

RAILWAY (METRONET) BILL 2018

Second Reading

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MS R. SAFFIOTTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport) [3.29 pm] — in reply: I rise to conclude the second reading debate on the Railway (METRONET) Bill 2018. I will go through some of the issues raised in the second reading contributions to make sure that I finalise them.

Let us go through them. I thank members for their varied and wide-ranging contributions to the debate. I will not go through how the debate demonstrated yet again that the Liberal Party does not support public transport, because I think I did that during question time. A contribution of the member for Churchlands was that rail stations and rail projects are monuments to government. The member for Scarborough was not quite sure whether Wellard had a train station. The Leader of the Opposition —

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I wasn't talking about Wellard train station; I was talking about suburbs in the catchment south of Armadale.

Ms R. SAFFIOTTI: You talked about Wellard, but I will go through that.

I have said there were lots of different issues. The member for Scarborough talked about Wellard and all the road-over-rail bridges that will be included in the Yanchep extension—nine new rail bridges. I think the opposition is now very interested in the topical subject of debt. I point out that the two rail projects we are talking about today—the Thornlie–Cockburn Link rail project and the Yanchep extension rail project—will be funded from the redirection of Perth Freight Link funds. So we will not add debt with these projects; the funds were redirected from the PFL project. The significant debt that lies with Metronet is in relation to the Forrestfield–Airport Link project, which the Liberal Party said it started. It had \$1.37 billion worth of debt. So the previous government thought it was okay to borrow \$1.37 billion for Forrestfield, but it is obviously now opposed to rail projects.

Both projects have a positive benefit–cost ratio. The Yanchep benefit–cost ratio is over two and the Thornlie–Cockburn Link benefit–cost ratio is over one, and including the wider economic benefits, they are stronger. The Yanchep and Thornlie projects both have very strong or positive BCRs.

Other issues included land acquisition and land swaps. I understand that some land swaps are proposed in relation to Yanchep. Some questions were asked about operating subsidies. I make the point that the previous government never put in the operating subsidy for the Forrestfield–Airport Link. This state government went and put those numbers in.

The member for Churchlands called Metronet a “white elephant transport system”. He opposes Metronet and the Byford rail line.

Mr T.J. Healy: Same old Liberals.

Ms R. SAFFIOTTI: Yes.

Mrs R.M.J. Clarke: Is it a rail line for criminals?

Ms R. SAFFIOTTI: He apparently said rail lines are only used by criminals; I think that is what he said in his contribution today.

Mrs R.M.J. Clarke interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTTI: The member for North West Central claimed that we do not subsidise regional transport services. I think that is what he said. Well, we do and this is how much by. Transperth metropolitan services are subsidised at 70 per cent, so the cost recovery is about 30 per cent. Regional town bus services are subsidised at 90 per cent, Transwa rail services at 74 per cent, and country bus services at 94 per cent to 95 per cent. I am not arguing against subsidies, but I think the idea that this government is somehow subsidising only metropolitan services is completely ludicrous, and again shows that the member for North West Central is not good with numbers. He said that a few times. His claim that Metronet would cost \$10 billion is false. As we said, the Forrestfield–Airport Link—the project his government borrowed \$1.4 billion for—actually has a shuttle between Claremont and the airport. As the Premier said, we can call that the “Catania Shuttle”, because it goes from the western suburbs to the airport. That will very much help the member for North West Central in the future, I suspect, as he serves that electorate so far away from where he lives.

The member for South Perth said he likes rail, which is great, and he wants a South Perth train station. The member for South Perth has been saying that for a number of years. It is not a priority of ours, but we will continue to look at projects. If the analysis is done and the numbers are strong, projects will always be part of our future consideration.

Mrs R.M.J. Clarke: They have the ferry; they don't need a train.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We have ferries and everything in South Perth now.

Mr T.J. Healy: You could call it the “John McGrath Train Station”.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: He already has the John McGrath Pavilion.

Mr T.J. Healy: It’s a set!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member is right; it is like a Monopoly board. He can have all the red squares.

The member for Bateman said there are issues in relation to third-party infrastructure on the Thornlie–Cockburn line, and there are. Continuing discussions and negotiations are being undertaken with third parties. I think the member for North West Central got confused about the pipeline; we are looking at the rail line with Arc Infrastructure, and the pipeline going to the airport.

Comments were made by the member for Bateman that we are chasing urban sprawl by developing projects to Byford, Yanchep, Ellenbrook and Bellevue. We do not believe that. We believe the housing is there and that we are assisting those communities to connect. The Yanchep project has a positive BCR. I think the member for Scarborough said the Liberal Party does not support the Yanchep rail line.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: No, I didn’t say that.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: So you do support it?

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I said it was in our transport plan, but for further out than when it’s being constructed. It was part of our transport plan.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: So you do not support building it in the next three or four years?

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I do support it. It is an election commitment that you need to keep. The federal government have put money into it. I am just saying —

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In yesterday’s contribution —

Mrs L.M. Harvey: — that patronage numbers will be low, and that there will be a large, ongoing subsidisation cost. That’s all I am saying.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The problem is that the opposition cannot decide how to deal with Metronet. It is like watching Gollum in *Lord of the Rings*—“Bad Metronet, good Metronet”! The opposition has to decide whether it supports it, because when members opposite stand and say they do not think there is the population to justify the Yanchep rail line, that gives the impression that the opposition does not support the Yanchep rail line being built in the next three to four years. That is basically what the member for Scarborough alluded to yesterday. But, okay; that is great.

The opposition said we had no strategy for activity centres. We are always looking out for examples of how we can incorporate a transport solution for the new activity centres, particularly Galleria and other shopping centre expansions.

The Leader of the Opposition’s comments were all over the place. I do not think he asked any specific questions. There was something about not releasing business cases or something. We are still waiting for the former government to give us approval to access the business case for the Forrestfield–airport line, which is under construction and under contract.

I think they were the main issues raised. I welcome the support of the opposition for this bill, despite basically 80 per cent of all the comments made in its contributions seeming not to support any of the projects. I have been in opposition, and I understand that members opposite have to be careful what they say and how they analyse things. I am of course very much open to questions about the future and how these projects will progress. But there is a line between legitimate questioning and standing up and saying some absolutely extreme things about public transport and rail projects. Everything the opposition said told me that it does not support Metronet and public transport. I welcome the opposition’s support for the bill, and hope I have addressed some of the questions on the projects asked yesterday and today.

I want to make a point about the planning for these rail stations. I think the member for North West Central was basically asking whether we have put a bike path here and have we done this. We have included the costs in the budget. A point was made that we have not told people how much it will cost and where the budget is. On page 138 of the *Economic and Fiscal Outlook* we actually created a whole box called “Metronet” that showed the cost of the projects and how they will be funded. We are very clear and confident with what we are producing today. I thank the department for having this legislation ready in very good time. We are getting on with it. We are going to the procurement phase soon and finalising the business cases. We have to comply with many steps with Infrastructure Australia. It is a very complex process, but we have always been very keen to work with the

federal government to deliver these projects. We support public transport a hundred per cent. We took these projects to the election and we will deliver them. Along the journey, numerous things will be said.

I will tell members what: when we have talked about the Forrestfield–Airport Link in this place, I have been very clear about my support. Even though I was in opposition, I was very clear in my support for that Forrestfield–Airport Link. I understand that the words I say in this place will be used outside this place. Members cannot stand in this chamber and say that we are building it too early, that they are narcissistic, grandiose monuments, that they will be white elephants, and that only criminals catch public transport. They cannot say those things in this place and expect us not to use that publicly because that is what will happen. I will always remember the Forrestfield–airport debate. I was very, very clear about my support for that project. Of course we asked questions but we never diminished the fact that public transport is a good thing. As my mother would say, *faccia la lavati*, which is “wash your face” in Italian—basically, it is being two-faced. I do not know how members can stand in this place and say terrible things about public transport, Metronet and the Byford, Ellenbrook and Yanchep rail lines and then go out and do social media standing near a proposed station and say, “Where’s the station? We want it now!” The duplicity is incredible. But we all live and learn about how people operate in this place and how they operate during campaigns. The good thing is that we took a commitment to the election. We have been working on it ever since. We continue to work on it. We go through all the processes: stage 1 business case, stage 2 business case, stage 3 business case, stage 4 business case, final negotiations with Infrastructure Australia, and procurement processes. You name it, we are going through every process as required, working with the commonwealth government. We are very happy with the progress we have made so far. I think we have made some significant progress. I thank my Metronet team and the Public Transport Authority for some of the work that we inherited, but more generally the work that has been done. It is very important to keep working into the future. I commend this bill to the house.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Leave denied to proceed forthwith to third reading.

Consideration in Detail

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members, a bit of order, please!

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members, I am just about to read something. There are six clauses in this bill and there are two schedules.

Clause 1: Short title —

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I would like to get a bit more detail on the record about some of these extensions and some of the issues that sit around the potential conflicts in the Cockburn–Thornlie Link. I understand that the freight rail corridor sits in there and that Arc Infrastructure and other services have infrastructure that may need to be moved. Could the minister please advise the status of negotiations with those infrastructure owners about moving their infrastructure to make way for the passenger rail connection.

Ms R. Saffioti: Sure.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I suspect that that might be better placed at clause 3, which refers specifically to the authority to construct the Thornlie–Cockburn Link.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We can do it there.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would you like me to put the short title of the bill and then you can move to your question?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Sure.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 2: Commencement —

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: With the commencement date, is it anticipated that there will be any delay between the bill passing this house and it receiving royal assent; and, if so, what might cause that delay?

Ms R. Saffioti: I do not anticipate any specific delays.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3: Authority to construct Thornlie–Cockburn Link —

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Clause 3 relates to the construction of the Thornlie–Cockburn Link. Further to my earlier question, could the minister please outline the owners of infrastructure that currently sits in the freight rail corridor and update the house about the status of the negotiations to move that infrastructure to make way for the passenger rail?

Ms R. Saffioti: Sure. The discussions are ongoing. I do not stand up, do I?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, I am sorry, minister; you do have to stand. It is good for the thighs!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I might do some squats!

The discussions are ongoing with Arc Infrastructure and BP in particular about how we do this, the timing and all those aspects. The movement of third party infrastructure is always an issue in building rail lines. It has been in the past and will continue to be. We have had very open dialogue with all the relevant owners. There is a range of different groups, including Atco Gas Australia, the Parmelia gas pipeline, BP, Western Power, Water Corporation and of course Arc Infrastructure.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Is the cost of moving the infrastructure for those entities built into the cost of the project?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: A variety of different costs are included in the estimates. I will not go through it. Some of this is currently in commercial discussions. I do not want to prejudice those discussions. The costs of some of that infrastructure movement—the ones that we recognise are the state's responsibility—are included in the numbers.

Mr W.R. MARMION: In terms of the Thornlie–Cockburn corridor, which I assume is clause 3, can the minister advise whether the width of the corridor has been determined along the entire course and what the general width of the corridor is?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Within the construction of the train line itself, the corridor is approximately 40 metres, and that is the corridor we operate in. When we get to the stations, of course, that corridor changes with regard to the land required for train stations and other parts of the station development.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Does the minister have a rough idea of the land requirements for the areas where the stations are?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: With regard to Nicholson Road, some preliminary planning has been undertaken for the station. That is all being worked through. For example, there has already been some acquisition of property to assist with access, potential car parks and other aspects. Ranford Road is a bit different; there are old tips. It is local government land and we are working with the local government on that. The station precinct group is working with the train infrastructure group to finalise the station design and, again, that will all be part of the procurement process going forward.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Further to that, have the land requirements that are being worked on been estimated and incorporated into the metropolitan region scheme? Once they have been estimated, will the minister need to change the current MRS for those requirements?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Some of it is in the current MRS and other parts will have to be progressed later, but as I recall with previous train lines, the MRS is sometimes changed subsequent to the lines being built. That happened, I think, with the northern and southern rail lines.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Will any residential houses need to be resumed in those areas? If not, will a clearing permit be required for any remnant bush?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No homes will be resumed for the Thornlie–Cockburn line, but we will need a clearing permit.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I missed the last bit. A clearing permit will be required; is that what the minister is saying?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: An environmental clearing permit, but we are not clearing any homes.

Mr W.R. MARMION: There were two questions. The minister got there so quickly, I did not hear the second answer.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sorry, no homes, but, yes, a clearing permit.

Mr W.R. MARMION: With regard to the clearing permit, does the minister have an idea of how much remnant bush will need to be cleared?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We will get that information for the member and provide it as part of the third reading wrap-up.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4: Authority to construct Yanchep Rail Extension —

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 21 June 2018]

p3709b-3724a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: In the briefing we were advised that the last section of the Yanchep line, which extends to around Yanchep Beach Road, has been moved further east of where it was originally planned to go. Can the minister advise about the status of environmental clearances being obtained for that new corridor?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The new corridor was basically more of a planning outcome. The whole reason was to have the opportunity to create the town centre vision that everyone is keen to see proceed in that area. It was worked through with the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage. With regard to the environmental clearances, we are preparing the stage 2 referral and that will go to the relevant agencies very soon. We have already discussed these issues with the Environmental Protection Authority, so we are confident of that process.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I have similar questions to those I asked about the other line with regard to the general width of the corridor. I also mentioned in my contribution to the second reading debate that this bill refers only to the alignment, which has no width at all; it is just an alignment. I would like to know what, historically, the maximum width could be, and what the general width is of the corridor for this line?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am advised that it is roughly 40 metres, except at the stations.

Mr W.R. MARMION: The other part of the question is that in this bill the definition of the alignment of the two nodes does not include any width; I think there is an implied width to which we could go if necessary.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am advised that the width of the corridor is 40 metres—the construction is always within that corridor, given the width—but we have the ability to go one mile either side if we need to, but I do not think we will need to.

Mr W.R. MARMION: We got that in the briefing but I had forgotten the figure. I thought, “A mile—it couldn’t have been that wide”, but historically that would have given a lot of flexibility. With regard to the stations, we know that some clearing will be required at a Bush Forever site. Are there any people or groups in the community that are concerned about that specific bush?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The team has had some initial consultation with a relevant group up there. I understand that we will go through the full public environmental review process, but we are confident of that process.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I would like to talk about the funding requirements of this line, particularly given what we saw in the media today about the value capture issue. There was value capture in last year’s budget that does not appear to be in this year’s budget. I just want to make sure that all the funding that is required to undertake this rail line actually exists, because we have some concerns, based on that article, that there may be a funding gap.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: All the funding that is required is described on page 138 of budget paper No 3. Last year we put in an estimate for value capture and land sales. We are still going through the process of the value capture methodology and we have confirmed some of those land sales. This project is funded through some land sales and the redirection of the Perth Freight Link funds.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Can the minister enlighten us about exactly how much there is on page 138 for value capture and the redirection of Perth Freight Link funds? As I understood it, the amount in last year’s budget was more than \$100 million and the figure this year for value capture or land sales is, I believe, only about \$15 million. I am trying to understand how it all adds up.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sure. Last year, in our first budget, we put in an estimation of land sales and value capture. As the member knows, value capture can be implemented through a number of mechanisms. One is a concept that we are looking at in relation to developer contributions, and that is the work that is being undertaken at the moment. I want an outline of that to make sure it is fair. Also, we are looking at the existing developer contribution model for other infrastructure in the community, because I think that is a bit unfair with regard to costs. We are working on that. There are a number of different ways of determining what value capture represents, and another one is value uplift through government-owned land. In a sense, those are the two concepts of value capture. The methodology for the one applied to the private sector is still being worked on. In this year’s budget we concentrated more on land sales. As I said, the land sales include part of a concept of value capture because it is government-owned land adjacent to infrastructure that we will sell, which will include some portion of uplift because of the infrastructure. That has been included, but as to the concept of the value capture disappearing, it is part of the land sales, and it is something we are still working on for the next budget.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Could the minister please provide the total budgeted costs for the Yanchep line, and the breakdown of the contributions from the federal and state governments, and “other”, and provide a breakdown of what “other” is? I am still a bit confused about how originally over \$100 million was coming from value capture, but I still cannot see the \$100 million in that other pile. I am keen to understand the total cost of this project, what is the federal contribution, what is the state contribution and what is the other.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will just go again through the \$100 million that disappeared. It did not disappear; it was just subsumed into the \$305 million figure. The member said that last year there was a \$100 million figure for land

sales and value capture. That is now a \$305 million figure of land sales across the forward estimates, and that includes —

Mr D.C. Nalder: Is that for other projects as well?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, it is an amount that we anticipate for land sales, but it includes the \$105 million that was in last year's budget, if the member knows what I am saying. There was \$105 million last year for land sales and value capture. That has now been superseded by the land sales. That is government land sales, which implicitly includes some value uplift, which is a measure of value capture, but we are still working on the other value capture mechanism, and we will finalise it within the next six to eight months.

Mr D.C. NALDER: To go back to my original question, can I still get the answer for the total cost of the project, the total contribution by the federal government, the total contribution by the state government, and what total contribution is for the "other" expected to be in this budget?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Which project is the member referring to?

Mr D.C. Nalder: We are still talking about the Yanchep rail extension.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The budget is \$420.2 million. That is the Public Transport Authority budget. There is another \$100 million from the Western Australian Planning Commission. The \$420 million comprises a commonwealth contribution of \$350 million and a \$170 million state contribution.

Mr D.C. NALDER: That does not add up. I am trying to work out the total budget cost for the Yanchep line, which includes everything. What is the total expense? There are three components to that. There is a federal component, a state component and the "other", which is land sales, value capture et cetera. I am trying to understand what are the totals of those three, and that should add up to the total budgeted cost of the Yanchep line. I just got confused with the \$400 million number.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The total is \$520 million. It is \$350 million. It is the Perth Freight Link funds that have been redistributed, basically.

Mr D.C. Nalder: That is the commonwealth funds—the \$350 million.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, and the state contribution to PFL is the other bit.

Mr D.C. Nalder: It is still state funding, though.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes.

Mr D.C. Nalder: How much was the state contribution?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It was \$170 million.

Mr D.C. NALDER: The sum of \$350 million and \$170 million is \$520 million. I am now confused. I am trying to break it into the three components, so what is the state contribution? There is a value capture and land sale figure, but it is separate again, because the government is doing something that is a little bit different and is creating a different budget. It is not going against debt or anything like that. I am actually breaking that into a third component. I imagine, of the \$170 million, some is state funding and some is land sales and value capture. Can I just get clarity around that?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No value capture for the Yanchep rail line is currently built into the numbers.

Mr D.C. NALDER: So, there is no value capture, yet what was in the previous year's budget was value capture. We talked about value capture; I think it was about \$105 million in the 2017–18 budget. I am just trying to understand. Does the \$170 million include land sales or is that just going to increase state debt by \$170 million? How is that being funded? I am still trying to work out how this is being funded.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yanchep and Thornlie were primarily PFL redirections. The funds that were for PFL—that is the state and the federal contributions to PFL—have been redirected to these two projects. The state and commonwealth contributions to PFL were then put to these.

Mr D.C. NALDER: The Perth Freight Link was about a 60–40 split. It was a bit more than that, because it was complicated, but it was about a 60–40 split. The minister is telling me that it was a 60–40 split there, and there is no land sale figure associated with the Yanchep line now. Before, the minister told me there were land sales, so I am now confused. Is Yanchep now solely PFL, or are there land sales, as the minister told me there were land sales with some uplift in value capture? I am trying to understand what the government is actually doing and how it is funding this.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: With Metronet, we have tried to create, in a sense, a pool of funds, if the member understands what I am saying. We have the individual projects, and now we are looking at how we can raise revenue through land sales and other mechanisms, and then put it into that pool of funds. In relation to these two projects, I will go

through the financials again. I will get clarification on the financials again, but we are basically using PFL funds and redirecting them. Does the member have the *Budget Statements* with him, because that might help?

Mr D.C. Nalder: No, I do not have the budget with me.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: For example, the Yanchep rail extension has two lines—the Public Transport Authority contribution and the WAPC contribution. The PTA contribution is \$420 million and the WAPC is \$100 million, so that is the land sales. Sorry, I will correct that—that is the land sales contribution going to Yanchep. Thornlie-Cockburn is \$535 million, and that is basically PFL funds. That is how it is broken up.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Now I am confused more. Can I just confirm that we are establishing the Yanchep line, where there is \$100 million that will be from land sales that may have some value capture built into it or whatever? That is an estimate, but that is what is being booked. That means that there is \$420 million that has come in from the PFL. Is that \$420 million split on a 60–40 basis, because then the \$350 million does not add up? I do not care that the government has value capture, and that the minister tells me it is going to do these things, but from a budgetary perspective, she still has to book a number. What I find difficult when I read the budget is that it was not really transparent or clear what the specific costs of these projects were. I do not find that acceptable, and we should not, because we should be able to see the cost of the project and where the money is coming from. If there is a redirection, there should be a line item or a footnote explaining that this is a redirection, but if it is a redirection from the PFL, it should be the same split that was on the PFL. We should be able to see what was the federal contribution to the PFL that has been redirected, and what is the state contribution to the PFL that has been redirected. I am still seeking clarity, across those three buckets, on exactly how much money, which I believe is \$520 million, came from the feds, what dollars came from the state that we are incurring debt for, and what dollars we expect to raise through land sales, value capture or other mechanisms the government may have. We need to have them specific, because it is not specific.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: At page 138 of the budget, there are two lines for the Yanchep rail extension—\$100 million from the WAPC through the MRIF contribution, and PTA funding of \$420 million. I will get this confirmed for the third reading, but the \$420 million is about 70–30. That is the split.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Is it 70–30 or 60–40? It was about 66 —

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I thought 65–35, but we will get that confirmation and at the third reading I will tell the member the exact data. In last year's budget, we put in an estimate for value capture and land sales. That is the one that the member started from—the beginning point—which is \$100 million. We have gone through the process, and we have worked with Treasury in particular on the land sales component and on identifying land that could potentially be sold and also on trying to get some estimates for that. We are still finalising the mechanism for the value capture, so the agreement with Treasury was that we would not show any amount against value capture per se. We have, therefore, concentrated on land sales in this budget, and that is why we have identified the land sales and are working through that. As the member knows, government agencies—LandCorp and the Department of Communities—normally purchase land for housing development. This is an issue that the Leader of the Opposition raised. They will be helping to purchase WAPC-owned land, and that will help fund the Metronet program. That will provide a bit of certainty to the numbers, because a lot of that will be government program purchases. Again, we are working with Treasury on that, because it does not want any risks in our land sales program. That is why we have done it in this way and have been pretty conservative in our land acquisition numbers.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Thank you. I understand that I will get specifics on the breakdown of state–federal, but it is a PFL redirection and it is probably on the same proportion, or should be on the same proportion. Okay. Just to extend that to the \$100 million that will come from land sales, I am trying to understand how realistic that is. Previous governments have attempted land sales, and I know it is a long process. Are the land sales that the minister is looking to do to underpin this project in the specific location for which the minister is trying to gain a benefit by value-adding? The minister said that there is potentially a value-capture mechanism or increment in there. Is the land that the state is looking to sell to developers in that vicinity? How will that come about?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There are a number of components. Again, Treasury is very keen that we do not double-count for future land sales, as the member would expect. As the member knows, a land sales program is currently in place, which we are continuing. That is looking at land that is required by government agencies and looking to sell that. On top of that, we have identified a significant amount of government-owned land around the corridors, in particular the Ellenbrook corridor, that has not yet been identified through any processes for sale. There is probably some land Malaga way. There is a lot of land around the place that will be worked through the planning process in relation to some greenfield developments but also other parcels of land adjacent to other parts of the rail infrastructure. That process is underway. LandCorp and the Department of Communities have their own land acquisition program. We will be working with those agencies and directing some of their activities into purchasing land that is part of the WAPC landholding and has come about as result of our planning for the new corridors, in particular the Ellenbrook corridor, which will create the potential for land sales in that area. Just to explain the

process, there is the existing process and the understanding that we do not want to double-count that land, and there is also the new process. The new process is really looking more in globo, which is the word used in the industry, at bigger parcels of land adjacent to, in particular, the Ellenbrook corridor.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Just to clarify this further, some of that \$100 million is already in the system and it is just the value of the land that will be caught and applied to the Yanchep line. I would imagine that if the land around the Ellenbrook corridor is sold, the proceeds would be for the Ellenbrook line, or will this be in globo, and, as the government makes the money, it will be allocated to where it needs to be allocated?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Apparently, it is in globo, which is basically a program of development and a program of delivery. Our process is to see where land can be developed and how it can be sold, and working on that to match our funding requirements. We are working very hard. As the member knows, Treasury is not easy on these issues. We have to convince Treasury every step of the way of our process, and we are involving Treasury very directly so that it can be confident that we do not double-count land and that our land assumptions are very strong. We believe, for example, that this number could be bigger, but we are working on that to, again, justify the future numbers for Treasury. The other issue is how we value the land and at which part of the planning cycle this land is valued. I always hear the comment about some of the LandCorp valuations, for example, that in some instances land is undervalued in its books. That is an issue of further work, points of valuation and also points in the planning process and when that valuation is created.

Mr D.C. NALDER: To wrap this up, essentially the total cost is \$520 million, and roughly \$420 million is locked away because it is the reallocation of the PFL funding, on the same split as the one for the PFL, but the minister will clarify that at the third reading. However, the \$100 million is probably still a bit vague and at risk, because although the minister says she has got that covered because the government has been conservative in its assessments on the property, it is still not clear, because the state still needs to go through that sale process to realise that money and be able to allocate it to these projects. That is how I am summing it up at this point.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I think the \$100 million is absolutely solid, because it is in the MRIF budget. I would say there is zero risk about that \$100 million, because it is revenue that is in the existing forward estimates and in the MRIF budget. Also, agencies like LandCorp and the Department of Communities have an acquisition budget, and that acquisition budget is solid, too, because it is in the forward estimates. In some instances, that acquisition budget moves to WAPC, as I understand it, and then it moves to the Metronet budget. That is the flow. It is a complex flow, but the aim is to ensure that we provide as much certainty in the numbers as we can. That is why for the first \$100 million in particular, and the first \$300 million, we are very, very confident about the land sales numbers. As I said, for the ones that Treasury was not confident about, we are working through that, because we believe there is more revenue that we can deliver. Treasury does not let us put the numbers in the books unless we are confident about them.

Mr D.C. NALDER: This is the final question on this line. When does this land need to be sold, and in what years do these land sales need to be finalised to realise the money to be able to pay for this construction?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Again, the forward estimates at page 138 show the breakdown of that \$100 million at \$30 million and \$70 million. I understand the \$30 million is an expense impact, and that \$30 million will come in in 2019–20. The other remaining land sales is \$70 million between 2021 and 2022.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Just to finish off on the finance side, the minister mentioned in her second reading speech that the alignment covers three stations—Alkimos, Eglinton and Yanchep. This alignment allows the government to construct as many stations as it likes anywhere it likes within a mile. I am seeking clarification that the money that we have been talking about includes the construction of those three stations. Also, were there any developer contributions in terms of cash or land for any of this development?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Yanchep rail line includes three stations—Alkimos, Eglinton and Yanchep. In relation to specific developer contributions—for example, for Alkimos—that has not been built in. We want to get the value capture mechanism done, and then we will have that fair mechanism that we can apply to all the developers and work with those. We have not included that revenue, which I think will occur. Again, that is why we are being conservative about the numbers. There is a lot of upside for us with the potential revenue. Every time we get more revenue from other parties, it potentially reduces the state contribution, which we will redirect to other projects. We have not included it in that. That is not to say that we will not have those negotiations. We just did not think we could ask one developer to contribute without having developed the mechanism that would be applied to all the developments in a fair way. That means that everybody who meets that particular criteria will get that particular benefit, whether that benefit is in the structure of the station or the location of the station. We are creating a mechanism that allows us to deal with the development industry in a fair and equitable way across all the rail lines. That is why the process has taken 14 months to develop. The member will be aware that there is currently a developer contribution model for all greenfield developments. The development industry is not happy with the current developer contribution model. There are a lot of issues with that. Again, I did not want to develop a value-capture model that was inconsistent with the existing model or that created more red tape, so we are trying

to make one model that works for the value capture for Metronet, but also for the development industry and developer contributions more generally.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I understand. Whatever the government gets will be a bonus. I understand the difficulties of doing this, because the design of the station can be absolutely fantastic or not, depending on access, the roads and the construction. It is tricky. Who is doing that negotiation? Is it the Public Transport Authority or does the minister have a special team?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Metronet team is developing the mechanism and, in particular, it is being led by the station precincts team. There is the Metronet team and the different arms—the infrastructure arm and the precinct planning arm. The station precincts team is developing the mechanism in conjunction with the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage. Industry talks to the Metronet team all the time. As I have said, we have not said this is how much we want or how this is going to be applied until we finish that mechanism. That will be done through an appropriate group set up as part of Metronet. Currently, we are not at that level of detail. Department of Finance and Department of Transport economists are also involved in developing the value-capture mechanism.

Mr W.R. MARMION: In terms of the deviation from the average 40-metre corridor, which the minister can also clarify in her answer, there are two lines; there are electrified lines north and south in that corridor. Obviously, there will be a deviation past the 40 metres at the stations. Are there any other locations or aspects of the infrastructure, apart from the stations—I suggest that one spot could be where trains are parked—where the government will have to deviate past the 40 metres?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am advised that there is not for Yanchep, which is slightly wider for the stowage of trains. There is also some requirement for drainage corridors outside the 40 metres. Also, where there is Bush Forever, there are issues to do with fire and emergency services access. Those are the areas where we will deviate beyond the 40 metres.

Mr W.R. MARMION: In terms of the design aspects, we are talking only about the termination point and the alignment. Will the station be at the termination point on the Yanchep rail extension—I will not read out the bearings—or will the station be a little further to the south? The alignment goes a little past the station to allow for the storage of trains?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is the latter. Those coordinates are 500 metres north of the train station.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I am looking at the alignment and there are no radiuses obviously, because that will be in the detailed design. I note that there are some tighter radiuses on the alignment, except for the start and stop on the other alignment. Can the minister advise what the maximum speed of the trains will be on that particular alignment, given that there are some curves?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is designed for 130 kilometres, which is consistent with the rest of the Joondalup line.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Is it likely that the three stations at Alkimos, Eglinton and Yanchep will be constructed concurrently or will they be staged; and, if so, what will be the staging of them?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I said, we are going to procurement soon, but we will take advice from the successful tenderer on how it will deliver these stations and whether it will do them simultaneously or at different stages. We will take advice from the successful tenderer on how it plans to deliver them. For example, the Mandurah rail line was done in seven different packages, and, as I recall, there were a lot of interface issues between the seven different contractors. This will be done by one contractor. Again, it will work to see how it can deliver in the best possible way. They are all scheduled to open at the same time, but how the contractor constructs them will be up to it.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Part of the reason for my question is that I understand that there is a significant LandCorp holding around Alkimos and there are other property owners around Eglinton and Yanchep. I am interested to know whether it is likely that there will be a joint venture between the owners of the land in the vicinity of the stations and the proponent who might build the stations. Is that what the minister is expecting as part of the process?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am not really expecting that. This will create enormous opportunities for everyone along that line, as we know. It will create enormous competition. It is very important to make sure that we have a fair and equitable process. Building superb train stations in these areas facilitates a lot of land development and housing outcomes. We do not envisage that the successful tenderer will be a joint venture with any particular developer. That is not how we see things forming.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Further to that question about the stations, the minister mentioned the value of housing. One of the balancing acts with housing is to have enough parking bays for people. One of the problems we had when we came to government was that the Mandurah line was so successful that there were not enough parking bays. People who lived in Mandurah—my parents lived in Mandurah—could not get a parking spot, so they would drive to the next station. I heard stories about people who had planned to park at Murdoch but they could not and

they ended up driving in. One of the important planning aspects of the railway stations is adequate parking, and that means land acquisition if necessary because that will form part of the land required for the station. Has the minister worked out how many parking bays might be needed when the initial line is opened? Is she also allowing for increased parking? As development around the train line expands over the next 20 or 30 years, obviously more car parking bays will be needed. Have those aspects been considered? Does the minister have the number of car parking bays?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Location of car parks and the form of car parks is something that we are putting a lot of attention towards. As the member knows, in Forrestfield, we are looking at how we can deliver those car parks in a different way. I will say a couple of things. First, location is important, and the infrastructure group and the planning group are debating where the car park should be. What we are trying to do in the design of the car parks is facilitate strong activity close to the stations. We may see car parks in different places and I am very keen to continue to explore the concept of multistorey car parks.

In relation to the Yanchep rail line, there will be approximately 2 000 car parking bays across the three stations. That is the current forecast, but we will have the capacity to increase that number. Again, we are looking at decking options in those areas, particularly where we have a town centre feel. In Yanchep and Alkimos in particular, we are looking at deck parking and a town centre approach—if it can be combined with some sort of commercial operation, that is what we are looking at. Again, there are differing views over time. For example, the rail line south was very, very popular, but if we look at Aubin Grove and some of the car park usage numbers there, we are learning from that as well. We are always looking at how we can improve, but the key focus is how we can create and maintain activity around the stations and create a feeling of safety and promote activity.

Mr W.R. MARMION: The ideal solution, as the minister hinted to, is having multistorey car parks because they take up less land. However, they cost money. If the budget is defined and the government decides to put in a multistorey car park, it is a considerable capital cost. I have done business cases on car parks; friends of mine ran Wilson Parking. I suppose that other things can be done, but then the consumer has to be charged. If the government has a defined budget and it decides to put in a multistorey car park, the only way it could do that and not change the budget would be if a developer threw in some money. I think the minister alluded to that being a way it could work: a development activity could help to pay for the car park through a developer. Could the minister clarify whether I am on the right track?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The current budget is for the car parks to be at-grade, but there are a couple of things. Firstly, the member is right; a multi-deck or multistorey car park is more expensive. However, it would free up other land that is at-grade—and particularly if government owns that land and it can now be sold for development, revenue could potentially be recouped from land sales by the land that was going to be used for at-grade parking. Secondly, the member is right; if the private sector comes to us and says, “We can build an X-storey building” and offers us concessional access to two storeys of the car park, but we want to be able to develop and own three storeys above all that, we may engage with the sector. The other issue, which I think will potentially come about through strata title reform, is the concept of leasehold strata and how that can allow government to retain ownership of land, particularly in proximity to rail stations. Over time, when the requirements for a car park change—for example, if the government has underlying ownership—it might be able to facilitate further commercial development.

The member for Bateman is not here, but I want to clarify the figures for Yanchep. It is \$520 million. The commonwealth is providing \$350 million, which is the number I said before, and \$170 million is coming from the state, which is \$100 million from the Western Australian Planning Commission and \$70 million from other contributions through the Perth Freight Link funds.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I have a question related to the environmental aspects that the government is going to have to go through with the Environmental Protection Authority. It has been alluded to that as the site is Bush Forever land, which is considered to be very good quality bush, offsets will be one option. That is not the minister’s department; the environmental department will have to deal with it. The question is about what offsets might be done and who decides. Who is the person or group that decides and tells the Minister for Transport or her department, “This is the law” and that there will have to be 10 times, 15.3 times, 20 times or 22.3 times the area that will be cleared to offset it? It is a very grey area and it costs governments lots of money when 20 times the area of land has to be found and the quality of that bush is subjective. I would like the minister’s comment on that.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There has been a lot of engagement with the commonwealth environmental agencies and the state environmental agencies, in particular the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions. We are in early discussions. We work with them to identify the offset strategy. Main Roads does this all the time and the Public Transport Authority does it when infrastructure is built. There is a strategy to assist with identifying offsets. Some work is undertaken through the soil and plant analysis process, for example, to initially identify retention layers. Work has been done, in particular during the last two or three years, to identify areas that would be required to offset major projects.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Offsets are sort of a favourite topic of mine. Regarding sustainability, we will get to a stage in 50 years when there will not be any land left to build anything on because it is all offset. It might be okay now to have 20 times the land area offset, but in 50 years, all the land will be offset. Who looks after the offset land is another issue. If there is a vested interest in the environmental agency to have large parcels of land offset and it ends up owning it, the state government has to manage these large parcels of land. It is a complex policy, which I am very concerned about.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am concerned about it, too. It is something that occurs across governments. The Mangles Bay marina development is an example. It created the opportunity to save Bush Forever land that was not going to be saved. Of course, there was also the Roe 8 decision more generally about the reserves that we can create. It is complex, but decisions are made both ways that sometimes increase the conservation and reservation aspect, but other decisions require land for infrastructure. The environmental processes are thorough. Every project that we do is costed. The community expects and demands these processes. Over time, this dialogue will continue to change and get more sophisticated, in particular, as we face the challenges the member highlighted about what happens when we run out of land to offset but we need to build infrastructure. I think we will probably face that down the track, but work was undertaken through Perth and Peel@3.5 million and also as a result of some of the early work done on soil and plant analysis. The federal government, too, increasingly identifies threatened species, which creates a lot of challenges for everybody. Again, we are working with the development industry and the federal government agencies so they can better understand our environment and how we need to work together.

Mr W.R. MARMION: The problem we have with Bush Forever land, and the minister might correct me, is that I understand it was a desktop study done by the Western Australian Planning Commission, so it was not even done by the Department of Environment Regulation. I was around in those days. It was a desktop study by someone in the WAPC. From aerial photos, it came up with land parcels that looked like nice bush and they were probably right 80 per cent of the time. There was feedback from some people that it was not, but we can assume that that is what happened. As it was so diligent in saving this lovely Bush Forever land, when we started doing offsets, that land was not counted. If they had not done that, we would have had all this Bush Forever to use as offsets. Western Australia—commonwealth offsets were mentioned—was already ahead of the game with its own offset program, which is Bush Forever. But it does not count as offsets because when the commonwealth brought in its legislation, the line was drawn. I do not know how we can unravel that. We have been very good in keeping pristine bush through the good side of the Western Australian Planning Commission's Bush Forever plan; it is preserved. The bad side is that when we need offsets, we are behind the eight ball.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I agree; government policy does not normally reward past good behaviour. That is pretty much what happens.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Can the minister advise what the size and asset value of the LandCorp holdings at Alkimos are at present?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I can get that information for the member. I am sorry; I do not have the LandCorp asset base at Alkimos with me at the moment.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: There are a few things we need to follow up. Is the minister likely to do the third reading today or next week?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We hope to do the third reading, so we will urgently try to get that information for the member.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5 put and passed.

Clause 6: Planning approval not required for certain METRONET works —

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Can the minister expand a little more on clause 6? There are Metronet works on non-rail land that can be commenced or carried out without approval. This is about projects that can be commenced without approval from the Planning Commission. What approvals will be required before the Metronet works or Metronet rail projects can commence if approval from the Planning Commission is not needed?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Because this is specific legislation, we do not need approval for the construction of the rail line. We need environmental approvals, so that will continue. We also need the specific approvals for the development of the stations, so we need the normal planning approvals as part of that.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I will use this opportunity to move back to the Thornlie line and clearing. I neglected to ask about the design speed. I know the design speed is 130 kilometres an hour, but the turn-off just past south of Beckenham and the turn back onto the Mandurah line looks like a reasonably tight radius. I am wondering what the design speeds are for that to exit and enter the two existing lines.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, the member is right. The Thornlie train will be taking that curvature anyway as it goes from Beckenham through to Thornlie. The member is right about the Cockburn link. Yes; they would have to slow

down to, we are estimating, approximately 90 kilometres an hour, but we will try to get that confirmed for the member.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I do not need it. I know they will have to slow down, and obviously there is a trade-off between the land required to clear and getting a larger radius in, so I can understand that. This clause relates specifically to the clearing. Does the minister have an estimate of the amount of clearing that has to be done for the project on both the actual rail alignment and non-railway land that the minister will have to submit to the Environmental Protection Authority?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We will get that information for the member, but some of the figures I have indicate that it is 23.7 hectares of bushland for the Thornlie–Cockburn line, and I will get confirmation of the Yanchep one for him in a minute.

Mr W.R. MARMION: One final question I have is: what patronage is anticipated for both lines? We have heard that the figures for the current line to Mandurah are sensational. What might be the figures on opening and after it has been in operation—I can get these on notice—for, say, three years later?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: On the day of the Thornlie–Cockburn Link opening, approximately 12 000 is anticipated, which is forecast to grow to 17 000 by 2031. For Yanchep, in 2021, it is 5 300 and approximately 19 000 in 2031.

Clause put and passed.

Schedules 1 and 2 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to third reading.

Third Reading

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport) [4.47 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [4.48 pm]: I am just filling in time because the minister undertook to get us some information for the third reading debate of the Railway (METRONET) Bill 2018. The member for Bateman asked for a specific breakdown of the total cost of the project—federal and state money—and what was anticipated for value capture for both the Thornlie–Cockburn line and the Yanchep line. We are waiting for that information to be provided by the minister. We are also waiting on information with respect to the size and value of the LandCorp asset held at Alkimos. While we are waiting for that information, I will take a few moments to fill in.

I make clear to the chamber that we support the rail projects. The former Liberal–National government had a history of supporting rail projects. I articulated in my second reading contribution that we put a lot of effort into planning for Perth and Peel@3.5 million. We had an integrated transport plan for rail, road and cycle pathways that sat within Perth and Peel@3.5 million. I articulated in my second reading contribution that all these projects form part of the transport plan put together by the members for Bateman and Nedlands when they each held the transport portfolio. We support these projects, but the role of the opposition is to always interrogate on behalf of taxpayers the government's intentions to make sure we are getting clear answers on the cost of projects, when they are required, and what the anticipated value uplift in benefit to taxpayers will be for projects such as these, the timing of these projects, when they are anticipated to be ready for taxpayers' use, and the patronage numbers anticipated on these rail lines. We also need to interrogate and understand any problems that might sit within the project definition plans. During consideration in detail, issues were raised about the infrastructure assets held within the freight corridor on the Thornlie–Cockburn Link. There are a lot of interests there. The minister could not articulate where negotiations are up to with the owners of that infrastructure. Understandably, if negotiations are in train, we do not want the activities of this chamber to in any way cause a disbenefit to taxpayers with respect to those negotiations. But they are not insignificant. ATCO Gas has a gas pipeline through that freight corridor, and BP has an oil pipeline running through that corridor. Arc Infrastructure runs a freight line through that corridor that will need to be moved. Freight movements will need to be managed. I understand that there are also Water Corporation sewerage assets and Western Power assets that sit within that 40-metre corridor allocated for a freight line and an electrified passenger rail line.

These are important things for us to ask of the government to understand the technical difficulties with a job like this. Indeed, getting full and frank answers in this place to some of the questions asked might even give the government an opportunity further down the track—should the time lines not be met with a 2021 opening date and operational date for these rail extensions—to express in this place a good reason for those time lines not being met, being the difficulty of negotiations around moving infrastructure that belongs to other entities but that sits adjacent to where we would choose to put our electrified rail assets. It is not an easy thing. Electrified rail assets are often

not good neighbours to certain forms of infrastructure. The problems with the electrification assets need to be ironed out and taken care of to ensure the safety of every user of that freight corridor.

There were a lot of questions from us to try to understand when the anticipated stimulus to development will occur along the Yanchep line, for example. Train stations are proposed for Alkimos, Eglinton and Yanchep. Which projects are likely to get the go-ahead? There are a lot of government assets held by LandCorp, in partnership, I believe, with other private sector developer proponents, but there is also a lot of privately held land owned by various property-holding companies. There may be a race to develop, but there may also be a race to not develop. Some of these individual property owners might prefer to sit on that land for a period until there is a higher value uplift available to them. We need to understand that there needs to be some incentive provided to those property owners to develop that land and make it available, thereby making the significant investment in this rail infrastructure of \$520 million viable at an earlier point in time by way of patronage figures, rather than at a point further into the future.

It is important that we try to understand those issues and have that information available to this Parliament, so that taxpayers can understand exactly what they are up for. People who wish to move into that northern corridor will be interested to know when the right time to move is, when will they get the cheapest land, when the developer contributions will come into play, whether that will be passed on to consumers, whether they should get in at the front end or back end, or whether they should wait until the whole thing has settled down and look at moving there in the future after further development of the Yanchep and Alkimos town centres—all those sorts of considerations. Any indication, minister, as to where that —

Ms R. Saffioti: I have all the info.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The minister does? Terrific.

Not wanting to hold people back past the expected rising time of this Parliament, I conclude my remarks by thanking the minister and her adviser for answering our questions. I thank members for their contributions, and state unequivocally that the opposition will relentlessly interrogate legislation and projects that the government has on the go. That is our job. Because we interrogate and question the timing and viability of them, that does not mean we do not support them. It just means we are doing our job in opposition in ensuring that we get the best understanding of the potential problems, pitfalls, cost overruns and time overruns—all the sorts of things that might occur—around these very big infrastructure projects that our economy is now becoming quite reliant on. With those comments, I conclude my contribution.

MR S.K. L'ESTRANGE (Churchlands) [4.57 pm]: I rise very briefly at the third reading stage of the Railway (METRONET) Bill 2018 to reiterate some points. The Minister for Transport tried to score some political points during question time today, so I want to make sure that the context of what I said is not misunderstood at this third reading stage, because it is important. During the second reading debate this morning, I said that this is not a debate against public transport networks. Neither I nor the opposition was taking a position that this is a debate in opposition to rail in metropolitan Perth. In fact, I said, and I quote —

We absolutely need to maintain an effective transport system ...

I also articulated that the Perth and Peel@3.5 million transport plan very clearly outlined some of the important network requirements of a population of 3.5 million. That is important. But the context was how we go about setting up these programs through this bill. I reiterate that the priorities of government must focus on what it can afford of the commitments it went into the last election with. Those priorities were very clear. One was to pay down debt like a mortgage. It is very important. At a time when there are rapid technological advancements in transport options around the world and in how different cities around the world are looking at public transport options, the last thing we want to do as a Parliament is not give due consideration to whether we should build a rail line as opposed to a better highway system or a better futuristic transit system that may have automated, driverless vehicles, ride-sharing options, and things like this, which could cause commuters to choose different options for getting themselves in and around our city. That is as opposed to what we could be committing to do in this Parliament in 2018. That is what I was trying to highlight in my speech.

It is very important that we always have an opportunity in this place. It is the role of opposition to make sure it prosecutes some arguments to make people think. Very often, ministers will lock themselves into a course of action and the backbenchers will lock in behind the minister because that is what happens in government. Government backbenchers rarely oppose a government bill. But the role of the opposition is to ask the questions: what are the priorities of government now? By this bill, the government is committing to six rail lines in addition to existing commitments. What is the ongoing operating subsidy going to be? What is the affordability to the people of Western Australia for that operating subsidy going to be now and into the future? These are fair questions that we are asking on behalf of the people of Western Australia. As an opposition, it is our role to be that voice for the community of Western Australia. It is our role to put these questions. We know the government has a Metronet

transport plan and we know that it took it to the election, but it also took to the election that it was going to pay off debt like a mortgage. Prioritise those Metronet line options and at the same time prioritise what else is needed in the community, be it a new hospital, such as the movement of King Edward Memorial Hospital for Women to the Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre precinct, the replacement for Graylands Hospital, or upgrades to existing hospital infrastructure so it can cope with an increasing and ageing population in metropolitan Perth and in Western Australia. These are very fair questions.

Whilst looking for political expediency in question time, the minister made out that the member for Churchlands is absolutely opposed to rail in metropolitan Perth. That was not what I was saying at all. All I was saying was that we need to look at whether the rail we are committing to now through this bill is going to be the best option for moving people around metropolitan Perth in 20, 40 or 60 years' time. That is a very fair question. These operating subsidies will extend into that period I just mentioned. I just ask the minister to take on board that we all acknowledge that the Department of Transport has a Perth and Peel@3.5 million transport plan. It was a robust plan; it was put together by a specialist. It was essentially apolitical in how it was drafted because it actually left it up to the government of the day, be it Labor or Liberal, to determine its transport priorities in the context of its government priorities and in the context of what it could afford. That is why that plan was written the way it was written—so that a government does not have to follow a previous government's agenda. It can set its own agenda but it has to approach its own agenda in the context of the debt situation for Western Australia, in the context of when we can return to budget surpluses to start paying down debt, and in the context of the other commitments in those three other critical areas of looking after the people of Western Australia. Those critical areas are health, law and order, and, of course, education. That is the point I was making.

I urge the minister to step up a bit beyond partisan political pointscore and understand that they were my points of view that I raised during my reply to the second reading. The minister will note that I quoted several other people in my speech. They are not just my views; they are the views of other people who show an interest in this particular field of endeavour—public transport in Western Australia. The minister should actually take a considered view about what is being said and try to ease back on the gas in attacking me and trying to make political points.

I do not need to say much more about this bill. As I said in my reply to the second reading, this bill has the support of the opposition. It is clearly a government bill that the government took to the election. I am just representing those Western Australians who are asking the government to look carefully at public transport patronage numbers, to look carefully at the changing nature of technology and automation that is going on in the transport sector right now, and to look very carefully at debt and deficits and what it can afford now and into the future.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport) [5.05 pm] — in reply: I will just address the outstanding issues as I committed to. The advice from LandCorp is that Alkimos Central is valued at between \$70 million and \$75 million on its books. In relation to the bush for Yanchep, it is approximately 28 hectares. In relation to the composition of the funding for Yanchep, as highlighted before, and I want to make sure I clear that up, it is \$350 million from the commonwealth and \$170 million from the state, which includes land sales and other contributions—for example, the redirection of Perth Freight Link funds. For Thornlie-Cockburn, it is \$535 million—\$185 million from the state and \$350 million from the commonwealth. That is all correct. I think they were the outstanding issues.

The member for Churchlands talked about autonomous vehicles. I did not address this in my second reading reply, but I want to address this now. Autonomous vehicles do not mean we do not need mass transit systems. Thinking about autonomous vehicles, we can increase the capacity of existing roads, but there is also a limit—there is a finite number. People may think it will end the need for mass transit; I do not think it will. It creates more challenges for congestion. My view is that we will see autonomous vehicles interacting with train stations and being the first and last mile concept. People will get in their autonomous vehicle, be dropped off at the train station and the trains will take them. Ultimately, if everyone gets autonomous vehicles and everyone goes onto the road and no-one uses the train system, the whole place will shut down. Although the capacity is increased, there is a finite limit.

As members would be aware, I did not interject during the second reading debate. I answered all the questions that were asked of me. But coming in here now and trying to correct the record, the member for Churchlands should apologise. You should not say that it is bad that I picked up what you said and threw it back at you because you deserved it, to be honest. You sit there as a bully and interject and say awful things about everybody on this side. Then, when you went too far—I know you went too far because I saw the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Scarborough talking about it. You went too far. You talked about rail lines being narcissistic monuments to people. That is what you said. I know you are shaking your head. I know you have got it wrong. You said that Metronet was a white elephant program. You went too far.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: Member, I didn't say that it was a white elephant. I said that you don't want to leave the people of Western Australia with a white elephant.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Member for Churchlands, you sit there with the arrogance of someone who has never had to debate the issues—who walked in, got a cabinet position and did nothing! You come in here and bully, trying to intimidate people on this side with your incessant interjections. Then we hold up a mirror to what you said—you know you got it wrong! That is why you were sent in.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: I did not interject on any of your members who were speaking, member.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: You know what you said.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: I did not interject.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: You're too cocky. You don't have the substance —

Mr D.A. Templeman: You've been caught out, mate.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: And you have been caught out.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: We're allowed to have a point of view, member.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: So it is your point of view! So now he goes back. He can't help himself.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: *Hansard* records the points of view, member. But you can't verbal me in your third reading speech!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I said, you come in—the way you treat people on this side—and you think you're so smart. You think you're so smart! We have held the mirror to what you have said to hold you to account; then you start running away from it. You called train lines “narcissistic monuments to the governments that build them”. You said Metronet —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! Leader of the House! Member for Churchlands!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: You called Metronet a “white elephant” program. That is what you did. During question time, I saw the Leader of the Opposition shaking his head because everyone on your side knows that you went too far. Of course, oppositions scrutinise and analyse legislation; that is what they are meant to do, and when there are questions about things, I answer them. But do not come in here being the empty bully that you are. That is what you are. You come in here, always intimidating or interjecting on people on this side, thinking you know it all. You have never been challenged properly. As a minister, you did nothing —

Mr S.K. L'Estrange interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Churchlands! You are on two calls, and you are very close to being on three. We are nearly done.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As minister, you went around and were happy to take a salary and do nothing to improve the lives of Western Australians —

Point of Order

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: This is the reply to the third reading debate. The minister is not allowed to digress from the topic of the third reading debate. She is now talking about my performance as minister, which has absolutely nothing to do with the subject of this bill.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I said —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price): Minister, silence, thank you. There is no point of order. The minister is actually picking up on comments the member made in his contribution to the third reading debate. If the minister could get on with it, it would be much appreciated by everyone. Thank you.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: To all those West Coast Eagles supporters, I am sorry! There is still plenty of time for the Socceroos game, particularly if they are on Optus!

You came in here and you wanted to restart this debate. As I said, I appreciate analysis of what we do. We put a plan to the electorate before the last election and we are every day going about executing that plan. We are working through it with Infrastructure Australia and jumping through the hoops—stage 1 business case, stage 2 business case, stage 3 business case, stage 4 business case. The Infrastructure Australia process is rigorous, but we are doing it, and we are treating everybody fairly in the process. Today the Liberal Party made a very big mistake when it once again showed itself to be the party that does not believe in public transport. Members opposite

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 21 June 2018]

p3709b-3724a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange

can put whatever they want on a flyer, and they can do whatever they want at the polling booths, but the people of Western Australia know that only WA Labor supports public transport. Next time, the opposition should have a strategy meeting and work out what it is going to say, but its stupid contributions today have exposed the Liberal Party for another four years.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 5.13 pm
