

CORRECTED PROOF
GENERAL PURPOSE STANDING COMMITTEE NO. 3

Tuesday 9 October 2012

Examination of proposed expenditure for the portfolio area

TRANSPORT

The Committee met at 2.00 p.m.

MEMBERS

The Hon. N. Blair (Acting-Chair)

The Hon. J. Ajaka
The Hon. C. M. Faehrmann
The Hon. P. Green

The Hon. P. G. Sharpe
The Hon. M. Veitch

PRESENT

The Hon. Gladys Berejiklian, *Minister for Transport*

CORRECTIONS TO TRANSCRIPT OF COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

Corrections should be marked on a photocopy of the proof and forwarded to:

**Budget Estimates secretariat
Room 812
Parliament House
Macquarie Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000**

ACTING-CHAIR: I declare this hearing for the inquiry into the budget estimates for 2012-13 open to the public. I welcome Minister Berejiklian and accompanying officials to this hearing. Today the Committee will examine the proposed expenditure for the portfolio of Transport. The portfolio will be examined as follows: Transport from 2.00 p.m. to 3.00 p.m.; ferries from 3.00 p.m. to 3.20 p.m.; rail from 3.30 p.m. to 4.20 p.m.; and State Transit from 4.20 p.m. to 4.40 p.m. We understand that the break-up may cross over into some areas. We will try to keep to those divisions as close as we can but there may be other areas that we need to revisit as we go through.

Before we commence I will make some comments about procedural matters. In accordance with the Legislative Council's guidelines for the broadcast of proceedings only Committee members and witnesses may be filmed or recorded. People in the public gallery should not be the primary focus of any filming or photographs. In reporting the proceedings of this Committee media must take responsibility for what they publish or what interpretation they place on anything that is said before the Committee. The guidelines for the broadcast of proceedings are available at the table by the door.

Any messages from advisers or members' staff seated in the public gallery should be delivered through the Chamber support staff or the Committee clerks. Minister, I remind you and the officers accompanying you that you are free to pass notes and refer directly to your advisers seated at the table behind you. Transcripts of this hearing will be available on the web from tomorrow morning. The House has resolved that answers to questions on notice must be provided within 21 days of receipt. I remind everyone to please switch off their mobile phones. All witnesses from departments, statutory bodies or corporations will be sworn prior to giving evidence. Minister, I remind you that do not need to be sworn as you have already sworn an oath to your office as a member of Parliament.

FERGUS GAMMIE, Deputy Director General, Transport Services, Transport for NSW, affirmed and examined:

LESLIE ROBERT WIELINGA, Director General, Transport for NSW,

CHRISTOPHER DECCAN LOCK, Deputy Director General, Transport Projects Division, Transport for NSW,

CAROLYN ANN McNALLY, Deputy Director General, Planning and Programs, Transport for NSW, and

RODD ANDREW STAPLES, Project Director, North West Rail Link, Transport for NSW, sworn and examined:

ACTING-CHAIR: I declare the proposed expenditure for the portfolio of Transport open for examination. As there is no provision for a Minister to make an opening statement before the Committee commences questioning we will begin with questions from the Opposition.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Minister, you recently told Parliament that a trip to the city by rail on the North West Rail Link initially will take about an hour and about 47 minutes after the second harbour crossing is open. Professor David Hensher from the University of Sydney's Institute of Transport and Logistic Studies has done modelling that suggests beyond Cherrybrook it will be quicker for residents of the north-west to get the bus to the city. Do you stand by your estimates of travel time?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I thank you for that question because the North West Rail Link is the State Government's key public transport infrastructure priority and it is important that as a Government we place on the record the benefits of this project. I am very pleased that since we have come to Government—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: The Government members have waived their time for questions. I have asked you a very specific question about the time it will take for commuters from the north-west to get to the city. I would appreciate it if you answered that question rather than provide a lot of extra information, which your members of the Committee have already waived their right to do.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Thank you very much but I think I had uttered about three sentences. I will take that on board but I also appreciate that as the Minister for Transport it is important to place on the record how important this project is for the future of Sydney, not just for the residents of the north-west but for anybody who catches public transport. The benefits of this project are significant. In relation to the specific issues of time savings, there is no doubt that people who use the north-west rail line will benefit significantly from the time savings. This project will obviously serve the growing demand for travel from the north-west to a range of key centres where people work, such as Epping, Macquarie Park, Chatswood and St Leonards. We know from the work we have done that about 40 per cent of commuters using the line will actually get off before the central business district. This is quite significant because it tells us a lot about the growth areas for jobs.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Thank you, Minister, but for those members of the public who want to travel to the city I want to know how long it is going to take them to get there on the Hills to Chatswood shuttle.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Certainly. As I said in Parliament, and as I am pleased to repeat today, this will have huge travel time savings for our customers. I would like to give some examples of how these time savings will benefit people.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Minister, I am not asking about time savings. I am asking about time taken. How long is it going to take people from the north-west who wish to travel to the city to get there on the Hills to Chatswood shuttle?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: As I said, I am getting to that. Obviously if you catch the train from Bella Vista to Macquarie Park commuters will save about 33 minutes each trip.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Minister, do you understand the question I am asking you? I am asking you about how long it is going to take people when they are sitting on the train. I am not asking about time saved. I am asking so that they can know how long it is going to take them to get to work in the morning.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Absolutely. I can also tell you—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Are you going to provide that answer? If you wish to provide the savings information you can put that on notice and we will read it later.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I am very interested in the Opposition's questions. If you allow me, I will get to the answer. From Cherrybrook to Macquarie Park commuters will save about 25 minutes. From Castle Hill to Chatswood commuters will save about 34 minutes. From Rouse Hill to St Leonards commuters will save about 37 minutes. We make no apologies for providing north-west Sydney with a variety of options.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Will it take them one hour to get into the city?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I also want to reiterate that the significance of this project is that since we have come to Government we have already issued—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Are you saying you do not know how long it is going to be? If you do not know then please admit that, or tell us what the answer is. I am not asking about travel time savings. When someone from the north-west gets on a train and wants to travel to the city at some point in time when the shuttle is open how long is it going to take them?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Obviously I am answering that question in relation to the savings.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: No, you are not. You are not answering it at all. I remind you that your members waived their time for you to provide this sort of background information, at your request.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Can I also say that obviously the time taken to travel to the central business district or to any other location depends on where you get onto the service. I want to make this point—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: So you do not know. Is it going to be an hour?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Can I make this point, Ms Sharpe, because you were the Parliamentary Secretary for Transport: Labor was talking about this project for 10 years.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: You have been the Minister for 18 months and it is your pet project. How long is it going to take people from the north-west to get to the city, or can you not answer that?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Regrettably the question demonstrates your lack of appreciation of the project.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: You said to Parliament on 6 September, "The trip to the city by rail from the north-west will take about an hour initially, and about 47 minutes after the second harbour crossing is opened." Do you stand by those numbers?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: If you would allow me to finish answering the question I would tell you that of course I stand by those figures. Of course I stand by the figures that we have given in Parliament and what we know of the project. What I will also say—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Thank you. That is all I wanted to know. I will move on to the next question.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Can I please finish my sentence?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: No, because you have now given me the answer to the question that I asked. My next question is: Given the modelling that the buses may be faster than the shuttle service, and given the great big question mark over the second harbour crossing, will you commit to keeping all the T-way bus services after opening the shuttle service if they provide a faster service?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Can I say I am extremely disappointed by that question because I thought after 10 years the Labor Party would actually support the north-west rail line. We know the Federal Government does not support the north-west rail line because they have said to people—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: No, they are going to fund the Pacific Highway. You have not been able to convince your own people of that. The question is very simple.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Excuse me, I have not finished.

The Hon. JOHN AJAKA: Point of order: Clearly the Minister is attempting to answer the questions asked of her. She is not being given any chance to answer those questions. If the Hon. Penny Sharpe wants to keep badgering her in relation to it she is only taking up more and more of her own time.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Ms Sharpe, please allow me to answer the question because it is very significant. The Federal Government essentially has said to people of the north-west, "Catch a bus." I am concerned now that the State Labor Party is saying the same. This is an important project. If the Labor Party does not support the project you should admit that right now. We have always said on the record that the people of the north-west deserve to have a number of options. That is why we are building the north-west rail line. It is a priority infrastructure project for the Government and it is crucial that this line is built to support the growth that is expected over the next 20 years and beyond. The north-west growth centre will grow by some 200,000 people over the coming decades.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Thank you, Minister. My question is: Do you commit, when your stated priority project is open and if Tway bus services are faster, to allowing that option to continue for the people of the north-west and to not reducing the number of services?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Can I say we have demonstrated our commitment to a number of public transport options in the north-west and—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: So you are not committing to keeping all the Tway services?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: —I will tell you how. Since we have been in government, we have actually provided 46 new services in the north-west to the city. We acknowledge that some people—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Are you committing to keeping those services?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: If you keep interrupting my answers, it will be a very long afternoon. I have barely said a sentence and you have already—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: That is okay, but I have a lot of questions.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I know, but you are only interested in listening to your questions. It is a bit disappointing.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: No, I am interested in getting an answer from you, actually.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: No. You are asking me questions, then interrupting me halfway through a sentence and then moving on to the next question. I do not really see how that is of benefit to the people of New South Wales.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: All right. Tway buses—yes, or no? Tway buses—yes, or no—and we can move on.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: We have already indicated on the public record that of course there will still be buses, express services, offered to people.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: All of them?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: You know what? If I could predict exactly how many services there were going to be when the North West Rail Line opens, I would tell you. But it would be dishonest of me to say exactly how many extra bus services there will be because there are a number of timetable changes between now and when the North West Rail Line is opening. As you can appreciate, when you are building a major piece of public transport infrastructure, such as the North West Rail Line, you have to take into consideration the specific growth of suburbs and specific demographic information about where people are working and travelling. I have already said on the record a number of times, and I do wish to reiterate, that of course people will have the option of buses. But to simply articulate the Federal Government's position about telling the people of the north-west, "You don't need a rail line. Catch a bus.", is frankly embarrassing for you.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Thank you, Minister.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I would hope and I would like to know—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Minister, estimates hearings are for members of the Committee to ask you questions. You do not get to ask me questions, so I would like to move on, thank you. Given that the funding of \$2.1 billion for public transport funding for Western Sydney that was earmarked for the Parramatta to Epping rail link will be redirected to the Pacific Highway, if an Abbott-Truss government is elected federally, were you consulted before this announcement was made and welcomed by the Premier?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Can I say that in relation to public transport infrastructure projects, it is regrettable—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: No. The question is: Were you consulted?

The Hon. JOHN AJAKA: Point of order: With all due respect to the Hon. Penny Sharpe, it is not for her to ask a question and then dictate how the Minister answers that question. The Minister is clearly being generally relevant to the questions being asked and should be allowed to answer those questions.

ACTING-CHAIR: I uphold the point of order. The Minister may answer the question in whichever manner she feels is appropriate. It is very difficult for the Hansard reporters when interjections are made very early in a Minister's answers and constantly throughout a Minister's answers. I ask all members to bear that in mind and show the usual courtesies to members who have the call.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Thank you, Mr Acting-Chair. I know this is a novel concept for the New South Wales Labor Party, but the O'Farrell Government is actually extremely consultative when it comes to these decisions. We are a government that gets on with building our major infrastructure projects. I would like to highlight the fact that unfortunately—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: So you were consulted before the Truss-Abbott announcement?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Can I say that unfortunately—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Were you, or were you not, consulted?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Let me answer the question. Unfortunately, what we saw in 16 years was the complete incapacity—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I want to know what you are doing for the next 18 months, Minister.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: —of the Labor Party to commit to and build any major public transport infrastructure. I also want to stress the commitment of this Government in relation to the North West Rail Line. Since we have been in government, we have committed \$3.3 billion over the next four years alone. We also have stated on a number of occasions, whether that is by the Premier, the Minister for Roads and Ports or me, that that project will be built, with or without the support of the Federal Government. I also want to state that since we have come into government, we have issued 18 tenders and 38 contracts on that project alone.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Thank you, Minister. I can read the eTendering website for myself. I am very aware of that.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: But the point is—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: What I want to know is whether you were consulted about—

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Mr Acting-Chair, can I finish my answer? I think it is appropriate that I be allowed to finish at least a sentence.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: If you had been even within a bull's roar of relevance, it would have helped.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I ask that I at least finish my sentence. The point I wish to make here is I am concerned about the tone of the questions. If the shadow Minister does not support the North West Rail Line being built, she should tell the people of New South Wales that is her position. Her government in office spoke about this project for more than a decade, cancelled it, and reinstated it. This is an important project and—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Your Government does not even support Federal money going into your own pet projects, so do not lecture us about what we do, or do not, support.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: If you do not—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: You are the Minister. Were you consulted before the Premier welcomed the announcement that an Abbott-Truss government would rip \$2.1 billion for public transport money out of Western Sydney and put it on the Pacific Highway? Were you consulted? Do you agree with it?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Not only do we consult each other on those issues, but we support them.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: So you support that. Great. Thank you.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: The important thing is for New South Wales to get its fair share of public infrastructure dollars. It is important for New South Wales for us to get on and do the job we were elected to do, and that is to build major projects. It is extremely unfortunate that under 16 years of Labor you announced 12 different rail lines—and I have them in front of me—the Bondi Beach rail link, the high-speed rail links to Newcastle and the South Coast, the Hurstville—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Thank you, Minister. You are now the Minister. We want to know what you are going to open. This has absolutely nothing to do with budget estimates. It is 18 months since you were the Opposition spokesperson. It is time to move on.

The Hon. JOHN AJAKA: Point of order: The Hon. Penny Sharpe cannot keep cutting off the Minister simply because she does not like the answer that is being given.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Does the Minister realise she is now the Minister for Transport and not the shadow Minister?

The Hon. JOHN AJAKA: She is now cutting me off on my point of order. She cannot keep cutting off the Minister, or any other member of this Committee, simply because she does not like what she is hearing.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: But, to be fair, you have to answer the question.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I am trying to, but you are cutting me off.

The Hon. JOHN AJAKA: The question is being answered generally.

ACTING-CHAIR: The Hon. Mick Veitch will have an opportunity to contribute to questions.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: You gave up your opportunity to blather on about your announcements when you asked this Committee to waive Government questions.

ACTING-CHAIR: Order! Does the Hon. Penny Sharpe wish to contribute comments on the point of order?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: No. I have another question.

ACTING-CHAIR: I reiterate to all members that constant badgering and interjections will not be tolerated; otherwise, it will be a long afternoon. The Minister is free to answer the question in the manner she wishes. The Hon. Penny Sharpe has the call.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I am happy to move on. I actually have a question for Mr Wielinga. Mr Wielinga, given that recently concerns have been raised through Transport for NSW documents that there is an extra unfunded \$4 billion of work needed to get people from the north-west of the city, including new trains, new track and new platforms, can you confirm that it is the view of Transport for NSW that this additional funding will not be required?

Mr WIELINGA: What I can say to you is that it is not extra money. We put out a five-stage long-term transport plan that provided for the resources that we need to make the network work. A lot of the projects in that were already included in our work programs.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: You are saying that there is no need for additional funds; that those reports are incorrect?

Mr WIELINGA: Yes, that is what I am saying.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Funding for the new interchange for The Hills to Chatswood shuttle at Chatswood suggests that at the 75-minute peak time you will have an extra 8,800 passengers sitting on there. Are you confident that you will be able to deal with that number of people alighting at Chatswood?

Mr WIELINGA: Yes, we are.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I will come back to that.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: Minister, what is the Government doing to secure the future transport corridors needed for future growth and infrastructure?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Thank you very much for that question, Mr Green. As you are aware, we recently put out our draft transport master plan. For the first time we have a plan that includes public transport, roads, freight and active transport all in the one plan. What we did in that plan, as Minister Gay and I went around the State and visited 14 different regions, is not only get feedback from the regions but also, in that planning process, identify existing corridors that are under stress when it comes to public transport and identify new corridors for the future. One of the challenges I face as the Minister for Transport, especially when you look at projects like the North West Rail Link, is—because the planning work had not been done to preserve those corridors—acquire lots of land and resume lots of land. That is because that previous work had not happened. We want to make sure that that mistake is not repeated in the future.

That is why the transport master plan recognises the importance of corridor preservation and that you have to plan ahead for the future, not just on what you are working for now but what you need to do to make sure that in the future you can plan for those corridors. In some instances we have been what transport experts have been calling a mode agnostic: That means we have preserved the corridor, but it could be a road, it could be a mode of public transport, or it could be a combination of both. The important thing is to plan for the future. What I am very proud of in relation to our transport master plan is actually having an evidence-based approach to that. We have looked at the regions in New South Wales that are growing quickly. We have looked at the pinch points in Sydney and greater Sydney. If I am not mistaken—and Carolyn is here—we have 19 corridors identified in greater western Sydney for the future, which we believe currently have not been dealt with appropriately.

The whole point of having a master plan in place—and it is a draft at this stage and we are still welcoming feedback—was to make sure we do our homework for planning for the future. I can appreciate as you are from regional New South Wales how important that is for you. The one bit of feedback we received from regional New South Wales and which was pretty consistent across the board was not just the convenience

of additional public transport services but the freight task and how future corridor preservation needs to deal with all those issues. That is why there is quite a lot of work dedicated in the transport master plan about corridor preservation and that is why as a Government we are making sure that we plan ahead for the future, so that future transport Ministers do not have the challenges I am facing in trying to get public transport projects off the ground very quickly.

Another example to give you is currently, as you know, the North West Rail Link ends at Cudgegong Road and we have a couple of options now for corridor preservation beyond that point. Those options have been subject to public consultation over the past couple of months. The public asked us for additional time, and by the end of the year we will be able to at least confirm which corridor will be preserved beyond that rail link. That is a good example of demonstrating to the community that public transport planning is not just about building projects, as important as they are; it is about planning for the future and making sure that we get the right balance in all of our public transport modes, as well as the roads that need to be upgraded.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: How quickly will you be able to resolve releasing redundant corridors instead of leaving them sterilised for years to come?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: We are obviously going through the feedback process now of our draft plan. One of the advisory groups we set up during the transport master plan process was in relation to local government. We know we need to give certainty to local government around planning issues. That is why we want to make sure. When councils have certainty they can give the green light to parts of their community that can be subject to development but also make sure they preserve those corridors that should be preserved. In that context, obviously the key thing for us is to provide certainty to local government and other stakeholders.

The other issue is corridors that are found not to be needed—although I would really struggle to find any existing corridors in New South Wales that are redundant, because the challenge in regional New South Wales is meeting the peaks and troughs of the freight task. I can say personally as the Minister for public transport that I am loath to get rid of an existing corridor because we have to plan for the future. Obviously, the feedback through the process, the corridor preservation we have identified, is subject to consultation now and by the end of the year we will be able to confirm which corridors will be preserved.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: The draft master plan talks about an integrated transport system, making it simple, direct and convenient for ticketing. Has the Government considered allowing people to go online and buy tickets online?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Obviously we are excited by the prospect of introducing electronic ticketing to New South Wales. There is provision to purchase tickets online, especially for those annual tickets, what we call MyMulti annual tickets. There is some ability to purchase those things online now. Obviously the system will undergo major change and transformation once we start introducing electronic ticketing. I am sure all of us in this room are anxiously awaiting that. It was first promised in New South Wales for the 2000 Olympics. The people of New South Wales are still waiting. I can tell you when I came to Government not only had the project not got off the ground but I still had to settle the court case that the previous Government had engaged itself in over the failure of the previous system. I appreciate that having a modern, technology-based ticketing system that is integrated will make a huge difference to the people of New South Wales.

That is why I am pleased to say that in December we will start the trial rollout on Sydney Ferries and then progressively move on to other modes. This will make a huge difference to people. When we release further details of the new ticketing system we also will be able to confirm the various points at which people can obtain those tickets. Obviously a strong online presence is key to that. We are in a modern, technological period and we need to make use of those initiatives when it comes to customer convenience. Having an up-to-date, modern ticketing system will make a difference to anyone who cares about public transport, especially when we are looking to increase patronage and asking people to leave their cars at home.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: Given recent incidents of security around the transport system, what is the Government doing to enhance the safety of our drivers in particular?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I appreciate that issue. We took the very firm decision in February this year to establish the Police Transport Command. Previously, transit officers were relied on to be the first port of call when it came to incidents on the transport network. On 1 May we started the Police Transport Command. When fully resourced there will be 610 police officers to deal with serious crime and antisocial

behaviour on our network. The Police Transport Command for the first time will not be focused just on rail but also on buses and ferries. We appreciate that the safety of our staff, our workers, is paramount, as is the safety of our passengers and that of everybody travelling in or around the network. More police on our public transport network means better safety. No matter whom you ask—experts or the public—I do not think anything can match or replace a police presence.

It is so important to have the police. The police are dedicating a lot of resources to fighting crime on the network. We now have a dedicated Assistant Commissioner and a hardworking team of officers and the Police Transport Command is already demonstrating it is getting results. In relation to some late-night bus services, especially the new one that has started at Kings Cross, we will have bus marshals on those buses. Some NightRide bus services have those as well. Having a police presence is already making a huge difference to safety and security. Obviously, we will remain vigilant as a Government to make sure the safety of our workers and anybody using the system is paramount at all times.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Minister, when did Mr Wielinga inform you that he was resigning from the board of Infrastructure NSW? Just the date is what we need.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Yes, sure. At the outset I want to place some facts on the record. Mr Wielinga, my very hardworking and capable director general, was invited to attend the initial board meetings to fully understand the Infrastructure NSW processes and procedures. As you appreciate, and at the time it was raised by members of this Committee, the Infrastructure NSW Act did not recognise Mr Wielinga as a formal board member. However, he did attend because, obviously, Transport and Roads have a huge capital contribution. Mr Wielinga's decision—and I will let him further address this issue if he wants to—not to attend future Infrastructure NSW board meetings was a recognition that Transport for NSW and Infrastructure NSW play two very different roles. Initially it was appropriate for the Director General of Transport to attend, and I understand from time to time that Infrastructure NSW is at liberty to invite anyone it wishes to attend its meetings.

We thought initially it was good when the two bodies were getting established. As you can appreciate, Transport for NSW was also a new body. It was only established in November last year. You had two new bodies in Transport for NSW and Infrastructure NSW starting their important work. We have a strong working relationship. Infrastructure NSW obviously has responsibility across all portfolios, not just Transport. Infrastructure NSW has priorities across Education, Health and Transport and it was important for us to make sure that the director general attended at least some meetings. Of course, in the future if Infrastructure NSW requests him to attend I am sure he will. I will allow Mr Wielinga to answer further if you would like.

Mr WIELINGA: I cannot remember the exact date. I will need to get my diary. I told both Minister Gay and Minister Berejiklian in advance of that. I explained to them why I thought it was appropriate. It was an opportunity for me to focus exclusively on producing the transport master plan. I felt that was my primary responsibility. I was obligated to provide the Government with that advice, and that is what I concentrated on.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: That really is quite an extraordinary statement, given that Infrastructure NSW has just released its strategy that, as we know, is very pro motorway, does not really advocate a second harbour crossing and does not advocate your favoured light rail down George Street. Mr Wielinga, do you think that the fact you were not involved in Infrastructure NSW has anything to do with the widely diverging strategies we received for the draft master plan and the Infrastructure NSW strategy?

Mr WIELINGA: Do I think it is a major problem? No, I do not. Perhaps I should explain why I do not think it is a problem. Essentially, we are talking about two different approaches to planning here and two different outcomes that put government in a fairly strong position to make some decisions. Let us talk about the approach to the Long Term Transport Master Plan. We felt that the primary consideration was a strong relationship between land use and transport. Our focus was to look at what was going to happen with land use over the next 20 or so years, look at some different scenarios and look at what the community's desire lines were—where they wanted to travel between centres. So we finished up with a set of corridors for which we could create a strategic transport model. Once we had that and the community preferences, we looked at those corridors in demand over a period of time and we had an open mind about which modes could satisfy that demand.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Sure, but the problem I think—

Ms GLADYS BEREJKLIAN: Ms Faehrmann, can I just add to that because I think this will address your question as well. Mr Wielinga, as Director General of Transport for NSW, is responsible for the State's transport, roads and ports strategy. It is not just public transport. The beauty of our model is that the Minister for Roads and Ports and me as the Minister for Transport are two Ministers but with one transport department. So Mr Wielinga actually has responsibility across all modes of transport—across road transport and freight. His job is to provide advice to us on how best to integrate all those modes in our planning process. I think, to an extent, that addresses the heart of your issue.

It is not really a question of one over the other; it is a question of integrating all those modes and making sure, certainly from a transport perspective, that we focus not only on the major projects, which are absolutely critical, but also, as Mr Wielinga suggested, on preserving those corridors, service delivery and future procurement planning for rolling stock. These day-to-day things are critical with an annual budget exceeding \$13 billion. Obviously it is important for us to make sure that we get our planning right. I just wanted to make the point that Mr Wielinga's responsibilities are not just to me as the Minister for Transport but, obviously, also to the Minister for Roads and Ports.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: The Infrastructure NSW strategy in some parts criticised some work done by Transport for NSW and some of the statistics and figures. It seems quite bizarre that Infrastructure NSW would produce a report like this without ensuring that it is at least on the same page as you in estimates, patronage and things like that—I am talking about light rail and, of course, the need for a second harbour crossing. Minister, was it a mistake for Mr Wielinga to stop attending these meetings with Infrastructure NSW, given the widely diverging strategies this State now has before it?

Ms GLADYS BEREJKLIAN: Not at all. In fact, I echo the words of Mr Greiner at an infrastructure gathering last week. Of course, there may be a point or two of difference in the reports, but Mr Greiner's comments were, "There isn't really much space between what we are advocating."

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: They is more than a point or two; they are two of your key transport initiatives. Infrastructure NSW has said, "No, they're not right for New South Wales." That is a huge divergence. It seems that by not having Transport's involvement in Infrastructure NSW the situation has been created where we have an Infrastructure NSW strategy that is, frankly, anti public transport.

Ms GLADYS BEREJKLIAN: We would completely disagree with the implication you are making, Ms Faehrmann, and I will explain why. Firstly, I am very pleased to say that we welcome the INSW State Infrastructure Strategy. It is something that has been lacking for so long in our State. We welcome it because it gives a comprehensive strategy across all portfolios, including Transport. As you can appreciate, when Minister Gay and I put out our draft transport master plan we did not identify which motorway was the priority because that was a task the Premier had specifically given to Infrastructure NSW. We are absolutely delighted that the State now has, courtesy of INSW, a priority motorway project.

We are absolutely delighted that the Premier saw fit to announce immediately after the State Infrastructure Strategy was released that we have committed to two of the key recommendations, which is the West Connex motorway and Bridges for the Bush. In line with our election commitment, obviously we are starting work on the major motorway for Sydney in this term. I am really pleased to say that these two projects, which are self-evident, will now form part of our final transport master plan by the end of this year. Minister Gay and I look forward now to incorporating the West Connex motorway, plus the Bridges for the Bush project within our final document.

As you know, the draft strategy is out for consultation. It was lacking a priority in the motorway space because the Premier quite rightly had said to Infrastructure NSW, "It is your task to identify in your Infrastructure Strategy what the priority motorway should be for New South Wales." We are absolutely delighted that has now happened and Minister Gay, me and our entire transport team will now incorporate that within our final transport plan. Obviously, we are now going through a consideration of all the other issues raised in the State Infrastructure Strategy that are relevant to transport. We will have a response to all those issues by the end of the year. As far as we are concerned, last week was an important turning point in the future of public transport and roads projects in our State. I think the public now has absolute confidence they have a Government that is planning for the future, whether it is public transport, roads or freight. For the first time in the history of our State the public can have confidence that all those strategies are within the one framework.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Why are you going against government guidelines in relation to public-private partnerships and providing up to \$10 million of taxpayers' money to pay each unsuccessful shortlisted tenderer for the Hills to Chatswood shuttle? Can you tell the Committee how many projects will be subject to these tender bonus arrangements?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I am very pleased to answer that question. Our position has been vindicated. Unfortunately, the Labor Government was so appalling at public-private partnerships that it left many prospective bidders shaking their heads about the future of projects in our city. In fact, I still get feedback from time to time about the CBD Rozelle metro.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Thank you, Minister. I am actually asking what you are doing. You are providing \$10 million of taxpayers' money to pay unsuccessful shortlisted tenderers. How many projects will that entail?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I am absolutely happy to answer that question.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I want a number.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Exactly, and I am about to give it to you but you need to appreciate the context, which I know you want to skip over. The reason we have done that—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Are you saying that you do not have confidence in your own project if you are required to pay them \$10 million?

The Hon. JOHN AJAKA: Point of order—

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I am just commenting on the appalling record your Government left us and the fact we are—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Yes, 18 months in. Tell us what you are going to do, Minister.

The Hon. JOHN AJAKA: Point of order—

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I would very much love to if you would stop interrupting me because I have a lot of positive news to give you on that front.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: And you had the opportunity to do so in Government questions, which you have given up. I am now asking you specific questions—

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Thank you, and if you could stop—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: —that have a very narrow scope. I would like you to answer them.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: —talking I will answer the questions. Thank you. I have the gist of the question and I am proceeding to answer it.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Well, provide the answer.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I will if you stop interrupting me please. Firstly, as I said, because of the uncertainty left after the CBD Rozelle metro project we have looked very closely at how we proceed with the north-west rail project. Under exceptional circumstances a repayment for unsuccessful bidders is offered, but I have to state at the outset that it relates only to part of the project and I want to explain that to the Committee. The North West Rail Line comprises three major contracts. If you need further detail around those, I am sure Mr Staples would be happy to explain those to you.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: No, it is okay. I am familiar with that.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Right. Obviously, the first two parts of the project are not subject to that payment. It is only the third part of the contract, which relates to the operations and systems design of the new transit system. For the first time in Sydney we are actually introducing single-deck carriages. We are also

converting the Epping to Chatswood rail line into a single-deck mass transit rail line and, therefore, that requires certain expertise.

We want to get the best and brightest around Australia and the world bidding for that part of the project. For that reason we have given an exceptional circumstance for the unsuccessful bidders. It only refers to the short-listed bidders and does not refer to people who put in expressions of interest. It applies to those people who were invited to put in a tender. Without giving anything away, we do not expect there to be more than two or three, but that is subject to the market. It is the lesser of a third of the bidding cost or \$10 million. In exceptional circumstances governments around the world do that. It is part of managing a complex and important process. We want to make sure we get the best and brightest around Australia and the world participating in this important project.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: You have provided me with the answer.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Unfortunately, after 16 years of failed projects and the cancellation of the central business district to Rozelle metro we have made sure that is part of the process for the third contract to ensure the best and brightest around the world and Australia help us finalise that aspect of the project. I will ask Rodd if there is anything he wants to add.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I do not require anything more. That is terrific, thank you. Minister, you said up to \$20 million or \$30 million for each unsuccessful tenderer. I note there is \$12 million for community transport over four years. Do you stand by this type of prioritisation within your portfolio of taxpayers' moneys and priorities?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I am sorry, can you repeat the question? I did not hear the question.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: You have just indicated there could be up to \$30 million of taxpayers' money that will be given to people who put in a tender even though they will not end up completing the work for The Hills to Chatswood shuttle. I am asking, given that you are providing \$12 million for community transport over four years and the very long discussion there is in the community about the unmet need within that portfolio, if you stand by this level of prioritisation within your portfolio?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Can I take a step back. Unfortunately, your question demonstrates a lack of understanding of major public transport infrastructure projects.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: You stand by it?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Can you let me answer the question, please?

The Hon. JOHN AJAKA: Point of order: This is continually happening. The Minister is not being given an opportunity to complete a single answer without continual interjections. The fact that the honourable member does not like the answer being given or it does not suit her is no reason for her to keep badgering the witness and not allowing the Minister to finish the answer.

ACTING-CHAIR: I uphold the point of order. The Minister had only just started to give her answer. I ask all members to show common courtesy and allow the Minister to respond.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I want to take a step back and say by offering that recoupment of bidding cost what that does is ensure competitive tension so we get the best and cheapest price possible for that part of the contract. Ironically, even though you offer the costs in actual fact you might save a substantial amount of money on the project and get a better quality project. It is done with the intention of getting a much better deal for taxpayers. It is about saving money and having that competitive tension in a major project. I do not think that the Labor Party has any credibility when it comes to prioritisation. You lot wasted half a billion dollars on the central business district to Rozelle metro. I could have given every community transport organisation across this State a whole lot of money and addressed a whole lot of other issues if you had not wasted that half a billion dollars. In relation to community transport, when I was shadow Minister for Transport—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I have finished that now.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: You asked the question; let me answer it.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: No, I asked a question about the \$10 million. I remind you again that the Government waived its time for questions. I have 20 questions to ask you.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Exactly.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: And if you would finish when I have the answer I require you can table any additional information and we can move on.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Ms Sharpe, perhaps you should look at the quality of your questions because if you are not happy with me providing the answers you should perhaps ask a different line of questions. You raised the issue of community transport and I want to place on the record—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Fill up the time, go on.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: When I was the shadow Minister for Transport and I assumed the portfolio I have to admit I knew little about community transport, but what I did learn was that for 12 years that part of transport had not received a single dollar extra in funding above the consumer price index. Community transport was going backwards in real terms. That is why I committed to an additional \$12 million over the first four years of Government to community transport and I stand by that. I am pleased we are entering the next round of funding for community transport.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Terrific. Minister, the draft transport master plan on page 127 states:

While roads in the central business district must continue to play a supporting role our central business district action plan establishes public transport at the centre of the long-term master plan through a major boost to rail capacity by way of the second harbour crossing.

You have previously stated that the second harbour crossing "... is the next cab off the rank after The Hills to Chatswood shuttle is completed". How do you reconcile this commitment with recommendations from Infrastructure NSW that the second harbour crossing not be a priority in the next two decades and how does it reconcile with the \$74 billion black hole in your transport master plan?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Thank you for the opportunity to answer that question. In June this year I did announce Sydney's rail future, which is the biggest change to our rail for more than 80 years. It does include the modernisation of Sydney's rail network that the city has craved for a long time. We announced our rail plan to provide a strategic context for the North West Rail Link. We know how important it is to get the North West Rail Link delivered and we know how important it is to have context around major decisions.

This is a Government that does its homework and we now have a plan that will see both short-term improvements for customers and a vision that will future-proof our rail network for generations to come. As has been mentioned on the public record already there is no doubt that we see the five stages of Sydney's rail future as absolutely critical to transforming the way we deliver rail services into the future. A few months ago we outlined our five stages of Sydney's rail future. The first two were about increasing capacity into the network. Firstly, to have operational efficiencies to improve how you operate trains.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Can I stop you there. I asked a specific question about how a second harbour crossing is going to be built given that it was unfunded.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: That was not exactly the question, but I am happy to get to that question as well.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I would like you to do that. I have very little time left. I know you like to avoid the questions, but could you please get to the point?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Sure. You have to appreciate, Ms Sharpe, that the second harbour crossing is the fourth out of the five stages of our State's rail future, and that is why I want to put that in context.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: You are saying it is going to be built, are you?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Absolutely. That is the Government's position and in the last week it has been placed on the public record that the second harbour crossing is Government policy.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Do you anticipate it will be in the final transport master plan and in the Infrastructure NSW priority list?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I cannot comment on what independent advice—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: How can you reconcile those two? It is your Government that will be making the decision, are you telling me that the second harbour crossing is going to be built or not? And will be funded under your Government, not Infrastructure NSW?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I will explain that to you now if you would stop interrupting me. Obviously there are five stages to our future, which are outlined in the transport master plan. The first two relate to operational efficiencies and network efficiencies to improve the overall system. The third is the new rapid transit system to move to a three-tier railway, and that includes the construction and operation of the north-west rail line, which is the first of the new tier railway system in terms of single deck carriages. The fourth critical thing is the second harbour crossing which we will start after the north-west rail line is open. That is Government policy and it has been stated publicly in the last week since the State Infrastructure Strategy came out.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: It will be included in the forward plan for Infrastructure NSW?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I cannot comment on what is included in the plans for independent bodies, but I can certainly comment on what is Government policy; and Government policy is to have our 20-year Rail Future—which is identified in this document, which I hope you have read. I am just going through the five stages of that Rail Future. That has been on the public record in the last week. There has been a lot of media commentary on it already. Mr Greiner and I acknowledge that is a point of difference; but you would be disappointed if an independent body completely echoed what the government of the day was doing. Similarly, government has to take the best course of action it thinks appropriate.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I have another question, but I have run out of time.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: Minister, in terms of the recent loss of life of a young child on a school bus, when are we likely to see an outcome on the school bus seatbelt issue?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Mr Green, thank you for that question. Can I say I join everybody in expressing how sad we felt after the incident in Singleton on 10 September. I do not think any of us can imagine what the family and friends in that community are going through. I want to place that on the record. I cannot think of anything more horrific than losing a child in those circumstances. I appreciate that the Newcastle Crash Investigation Unit and the Coroner are undertaking investigations to find out exactly what happened there. It is also completely natural and acceptable that an horrific accident like that will prompt discussions about safety issues; I completely accept that. I have welcomed the feedback I have received from a number of members of that community since that horrific incident. I appreciate that many people feel strongly about the safety of children on school buses, as do I, especially in rural and regional areas. I know it is an issue that you have been pursuing; and I acknowledge that the South Coast, through local members and through you, has been very vocal to me about that issue, as has Ms Faehrmann and others. So I welcome that, and I completely understand where you are coming from.

It is true to say that there are more than 60,000 students across regional and rural New South Wales who travel on about 1,500 dedicated school buses each and every day. We know for a fact that the vast majority of school travel occurs without incident. Buses are generally a very safe way to travel to and from school; in fact, Austroads data shows that bus travel is the safest mode of transport for our schoolchildren. For example, it is regarded as seven times safer than travelling by car. But that does not negate the need for us to have a debate about additional measures that can make the transport for our kids even safer. We are a Government that pays attention to our rural and regional communities and the issues.

We acted quickly to establish the School Bus Safety Community Advisory Committee in July last year. I did this because of the experience I had as shadow Minister with the concerns raised by parents, the feedback from bus operators and safety experts. The reason we put that committee together was to make sure we had all

sides of the debate around us at the one table. That had not happened before. There were various written reports which had a certain perspective. We wanted to make sure we had all the stakeholders around the table. I want to thank the Parliamentary Secretary for Transport for assisting by attending some of those meetings and giving me feedback. I did attend the first meeting in July last year.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: Minister, with all due respect, I just want some outcomes. You have noted that the School Bus Safety Community Advisory Committee was established in July last year. That is quite a while ago. What outcomes is the committee suggesting?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: As you know, the committee is chaired by Carolyn Walsh, who was a Commissioner of the Australian Transport Safety Bureau. When I asked Ms Walsh to chair the committee I also said to her, "Take as long as you need, and be very upfront and frank in what recommendations you make to me." Recently, after the tragedy in Singleton, Ms Walsh issued a statement to say that she would present me with a report in the near future. So I am looking forward to receiving that report. But I did not want to place any restrictions on the committee or committee members about when they got the report to me. I understand there is a draft report, which has been subject to consultation within the committee. I have not yet received a formal report. But, as soon as I do, I can assure you that I will consider the recommendations and make a public comment about that.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: Are we talking about a month away, or a week away? The "near future" is a very open-ended time. Can you give us some better indication of the time?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: The advice I have received from the committee chair, both formally through public statements and also informally when I bumped into her, is that it would be coming soon. So I am hoping it will be by the end of the year definitely—and maybe even sooner. As Minister, I do not want to say to them, "You must hand me the report by X date." I want them to feel that they are in a position to give that to me. I do not think there is anybody around this table who does not want to see transport made as safe as possible for our children. Obviously, as soon as I receive the committee's report I will consider that and then make some public comment about it.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: In terms of higher mass limits—and I note our transport strategy talks about higher mass limits on our roads—what sorts of guarantees are you going to give the community in terms of consultation that will take place, because those higher mass limits will be on strategic roads and probably will impact a lot of regional and rural areas?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I appreciate that that is an issue, but it is more within the responsibility of my colleague the Minister for Roads and Ports. But, if you want, I will ask Mr Wielinga to expand on that.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: No. I am quite happy to take that up with your colleague.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: My ministerial colleague is addressing that issue.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: That is fine. I see cycling is an integrated part of your public transport portfolio. How do you see it integrating in terms of the strategy of the future?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I am very pleased to say that we dedicated a lot of time in our draft transport master plan to cycling and cycleways, and also active transport, which includes pedestrian access as well. I am not very good on the bike, but I am a good walker. So pedestrian access and active transport are critical parts of our integrated transport network. We would love to be able to give everybody door-to-door public transport service, but we know that is not going to happen. So we will be asking people to use their bikes where appropriate, or to walk, to get to certain transport spots. Obviously, that needs to be integrated. And, for the first time, we have a draft transport plan which actually incorporates active transport. Of course we have a lot of work to do in this area, but we are working very closely with councils and also with Bicycle NSW about how we can better integrate those issues within our planning process, and also about giving some guidance and leadership to our councils.

We know that many councils spend lots of money on their own cycleways, but we believe very strongly we need better definitions around what constitutes a safe cycle path and what constitutes a safe pedestrian walkway, and how to ensure there is an integrated approach. That is why we included at least a

chapter and quite a few dedicated sections of the master plan to active transport. We see it as a very important part of the future. We also want to continue to work closely with our stakeholders to make sure that those plans become a reality in terms of increasing the share of people cycling. It is in the NSW 2021 plan to increase the share of people cycling, but also to make pedestrian access easier for people who want to get to and from public transport interchanges as well.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Minister, do you agree that the original estimate by Labor for the Dulwich Hill light rail extension was \$120 million?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I am glad I have Chris Lock here, because I remember Chris and I had a conversation very early after I became Minister for Transport. When I assumed the ministry I looked at the figures that the Labor Party had claimed on the public record were the cost of the inner west light rail extension. Unfortunately, when I asked the department to do certain work, the figures I had seen quoted were not the case. The cost of the project was more significant than the Labor Party had said it was. I had assumed, when I became Minister for Transport, that there would have been detailed designs and geotechnical work. Unfortunately, they had not even thought about where they would get the rolling stock to operate the line. So not only had Labor failed to do any design, and not only had it not done any geotechnical work, but it also had not considered where to get the rolling stock from. So I essentially had to do a lot of work early on, with the assistance of the head of the project team, to—

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Minister, I have a few questions on those numbers. Your Government has announced that the light rail extension will cost \$176 million, and has awarded the contract for construction to John Holland. Does that figure of \$176 million include vehicles? Does it include rolling stock?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I will ask Chris Lock to answer that question.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: I was seeking a yes or no to my question.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: But I also want to say that recently we very successfully engaged a rolling stock provider to give us new rolling stock but also leased rolling stock to make sure we have adequate rolling stock when the line opens. But I will ask Chris Lock to provide more detail on that.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Is rolling stock included in the \$176 million?

Mr LOCK: Yes, the rolling stock is included within the \$176 million figure.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: How much is the rolling stock component?

Mr LOCK: The rolling stock is about \$24 million, which includes procurement of new rolling stock but also includes the leasing of some additional rolling stock before the new rolling stock can be procured. It also includes a small maintenance component.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Minister, can you confirm that to date no detailed costing information has been released publicly on the light rail?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I know we have released information in the budget papers and also through my press comments about the cost of the light rail project.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: But no detailed costings.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: The detail we have offered is consistent with what we offer other projects. If you want a further breakdown of costs, we are happy to provide that. I am not sure whether Mr Lock has that on hand, but we are happy to provide you with further detail. I have got no issue with breaking down the cost of that, to demonstrate the work we had to do to come to that costing.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: I think some people in your department have an issue with providing that information, because I have in front of me a document that was provided in July this year through the Government Information (Public Access) Act, which is an Inner West Extension Forecast Cost Summary, July 2011. Every single costing in that—the Department of Transport, delivery including GreenWay, and the Department of Transport, delivery excluding GreenWay—is redacted. Is there a reason that that is not provided?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I will make an opening comment and then pass to Mr Lock. Obviously, I cannot comment on the timing of the document or how old the documents are, but certainly we have been through a very competitive process in relation to issuing tenders for the construction of the light rail. We have also been through a competitive tender process in relation to acquiring rolling stock. At the end of the day we want to make sure that we get the best price and the best value for taxpayers and that we complete the project efficiently in terms of cost but also in a timely way. I can imagine that is why at some stages of the process you do not want to keep numbers in the marketplace to make sure you get that competitive tension. But, obviously, once those things are confirmed I have no issue with providing public information. Can I pass on to Mr Lock in case he has additional information to what I have provided?

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: I did receive one sheet through the same source under the Government Information (Public Access) [GIPA] Act, that is, Currie and Brown. It is a summary of costs—Sydney Light Rail Extension preliminary concept design capital cost estimate report for the Inner West Extension and GreenWay. I am curious about some of the figures for the inner west extension. They total here \$121,567,000. But part demolition civil works, track, structure, light rail systems and stops total \$34,882,000, and then there is a figure of \$86 million, which includes contractors' indirect costs, client costs, other stakeholders' costs—which is \$35 million—and contingency, which is \$26.5 million. Out of the \$176 million for the inner west light rail, how much is for contractors' indirect costs, client costs and other stakeholders' costs? Here it seems to be 2:1 to what it is actually going to cost or should cost the Government to build it in the first place. There seems to be a lot of money not going to very tangible benefits for the taxpayers of New South Wales.

Mr LOCK: I believe that the document you are looking at, the Currie and Brown one, is actually the one prepared for the private sector public-private partnership organisation MTS at a time before the Government purchased MTS, so we are working on a completely different set of figures.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: In terms of my question, how much out of the figure that you have given and stated publicly, \$176 million, is factored in for contingency, contractors' indirect costs and other stakeholders' costs for escalation?

Mr LOCK: A couple of those things I cannot tell you and I will not be able to tell you because we have now been to tender and we have a fixed price, lump sum contract with John Holland for the civil work. I do not know what their indirect component is, I do not know what their margin is; they just gave us a lump sum for doing the project. I could tell you what the contingency is remaining but that would not be a good idea as that is the contingency that we would be using for any variations that come along later. I certainly would not be wanting to alert John Holland to the amount of money that we have in the client-owned budget for that.

ACTING-CHAIR: We will now move to Opposition questions in relation to ferries.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Minister, since the handover of Sydney Ferries services to Harbour City Ferries it appears that a whole lot of general reporting data is no longer publicly available. Are you able to tell the Committee when, where and how frequently data such as service reliability, on-time running, patronage, fleet availability and reliability and safety and environment statistics will be reported?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Can I allay your concerns at the outset, Ms Sharpe, and say that certainly Harbour City Ferries will be subjected to the same public disclosure requirements as Sydney Ferries was when it was run by the government. Certainly they have obligations in relation to making that information publicly available, and that will continue to be the case. We are committed to providing a world-class ferry service for people and I have to say I have been absolutely delighted with the transition. If you asked most ferry customers whether they noticed—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: This is not a Dorothy Dixier about your transition to ferries—

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I am just answering your question.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: You are not. You said yes it will be available. I want to know when that data is going to be available, because it is currently not available.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I am happy to say that they have significant reporting and there is data available because it has been on the public record. In fact, if you look at the Transport for NSW website that data is available.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Some of that data is available.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: My understanding is that if you look at the website that data is available. But I am pleased to give you whatever information you require. By way of update I can tell you that we have had an increase in patronage since the private sector has taken over operations and we have seen improvements in customer service. Certainly I am pleased to say that Harbour City Ferries will be subject to all those other public disclosure requirements. As far as Sydney Ferries is concerned, we have a great story to tell and I want the public to know what is going on and we will make sure that all the information is made as publicly available as soon as possible.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Can you tell me when, where and how frequently that data is going to be available?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Whatever the frequency was when the ferry operators were run by the Government it is the same frequency. There is no difference.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Exactly the same?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: It will be the same frequency because we expect the public to have complete information and advice on what is happening. Our whole intent when we transferred operations to the private sector was that it would improve services but also it would be more efficient in the way we provided those services. I am pleased to say that since Harbour City Ferries has taken over the operations most customers have not noticed initially—which is exactly what we wanted. They will notice in coming months when there are various improvements. I also want to say how pleased I am that in addition to having a smooth transition we have 165 more weekly ferry services than we had when we came to Government.

The previous Government slashed ferry services; the previous Government reduced its patronage forecasts and actually predicted a decline in ferry customers over the next 10 years, which I thought was unforgivable. We have a very bright outlook when it comes to Sydney ferries. We see the waterways as a great way to increase public transport use, which is why in handing over the operations to the private sector we have been able to allocate resources to increase services and improve customer service. I can assure Committee members that the frequency of that information will be the same as it was previously.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Can you tell us what has happened to the review of ferry services and, if it is completed, will you make it publicly available?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I am very pleased to say that the network review is going on and—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: When will it be completed?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: We are in the midst of conducting a review now and can I say how pleased we are with the progress we are making.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I just want to know when it is going to be complete. The date, that is all I really need.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: We are going through that process now. But I can tell you that what the customers are experiencing through the reviews we have done to date is a return of 140 weekly services.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: You have already told us that. Can I remind you that this section is 10 minutes shorter because the Government decided, on your request, to not have these questions asked. You could have had time allocated to do this. I put a very specific question: When is the network review going to be completed and is it going to be made publicly available or are we going to have to try and pursue it through GIPA and have the taxpayers of New South Wales pay for this information twice?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Of course the network review will be available, because we are about putting back services, not taking them away.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Publicly, not through GIPA?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Of course we will tell you the results because the results will be—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Will you publish the report?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Can I just finish the answer? You will actually see from the timetable what the network review has resulted in, because we anticipate services that are more efficient. The whole purpose of doing a network review is to make sure you are getting the most out of the vessels you have, the staff you have and the organisation that is running the services, and we have demonstrated in our time in Government already our commitment to increasing ferry services. So I am more than happy to share the results of our network review because the public—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I want to know whether all of the documents associated with the network review will be publicly available and if they are not going to be publicly available are we going to be able to pursue them through GIPA—which means the public has to pay for them twice—and then are we going to get a whole bunch of documents that are basically redacted, which is what has been happening with the rest of the GIPAs?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: As a citizen and as a member of Parliament you have every measure available for you to obtain those documents.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Not when you will not release them.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I will certainly release what is in the public interest. But I think ferry customers are very pleased with the progress we are making. I am extremely thrilled by the transition we have had to the new operators and their values relating to customer service. If any of you around the table have not had the good fortune of catching a ferry recently please do so; you will find a noticeable difference in the attitude of the organisation and how we are providing customer service and also in the frequency of services we are offering.

The network review we are currently conducting is making sure that we are running services as quickly as we can between growth areas. For example, we know there has been a huge increase in demand in the inner west and obviously the review is focusing on how we can better service that community. There is also a huge increase in demand in the east as well. We want to make sure that we have a ferry service that is world-class. We certainly have the best harbour in the world; let us have the best ferry service in the world. I am pleased to be able to report to the public what we are up to at every key milestone because the story we have to tell is extremely positive. Contrast that with Mr Robertson. When he was transport Minister he cut 233 weekly ferry services. Your most recent transport plan—there were nine of them—I think on page 8 or 12 talked about reducing the number of ferry passengers by 5 per cent over the next five years.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: So far you are up to four transport plans so we will just move on.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: That is incorrect but I will leave that for your next question.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I am moving on. I am interested in real-time data, which is to do with the Twitter accounts for the 131 500 trains, buses and ferries. What are the hours of operation for these accounts?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Obviously we are placing a lot of attention on improving the customer experience for our transport users and that includes the use of technology. It might interest Committee members to know that seven out of the 10 most frequently used government websites are in the transport cluster.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I am asking a very specific question about the Twitter accounts which are used to provide real-time information on transport and service disruptions. I want to know when they are active, whether they have set hours, and what those hours are. It is a very specific question.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: As you know, the transport information line, which is the 131 500 number, provides customer assistance 24 hours a day, seven days a week. We handled approximately 1.2 million calls in the last year.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I am aware of that. That is not what I am asking you about. I am asking you about the official Twitter accounts, the @131500, for trains, buses and ferries.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Sure. The mobile website and the mobile trip planner app was launched—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: That is not what I am asking you.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I know you are not but can I just—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Can you answer the question that I am asking you, please?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I will when I get to it. The mobile website and the mobile trip planner app were launched last year and they are proving very popular with transport customers. We are committed to improving the 131 500 information system we have. Obviously we want to improve the technology we offer our customers. I know we have Twitter accounts. I do not know offhand how frequently they are utilised and how extensive they are. Certainly our key engagement and initiative is to make sure we provide as much access to customers as possible in relation to real-time information. That is one of the reasons why we established our customer experience division. When I became the Minister for Transport we did not even have a section in Transport that looked after customers or technology and providing information.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Minister, since you have put all these things in place why on earth were passengers on the Central Coast and Hunter line left stranded for five hours in September with no information provided?

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: Minister, when are we likely to see the first report on the performance outcome of the privatisation of the ferries?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: As I mentioned to the Hon. Penny Sharpe, the same reporting requirements exist for Harbour City Ferries. I understand they have requirements to provide information every quarter, if I am not mistaken.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: When is that quarter?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Obviously they took over on 28 July, so presumably three months after that point would be the first quarter. That is a reasonable time. We have some preliminary data which I believe is on the public record already. It is on the Transport website already, about patronage and other things. There is information already available. I understand that that requirement is quarterly. If I am mistaken I will correct that and update the Committee, but I understand that was provided quarterly under the previous arrangements and will be done so again. We have a great story to tell when it comes to ferries and I have no issue if people at any given time want information or data.

I think whether the information is positive or otherwise, customers have a right to know, as does the public, but I am extremely pleased with the way we are going with Sydney Ferries. I want to thank the staff from Transport for NSW and the staff from Sydney Ferries because when you are transitioning from a government-operated entity to a private one you need the cooperation of the staff and the stakeholders. I really want to say thank you to them for the smooth transition. I know there was a period of angst for them but that has since been resolved. The reason why the successful bidders were successful was that they share the same values as the Government in relation to customer service and also in relation to meeting their obligations to staff.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: We appreciate that customer service is the highest priority. I congratulate the Government on that approach; it is good way to go. Minister, given the successful trials of the SolarSailor passenger ferries in Sydney Harbour and now Newcastle, and given their low maintenance and running costs, will you consider expanding their use?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Obviously as part of the franchising program we are having a network review regarding fleet replacement as well. That was one of the recommendations of the Walker inquiry. We have a staged approach when it comes to ferries. We have transitioned to the private operator. We are looking at the additional services we can offer. We have asked the private sector to be involved in that process as well. Obviously we are looking at the best way that we can have a very comprehensive fleet replacement strategy. That is outlined in our transport master plan as well and we are turning our attention to those issues.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: Initially it sounds as though they are quite efficient. Could the public expect lower fares if they do provide such efficiency?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: As much as I would love to say that lower public transport fares are on the cards, they are not because we have a huge transport challenge in front of us.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: Just for ferries?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: No. Nice try.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: The tooth fairy?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: The tooth fairy perhaps. What I have said is we expect customers to get value for money. The challenges for us in public transport are increasing simply because we have additional population, additional patronage and additional stresses on our network. We want to make sure customers get value for money but at the same time I need to make sure I am running the system as efficiently as possible. There will not be fare reductions, I am afraid to say, but customers can be assured of getting good value for money. I can also say we are looking at ways in which we can engage the private sector much more readily in providing services and also fleet issues. For example, the fast ferry services that are offered and some of the inner west services use private vessels to complement the existing vessels that the State Government has. Obviously we want to engage more with the private sector in how we can get better utilise our assets. That will be part of the network review.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Are there any proposals to change any of the arrangements relating to the Balmain shipyards?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Not that I am aware. Obviously we want to make sure that every aspect of running ferry services is as efficient as possible. I certainly have not suggested or seen anything which dramatically changes the way we do that. On a day-to-day basis obviously we want to make improvements where we can but there is certainly nothing in terms of a policy regarding that.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: There are no proposals around the continuing use of the Balmain shipyards for maintenance programs?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: The network review might look at the way we deal with maintenance issues, and the fleet replacement strategy does. One thing that Mr Walker highlighted in his inquiry into Sydney Ferries was that we have at least eight different classes of ferry vessels and that means eight different maintenance regimes. Obviously in the future when we look at fleet replacement we would like to reduce the number of classes we have so that maintenance becomes much more efficient, as does parts replacement, as does upkeep of the vessels. Clearly there may be improvements in that regard in terms of maintenance simply when we get round to the fleet replacement strategy. I do not think anyone thinks that having different classes when you have a certain number of vessels is efficient. In due course when the Government outlines its fleet replacement strategy I would hope that we would have fewer classes of fleet and thereby have fewer procedural issues with maintenance because we would make that more efficient.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: What is the schedule for the construction of accessible wharves and can you inform the Committee what budget has been allocated to make wharves accessible?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: As you know we combined six different programs that previously existed into the one Transport Access Program. Now we look at wharves and station upgrades and interchange upgrades in a holistic way rather than in a modal way, which I think is of enormous benefit to transport users. That includes ferry upgrades. We allocated over \$100 million in the first round, which included improvement at more than 35 locations. That included car parks and also included wharves and railway stations. I am pleased to

say that part of that program included the completion of the Neutral Bay wharf upgrade in August this year. It is a great wharf which I was able to go and look at. It includes the completion of the Rose Bay wharf upgrade in September this year. Those two wharves were upgraded just recently.

Work is currently commencing on the \$4.9 million Balmain Thames Street wharf in September. Actually it started last month and the new wharf is scheduled to be ready for service early next year. Planning work is also underway for the replacement of wharves at Huntleys Point and Double Bay. We are expecting construction works for Huntleys Point and Double Bay to be scheduled to commence later this financial year. As part of our ferry network review, we will determine which wharf upgrade projects receive the highest priority beyond the ones I have already spoken about. But the important thing for us, which was highlighted by Mr Walker, is that one of the previous deterrents of getting people to use ferries was the lack of coordination between bus and ferry timetables. We are also doing a lot of work not just on upgrading our wharves but also on making sure that those connections are much better and stronger than they have been in the past.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Are you committed to making all Sydney Ferries' wharves accessible?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: In a perfect world, I would love to be able to make every single railway station and every single ferry wharf accessible. Certainly our intention in combining the six different programs into one was that there was never ever a snapshot available previously of what was happening in each mode at each location. What we are doing now is, instead of putting all our resource allocations into one or two locations, looking at a comprehensive way of making improvements across the board. It might involve a ramp somewhere, it may involve a lift somewhere else; but, clearly, having full accessibility is every Minister's dream. We are progressing very strongly in trying to make as many of our wharves and our railways stations as accessible as possible.

I do not want to underestimate the challenge. It does pain me when I use the network and see how many of our stations do not have easy access and how many of our wharves should be more accessible. It also pains me when I see people who have mobility impairments, or even parents with prams, trying to negotiate the public transport network. But I assure the Committee that that is why, as Minister, one of the first things I did was establish a Transport Access Program, which goes across all modes of transport. We have given an extra \$40 million boost to that program. Instead of announcing one or two upgrades per year, we have managed to do 35 already. But, again, I do not want to underestimate the challenges and I do not want to say, "I wish I could do more", because I do.

ACTING-CHAIR: Thank you, Minister. We will take a short break until 3.30 p.m. and examine rail transport when we resume.

(Short adjournment)

ROBERT FRANK JAMES MASON, Chief Executive, Rail Corporation NSW, affirmed and examined:

PETER ROWLEY, Chief Executive, State Transit Authority, sworn and examined:

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Mr Acting-Chair, may I offer a supplementary answer to a question asked by the Hon. Penny Sharpe about Twitter accounts? I have an answer here.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Just provide it to the Committee on notice.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Okay, but just to let you know—it is Monday to Friday, 5.30 a.m. to 7.30 p.m. That is the answer to the question.

ACTING-CHAIR: We will now examine rail transport.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: My question is directed to Mr Mason. Town Hall and Wynyard stations are already at capacity. Some would argue they are dangerously over capacity. What is the time frame for the upgrade of these stations?

Mr MASON: Town Hall and Wynyard clearly are built to a standard applicable to the time of their building. They are not ones that you would build in line with current standards. The final plan for the upgrade of the stations is not part of my portfolio, but currently what we do is manage the number of customers on the platform by controlling the number of customers into the station from the gate line, or manage them on the platforms through the station management processes.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Based on that, obviously it is very, very crowded there. Can you take me through the active demand management techniques that you are using on that station, and if there are others that you are predicting you are going to have to use?

Mr MASON: Certainly, but I am just repeating what I have just said.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: So, gates?

Mr MASON: One can use the gates to control the number of people coming into the station and then, as soon as it is full, the station staff will close those gates and make customer announcements to make sure customers are aware of what is going on. One could regulate the trains, if need be. They can hold the trains outside the station, if need be—if the platforms are significantly crowded—or one can reverse escalators. In long-term planning, one could do that, but that is not part of the plan at the moment.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Does that mean that there will be people who are trying to get onto trains at Town Hall and Wynyard but who will be turned away and will not be able to get on their train?

Mr MASON: Even today we have situations when not every single person gets onto a train they would like to get onto, and they may have to catch the next train.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Is that due to overcrowding?

Mr MASON: That is due to the fact that we have a train going through the peak at about every three minutes in the evening.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: But it is because it is overcrowded that you cannot get everyone on. Is that right?

Mr MASON: There is a need to keep the trains moving as well as keep the crowds under control.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: So it is an issue about dwell time as well. Do you have staff on the platforms who are basically stopping people from getting onto trains to try to cut down on dwell time?

Mr MASON: We introduced a dwell-time management process probably three or four years ago when we started to put extra staff onto the platform to manage the trains and manage the customers as well to make people move along the platform to where there are more spaces on the trains and more space on the platforms.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Given that tens of thousands more people expected to come through Wynyard, for example, and down Barangaroo as Barangaroo gets built, and clearly the upgrades to both Town Hall and Wynyard stations are a fair way away, what other active demand management systems are you going to have to use? If you are already starting to turn people away, do you have modelling or plans for how you are going to manage those increasing numbers with no increased platform space?

Mr MASON: The modelling is done by the Transport for NSW team in terms of the stations' upgrade, but certainly there are already plans—the Minister has mentioned them—to increase the number of trains going through the central business district [CBD] stations, both during the morning and the evening peak.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Minister, without going into a long discussion about your plans for the new timetable, which is due to be implemented in 2013, are you able to confirm that there will be no reduction in the overall number of services provided on the network?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Absolutely. In fact, as you would know, Ms Sharpe, unfortunately the previous Government took away 416 daily rail services, which is about 2,000 a week or 100,000 a year. Since we have been in government, we have introduced an additional 62, I think, or 61 new rail services—last October—and we were very pleased to do that. Similarly, this October there will be additional services. But, as you suggested, late next year is when the new timetable will be coming in. Just in relation to the point that you raised with Mr Mason—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: No, I am not asking you that. I have finished with Mr Mason.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Okay.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: You have guaranteed there is not going to be anything in that. In that case, Mr Mason, are you confident that the new timetable will not require the older non air-conditioned carriages, particularly C and K sets and S sets, to remain on the network?

Mr MASON: The new Waratah trains are due to be delivered by the end of 2014. The timetable you were referring to was 2013. New trains are coming on. We have now got 13 new Waratah trains on the network with customer service.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: What I am saying is that the Waratah trains are due to replace the non air-conditioned fleet, obviously. My question is: Are you planning beyond 2014 for the C and K and S sets and other non air-conditioned sets to have to remain on the network to meet the timetable changes?

Mr MASON: All the modelling for the future network and for the future timetable is done by Transport for NSW. We work with them to make that operate and we validate that in terms of the processes that we need to go through to certify the timetable, but that responsibility lies with Transport for NSW. We are working very cooperatively to design the 2013 timetable, look at the number of staff we will need and look at the number of trains we will need as well.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: In that case, Mr Wielinga are you confident that the C, K and S sets are not going to remain on the network beyond the rollout of the Waratahs?

Mr WIELINGA: No. We are being as flexible as we can be. The question that needs to be asked is: How many additional services do we want to put on? If our customers are seeking additional services and we want to increase that above what is programmed at the moment, we will use whatever rolling stock is available to us to provide those customer services.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: That means that about 72 per cent of the fleet is currently air-conditioned. After the rollout of the Waratah, it was planned that 100 per cent of the fleet would be. Are you able to tell us what percentage of the fleet will remain non air-conditioned and for how long? You can take that on notice, if you like.

Mr WIELINGA: Yes, we will take it on notice.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: But I also want to stress, Ms Sharpe, in addition to what the officers have stated, that when we took over government the previous Government had not received a single new Waratah carriage. We actually fixed up that project. Now I am very pleased to say that we have 13 in operation and I understand two additional ones are close to being received. If you look at the draft NSW Long Term Transport Master Plan, we dedicate a lot of time to fleet replacement and fleet enhancement as well as potential to retrofit. I have had the good fortune of catching trains in Hong Kong. It is interesting to see in other places around the world how they can upgrade existing carriages as well as complement them with new trains.

We inherited government last March with a dismal set of affairs when it came to the Waratah project and also to the replacement strategy. We have now dealt with those issues through the plan. We are looking forward to receiving more Waratah carriages. We are looking forward to increasing services, which is so important. I also want to stress the point that our Rail Future strategy has two key areas of improvements in terms of overhauling the timetable but also looking at clock-face stopping patterns, which make it easier for customers but also increase the likelihood of providing express services. We are also looking at significantly improving dual management, which is something to which you referred. That means that trains spend less time at stations and more time taking people where they need to go.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: But you accept it also means that some passengers, when they seek to get on their trains, will not be able to?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Unfortunately that was the case when we took over Government, and that was because 416 daily rail services had been ripped out of the system. When you have fewer services—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: So you are actively planning for that sort of management to happen as the system continues to get more overcrowded?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: As you can appreciate, we inherited a system where the population is increasing but the previous Government had chosen to rip out 416 daily rail services. Therefore, of course, you are going to have challenges in relation to overcrowding and draw management, which is why we were addressing those issues and which is why we increased by 60 weekly services—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: You have already told us that three times, thank you, Minister.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: And there will be more to come next year as we go through the process of massively rewriting the timetable.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: We look forward to seeing that. You have turned in the worst on-time running figures in four years, with every line being affected and seven out of 16 lines not meeting the Government's own 92 per cent target. You recently said it would be at least three years until this would be improved. Given the massive funding deficit in the transport master plan and the lack of support for public transport projects in the Infrastructure NSW plan being prioritised by this Government, how long before commuters can be guaranteed that their trains will run on time?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I accept the sentiments in your question because when I became Minister for Transport I said the challenges we face would take longer than a month and longer than a year to fix. That is certainly the case. I believe I have been very open and transparent about the challenges we face. Certainly there are lots of figures and statistics I would like to see improved in the future. I make no excuses for that, but you cannot turn around a system which was run down and not run as efficiently as possible because of bad leadership from the previous Government.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Not wanting to go back to the future but given you love it so much, could you accept that the last three years of the Labor Government delivered on-time running on the 92 per cent figure—on the same basis that on-time running is currently measured—for every single line? If you accept that, which you should because that is what the statistics say, how do you explain that seven out of 16 lines on your watch are not meeting on-time running figures and you have said it will be three years before they get any better?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: As you would know because you were Parliamentary Secretary for Transport, customers need a number of measures in addition to on-time running. One is travel times. When the previous Government took out so many services, it substantially slowed down the network. Regrettably, we saw travel times blow out. My challenge as the Minister for Transport is to increase the frequency of services, to reduce overcrowding and to maintain satisfactory and improved on-time running figures, and I do not resile from that for a second. We have many challenges awaiting us, but what excites me is the opportunity to turn around our system. I was pleased to get extremely positive feedback, for example, on our 20-year rail strategy. Experts around Australia and around the world who have observed major transformations—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I am sure you will share that with Parliament and we will get to hear about that another time.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: —know that you need to make the operational and network efficiencies; you need to build the project and then you need to offer additional services. All of that is contained in our planning work. It is bearing results because we have already noticed a return to services, the return of customer initiatives such as mobile phone reception in tunnels, such as quiet carriages—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I remind you that the opportunity for you to answer Dorothy Dixers has been given up by the Government's Committee members.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I am just answering the question.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I want to turn to transit officers and ask Mr Wielinga whether he has had advice from NSW Police whether it expects to meet the recruitment target of 610 officers by the end of June 2014?

Mr WIELINGA: We have a program that we are working jointly with on the training of those police officers. They are scheduled out in batches of 50 over the next 12 months or so. The last time I spoke to the commissioner about it he said he expected to achieve those numbers.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Given that the current commuter command is under strength—and I know this is a police issue—can you tell me how many transit officers are currently working on the RailCorp network?

Mr WIELINGA: I will need to come back to you with the numbers. I can speculate, but I would rather those be accurate.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: While you are doing that, can you tell me how many have been made redundant and how many, if any, have already been transferred over to be revenue protection officers?

Mr WIELINGA: We will take that on notice.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I have those figures in front of me. I can tell you that at present there are about 500 transit officers and about 328 police officers in the Police Transport Command.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: That is not what the police website says, and it is not the previous advice you have given when you said there were only 450 transit officers to start with. Anyway, we digress. Are transit officers operational on CountryLink services?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: My understanding is that since 1 May transit officers are operational on all CityRail stations. In relation to the number of security measures on CountryLink stations, I will take that on notice.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: So it is possible there are no transit officers currently operating on the country system?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: No, I know that we have the security measures on our CountryLink stations.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I am asking specifically about transit officers, not other security measures. If you have guards operating instead of transit officers, can you please also report that to the Committee?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Sure, I am happy to do that, but I also stress there is a difference in responsibility between what guards do and what transit officers do. Guards have an operational role on the network as opposed to security.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I meant security guards; I am not talking about guards on the trains.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Thank you for making that distinction, because I was not clear from the question.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I note that the Emu Plains stabling facility has been deferred indefinitely. Can you indicate what impact that is going to have on the Western line as a result of this deferment?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I will ask some of my officers to finish answering the question, but you would expect us as a new Government to run a fine-toothed comb over our capital program and determine what we believe the priorities to be. That is exactly what we have done with that stabling yard.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: So you would say there will be no impact on customers or passengers on the Western line as a result of the deferment of this project?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: The only impact we have had on Western line customers is a positive one, because last October we increased by 15 the weekly rail services offered on the Western line. We intend to increase the number of services we offer our western Sydney commuters.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Even though the trains are late?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I also know our Blue Mountains customers are particularly grateful for quiet carriages. I know some customers further down the line are also grateful for that. I am happy for one of my officers, if they wish, to provide any further information about an issue. But certainly what we have done in our capital program in RailCorp is, as you would expect every good new Government to do, to run a fine-toothed comb through all of our priorities and reprioritise, and that was determined not to be necessary at this time.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Can you provide to the Committee how much money was spent in the development of the project before you dumped it? Can you take that on notice? [*Time expired.*]

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: Minister, you finished your last session talking about transport access programs and I noted that you talked about upgrades of 35 stations. On 23 August you spoke in Parliament about those particular upgrade services. Given that Redfern train station is the seventh busiest station, do you have any timetable as to when commuters would see an accessibility lift there? I note you earlier acknowledged disabled people and parents with prams needing easy access. When do you think that Redfern train station will see a lift?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I emphasise with that community. Without wanting to harp too much on the past, the previous Government had made a commitment back in 2007. It was the former Premier who said they were continuing to work on upgrades to Redfern station. The previous Government had made a commitment five years ago and unfortunately did not meet that commitment. We are committed to looking at Redfern station. We know that approximately 1,300 trains stop at Redfern each weekday. We know that approximately 50,000 passenger movements happen there are on a weekday. Unfortunately, Redfern is one of many stations that need easy access. Obviously it is a considerable station with many engineering challenges. We have announced the first round of the station upgrades and I have announced an additional two. We are doing work on what it would take to upgrade Redfern.

As I provided an answer to the Hon. Cate Faehrmann, I would love to be able to provide easy access at all our stations. It is a question of understanding the scope of the work necessary and how we can prioritise that. As many commentators have stated, Redfern is almost a City Circle station. It is not quite, but it has a

significant number of people moving through there on a daily basis and a significant number of services. Obviously that will only increase in the future. I have asked the team to look at that station. We have done some preliminary work on scoping. Obviously, when I am in a position to be able to articulate anything we can do there, I will make that public. Rest assured that it certainly is on our radar in a big way.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: What other stations throughout New South Wales would be at that priority level of 50,000 people and all the statistics you just mentioned needing, say, a lift?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Just to give you some context about the challenge we face, we have about 307 stations on the network and when we came to Government only about 131 were considered to be wheelchair accessible. That is a huge challenge we face; about two-thirds of all stations do not have easy access. As you alluded, obviously some stations are larger than others and some have more challenging engineering issues than others when you talk about steepness and gradients. Some stations can have improved access with a ramp and others need a lift.

Redfern station pretty much needs everything and that is why it is complex. If it were easy, I am sure it would have happened years ago. That is why I have asked our department to look at that issue specifically. We are trying to make sure that we get to as many stations as possible on the resources we have. I have given a boost to the budget in relation to the transport access program and made a number of announcements in that regard. But that is one station. We actually even dedicate a lot of attention to that in our transport master plan draft because of its significance. But again, I have asked the department to scope what is required so that when resources are available we can consider what we do.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: Recently the media reported about train cancellations. The South Coast constantly has cancellations. Can you enlighten the Committee on exactly what the Government will do to reduce this?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Reliability of service is absolutely important. We are committed to fixing the trains. We are committed to improving reliability so that people can feel confident about that. The South Coast has experienced additional services and the additional seats we have provided. The quiet carriages are proving to be very popular as well. Obviously, we need to do better. The South Coast line is subject to track work as well because of sharing with freight services.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: We seem to have more buses.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Yes. I have been on the track-work buses a few times between Dapto and Kiama in particular.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: You would appreciate coming home from work that the last thing one needs is to be diverted onto a bus—a totally different system?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Yes.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: It is one of the frustrations on the South Coast.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I appreciate that and I have experienced it a couple of times when I have gone down to visit my colleagues. What I can tell you is that part of our Fixing the Trains strategy is about improving the way we do maintenance and reduce disruptions. If you look at our rail network compared to others in the world, other rail networks have very different ways of managing their maintenance, but they are not things you can change overnight because you want to make sure you maintain the quality of the upgrades and the maintenance but reduce the number of disruptions. Looking at ways in which we can improve that is part of our Fixing the Trains strategy, which I announced a few months ago. The South Coast line is subject to particular track work and also disruptions, which occur from freight services, but at the same time we have increased the number of services to the South Coast. I am looking forward to doing that again next year. Also, initiatives like the quiet carriages have improved customer experience and, obviously, we will try other initiatives.

We also have changed the way in which the platforms are configured at Central railway station. Some people have raised issues with it, but others have preferred it. We are looking at how we can improve services, especially with our regional customers. As you are aware, another significant reform I announced, which takes

place from 1 July, is the commencement of two new rail organisations: Sydney Trains and NSW Trains. From 1 July next year Sydney Trains will focus on Sydney metropolitan customers. Obviously, being on a train for 20 minutes is different to being on a train for two hours. NSW Trains will focus on all our customers, such as those from the South Coast, who travel for longer journey times. Obviously, passengers need more comfortable seats and toilet facilities. On-board facilities were a major issue for customers from the South Coast and other areas. We want to make sure that we have two new rail organisations specifically focussed on their own customer segments because, as I said, jumping on the train at Redfern or Newtown is different from jumping on a train in Kiama.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Returning to my previous question, how much was the fixed price lump sum that Mr Lock talked about earlier that was paid to John Holland for the light rail extension?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I will ask Mr Lock to answer that question.

Mr LOCK: It has not been paid to John Holland. It is for contract for future performance. They do not get paid until they do the work. The actual number I believe is on the Transport for NSW's website. From memory it is \$86 million, but I will get back to you to confirm that actual amount.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: How much money would be saved by drilling smaller tunnels for the North West Rail Link for single-deck trains?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I state at the outset that the scope for the north-west rail line is determined by world best practice and the customer outcomes we want. I have to accept what I said on the record when I spoke about the scope of the north-west rail line. When I was shadow Minister for Transport and then became the Minister for Transport I assumed that single-deck carriages were the best option for the new north-west rail line. Obviously, being subject to expert advice from within my department, and also expert advice from operators around the world externally and independently, I realised that to have a step change in the way we provide public transport in New South Wales, single decks were by far the best option. What is exciting about the north-west rail line is that that new single-deck service will actually be the start of a new rapid transit service in New South Wales. We are the only global city—if anyone has any other examples, please highlight them—that relies solely on double-deck carriages. It is about time—

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Is the Government saving any money by drilling tunnels suitable for single-deck rather than double-deck carriages?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: No doubt the diameter of a tunnel will cost less to drill if it is a smaller tunnel, however—

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Do you have a cost estimate? You would have to have firm figures?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Yes. Can I just say though that it will cost us more money to actually change the Chatswood to Epping rail line from a double-deck configured line to a single-deck one. We actually are spending resources to make sure we have a world-class rail network based on single-deck carriages. Obviously, we need to get operations and systems in place to allow us to introduce that rapid transit system. I do not know of anybody in the north-west or elsewhere who has actually told me that they do not want to have five-minute frequencies instead of 15-minute frequencies. That is an exciting prospect and also the beginning of a new network. I am happy to throw to Mr Staples—

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Double-deck trains do not mean 15-minute frequencies, with all due respect.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: But if we had not provided the scope we had because of the challenges of getting a certain number of services across the bridge and opted for the double-deck option, we would not have been able to get more than four services an hour or thereabouts across the bridge. That was the dilemma I faced. I had to ask myself, do I want to stick with what is fixed in my head and offer people a quarter of an hour service up to four services an hour or did I want to give people a five-minute frequency opportunity. Clearly, that was the best option. That is why we did the work we did. That is the benefit of being the Minister and having access to the best experts around Australia and the world for advice. I feel extremely vindicated and thank the team for testing our rail future strategy against the best experts in the world, all of which have been

effusive in the direction we are taking. If Mr Staples wants to add anything on that, I am happy for him to make some comment about that as well.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: No, that is fine. By when do you plan to build the second harbour rail crossing? What is your plan?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: What we have said to date about the second harbour crossing is that we have actually already started planning work now. As you can appreciate, alignments, possible routes and possible options take a long time to get ready. Unfortunately, it was the kind of work the previous Government had not done. What we have said on the public record is that after we build and open the north-west rail line the next major rail project will be the second harbour crossing. Not only does that help residents who use the north-west rail line, but also it will increase capacity substantially across the whole rail network. If we are serious about increasing services and running more trains an hour through the network—

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: When you are preparing those cost estimates and you are looking at the planning stage are you going to be preparing cost estimates for several alternatives including a tunnel, as well as using the existing bridge, whether it is the current car deck or under the bridge—I am sure you are aware of the alternatives that have been thrown around on this—will you be looking at all alternatives or are you committed to one?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Just to give you an example, when we considered what the rail future should be and considered all the options that exist about our 20-year strategy, including the scope of the north-west rail line, we considered 15 different options. They are outlined in the draft Transport Master Plan. We have dedicated quite a bit of work to the planning. All the different options we had before us and why we chose the option we did in terms of our 20-year rail future are publicly available.

I believe very strongly—sometimes to my detriment—that doing the homework is the best thing to do. I do not want to announce things publicly until we do our homework. I have openly said we know from the work we have done that the next major rail project after the north-west rail line has to be the second harbour crossing. We have started the planning work now and when we are at a stage—

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Is that planning work planning for single or double-deck trains and is it planning for a tunnel or a car deck? Do you know more in relation to the scope of the project?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: The draft Transport Master Plan has quite a bit of detail. The rail future document looks at potentially Chatswood to Redfern in terms of a route but there are lots of permutations and options in terms of how you do it. It will be a single-deck option because that increases the capacity. We have the double-deck option already. The rail future strategy, the 20-year plan, indicates all that. That is subject to testing. We are very much in preliminary stages.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Minister, the problem with the single deck is that it automatically excludes the double deck.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: We already have a double-deck crossing.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: If there is a train stuck on the double-deck crossing—that we have seen many times before—what does that mean?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: What the rail future document highlights for us is—

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: It means the double-deck train cannot use the single deck tunnel.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Obviously. If you look at the most successful systems around the world they have dedicated rail lines for particular rolling stock. It is not best practice to have two different types of systems running on the same line. I am happy if any of the rail experts want to add to that.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Everybody is protective of time in terms of questions.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I am happy to provide more information on that.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Minister, can you guarantee the day rail service to Dubbo will continue?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I am very pleased to say that we regard country rail travel as very important. I have given every indication that services that currently exist will continue to exist. I realise a lot of the scaremongering that took place about our not fulfilling our commitment in relation to Bathurst, but I am pleased to say that in a few weeks I will welcome the first commuter service to Central railway station from Bathurst.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: In light of the Bathurst service that is going to be introduced, will there be any reduction or impact on the Dubbo service? Will it continue as a rail service?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Not at all. We have a lot of work to do in terms of making our system more efficient but any gains we make from making the system more efficient will be returned by way of increased services.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: It will be a rail service; there are no plans to turn it into a coach service?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: No, there are no plans to turn it into a coach service.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: In light of the Bathurst day return train and the move of the carriages from Maitland to service the day return service to Bathurst, can you guarantee that the CountryLink services into the Hunter will not be impacted at all?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Absolutely. Given the understandable interest in the Bathurst rail service, I will let you know what is happening: We are going to have a new—

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: I have moved on to the Hunter site.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: As I have said on the record, we are about making efficiencies in how we operate our network and increasing our services. That remains our position.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Just to be clear, there will be no impact on the Hunter CountryLink services because of the introduction?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: The introduction of the Bathurst commuter service is a standalone improvement and there will not be any detrimental impact on any other part of the network. I was buoyed by the response we had when we announced the Bathurst service because a lot of country towns said how grateful they were—even if they lived a distance from Bathurst—that the State Government was giving attention to country rail. That is a commitment we made and a commitment I am proud to make and I cannot wait to welcome the first commuter service to Bathurst in a few weeks time.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Minister, I want to ask you about consultants for recruitment services. The eTendering website from Transport for New South Wales—

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Can you repeat that?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Consultants for recruitment services: the eTendering website indicates that Transport for New South Wales has paid \$5,137,686 for recruitment services. I would like to confirm whether that is correct? I want you to take on notice if there are any services that have not been put on the register. Within that I would particularly like to know how many positions they were contracted to recruit for \$5 million plus. How many people for the positions have been successfully recruited? How many people are actually in the positions? How many positions remain unfilled, and is the cost of advertising included in the contracts or is it a separate line item?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Ms Sharpe, I am happy to take that on notice. It is a very detailed question and I do not know all the details. I can assure you that in the annual report we will make sure that whatever we are required to disclose publicly will be disclosed in the annual report. I do not know off-hand the specific answers.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: That is fine. I appreciate that. Minister, the draft New South Wales Long Term Master Plan does not mention the Cooks River to Iron Cove GreenWay. Do you concede that under this Government funding for the GreenWay will never be provided?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: We had to make the tough decision to defer the GreenWay project. It was a tough decision and I did not take the decision lightly. I know the amount of community angst about that decision but I had to do what I thought was in the best interests of the State. I did not want to see a delay in the inner west light rail extension and I wanted to make sure that any future funding proposals regarding the GreenWay and other active transport cycleways were part of an integrated strategy. We have a large section dedicated to active transport in the draft master plan—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I know that. That is fine, but the fact that it is not in the 20-year draft plan means it is not going to be built in 20 years, is it?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I would not make that assumption.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Are you saying that there are projects that are currently not in the 20-year master plan—which is supposed to be the great plan that dictates everything that is happening in transport—that might drop in and if so which ones are they and can we go and tell people so they can start applying for their new projects?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I reiterate that we did not take the decision to defer the GreenWay lightly but what the Transport Master Plan provides is a guide for a strategic framework in an active transport strategy. It is a draft. We are looking forward to providing greater detail in the future about what active transport initiatives we are taking, whether it refers to cycling or pedestrian access. The key thing is getting the framework ready for integration. If we are serious about getting more people cycling—people like me are not going to use a cycleway that merges into a bus lane—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: You cannot use a GreenWay if it is not there either, Minister. I want to ask you a taxi question. There is a currently a taxi driver who is working in New South Wales who was found by the Administrative Decisions Tribunal to have made vilifying remarks on his blog. They are pretty offensive and I am not planning on putting them on public record here. It has been suggested that after investigations this person continues to make similar offensive remarks to passengers in his taxi. Are you willing to look and include breaches of antidiscrimination laws in assessments of people to be a fit and proper person to hold a taxi licence?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Roads and Maritime Services has very strict guidelines as to who is allowed to drive a taxi and the various rules they have to adhere to. Unfortunately, we cannot interfere with what the Administrative Decisions Tribunal determines. We can certainly determine the rules and regulations we have in place.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: That is what I am asking, Minister.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: If you are happy to provide me with the details—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Yes, I am happy to provide the details. I believe this person has made comments like, "The Mardi Gras is a very wrong event. It is run by child paedophiles and criminals who sell pornography." He has also made—and this has been found to be true by the Administrative Decisions Tribunal—a number of remarks that are very offensive to the Muslim community in New South Wales. Clearly, if you are saying these things to passengers as they are going home late at night, they are incredibly inappropriate. I want to know whether Transport for NSW—and I understand also that these issues have been around for a while—would be prepared to look at these sorts of breaches and whether this is a fit and proper person to be driving a taxi and taking public passengers.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: If you are happy to provide me with further details, I am happy for the department to look at that. Obviously, we maintain the highest standards when it comes to issuing licences and maintaining guidelines; we expect a certain level of customer experience and customer service for anybody who uses our public transport modes.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Minister, you went to the 2011 election on a policy that said, "A New South Wales Liberals and Nationals Government will build light rail in the CBD." Your draft master plan backs away from this commitment by stating that, "subject to ongoing feasibility work, the centrepiece of a redesigned bus network in the CBD will be a high capacity north-south light rail line as part of a pedestrian boulevard on George Street". Infrastructure NSW clearly dumps light rail in the central business district entirely for a bus rapid transit project. Will you deliver on your promise to the people of Sydney that light rail in the central business district will be built?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Thank you for that question. When we came to government we absolutely committed to a feasibility study of light rail in three specific corridors: one was the central business district, as you mentioned; the second was from Circular Quay to the University of New South Wales; and the third was from Circular Quay to the University of Sydney. Early on, it was obvious to us that the route from Central to the University of Sydney was not feasible, so we did not do any further work on that. We have done further work on the feasibility of light rail through the central business district and also to the University of New South Wales.

Obviously, the Government will consider the light rail strategic plan once it is finalised. And we are responding to the State Infrastructure Strategy by the end of the year. So by the end of the year the public will have a very good appreciation of what we are doing in relation to light rail. But I stress that I am very pleased that we have met our commitment to do a lot of work in relation to light rail through the central business district and to the University of New South Wales. I have also stressed on the public record that the only route that is really feasible for light rail in the central business district, if the Government chose to do that, is down George Street. The other routes did not prove to be feasible, and that is something we said on the public record.

ACTING-CHAIR: Sorry, Minister, but we will have to move on, if that is all right.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Yes.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: Minister, in recent times government has looked at expanding the laws on smoke-free zones to bus stops and taxi zones. Can you elaborate how you will ensure compliance with those expanded laws?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Obviously, smoking is prohibited in certain public transport places already, such as on train platforms. The Minister for Health, quite rightly, has extended smoke-free zones to bus stops and other areas. This sends a strong message to the community. We would love to be able to say we can police that at all times at all places, but that is not possible. But I think this sends a very strong message to the community that invading people's space by smoking in public transport queues is not on, and the Government opposes it. Obviously, we have responsibility to ensure the public is informed about our position; and we will do what we can.

If there is a Police Transport Command officer or a security person in the vicinity and someone is smoking, they will be told not to. We would love to be able to be at all places at all times. But I think it is important that the will of the Government is to prevent the detriment of passive smoking to people who are catching public transport. Public transport is a very healthy way to get around, and of course we want to maximise that by reducing the impact of passive smoking.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: So are you envisaging an advertising campaign or some other measure?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: NSW Health has its anti-smoking campaigns; and, in introducing the regulations in addition to legislation, the Minister for Health spoke about various places being targeted for information and education. I am not sure whether anyone at the table can offer further input on what I have stated, but the Government has discussed the issue and is very proud of the stance it has taken. It is interesting that people who catch public transport generally have a healthier lifestyle because they are mobile and walk to get to a bus stop or train stop; and we want to encourage that kind of lifestyle.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: How much money was spent last financial year on the clean-up of graffiti or repair of damage caused by vandals?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I am sure Rob Mason, the Chief Executive Officer of RailCorp, will be able to give you more specifics on that issue, but I want to say that, as part of our Fixing the Train Strategy, cleanliness was a huge initiative for us. Cleanliness is not only—

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: Next to godliness.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: You are from the right party to articulate that.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: Sorry.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: But as part of our Fixing the Train Strategy we committed to improving the cleanliness of our stations. That is why we have set up a separate cleaning authority, which will focus on the issue of graffiti removal. But we also know that the presence of the Police Transport Command will be a deterrent against graffiti. A positive response on cleanliness has a number of important positive impacts on the rail network. Firstly, it provides a better customer experience. But we also know, from information that police provide us, that graffiti often leads to other, more serious crimes. If we are able to prevent people from putting graffiti on the network we reduce the propensity for an increase in crime. That is one of the reasons that the Commissioner for Police and his team were so enthusiastic about taking over the Public Transport Command, because that gives police the opportunity to deal with those issues. Rob Mason might have some additional information on the types of resources we are putting into that, and I will throw to him for that.

Mr MASON: In the financial year 2010-11, the last published results, we spent \$40 million on things like graffiti removal and vandalism. That includes things like window replacements, when somebody kicks out a window or scratches windows, film in the windows, graffiti paint-outs on trains—

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Point of order, Chair.

ACTING-CHAIR: I am sorry, Mr Mason, but we have run out of time. Could you provide the rest of that answer on notice?

Mr MASON: Yes.

ACTING-CHAIR: Thank you.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Sorry. I did not mean to be rude, but we do have limited time. Minister, could you tell the Committee what was the final estimated cost of the GreenWay at the time you said it would not be built?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Yes, I can.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: I have a figure of \$37 million.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I just want to confirm that figure.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: If you could just confirm the figure, rather than reading out all about GreenWay.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: When we came to government I asked the department to do some work on the GreenWay. Labor promised that the total cost of both the light rail and the GreenWay was \$150 million. Unfortunately, our estimate is that the cost of both was \$213 million.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: So what is your figure for the GreenWay?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I will have to take that question on notice. From memory, it was about \$37 million.

Mr LOCK: My memory is exactly the same: \$37 million.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Could you also take on notice this question and provide the Committee with a breakdown, as much as you can, of what was in that \$37 million?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Whatever information we have about that I am happy to provide. But I know that the figure that Labor quoted was an underestimate.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Sure. But I am talking about your figures now.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Unfortunately, they had not done the pre-feasibility and engineering, scoping and design work. And once we did that, we knew that the cost estimate was way under what it would have been.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: I have in front of me a spreadsheet entitled "Inner West Extension Forecast Cost Summary, July 2011," which is an internal departmental document of Transport for NSW. Again, this is heavily redacted and has none of the figures on how much it would have cost you to deliver the inner west extension with the GreenWay, or the light rail extension without the GreenWay. But it does show a few figures in relation to the GreenWay. The total cost shown here for the GreenWay is \$34.377 million, as at July last year. It has the GreenWay direct costs at about \$18.042 million. Then it has indirect costs of about \$8.300 million. It has a contingency of about 25 per cent, which is about another \$7 million. Contingency and indirect costs for a project of \$34.5 million—that is a lot of uncertainty and a lot of costs not associated with just getting out there and building it, is it not? Could your department probably have built the GreenWay for a cheaper price if you put your mind to it?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I wish we could, and if that was the case we certainly would have considered that. But I will ask Mr Lock to give you some further information on those breakdowns which you described.

Mr LOCK: We spent a degree of time in the rail costing inquiry around contingency—

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: We did and we are still getting overinflated prices, so I am still going to keep pushing.

Mr LOCK: I will keep answering questions.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: We all keep pushing on that case; it is a common issue.

Mr LOCK: The language of indirect cost is that cost which the construction contractor incurs over and above the cost of physical concrete, physical reinforcement and the labour to pour the concrete and so on. So this is the contractor's site supervision, the contractor's margin profit, the contractor's risk allowance and so on.

ACTING-CHAIR: Mr Lock, if you have any more information, could you provide it on notice as well? We will now move on to State Transit questions from the Opposition.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Mr Rowley, last year I asked you about the fire suppression systems and you told me that you thought you were going to be going to tender for the fire suppression systems in the near future. I notice that this tender was let on 1 August this year. I note the new deadline for all of the compressed natural gas buses being fitted with the system is April 2013. Could you just take me through where that is up to and whether that deadline is going to be met?

Mr ROWLEY: The tender was released in March, issued in late July—

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: It went on the register on 1 August.

Mr ROWLEY: The actual contract is for full installation over an 18-month period with five years' worth of maintenance after that. Even though there is an installation timetable of 18 months I am advised that full installation will occur prior to April 2013, and that was in the 18 months, as I indicated at last year's budget estimates.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Are you able to tell me how many have been fitted so far?

Mr ROWLEY: No, I cannot; I am sorry.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Could you take that on notice and let me know?

Mr ROWLEY: I will take that on notice.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I also note that the licence for the bus advertising contracts has recently been let. If I read it correctly it is \$100 million over five years. Is that correct?

Mr ROWLEY: Say that again, sorry?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I have got the contract award notice for a State Transit Authority licence to sell advertising space in the State Transit vehicles recently let—estimated value \$100 million over five years.

Mr ROWLEY: No, I do not think that is correct.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: That is what it says here. I can show it to you if you like. Is that a typo?

Mr ROWLEY: I think it is \$16 million a year for the advertising rights on our buses.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: You might want to check because the document I have in front of me, which is from the eTendering website, publishing date 8 August, says that the contract value for the licence to sell advertising space on State Transit vehicles is \$100 million and that is over five years. You do not know anything about that?

Mr ROWLEY: I will have to take that on notice. My understanding is \$16 million a year. I do not know where that information has come from.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: It has come from the eTendering website and the contract award notice, so you will have to believe me. I am happy to give it to you after the meeting. On that basis what I am interested in is the money that comes from the contract. Does that go into consolidated revenue or does it stay with Transport for NSW?

Mr ROWLEY: State Transit is funded, like any private bus operator, under the Metropolitan Bus Service contracts. Each dollar we earn from alternate revenue streams means that I can put in a lower bid for those contracts and therefore State Transit retains the revenue for the advertising rights on our buses.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: So all of that money stays with you?

Mr ROWLEY: That is right. There is a small commission given to Transport for NSW due to the new buses that it funds.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Would you be able to provide details to the Committee about the commission?

Mr ROWLEY: Yes; that is not a problem.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: You may not be the person to ask, but is there a different arrangement in relation to private buses and advertising and who gets the money for that?

Mr ROWLEY: I can only answer what I think I know: It is the same for the private industry. However, they do not have the pulling power that State Transit does so their advertising is nowhere near as—

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Lucrative.

Mr ROWLEY: That is right.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Does that mean that if State Transit was privatised you would be getting less revenue?

Mr ROWLEY: No. It is the operating environment that we operate in that makes our services attractive to advertisers.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: The issue of security on buses is obviously important. There has been a lot in the media about that poor bus driver and I know there are issues around the new night buses coming from the coast. I notice that there has been another tender let—and I hope it is right this time: \$6 million over three years for security functions on buses for State Transit, which includes duties such as patrolling trains and bus depots. Can you confirm that that is correct?

Mr ROWLEY: I would have to take on notice the actual amount. I know that we provide approximately \$2.8 million per annum for security guards to patrol our buses in regions where there is antisocial behaviour. However, over the coming years with the new Transport Security Command we are looking at ways to reduce the reliance on external security guards and utilise that organisation.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: On 18 September a contract award notice was put up that said \$6 million over three years to provide patrolling services as you have just described. Does that mean that you are cutting \$800,000 a year from bus security?

Mr ROWLEY: No. There are two parts of that security tender, from memory: there is one where it is on-road mobile security—in other words, on our buses when they are out on the road; there is also a component about security in our depots. We have reduced the reliance of security in our depots when we introduced a new structure into our depot environment where we had yard supervisors introduced and they did access control rather than security guards.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: So physically there will be the same number of people on buses under this contract?

Mr ROWLEY: Yes.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Can you provide to the Committee how many people there currently are and how many will be provided over the course of this contract in a way that makes sense—per week or however many years and how many buses they are on?

Mr ROWLEY: Yes.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Is the amount that is provided for the Kings Cross late night buses over and above what is in this contract?

Mr ROWLEY: Yes, that is a separate contract.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I know that the Minister came back to us about the Twitter 131 500 buses. Is the time frame for all of those, including buses, only Monday to Friday, only from the figure that you gave us? I am sorry I cannot recall it off the top of my head.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: From what I understand it is on all modes from Monday to Friday 5.30 a.m. to 7.30 p.m. That is the information I have. But if that is not correct I am happy to be corrected.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Mr Rowley, in the 2011-12 budget it suggests that there will be 261 new buses—95 buses for State Transit and 166 for private operators. Is that correct?

Mr ROWLEY: I cannot speak for the private industry, but there are 95 replacement buses anticipated coming into State Transit, yes.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Can you tell me how many of those have been delivered to date?

Mr ROWLEY: What financial year?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: It is 2011-12—it is new.

Mr ROWLEY: There are two contracts on foot: there is a Volvo contract over a two-year period delivering 100 buses and there is a Scania contract over a two-year period delivering another 100 buses. All those buses are on schedule at the moment.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Can you remind me which manufacturers are making those buses?

Mr ROWLEY: Custom Coaches are doing the bodies on both contracts.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Are there any buses at all now being made at Volgren?

Mr ROWLEY: We just had 30 B7s made up at Volgren and they have been delivered into Newcastle.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Are there any more planned to be coming out of Volgren?

Mr ROWLEY: I am yet to put in an order for 2013-14. There will be a further 93 buses being ordered in 2013-14. I will be utilising the Transport for NSW new bus panel, so that decision as to who the manufacturer is of those buses is yet to be determined.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Is it likely that Volgren will struggle to compete given that they are not currently making any buses for this year other than the ones they have just delivered?

Mr ROWLEY: I cannot answer how Volgren are travelling. Certainly I am aware that CDC had a number of buses being built up there but I do not know specifics of the private industry. All I can talk about are my contracts.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I appreciate that. Thank you.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: I understand that State Transit has adopted a number of anti-graffiti strategies over recent years. Can you elaborate on what they are and how much they cost?

Mr ROWLEY: Graffiti is a real issue for public transport in general. An initiative that we put in place is providing film on buses to stop the etching. Graffiti is something that we can actually get on top of reasonably quickly. If we can identify the graffiti, as in Texta and so forth, we can get in, clean it off and it is not too bad. These days the etching of the rear windows especially is a major problem for us. It is very expensive to remove. We have trialled 3M film, which means the etching gets onto the film and not the window. We do not have to replace the window; we just replace the film. However, that is once again very expensive. I know we have worked this out in recent times. I think costs are about \$2 million per annum on graffiti, and that is cleaning, supervision and replacing the window film.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: Who is cleaning them? Have the cleaners got something with them or is someone actually hired?

Mr ROWLEY: If a bus is graffitied to the extent that it may get changed over on the road our mobile supervisors have spill kits and clean-up kits that can clean up the bus sufficiently to keep the bus on the road and prevent any disruption to service. However, on most occasions as a bus comes in through the fuelling bay the fueller walks through the bus to see if there is anything untoward on the bus and then reports that night to the evening cleaners. If there is graffiti on the bus the evening cleaners clean off the graffiti as they go through the bus. If you can get the graffiti within 24 hours there is a good chance you will get it all off.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: Secondly, what sorts of numbers are we seeing in prosecutions?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I am happy to answer that question if that is okay, Mr Rowley. Also I inadvertently gave a figure of 500 current transits when I talked about transits and police officers. It is actually 400 transits and the correct figure for police officers. I just wanted to correct the record. In relation to the question asked by Mr Green, as Mr Rowley would know, State Transit has been working with police local area commands, councils and schools to reduce antisocial behaviour such as graffiti. I have some figures in front of me that state that during 2011 State Transit staff conducted 56 joint operations with police. More than 3,000 buses were inspected and more than 68,000 passengers were checked and 605 fines were issued.

Over the next three years \$25 million of new closed-circuit television cameras and duress alarms will be installed on passenger bus services in Sydney, Newcastle, Wollongong and the Central Coast. This will also allow private bus companies to add the latest security technology to their fleets. All new buses coming into service, as I understand it, must have cameras fitted which aid in the early detection of antisocial behaviour. I

commend the work that Mr Rowley has done in relation to this issue. It is a tough ask. I sit on buses a lot and I know the challenges we face. I commend the action he is taking. I am also pleased that the transition from transits to police transport command will mean we will have more police on the beat as well. We know that a police presence is always a huge deterrent to antisocial behaviour.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: What about prosecutions directly dealing with graffiti?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I will need to take that on board. I do not have a figure in front of me but if the figure exists I am happy to provide it to the Committee. I know a certain number of fines have been issued which cover a broad range of issues but I am happy to provide any information we have on that point.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: I just note that in a question without notice there was something about 60 prosecutions in Newcastle and two in Sydney. I was just wondering why there is such disparity in the prosecutions.

Mr ROWLEY: I cannot answer that.

The Hon. PAUL GREEN: I am sure I will get further information on that. I will leave it for another day.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Has the department done any work on an underground CBD bus tunnel?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: As we are all aware that was a recommendation made last week by Infrastructure NSW through its State Infrastructure Strategy. Obviously, we will consider that recommendation and the Government will respond in total to the State Infrastructure Strategy by the end of the year. We will obviously incorporate any of the work we have done into our final Transport Master Plan.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Nothing has come from within the department in relation to an underground CBD bus tunnel? You have done no work internally?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: No, I would not say that at all and I would not make that assumption. But the Government obviously has a number of issues to consider when it comes to the future of public transport and road configuration in the CBD. We have outlined the work that we have done currently in the draft Transport Master Plan. Last week's release by Infrastructure NSW of the State Infrastructure Strategy has also made a number of suggestions that we will consider.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: The draft master plan does not mention an underground CBD bus tunnel, does it?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I know that we have considered a lot of options; however, given that Infrastructure NSW has raised that in its State Infrastructure Strategy I will be asking the team to look at that proposal, because we have committed to responding to the State Infrastructure Strategy by the end of the year.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: What discussions did you or your senior officers around the table have with Infrastructure NSW around its proposed underground CBD bus tunnel—the big alternative to your light rail?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: There are ongoing discussions about those issues and again infrastructure—

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: What discussions were there and who around the table had those discussions with Infrastructure NSW? Perhaps Mr Rowley can answer in terms of buses?

Mr ROWLEY: No.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: No discussions with Infrastructure NSW?

Mr ROWLEY: I was not asked, no.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Infrastructure NSW is at liberty to make recommendations, which they have done. As a government it would be prudent and sensible—which is what the Premier has announced—for us to consider those suggestions when we are formulating our plans in relation to the CBD.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Do you think Infrastructure NSW would have had discussions with Minister Duncan Gay and his staff about the various toll roads that they have suggested?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: You will have to ask the Minister that question.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: About Parramatta Road?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: That is a question for Ministers with that responsibility. I assure this Committee that our Government is focused on delivering major change and upgrades. As far as the CBD is concerned, we know we have a huge issue with bus congestion. I know that firsthand.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: Minister, do you think an underground bus tunnel is a viable option and do you have any views, for example, on what we would do with the smog created underground? I wonder whether you have discussed this. What are your views? Is it viable?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: The State Infrastructure Strategy has outlined that as one of its recommendations and we will be responding to that by the end of the year. We are obligated to make sure that we consider all expert independent advice that we receive. Infrastructure NSW was tasked with the job of providing us with independent advice and recommendations. It is our obligation in relation to the parts that relate to Transport to consider those options and report by the end of the year, which we will do.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: So Infrastructure NSW did not approach your department to find out whether any work had been done on an underground CBD bus tunnel, which might have saved them a bit of work? Nobody picked up the phone from Infrastructure NSW and said, "Maybe this has been done before. Maybe Transport for NSW is already thinking about this. Let us see what they have." Nobody around the table received a call from Infrastructure NSW? Mr Lock is shaking his head.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I am certainly not suggesting that did or did not happen. I cannot comment on whether Infrastructure NSW—

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: It sounds as though it did not happen, Minister. With respect, everybody around you is either shaking their head or not answering. I am sure if somebody had spoken to Infrastructure NSW they would have spoken up by now. I am assuming that there were no discussions about the underground CBD tunnel with Transport for NSW. That is frankly extraordinary.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: But, Ms Faehrmann, can I also make this point in relation to Infrastructure NSW: Its job is not to echo the Government; its job is not to rely on advice that I receive. Its job is to provide independent, external advice, and that is its prerogative. What would be the point of its existence if it just relied on the advice that I receive as the Minister for Transport?

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: It is pretty important for the taxpayer. For the Premier now to have a look at the transport master plan and the widely diverging Infrastructure NSW master plan strategy is madness because now we have to choose between one or the other.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I do not agree with the implication in your question. Both strategies complement each other. We are looking forward to providing the Government's response.

The Hon. CATE FAEHRMANN: I am not sure whether complementing each other is the right language.

ACTING-CHAIR: Order!

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Can I just finish this statement? We are looking forward to responding formally as a Government to the State Infrastructure Strategy. I and people at this table, I am sure, will join me in looking forward to finalising our final transport master plan. I hope everyone around the table makes a submission, if you have not done so already.

ACTING-CHAIR: Minister, I thank you and your officers for your time and for appearing before the Committee this afternoon. I remind you that answers to questions taken on notice are to be received within 21 days upon receipt of the questions.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I thank you, Mr Acting-Chairman, and all the Committee members for their contributions today.

(The witnesses withdrew)

The Committee proceeded to deliberate.
