our taxis to maintain viability so it will

still be attractive. So it is part of that wider story, but, sorry, I just thought I would add that, thank you.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Just for Hansard's clarification TUSS is the taxi users' subsidy scheme.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** Does that total number projected modifications include proposed modifications to London-style cabs, based on the trials?

**Ms Lyhne:** It is not anticipated that we are going to have to modify the London taxi. As you would be aware, the London taxi comes with a number of accessibility benefits as it is—ramps, a place for the wheelchair and, in fact, intercoms and those sorts of things—so there is no budget allocation for any modifications to the London taxi. You may be aware that we are currently running a trial to determine how that taxi might in fact benefit wheelchair users and we are very hopeful that it will be a significant change for many people in our community in terms of their ability to use taxi services. Obviously, the London taxi is limited in the type of wheelchair that it offers accessibility for, but we believe that there will be some very real opportunities there for wheelchair users.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** Has that trial concluded?

**Ms Lyhne:** No, we have been doing a lot of work behind the scenes talking to people who, I guess, have expertise in terms of the design of wheelchairs and the impact of potential crashes on wheelchairs—people who have this kind of expertise in the disability sector. We have also been talking to the Insurance Commission around, obviously, insurance during the period of the trial, so we have done that work and we are now in the process —

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** Sorry, insurance for the taxis or for the passengers?

**Ms Lyhne:** No, in the event that somebody is injured in a crash during the period of the trial, we clearly need to make sure that there are the appropriate insurances in place. The main concern is really around the design of the wheelchair, not so much the vehicle. Wheelchairs are not necessarily designed to withstand impact with somebody actually sitting in the wheelchair, so our trial is very much around, I guess, determining those design features, but also our plan is to get a number of drivers and a number of wheelchair passengers to use the taxis in very real-life situations so that we can learn from their experience and see how that works. Obviously, people who use wheelchairs are very diverse and there will be very different needs, different types of wheelchairs, and different types of people with different abilities, and we need to work through that through the trial.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** So is the trial considering restraints or the best way to restrain a wheelchair while the passenger is still sitting in a wheelchair?

**Ms Lyhne:** At this stage, the taxi is obviously designed to have a wheelchair in the taxi with a passenger in it, and the vehicle has been designed to do that. The concern is around the design of the wheelchair should there be an impact and we need to work through very clearly with, I guess, the people in the health sector and the disability sector who understand—there currently are not any specific design rules around those taxis. So, I would envisage that this will require a fair bit of work. It will obviously be of benefit, you know, right across the country as we do this work. There is an opportunity at the moment for people who have wheelchairs, obviously, to still use the ramp and people who are able to maybe slide across the seat and use the seat and the seatbelt to do so.

[10.40 am]

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** To transfer.

**Ms Lyhne:** That is right. And for some people that still offers quite a lot of additional mobility for them.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** So the current equipment that is in the vehicles, including the clamps, do actually work. So, anybody can actually—no, not transfer—use a wheelchair to get into the vehicle, secure the wheelchair using the current clamps, and not transfer.

---

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** That is correct. And that is where Ms Lyhne was just saying it is then the safety of the wheelchair, whether that wheelchair itself is able to take up the impact of a crash, and that is what they are testing at the moment.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Two brief questions from Hon Ken Travers and then we will break for five or 10 minutes.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I just wanted to confirm that work that you did on the Ellenbrook BRT identified that it would save about 13 minutes on the current bus travel time between Ellenbrook and Bassendean train station; is that correct?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Mr Reece Waldock.

**Mr Waldock:** I cannot confirm that. I thought it was in the order of 10 minutes, but again you may have more relevant information than me. But certainly there were significant savings and, of course, that was why we did see some significantly higher patronage than we enjoy at the present moment both because of travel time and high-frequency services. So, that was the benefit.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Whether it is 10 or 13 minutes, it is significant in public transport terms. Did any of your modelling indicate what the additional patronage would be as a result of the time savings?

**Mr Waldock:** Without question. In fact, I think the original figure we had was in the order of 8 000 to 9 000. No, the patronage estimates originally were 6 500 passengers per day and I think we provided you with that information before. That was based on our STEM modelling at the time. So, you know, if you can move from the current numbers we have got now, about 2 500 patrons per day, to 6 500, that is a combination of travel times, high frequencies, better delivery, more integrated services. To answer your question, all those factors would come in as part of the modelling.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So that 2 500 was on what sort of time frame—is that at 2031?

**Mr Waldock:** That is currently. And, of course, the 6 500 I gave you was 2031; nevertheless, if you factored currently up to there, under the current regime it certainly would not be anywhere near 6 000 to 6 500.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** No, but, I mean, I assume your modelling would have done a base case of the 2 500, what it would be—I assume this is —

**Mr Waldock:** When you say “base case”, what it does—it is a four stage modelling process. But certainly what the variables, as I mentioned, both frequency and travel times do, in fact, is create the numbers that we see at the end.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Would that have been based on the old population projections or the new ones?

**Mr Waldock:** Yes, it was and, in fact, we have just run another—we are just upgrading our STEM modelling all the time and the numbers are certainly higher than the 6 000, 6 500 now.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Because I think we have now reached the population that you were predicting in 2021. We have reached that now.

**Mr Waldock:** Sort of. Indeed, if you remember we held back the public transport draft because we were working on a 2.2 million population for 2031 and we are currently working on a 2.7 million—2.6 million, 2.7 million. I think the Department of Planning use 2.6 million and we use 2.7 million, but they are very close. That is right; patronage has increased.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** From that modelling are you able to go away and tell us what the difference will be in terms of what you expect the difference in patronage in 2031 would be with or without the BRT?

**Mr Waldock:** I cannot do it without necessarily, but we can have a look at that.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** You must have a figure on what it would have been in a do-nothing scenario, which is what is currently happening.

**Mr Waldock:** I have not got that information on me but we can look at that.

*[Supplementary Information No A7.]*

**Mr Waldock:** The do-nothing is perhaps not a do-nothing because the minister is already seeing if we can actually improve services and our market offering in some sort of hybrid arrangement, but yes, we can certainly look at the context if we did not do anything at all, most definitely.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So, if you do not have that 13-minute saving, if you do have a 13-minute saving and if you have got any modelling of savings in between, I am happy to receive that. If you could also provide what that would mean in terms of traffic volumes on Gwangara Road. So, if you do not have that service, what the traffic modelling is on Gwangara Road and Lord Street, what the traffic volumes are. Because I assume that there is a corresponding—if you do not get the patronage on the buses, people are still going to travel.

**Mr Waldock:** There is a corresponding.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Yes, so if we could have that modelling about passenger numbers and also vehicle numbers on Gwangara or any other roads that they then go on to.

**Mr Waldock:** The Lord Street situation may indeed improve substantially with the NorthLink project.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** That last supplementary information that Hon Ken Travers required, we will keep that in A7. We will just take a break and reconvene at 10 to 11.

**Proceedings suspended from 10.46 to 11.00 am**

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I refer to the bicycle network plan on page 795. Was that originally due to be released on 28 February this year?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** We have it down that it was released on 29 March.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I understand that that is the date it was released, but I am just asking whether or not it was ever intended that it would be released on 28 February. Maybe I will table another document so we can get copies for people. I might move on while we are getting that done.

I realise that the tier 3 rail network issues are combined between the Department of Transport and the Public Transport Authority, but I am wondering if the parliamentary secretary can explain to me what the department's understanding is of the government's election commitments, in terms of how they have been conveyed to the department; that is, the election commitment made by the new government.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Whatever the government's announcements are, the department's opinions are just that—opinions.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** No, the parliamentary secretary misunderstands my question. I asked: what is the department's understanding, as conveyed to it by the government, of the government's election commitments? I am not asking the department to comment on the policy; I am asking it to explain to me what it understands the policy to be.

**Mr Waldock:** Our understanding is that the key issues were subject to economic viability. Part of that understanding of economic viability is to see and work through the Brookfield-CBH issues, and my understanding is that the government's view is that those commercial realities and commercial negotiations need to go forward. They are in a process of that, as we know, through the ERA and subsequent negotiations and, potentially, arbitration, and that is where it stands. It is economically

viable, which means that the two commercial parties, as part of that economic viability, need to work through the issues. That is my understanding.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** In achieving that economic viability, is it the intention that there be any government money provided to upgrade the rail lines, as it did with tiers 1 and 2? As I understand it, tier 2 would not have been economically viable either, because to have done the upgrade commercially would have meant that the access fees would have been so high that no-one would have used it. Is it the department's understanding that there is still a commitment on the part of the government to fund an upgrade of those lines, or is it simply a commercial negotiation between the two parties?

**Mr Waldock:** If I could take the member back, the strategic grain network review, as he is well aware, was —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I am not interested in that; I am asking about the government's election commitment. Times have moved on; the government keeps trying to go back to information it had when it made its election commitment, but I am trying to understand what the department's understanding of it is today.

**Mr Waldock:** My understanding is that, certainly, the commercial negotiation process has to proceed, and it is proceeding. If the member is asking me whether, at the end of that, the government will play a role, I would not want to comment, and it certainly would not be my place to comment.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So as an agency, the department is not seeking to be a part of those negotiations to determine what level of government investment is required to make them commercially viable in the same terms as, say, tier 2 was? The department involved itself in making sure that tier 2 lines were commercially viable.

**Mr Waldock:** That is precisely, in every respect, correct. From our point of view, we are not engaging in looking at government assistance packages; we are letting the two key parties, both very profitable companies—CBH made more than \$130 million last year, and will make a lot more this year; Brookfield is a very, very profitable and successful organisation—move together rather than taxpayers putting any more than \$300 million into this. That is the basis of what I understand the process to be from here.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Before you proceed, Hon Ken Travers, are committee members happy to have the paper that was just tabled made public?

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** Yes.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** So we will have that made public and it will be distributed to everyone.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** If tier 1 and 2 lines could not have been made commercially viable without an injection of state government money—commonwealth money is probably a better description of it—how will tier 3 lines become commercially viable if tier 1 and 2 lines could not without state government investment?

**Mr Waldock:** I would just like to remind the member of what he just reminded me. When we did the strategic grain network review, CBH was not into vertical integration with rail, so the whole dynamic has changed to some extent. But again, whether it has or has not, the process needs to proceed. The government may—who knows—have other thoughts, but it is certainly very clear that the two key parties must sit down and negotiate. Both of them are keen to see if they can make it happen, so let market forces work.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Have you been given any instructions to consult with industry and farmers about identifying viable lines that could remain open?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** No.

---

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Have you done any analysis of the state of the tracks, the volume of grain that is likely to be carried on the lines, and the condition of roads nearby? Have you done any analysis since the election on those matters?

**Mr Waldock:** We obviously speak to Brookfield regularly, given it is the lessee of those rail lines. We have some of our people keeping in close touch, and as you would be aware we have recently moved forward to do both a desktop and physical audit of the tier 3 grain lines.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So you are now doing an audit of the state of the tracks, but nothing on the volume of grain that is likely to be carried on those lines, or high-level assessment of the volume of grain or the condition of roads near those lines. Has no work been done on that?

**Mr Waldock:** I am not quite understanding that. Certainly, as was detailed in the parliamentary committee, we do a lot of work on the roads, and Main Roads has responded to that in line and verse. In terms of the volume the network carries, we understand the current task potentially, but as we will all be well aware, we are now in a one-off record year, and the load on the whole network can range between six million and 16 million tonnes, but in terms of tier 3 grain lines, they can change enormously as well. I am not quite sure of your volume position. As has been stated, we were part of the Brookton response. Sue McCarrey might be able to add some more detail.

**Ms McCarrey:** Thank you for that. We do actually monitor what grain is running on the tier 3 railway lines, and have been doing so over the past number of years. We can use that, based on an average, obviously, to do predictions of what would run in the future on all of the rail lines but, as Mr Waldock said, that very much differs depending on the season, as you would well know. We have some seasons when very little runs in that area, because they just have not had the rain in that particular area. We have been monitoring that for some years, as to how much grain is running on those railway lines. We have also been monitoring, particularly since around November last year, the movement of grain on those tier 3 railway lines on a monthly basis, so that we know what has actually moved since November. Based on information that is provided to us by Brookfield and CBH, they, at times, differ between the information that they actually provide. So, using that, we have been able to look back at how much grain has actually moved, and I am aware from Main Roads that they are actually out there at the moment keeping an eye on the roads and what movement is occurring on the roads at the moment.

[11.10 am]

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I do not want to go into it because there is another inquiry, but I just have one question that I would love to have answered. Clause 15 sets the initial performance standards of the lines for the tier 3 lines; clause 16, when I read it, makes it clear that if it is not economical to maintain those lines at those performance standards then they have an option of handing them back to the government. If it is not economical to maintain those lines at the initial performance standards, why have those lines not been handed back to the government in accordance with clause 16?

**The ACTING CHAIR:** The questions you have just asked referring to that agreement, are they public?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Yes, clauses 15 and 16 are public. It has been previously made public, that section. I have not gone into the detail of the initial performance standards because they are still confidential.

**Mr Waldock:** The answer to your question can only or best be answered by Brookfield. Brookfield have made a decision—a clear choice—that they choose not to hand those lines back, and as the lessee that is their right under the agreement.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** But are they not then required to comply with clause 15 and meet the initial performance standards?

---

**Mr Waldock:** Yes, yes.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** As the owner of the asset, would the government not then be in a position to require them to meet the initial performance standards on those lines if they are not going to hand them back?

**Mr Waldock:** We could spend the next two hours on these —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** This is the one little question I want answered about the whole issue.

**Mr Waldock:** No, but it is a very complex question because as part of the strategic grain network review this was part of the variations in the agreements across government. But maybe Ms McCarrey might want to give more detail.

**Ms McCarrey:** It is very complex, and I could spend a fair bit of time on what actually happened a number of years ago in relation to the grain network. The first part of the test is whether or not the lines continue to be economic for the lessee. When the lease was originally done, in order to determine whether or not the lines were economic or not economic what was taken into account was not just the revenue being raised by the below-ground operator, as in WestNet or Brookfield; it also had to take into account the revenue that was being raised on each of those railway lines by any related company that was an above-ground operator. Australian Western Railroad was a related company to WestNet Rail at the time of the lease. When ARG sold and it was purchased, Australian Western Railroad was then onsold to Queensland Rail at the time. Therefore, that related entity disappeared, so the revenue that was being raised by the above-ground operator no longer had an impact on that formula, which essentially changed the picture of what was actually occurring and what revenue was being raised on the lines. It was raised with government in relation to, as you rightly said before, if Brookfield had had to fund all the re-sleepering and, quite rightly, were able to build that amount of money into their access charges, it would have driven grain off most of the railway lines, including maybe some of the tier 1, but certainly tier 2 and tier 3. So government made a policy decision at the time in regards to those lines on where do we actually go, hence the strategic grain network review. A decision was taken at that time around do we actually talk to Brookfield Rail and negotiate having some of those railway lines returned to government. At that particular moment in time CBH was not running their own rail operations and there was no interested party to actually take over operating those railway lines; a decision was taken for Brookfield to hold them, and then if and when they no longer carry trains, they would have to be responsible for the care and maintenance of those railway lines, as opposed to actually having a small number of lines back in government hands and government having to fund the staffing required to look after a small number of railway lines out in that tier 3 area. It was a different situation; we did not have anyone who was interested in taking those railway lines on at the time that that decision was made.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So I think the simple answer to my question is that there have been variations to the agreement since the original agreement was —

**Ms McCarrey:** Yes, there have.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** That now means that for tier 3 lines the provisions of clause 16 do not apply, and, further, that as a result of those variations there is no subsequent capacity now for the government to take those lines back off the lessee?

**Ms McCarrey:** That is correct.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Can I just ask a question on this? I do not know whether it is within the scope of the Department of Transport, but has any analysis been done on the extra burden on road to cart grain on road, and what that cost is of maintaining those roads and upgrading them?

---

**Mr Waldock:** Yes, there has been an enormous amount of work done on the roads both in terms of understanding what the extra burden is and the truck movements, but also \$118 million has been put into both state and local roads as well, which will be finished, I think, next year.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** The analysis will be finished on the roads?

**Mr Waldock:** The roads spending will be finished next year, yes. All the state roads have been finished, which is about 40 per cent of the \$118 million, and the local government roads should all be finished by next year.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** So how much responsibility is on the local governments in that area to maintain access roads and things like that?

**Mr Waldock:** As I say, the money was provided to them, and there is also provision for maintenance.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Thank you.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** I refer to “Driver and Vehicle Services”, on page 799 of the budget papers, and it is mentioned, of course, on page 796, under “Significant Issues”. How is the Mirrabooka driver and vehicle service centre, scheduled to be completed in August this year, progressing? It is listed under “Significant Issues”.

**Ms Lyhne:** As you may be aware, we have been doing quite a lot of work on our driver and vehicle service centres; we were very happy to open a new Cannington service centre last year. As you rightfully point out, we are in the process of developing the Mirrabooka site. My latest update is that it should be open, I think, in September of this year; we are certainly progressing very well and on target with that centre.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** Will Morley close one day and Mirrabooka open the next day, or will there be a crossover?

**Ms Lyhne:** Whenever we move, obviously there are significant things that happen behind the scenes to ensure that our customers are not disadvantaged in any way and also that our staff are comfortable with the move and familiar with their new operating environment and so forth. So the plan will be to close one day, and move to the other the next day, obviously for resource reasons. But we will be doing a lot of work behind the scenes to ensure that our customers are aware of the move, and that our staff are also comfortable and able to operate in their new environment when they go there.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** How many customer contacts in person were there in Morley for the last financial year?

**Ms Lyhne:** I would have to take that on notice; I am sorry, that is not information I have.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** I might just go through a few.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Did you want this on notice?

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** I have sort of similar ones, so we might end up grouping them all together, if you would just bear with me for one minute. I am asking for the number of customer contacts in person at Morley for 2013-14; the estimated customer contacts in person in Mirrabooka for 2014-15; the length of waiting times in Morley for customer contacts in person in 2012-13 and 2013-14; the number of full-time equivalent employees in Morley for 2012-13 and 2013-14; and the number of FTEs in Mirrabooka for 2014-15 and 2015-16.

**Mr Waldock:** That is all fine.

*[Supplementary Information No A8.]*

[11.20 am]

---



**Ms Lyhne:** Can I perhaps give you some information around those questions? We can certainly take the specific numbers on notice because I do not carry them in my head. There is a lot of reform happening within our driver and vehicles services area. We have been working very hard to ensure that we deliver services to our customers in the way that is most applicable in the modern world. Many of your questions are around the number of FTEs and the number of contacts. Due to the reforms that we have been undertaking, a lot of our contacts now happen online. A lot of our customers choose to pay their bills and look for information like demerit point checks and those sorts of things online, which means that they no longer have to come into our service centres to make those simple transactions. Our service centres are much more focused on those more complex transactions that customers need to come in and make inquiries.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** I noticed that, which is particularly why I want to talk about the length of waiting times of customer contact in person because of the complexity of it. I would also like to know about the number of practical driving assessments undertaken at Morley over the past two financial years and the estimated number of practical driving assessments for Mirrabooka. Do you have any data on you now about how many practical driving assessments were done at Morley?

**Ms Lyhne:** Again, I do not have the details with me here today but I would be very happy to do that. One thing that you need to bear in mind is that when we move to Mirrabooka, we will have a substantially larger centre in Mirrabooka and a much better designed centre. Morley has been one of the centres that we have been very concerned about, particularly in relation to practical driving assessments. It is not ideally located. It is not very suited to that particular service delivery. We have only been able to locate quite a small number of driver assessors at Morley because of the parking situation and traffic there that you may be aware of. When we move to Mirrabooka, it will allow us to assess in a better way what the demand is going to be in that part of the Perth metropolitan area and we will have more room for driver assessors at our Mirrabooka office. We will be able to move our resources around to meet that particular demand. It is a centre that is much better located. The parking facilities, the traffic and so forth are much better designed for doing things like practical driving assessments.

*[Supplementary Information No A9.]*

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I am just intrigued. As part of the development of Mirrabooka, is there funding for additional inspectors? You said you can move them around but that is just robbing Peter to pay Paul, is it not? Is there a driving PDA centre in the metropolitan area that has a surplus of examiners at the moment?

**Ms Lyhne:** Our customers are able to go online to book their practical driving assessments and they are able to look at the different locations where they can do them. We have a sense of the locations where customers are most likely to want to have their practical driving assessment done. It does not mean that we will increase the number of driving assessors but we will be able to locate those driving assessors where they are best able to give the service to the customer as close and as conveniently as possible for the customer.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Is not the issue that people cannot get a driving assessment in a timely manner?

**Ms Lyhne:** That is not my understanding of it. We have had in the past issues with bookings because we have had a booking system that has required people to call the contact centre every time they wanted to change. We now have an online booking system, which allows customers to do it in their own time and to change it to meet their own needs. They can plan their driving assessment many months ahead in accordance with when they think they will be ready to do that driving assessment. Wait times is not as relevant a measure as it perhaps used to be because as a customer, you can go in there and potentially find an appointment tomorrow or one in November, depending on what suits your particular —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Or none.

**Ms Lyhne:** It would be very unlikely to find none in the system.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I get contacted by people all the time complaining that there are no spots available. If you look at your figures, you have seen a dramatic increase in people going to regional centres. The number of people taking their tests in regional areas is growing faster than in the metropolitan area or the population in regional WA. I understand that is because people are going to regional centres and they are being advised by your staff to look at that as an option.

**Ms Lyhne:** Some customers may choose to go to a centre where they can find a booking at an earlier time but that is a customer's decision.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** It is their decision because they cannot get one in Perth. I am speechless if you think there is still not an issue about people's frustrations in being able to get bookings in a timely manner.

**Ms Lyhne:** I understand at times people can be frustrated because they may not be able to get exactly the time slot that they are after but if people plan ahead in terms of their learning journey, there is now a booking system that is very transparent and allows them to book out many months in advance.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** What is the average waiting time for a practical driving assessment in metropolitan Perth?

**Ms Lyhne:** The way the system works is that we do not have an average wait time anymore because when the bookings are released into the system, you can go onto the system and have a look, so you may look today and find that the next booking might be in August.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** What if someone cannot access the online system and they use the telephone contact centre and they phone to make a booking? What is the period of time that you expect that they will have to wait for a practical driving assessment?

**Ms Lyhne:** You may find one on the system for tomorrow or you may find one on the system for August. It is a live system.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** Would you be surprised to learn that some people have to wait five months for a practical driving assessment?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** It depends on what station they want to go to.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** In metropolitan Perth.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Have you got one in particular? Is there one that everyone seems to go to that they cannot get into or are you talking about every licensing department?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I have had them about all centres.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Exactly. You are saying that at every licensing department, you cannot get on for how many months?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** In many cases there are no spare bookings. You could go on right now and the bookings that you issued at nine o'clock this morning could all be taken and there may be no bookings available at all between now and six months in advance. Is that not possible in the metropolitan area?

**Ms Lyhne:** It is a live system so if there are many people in there booking, suddenly they may all be consumed. If there are people in the system cancelling a booking, it becomes immediately available on the system. It is a live system that allows what is available to be put into the system immediately.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** So for those people who make telephone contacts or in-person contact —

---

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** The same system will be used.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** It is the same but are those people who do not have access to the internet in particular more likely to have a longer waiting period because those live bookings are being taken up earlier in the day?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** It is the same live system that is being utilised, whether it is a phone call or whether —

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** Would you expect to find a booking —

**The ACTING CHAIR:** It is very difficult for Hansard, with conversations going on across the chamber. Could you speak one at a time.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** I was answering a question. If you go online and there is a vacancy at nine o'clock tomorrow morning and you rang up, that vacancy is available whether you ring up or whether you go online. You cannot say that because I rang up, I am not going to get the option to go at nine o'clock tomorrow morning. If that vacancy is there, it is available whether you go online or whether you use the telephone.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Do you maintain any records of how many occasions and for how long there are no vacancies available in the metropolitan area? You are right; it is a live system but there would be many occasions when there are a limited number of vacancies available in the metropolitan area. If not, how do you monitor whether or not you are meeting demand?

[11.30 am]

**Ms Lyhne:** No, we do not keep those sorts of statistics. There may be periods of high demand where there may be a point in time that there may not be a particular appointment on there. We then release more appointments. We constantly monitor the demand for the PDAs and we release appointments further out, depending on the demand. But you have to realise that somebody may cancel an appointment at the same time and that will immediately become available and that may be tomorrow. I speak to customers from time to time who are unhappy with not being able to book an appointment and I often encourage them to have another look the next day because they find that appointment the next day because new appointments become available.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** How many times would you expect a customer to make contact to find a practical driving assessment—for example, if they made contact today—within the Perth metropolitan area inside four months?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** I do not think that is a reasonable question.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** It is actually just about quality assurance and how you monitor whether people are actually getting access to a service and what their waiting periods are for that service, because certainly we are receiving information that there are significant waiting times.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Okay, but I think we need to also determine what you mean by “waiting period”. You get online —

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** If you wanted to book a PDA today and phoned up —

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Sorry, member; would you just let the parliamentary secretary answer that and then we can continue?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Thank you, Mr Chair. If you expect to have an appointment today, in this day and age, in anything, that is highly unlikely. If I want to go to the doctor and I ring up at 10 o'clock this morning and demand an appointment, I will go on a waitlist and I will be lucky to get in or I will need to sit there and wait as long as it takes. If I want to make an appointment to go to the hospital, I have to make an appointment to do that, and you have to wait. To expect to be able to ring up and get an appointment the same day or the next morning in any industry I think is not

---

realistic in this day and age at all. So that is why we need to find out what you mean by “waiting period”.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** What is the government’s KPI for a waiting time?

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Hon Alanna Clohesy, if you could just wait for a moment and let the parliamentary secretary complete her answer and then we will continue from there.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** I was just saying we need clarification on what you mean by “waiting period”.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** What is the department’s KPI for a reasonable amount of time to wait for a PDA?

**Mr Waldock:** If I may just add, what we do know is there has been a very large reduction in phone calls. People are happy—certainly the industry tells us —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** But you hang up on people.

**Mr Waldock:** No, we do not. In fact, I must say, overall in the DVS, the whole of our reform program has become incredibly successful. I do not think anybody would argue that we have changed the whole nature of DVS. There is no question that the PDAs are a tough area. Again, when we work with the driving industry, because of the new 50-hour arrangements—25 hours prior supervised driving experience—what we are seeing is a lot of people sensibly in the industry booking well ahead. They can get those bookings and that is the way it should work. So, rather than expecting to get on the phone and say, “I’ve just finished my 25 hours today; can I come in tomorrow”, what people are doing, and what the driving industry is doing, is pre-booking. It is working incredibly well. There is always going to be a question of resources—how much we can afford. We do the best we can. Our sense is, and we know in a sense, that despite the phone calls you get, clearly we get a lot more phone calls and the issues in terms of community concern have reduced vastly. I am not suggesting there are not some hotspots. I am not suggesting, as the member suggests, there has been some people moving to different centres, but compared to where we were two years ago, we have come an incredibly long way. There is more work to do but we are getting there.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Just on this subject, with someone going in and getting their learner’s permit, are they advised at the time of applying for their learner’s permit that they should actually book a practical test there and then?

**Mr Waldock:** It is all there, both online and in pamphlet form.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** I know we have not quite got to it yet, but what is the average waiting time? If I went in for a learner’s permit today and got my learner’s permit and said, “I’m getting my learner’s permit so I want to book ahead for a practical test”, what sort of waiting time am I looking at?

**Mr Waldock:** This is where it is an interactive process. If somebody goes in and says, “I want to get my driver’s licence. I’m going to do 25 hours of experience and then do my test and then have another 25”, clearly they have got to make an assessment at the time, or ideally early, how long that is going to take. That is why it is a dynamic system, because that will change. Inevitably, whatever their plans, they are never met. That is why it is a dynamic system. So, to ask the question how long it takes, it depends on how you plan for it.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** If someone was to fail their practical test and had to rebook —

**Mr Waldock:** If they “want” to fail their practical test?

**The ACTING CHAIR:** If they “do” fail their practical test, not “want” to fail their practical test; I am sure no-one does, but quite often they do. Quite often, first time applicants—young people getting their learner’s permit—do fail their practical test. It is not uncommon.

---

**Mr Waldock:** No; about 57 per cent pass, but there is the residual.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** That is 43 per cent that do not. How long do they have to wait to rebook? I know there is actually a period of time when they cannot do the test again. Is it one month?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Sorry; we do not have that information.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Could we take that as a supplementary?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Ms Nina Lyhne.

**Ms Lyhne:** I do not have the specific time period. I think it is very short. What a person would do if they fail is—many of these people are young people, remember; they are very comfortable with online systems—they would go straight out, get out their iPad or their iPhone and go back onto the system and look for another appointment and take the first available in that particular case. In some cases, they might say to themselves, “I failed that and I need to go and do a bit more practice with my parents.” This is a highly structured learning process. What we are doing is encouraging people to go out there and practise and practise and practise until they think they are ready, and encouraging people to teach their children to be safe drivers. If you fail, you might try to get on again, but we would probably encourage you to go and learn more about what it is you need to know to pass the test.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** I understand that. Some people might fail for a small reason or whatever. What I would like to know is: what is the mandatory waiting time between the failure date of that test and when they can actually go and do the test again; and, if they fail the driving test and wish to rebook it, what would the wait time be?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** That is something I suppose we can have a look at and see if we have got any information on.

*[Supplementary Information No A10.]*

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Also, I want to explain that what might be an appropriate time for you to make your appointment, there might be vacancies during that day between 11.00 and 12.00, but you want your appointment at four but there is no —

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Parliamentary secretary, what I want to know is if there is no vacancy. I understand that there could be holes in the schedule that come up and that is fine, but if there are no holes in the schedule, what is the average wait time?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** We can have a look at it and see if we can get some information.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** In regard to your phone system, do you now answer every call that is made or do you still during peak times drop calls? Do you have a recorded message saying, “This is a busy period. Call back later”, and clunk?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Ms Nina Lyhne.

**Ms Lyhne:** I am aware that in the past when there has been overload on the system—the system has not been able to cope with the calls—that has happened. We are actually in the process of moving our contact centre to a new location and purchasing new technology to go with that, which is going to, I guess, significantly deal with some of the technological issues that we had around the system. Modern systems will help us to deal with a lot of those sorts of issues that we have had in the past.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Will that allow you to actually take the person’s number and call them back? A lot of the modern iiNet and people like that say, “You have now been placed in a queue. Enter the number that you want us to call you back on”, and then they call them back three times. Is that the sort of technology you are moving to or will they just have to wait in the queue on hold?

**Ms Lyhne:** Certainly, there will be a number of options for customers. There are no plans at this stage to call customers back. That is obviously something that we can look at in the future, but there

---

will be a number of other options for channelling. Often it is not just simply about pushing calls through; it is about how we channel that work and how we channel the type of calls to an appropriate operator or maybe to another source of information and those sorts of things. It is actually about a system that allows us to use the resources that we have better.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Do you mind; Mr Reece Waldock has a few words?

[11.40 am]

**Mr Waldock:** We do clearly keep KPIs on this and our contact centre has got so much better than it was three years ago. In fact, if you remember around the time of the great hailstorms, our centre was so badly—not managed—able to respond to those issues, we never knew what the demand was because people kept dropping off and ringing up, dropping off and ringing up, so you never got an understanding of what the free demand would be if this cyclic thing was not happening. Our KPIs over recent years have improved substantially. There have been one or two glitches but even that has improved in recent times. I can say, that it is a work in progress. We are going to Tassels Place next month and new technology. I would like to see that bedded in and see how we go. But if you would like us at any time to provide the trend lines of how we are going in terms of responding and people that do drop off the system, we can provide that.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Can I go back now to Hon Alanna Clohesy, who originated this question.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Can we get that taken on notice? Will that include the number of calls that are dropped?

[*Supplementary Information No A11.*]

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I have had personal experience where it says that the phone centre is busy, you need to either go online—and I could not because they had already told me I could not pay it online—or go into a centre or call back later. It then just clunked. Will that tell me how many people get that experience?

**Mr Waldock:** I think it does, but we will check that out. Did you mention your name?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I did not get a chance.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** I tried to do it online, I said I wonder whether there was a reason —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I tried to do it online and they said I could not pay it online and to ring up, so I rang up and then I got hung up on.

**Mr Waldock:** If I could share something —

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** I suggest because they did know who he was!

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Maybe you have my number bedded into your system!

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Noting the time, we have only 20 minutes left. I think the original line of questioning came from Hon Alanna Clohesy.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** On the supplementary information we are getting, will that information include the number of calls per day where the call has been terminated by the Department of Transport contact centre because the number of calls received by the Department of Transport contact centre has exceeded the capacity?

**The ACTING CHAIR:** That is what they said they would do.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** That is what the announcement says when you phone up. It dumps you very politely, but it dumps you.

**Mr Waldock:** One of the reasons we have sometimes had some variations and some swings is because, clearly, when people are waiting, often it is because, as we roll out online services, we are rolling out a whole host. To respond to your issue that you tried to go online and you could not, if

you look at what we are doing with online services, especially with My Account, you will see that a lot of the phone calls are from people asking questions and seeking support. So, in some respects, it can be a little bit of a phoney war, as it were, as those people try to get into the system with a whole new suite of programs. We think they are aberrations that will not maintain, but that does affect some of the issues you have seen.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** To conclude that point, we eventually got excellent service from the staff at the Joondalup centre.

**Mr Waldock:** Then, clearly you did not give your name!

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** The hardworking, stressed staff at the Joondalup centre, who did a great job.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** As part of that supplementary information, which we have not concluded yet, is information available on driver and licensing services, telephone contacts—the actual number of successful telephone completions for 2012–13, 2013–14—and what you are anticipating for the next year with the new system?

**Mr Waldock:** We will do the best we can.

**Ms Lyhne:** We can certainly provide that information to you. In relation to your question around what we are anticipating, we are anticipating a drop in calls to our contact centre as more customers go online. We are already starting to see some of those benefits now. Time of calls might be longer, though, because of more complex issues being dealt with on the phone. We are expecting a drop, which is great, and that is the strategy.

**Hon ALANNA CLOHESY:** Dropped and dumped.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Speaking about being online, I have been on many a long line at the licensing centres themselves. Is any work being done to reduce that?

**Mr Waldock:** I do not know if anyone has been more recently, but the whole nature of our centres has changed. When you go into—we talked about Mirrabooka earlier—the Cannington centre, which was the first of the new breed, most of them are friendly; you actually have a chance to sit down. I think the waiting average is about—I am guessing—14 minutes or less. In fact, I should not say it, but Ms Lyhne has just put in for a Premier's award. It shows how these centres looked some time ago versus what you see now. The nature of the amenity, the nature of how they are managed, the quality of staff and the waiting times, the customer services have gone through a revolution, a total transformation. I think if you experience it—we do not want you to experience it particularly; we would rather you do it online or through Australia Post—if it is complex, when you do come in, I think you will have a wonderful experience.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Glad to hear that.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** In budget paper No 3 on page 308, it refers to —

A Driver and Vehicle Services Regional Price Index will be applied to vehicle examination fees ...

It gives us the initial inspection fees of \$88 to \$104 for light vehicles and from \$143 to \$170 for heavy vehicles. What will be the new fees? Is there a list of what the new fees will be on a region-by-region basis?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Ms Nina Lyhne might like to answer that question.

**Ms Lyhne:** I do not have the complete new fees with me; Mr Doyle may have that. We have applied the regional price index; that is, the standard index that is applied to these sorts of services around the state. We have applied the same index to taxi fares. It basically acknowledges the higher cost, for example, in the Pilbara and the Kimberley of delivering services there.

---

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Does that mean in some areas they will be cheaper than in Perth?

**Ms Lyhne:** No; not cheaper than Perth. In some areas it will be certainly much more expensive.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** The regional price index shows that there are regions where the cost is cheaper than in the metropolitan area.

**Ms Lyhne:** Mr Doyle might be able to give you the exact figures.

**Mr Doyle:** I do not have the regional price index with me. As Ms Lyhne said, that is the published regional price index from the Department of Regional Development. They are the exact figures we use. Where the figure is higher than 100 per cent, which is the Pilbara, Kimberley, Gascoyne et cetera mainly, we multiply the gazetted fee by that to get the new fee.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Can we get a list of the fees on a region-by-region basis that you are now charging?

**Mr Doyle:** Yes.

*[Supplementary Information No A12.]*

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Prior to that change in this financial year, there was a standard fee across the whole of the state?

**Mr Doyle:** Yes, there was.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Now people in expensive areas to live will be charged more to have their vehicles inspected compared to those in the metropolitan area? I want to be clear that that is what you are proposing.

**Mr Waldock:** That is not because we like charging people more, but the issue is that we were finding it extremely difficult to attract AISs to do those works in some of those expensive areas. This is in response to giving people in those regions good services and making services available when they want them.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** That is privatisation leading to higher charges.

**Mr Waldock:** No; it is responding to normal market forces, as it does anywhere else in the world.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** It is privatisation leading to higher charges and the loss of a universal tariff.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** That is your opinion.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** It is the facts, but I am sure you will interpret it otherwise.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** As Hon Ken Travers says.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So if we can we get those new fees. Is there any intention to roll that out to any other fees and charges of the agency?

**Mr Waldock:** At this stage, not to my knowledge, no.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** What about heavy vehicle HC, MC licences and testing, which is now done on a privatised basis? Are you looking to charge that; if not, how will you manage that in those expensive regional areas?

**Mr Waldock:** We do not appear to have anywhere near the same cost pressures. I must say that for heavy vehicles, we have been running multi-combinations at AISs for many, many years—it is not AISs—at privatised training schools.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** If we can we go back to the bicycle network plan, the document that I have given you there shows a media release dated, at the top of it, 28 February. I assume that would have been prepared by your office, director general. Again, an email sent out late on 26 February asking if it was okay to go out. I assume at that stage it was planned to have the bicycle network plan



released on 28 February 2014, just prior to Bike Week, a very appropriate time, I would have thought.

[11.50 am]

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** What are you actually referring to?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I am asking: is it correct that the original planning date for the release of that plan was 28 February?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Okay, but are you referring to the document that was just tabled?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Yes.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** We have only got the media release.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Yes, and you will see in the top left-hand corner “28 February”.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Yes, mine is blue, I just see it, okay. Sorry, your question is?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Is that correct that there was a planned release of the bicycle network plan for February; and did it then subsequently have to be shifted?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** There was a media release drafted and sent to the minister for 28 February.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Yes; so was the agency expecting the release to occur on the twenty-eighth when they drafted that press release?

**Mr Waldock:** If I can speak frankly, we do many of these and it is always, as you might expect, at ministerial discretion.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I understand that, but I am asking the question and I cannot understand why I cannot get a simple answer. Was there an original plan to have it released in February on the twenty-eighth and that was subsequently delayed until the March date or whenever it was—I think the end of March—when it was finally released?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** As per the documents you have tabled, you have the twenty-eighth, but then you have also got another email attached to that where it is asked that they will wait for the minister to come back. Now, that is not abnormal.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Parliamentary secretary, I am asking the director general: when his agency prepared the release, were they expecting a release on the twenty-eighth? It is a pretty straightforward question.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** I think regardless of what they are expecting, it is up to the minister of the day when he decides to put out a media release.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** And I completely understand that; I am asking the question of whether they were expecting it to be released on the twenty-eighth.

**Mr Waldock:** Whilst, as you know, I am a very keen rider, I do not even remember when Bike Week is, so I cannot remember whether this was —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Mid-March.

**Mr Waldock:** Thank you for that. So, the answer is: I have got no idea.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Can you take it on notice then and advise us whether or not on the twenty-sixth it was the expectation of the agency—and I respect the right of the minister to change this at any moment right up to the last moment—for the plan to be released on 28 February?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** I am just struggling with the relevance of that to the estimates committee, of when a media release is expected to be put out or not, regardless of what the department —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I struggle with the relevance of what a lot of the government does, but nonetheless I let them do it.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** That is why you are on that side, Hon Ken Travers. But the question of when a media release is to be announced or not I find totally irrelevant to the estimates committee and, really, that is business between the department and the minister's office.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I am glad you raised that, parliamentary secretary, because my next question was: if on the twenty-sixth you were expecting it to be released on the twenty-eighth, did you have the document printed at that stage?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** The date on the media release that was sent through is the twenty-eighth.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So, if you were expecting it to be released and the minister's press secretary was expecting it to be released on 26 February 2014, I would assume then that there was document ready to be released on the twenty-eighth.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Again, I struggle to see how that fits in with estimates, Hon Ken Travers.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Because, parliamentary secretary, it means that those documents were pumped, and that means that we wasted a lot of money on printing a document that was never used. Now, that is a very clear role for the estimates committee.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** I do not like your tone, Hon Ken Travers.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I do not like your tone either.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Members, if you can just take a deep breath for a moment. I think, parliamentary secretary, in fact, Hon Ken Travers can ask those questions.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** I would ask that that be put on notice so we can find that information.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I want to know whether the department was expecting it to be released on the twenty-eighth.

**Mr Waldock:** I can answer that one now. I just do not think I could ever give you a response to that.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** What, whether you had a document printed and then —

**Mr Waldock:** No, that is not the issue. We do lots of prints of documents and they do go out, but I just think the arrogance of a DG with the sense of enormous hubris that somehow we actually tell the government when things are done —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I am not asking —

**Mr Waldock:** But just when you were asking me—the fact that we would even have an expectation is not appropriate; we do not have expectations. It is the minister's, the government's, decision, not ours.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** The point I am making, director general, is that you would have prepared that release at the request, and you will see that that earlier email is from the minister's press secretary asking the chief of staff whether that release was ready to go out. I am assuming that for those people in the minister's office to have done that, they would have communicated with your office that that is what they intended to do and that you would have had the necessary materials prepared for that to occur on 28 February. By late on 26 February, you would have had documentation ready to go out for the twenty-eighth if that is what had been communicated to you by the minister. The point of these questions is ultimately to determine whether or not you then had to dump those plans that were prepared for that 28 February announcement, and whether that is a waste of public money, because you had to reprint them.

---

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** But again, the email you are referring to we do not have. That is what I tried to state at the beginning.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** You have got it on the front cover.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** We have a media release and one email.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Yes.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** But you are saying an email from a secretary.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** From Vivienne Ryan, the media adviser, to Rachael Turnseck, the then chief of staff of the Minister for Transport.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** But there is no request on our email.

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Sorry everyone, before we get bogged down on this, and noting the time because there could be another question or two that another member might want to ask, where are you leading to with this, Hon Ken Travers? Do you want to streamline this thing and get to the point?

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I want to know whether or not the agency had been advised by the minister that they intended to release it on 28 February. I want to know whether or not in preparation for that release on 28 February they had printed copies of the bicycle network plan and whether, as a subsequent fact it was not released until March, they had to get a new version of the document printed with the new minister's details inside, and what the cost of that was. I am happy for that to be taken as supplementary.

*[Supplementary Information No A13.]*

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** If I can just continue on bicycle matters —

**The ACTING CHAIR:** Sorry, Hon Ken Travers, with supplementary information A13, if the agency cannot answer that, would you just let us know that in your response.

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Certainly.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** The other question on the bicycle network plan: in the draft plan it identified that you had estimated that about \$10 million per year in 2012 will be needed for constructing and completing the high-priority links over the next decade. Does the agency have the necessary funding to complete that task in terms of that \$10 million a year for the next 10 years?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** Mr Reece Waldock will answer that.

**Mr Waldock:** No agency goes out past the four-year estimates period. Over the four-year estimates period our internal cycling budget is \$39.95 million, so that is an enormously good start to an area that has been poorly funded over the decades. In fact, it is probably a four or fivefold increase in funding. This is actually above and beyond the normal funding that would come from both PTA and Main Roads as they roll out their projects where they can actually do PSPs. So if you are looking over the next four years in terms of what is happening, we are spending \$23.67 million on PSPs, \$5.34 million on the Perth bicycle network, \$5.34 million on the regional bicycle network, and on top of that, we are spending \$1.1 million on the West Parade path and \$4.5 million in terms of CBD cycling initiatives, which comes to \$39.95 million. So, to answer your question, we have actually got a very, very positive forward budget outlook. In terms of post that, that will be determined by government at the appropriate time.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** How much of that is money that is re-cashflowed from previous years?

**Mr Waldock:** There have been some delays because of design, but Mr Doyle would have those numbers available.

**Mr Doyle:** The total allocation for 2014–15 is \$16.46 million. Of that amount, \$9 million was re-cashflowed from the early year, the first year of the program, because that was mainly focused on

planning and design, so they did not spend much money in the first year of that program. That \$9 million was rolled in to 2014–15.

[12 noon]

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So as you go out into the out years, my understanding is you drop down to about \$6 million per annum that you can get funded for bicycle plans —

**Mr Doyle:** So as it is printed in the budget, there is \$6.33 million in each of the forward years plus there is also, as Mr Waldock mentioned, \$2.5 million for the CBD in 2015–16, which is funded out of the Perth parking fund.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Right. That is still not \$10 million a year.

**Mr Doyle:** It is \$8.83 million and then on top of that you have got whatever Main Roads and PTA spend on the PSP network for new roads et cetera.

**Mr Waldock:** Which will be a big spend given in particular the Gateway project.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I will just quickly move on. In terms of the “Broome small boat harbour stage 1”, were there technical issues that caused the cancellation of that project or was it simply a policy decision of government?

**Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN:** This was just a decision by government not to go ahead with this program.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** So there was nothing technically stopping it occurring? There were no changes in the cost of it or anything like that?

**Mr Waldock:** There had been significant changes in the costs, as you know; it had gone up \$15 million —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** No, since the election commitment was —

**Mr Waldock:** No. But I think there was a general recognition that Broome is particularly difficult to do a boating facility. We got to a P90 on the \$50 million, which was a high level of confidence—a 90 per cent chance of it being at or below budget—but there is no doubt it is not an easy place to build marine facilities of the nature we are talking about.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** But that was known at the time the commitments were made.

**Mr Waldock:** Sure.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Looking at the “Asset Investment Program Efficiency Measure”, the Port Geographe and the Augusta Boat Harbour are already committed so the “Works in Progress”, they are already underway. Will that need to come out of those other expenditure items under “New Works”, the savings that you have required, the \$2 million this year and the \$2.5 million over the forward estimates? Are not most of those out of fee-for-service programs?

**Mr Doyle:** We still need to work through that in detail. As you mentioned, Port Geographe and Augusta, they are coming towards a conclusion in this financial year, so once we have a good take on what their final costs will be, we will know how much, if any, of that asset efficiency measure can be applied to those projects and then, obviously, if there is a residual, how we go about managing that. We still need to work through that in detail. In terms of the funding source for those programs, some of our asset investment is funded from fee-for-service; for example, some of the maritime facilities program comes from —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Can I maybe ask, because of the time, as a supplementary, for the new works program, can you identify which of those different programs that are listed under “New Works” on page 802 and the top of 803 are funded from fee-for-service and which are appropriation funded?

**Mr Waldock:** Yes, we can do that.

---

[*Supplementary Information No A14.*]

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Who is funding security cameras for taxis in Mandurah?

**Ms Lyhne:** We are currently looking at a number of different models for how we get some of those cameras into the taxis in Mandurah. As you would be aware, they are regional taxis, so TIDA does not cover that. As you would also be aware, the government funding was provided for the replacement program in the metropolitan area and after that, new taxis coming onstream are actually funding their own.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** I still do not know that I got an answer out of that. Is the answer that you do not know how they are going to be funded yet?

**Ms Lyhne:** I said we are looking at a number of different models for doing that.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** What are the options?

**Ms Lyhne:** Well, obviously, one option is for them to fund it themselves. Other options would be to look at different ways that we might add various charges on to the licence fees, although there are legal issues around that, so that might not be possible. Other options may be to use some of the cameras we currently have from previous taxis. So, there is a range of options that we are looking at.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Is applying for R for R money one of the options that you are looking at—royalties for regions?

**Ms Lyhne:** Potentially, we could do. That is not in the current —

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Can I suggest it? A positive way to finish the hearing—I have always got positive ways of how to help you. When do you expect that those cameras will be rolled out into Mandurah? When is your time frame then for the delivery of or the requirement for security cameras on Mandurah taxis?

**Ms Lyhne:** I have not got a time frame now but our staff are working actively with the taxi people in Mandurah to work through those solutions.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Can you maybe take that on notice about when you expect that it will be finalised?

**Ms Lyhne:** Yes.

**Hon KEN TRAVERS:** Part of the supplementary, are you then looking to roll it out to other towns across regional WA; and, if so, which towns and when?

**The ACTING CHAIR:** It is all part of supplementary A15.

[*Supplementary Information No A15.*]

**The ACTING CHAIR:** We will bring the hearing to a close.

The committee will forward any additional questions it has to you via the minister in writing in the next couple of days together with a transcript of evidence, which includes the questions you have taken on notice. Responses to these questions will be requested within 10 working days of receipt of the questions. Should you be unable to meet this due date, please advise the committee in writing as soon as possible before the due date. The advice is to include specific reasons as to why the due date cannot be met. If members have any unasked questions, I ask them to email them to the committee as soon as possible after the hearing. On behalf of the committee, thank you for your attendance today.

**Hearing concluded at 12.06 pm**

---