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Executive Summary

The RAC welcomes the release of the Public Transport Network Plan (Public Transport Plan for Perth in 2031: Mapping out the Future for Perth’s Public Transport Network) and the announcement that this Plan will be complemented by a Metropolitan Roads Network Plan, a Metropolitan Freight Plan, and a Metropolitan Bicycle Network Plan.

The Public Transport Network Plan (the Plan) is a considered and thoughtful contribution to the debate on how to meet the mobility challenges facing our capital city. It has the potential to be a key tool in delivering much needed public transport infrastructure and services and the RAC welcomes the willingness to embrace new public transport options such as light rail and rapid bus transit services.

Public Transport will be one of the key levers through which the State Government is able to deliver vibrant and revitalised activity centres that are well connected to Perth’s residential population. These connections must be made in both the inner and perhaps most importantly outer sub-regions where mobility is constrained and people are most vulnerable to rising transport costs.

While the Plan is a useful first step in the process, it does have some significant shortcomings. In particular there is currently no funding committed to delivering the Plan and the staging of projects appears to lack a sense of urgency. The involvement of stakeholders is essential to improve the scope and substance of the Plan and to help guarantee work moves swiftly from the planning stage to implementation.
Recommendations

The RAC provides the following recommendations which are discussed in more detail in this submission:

**STAGING**

**RECOMMENDATION 1**
An additional, higher population growth scenario should be modelled to identify the appropriate project staging if population grows at a faster rate than the Western Australian Planning Commission has forecast. A similarly varied scenario for higher than anticipated patronage growth should also be applied.

**RECOMMENDATION 2**
Infrastructure projects are separated into three timeframes – implementation before 2021, before 2031 or after 2031. The Plan should be reviewed to bring forward projects for delivery to provide a sense of urgency and priority to investment in public transport. A firm commitment to actions should be indicated in the Plan and timeframes assigned to all investment decisions.

**FUNDING**

**RECOMMENDATION 3**
The Plan should call for increased investment in transport, rather than trying to spread existing allocations over an increasing number of priority projects. The Plan should also identify timeframes for the preparation of funding plans for public transport projects.

**RECOMMENDATION 4**
The RAC welcomes the Plan’s call for government to seek contributions from the private sector. However, further detail needs to be provided regarding the preferred mechanisms for obtaining developer contributions, as well as clarification on the future role/extent of parking levies and the application of the cash-in-lieu model.

**INTEGRATION**

**RECOMMENDATION 5**
Explanation is required to show how the Plan will integrate with other metropolitan transport strategies and plans that are currently being prepared.

**RECOMMENDATION 6**
The time when important activity centres are connected to rapid transit services needs to be advanced and new public transport connections made. Connection of the five strategic centres and key employment nodes (greater than 5000 workers) to other centres via radial rapid transit services is a priority.

**RECOMMENDATION 7**
The Plan should detail proposed major development projects and how these will be connected to the current system.
**INFRASTRUCUTRE / SERVICES**

**RECOMMENDATION 8**
The construction of key heavy rail projects is pushed too far into the future and these should be brought forward, including construction of heavy rail brought forward at least prior to 2031, and possibly 2021 including:
- Extension of the Thornlie line to Canning Vale, with a connection to the Mandurah Line at Cockburn Central
- Extension of the Armadale Line to Byford
- Construction of the airport rail link.

**RECOMMENDATION 9**
In order to avoid expensive land purchase and retrofit costs, plans for future rail right-of-way reserves need to be detailed. This is particularly important for developing areas identified by the *Urban Growth Monitor*. It is essential that public transport infrastructure is planned to coincide with development rather than follow it, to avoid vehicle use becoming established as the main mode of transport in new communities.

**RECOMMENDATION 10**
In the same vein as long-term planning for new public transport corridors, a long-term plan for the identification and development of priority transit oriented development is needed.

**RECOMMENDATION 11**
A long-term program should be established to upgrade existing stations.

**RECOMMENDATION 12**
Strong emphasis should be placed on ensuring commuter support for new public transport links to help reduce negative perceptions from loss of road space.

**RECOMMENDATION 13**
Existing rail network capacity needs to be more thoroughly detailed including when this will be utilised and expended. A plan is needed for how trains will access or pass through the city centre once Perth Station reaches capacity.

**RECOMMENDATION 14**
More information is required about the future operation and potential expansion of CAT services. Additionally, consideration should be given to the provision of similar high frequency bus services in major activity centres and central area suburbs.

**RECOMMENDATION 15**
More detailed route alignments are required to allow for a more rigorous assessment of the adequacy of the proposed projects.

**IMPLEMENTATION**

**RECOMMENDATION 16**
A statement describing the preferred governance arrangements for developing projects would provide more clarity around implementation. Additionally there is merit in establishing an implementation committee through which stakeholders can stay informed and contribute to the implementation of the Plan.

**RECOMMENDATION 17**
Performance indicators are crucial to ensuring that outcomes are monitored. Performance indicators including an accessibility measure should be detailed in the Plan and monitored by an implementation committee.
Introduction

1.1 The RAC
The RAC represents the interests of more than 720,000 Western Australians and is a leading advocate on the mobility issues and challenges facing our State.

The RAC collaborates with government and other organisations on issues that affect the way Western Australians move around their community, informing and representing members on such issues as road and vehicle safety, fuel pricing, transport planning, infrastructure funding, energy and the environment. The RAC is committed to ensuring that the right public policies are in place to deliver safe, accessible and sustainable mobility options for its members and the broader community.

1.2 Background
By 2020, Western Australia’s population is expected to grow by more than 500,000 people. Using current levels of motor vehicle registrations, this could mean an extra 400,000 vehicles on our roads by the end of this decade. It has been forecast that traffic congestion will cost the WA economy more than $2billion each year.

These figures illustrate the enormous challenge we face in providing safe, accessible and sustainable mobility options. There is now a real sense of urgency that this challenge must be confronted sooner rather than later.

Despite its motoring heritage, the RAC has been a long-standing advocate for an efficient and effective public transport system. The RAC believes that ongoing investment in our road network should be complemented with investment in extending the reach, quality and accessibility of public transport.

Western Australia has the fastest growing population in Australia. The RAC is concerned that key government planning documents appear to be based on a population growth estimate which is at the lower end of expectations. It is essential that public transport options are planned and developed well ahead of population growth, not as an afterthought. This means committing significant funding at the outset of this Plan’s period of effectiveness.

The RAC welcomed the release of the Public Transport Network Plan as an important step in this debate. We also welcomed the creative mix of transport infrastructure types particularly light rail and bus rapid transit (BRT). There are, however, some question marks over whether the Plan goes far enough, quickly enough to address Perth’s public transport needs.

1.3 RAC Members
The membership of the RAC broadly reflects the community of Western Australia. The RAC regularly surveys its members on a range of issues, including public transport.

According to recent RAC surveys, approximately eight per cent of our members use public transport for their commute to work. This is consistent with State Government mode share analysis. About half of the survey’s respondents do not think public transport is an option for them.

The majority of those who use public transport rate the services as good. There are, however, a number of recurring concerns which members say make them less likely to use public transport. These issues include overcrowding, frequency of services and personal security concerns.
RAC response to the Plan

2.1 Staging

2.1.1 POPULATION FORECASTS

Local Government population forecasts predict higher growth than those indicated by State Government. Additionally the State Government is forecasting that annual population growth will be less than the average percentage growth experienced in the last decade.

Various population and land use scenarios have been used in transport modelling and transport corridor studies carried out by Department of Planning and scenario planning has been applied to Directions 2031 and Beyond. A similar approach should be employed in the revised Public Transport Plan.

RECOMMENDATION 1

An additional, higher population growth scenario should be modelled to identify the appropriate project staging if population grows at a faster rate than the Western Australian Planning Commission has forecast. A similarly varied scenario for higher than anticipated patronage growth should also be applied.

2.1.2 TIMING

Infrastructure projects are separated into three timeframes – implementation before 2021, before 2031 or after 2031. The RAC believes there is a risk that long time frames will lessen the urgency with which projects need to be delivered. The RAC does not support an open-ended approach to implementation and prefer to see the implementation of, or at least detailed planning for, major infrastructure projects such as heavy rail brought forward prior to 2031.

Additionally, the Plan as it stands is unlikely to deliver public transport services quickly enough to meet expected population growth. Given the concerns about the Government’s reliance on low-end population growth estimates, there is a significant risk that Perth could still be left with an inadequate public transport system by the end of this decade. The RAC believes the investments should be made now while the economy and revenue flows to government are still strong.

For example, the Plan proposes just one additional heavy rail project over the next nine years – a small but significant extension of the northern rail line from Butler to Yanchep. Other heavy rail extension such as the relatively short extensions of the Thornlie line to Canning Vale and Cockburn Central is not planned to occur until after 2031, creating doubt as to whether these will ever be constructed.

In some cases no timeframe or indication of likelihood is given for initiatives e.g. the Plan indicates mobile applications ‘could’ be used to enhance the provision of real time service information. Information is needed as to how this will work and when. Similarly, in relation to the central area, the Plan indicates that super stops ‘could’ operate in the CBD but does not provide detailed information as to when this might occur.

RECOMMENDATION 2

Infrastructure projects are separated into three timeframes – implementation before 2021, before 2031 or after 2031. The Plan should be reviewed to bring forward projects for delivery to provide a sense of urgency and priority to investment in public transport. A firm commitment to actions should be indicated in the Plan and timeframes assigned to all investment decisions.

Public Transport To And From Work: Whether Possible For Members To Use

- Not possible to use public transport 52%
- Possible by bus 16%
- Possible by train 7%
- Possible but need to use both bus and train 25%

Source: 2010 RAC Motoring Public Relations Survey

www.rac.com.au
2.2 Funding

2.2.1 Funding Allocation

The Plan lacks detail on funding. Importantly, it does not state how much will be allocated to implement the proposed projects, nor when the planned short and long-term funding plans will be completed and provided to Treasury.

The Independent Panel has recommended ‘A reallocation of funding within the State’s transport portfolio budget to increase the funding share for PT, reflecting its role in meeting transport needs of Perth’s growing population’. The RAC believes this fails to address the real issue.

If Perth’s population is growing rapidly, the amount of funding dedicated to the road and public transport networks must also increase. In fact, significant investments in each will need to be made ahead of the projected growth. Diverting money from the road network to fund public transport projects will not fix the problem. It should also be noted that many of the significant challenges facing the road network are regional road projects where there will never be a public transport alternative.

Additionally, there should not be an over-emphasis on cost benefit analysis based on historical trends relating to public transport patronage. It is generally agreed that there will be more fiscal and other pressures affecting travel choices in the future and therefore historical trends may underestimate the anticipated uptake of new infrastructure and services. The Mandurah rail line is an example of this, whereby actual patronage exceeded expectations.

RECOMMENDATION 3

The Plan should call for increased investment in transport, rather than trying to spread existing allocations over an increasing number of priority projects. The Plan should also identify timeframes for the preparation of funding plans for public transport projects.

2.2.2 Funding Sources

The Plan presents a wish-list of potential funding sources. However, the likelihood is that government will still at least in the short-term, be the primary source of funding for these projects.

The RAC welcomes the Plan’s call for government to look to contributions from developers to support public transport and to develop opportunities for public private partnerships especially where light rail is concerned. However, the concept of developer contributions is not a new one in Western Australia. To date, no government has been able to define or describe how this concept would work in practice. This latest plan also lacks detail about how and when developer contributions will be obtained.

Parking levies (obtained in strategic centres) are identified as a potential source of short-term funding, whereby the net revenue would be dedicated to public transport. Currently, a parking levy only exists in the Central Perth Parking Management Area. Given the significant time-lag in the spending of the Perth Parking Levy revenue, the RAC seeks further detail on how such levies would be managed in suburban centres, including guarantees that such revenue would be used solely for the provision of additional public transport services.

The final section of the Plan states that the traditional cash-in-lieu model has been broadened. More explanation about the changes to the cash-in-lieu model is required particularly as Local Government policies are increasingly being revised to stipulate a maximum number of bays rather than a minimum.

The Plan also includes suggestions of congestion charges on motorists to further subsidise the expansion of services. The RAC does not support a congestion charge. Public transport users already receive a subsidy of almost 80 per cent from consolidated revenue and motorists should not therefore be asked to pay an increased subsidy for public transport. The RAC welcomes the Minister for Transport’s rejection of a congestion charge.

RECOMMENDATION 4

The RAC welcomes the Plan’s call for government to seek contributions from the private sector. However, further detail needs to be provided regarding the preferred mechanisms for obtaining developer contributions, as well as clarification on the future role/extent of parking levies and the application of the cash-in-lieu model.
2.3 Integration

2.3.1 Integration with Transport Policy and Planning

The RAC has also welcomed the commitment to develop a Metropolitan Roads Network Plan (‘Moving People’), a Metropolitan Freight Plan (‘Moving Freight’) and a Metropolitan Bicycle Network Plan (‘Western Australian Bicycle Network Plan’) which are all due for release within the next year.

However, these plans are being prepared separately and it is unclear how the Public Transport Plan will integrate with these strategies. It is essential that the Plan deals with integration between modes, particularly where road space reallocation and station accessibility are concerned.

**Recommendation 5**

Explanation is required to show how the Plan will integrate with other metropolitan transport strategies and plans that are currently being prepared.

2.3.2 Connectivity Between Activity Centres

Directions 2031 and Beyond indicates that growth in Perth will be concentrated around key activity centres. Metropolitan centres have been categorised into a hierarchy which assigns the appropriate level of strategic importance. Due to the schematic design of the maps in the document it is difficult to accurately identify whether smaller centres (located between main centres) are located on or connected to new public transport routes.

A weakness of the current public transport system, acknowledged in the Plan, is that ‘the current focus of public transport services on the CBD does not support connectivity between the strategic centres identified in Directions 2031 and Beyond’. Despite this acknowledgement, some key linkages between strategic centres will not occur for at least a decade or more.

There will be continuing debate over the strong focus on projects north of the city as opposed to the south. The three priority projects in Stage One announced by the Minister are all north of the river (heavy rail – Yanchep, light rail – Mirrabooka, BRT – Ellenbrook).

The southern Metro region is also growing rapidly – for example there are significant concerns about the impact on traffic flows of the Fiona Stanley Hospital and Murdoch Business Precinct development, the redevelopment of Canning Bridge and similarly, the development of Armadale, Fremantle, Cannington, Mandurah and Rockingham as strategic centres.

In particular, better connections are required to areas which function as important employment hubs to ensure the workforce can access these centres. For example, Canning Vale is rated as Perth’s 7th largest employment area with major plans to expand, but it does not appear to have heavy or light rail connections planned until after 2031.
The RAC would welcome further analysis of when more radial connections between important activity centres such as those listed below will be built. This is additionally important in terms of reducing the pressure on the central stations (refer to 2.4.6). For example:

- **Morley**: Morley currently provides more than 5,000 jobs and is earmarked as a major growth area. The Plan identifies that the Public Transport Authority’s Satisfaction Monitor for passengers in the Morley bus contract area has reduced from 92 per cent to 52 per cent over the last six years. There is no heavy rail and the only connection via rapid transit prior to 2021 is east to Bassendean, with no connection west or south to the city or to the nearby activity centre of Mount Lawley. Prior to 2031 a BRT link is planned to the city but there are still no planned connections to the west or to Mount Lawley which at that time will be serviced by light rail.

- **Stirling**: It has been touted that Stirling will in the future be known as Perth’s ‘second CBD’ (City of Stirling, 2011). It is planned that ultimately the centre will provide approximately 30,000 jobs and dwellings for 25,000 residents. Planning work for a light rail link between Stirling Station and Glendalough Station has commenced and the Public Transport Plan indicated this link will be in place by 2031 and will be preceded by BRT which will be in place on the same route by 2021. Whilst this is a welcome addition to the network, no new radial rapid transit connections to nearby centres are planned until after 2021, or in some cases, after 2031. This includes connection to the densely populated nearby suburbs of Mount Lawley (not planned until after 2031) and Subiaco, and Scarborough which is a key tourist destination. There is also no apparent intention to connect Stirling to Morley (a strategic centre) and Mirrabooka (a secondary centre) or to the planned northern light rail line until sometime after 2031.

- **Rockingham**: There are no new rapid transit connections planned to Rockingham until after 2021 including no connection north to Fremantle, which is also a ‘strategic centre’.

- **Mandurah**: Rapid transit connections to surrounding residential suburbs and the industrial areas of Keralup and Nambeelup are indicated as occurring in Stage 2, the time when much of the development in those areas is expected to occur. However, no rapid transit connections are planned between Mandurah (population 85,000) and the Mandurah rail station until after 2021 and with park and ride already under pressure the provision of BRT on this relatively short link should be brought forward prior to 2021. A similar priority bus service currently operates from Rockingham to Rockingham Station.

- **Midland**: No new rapid transit connections are planned for Midland until after 2031. Midland is proximate to the Kewdale/Welshpool area which is the second largest employment centre outside of Perth CBD and the RAC would like to see further investigation of the expansion of services between the two centres. Midland is also undergoing a large scale redevelopment which will result in substantially higher residential densities. The Plan notes that Midland is an important centre of population and workplace growth, with a potential town centre population of 24,000 by 2031.

- **Belmont**: an established ‘secondary centre’ which is not currently well-connected to Perth CBD has no connection to heavy rail services, yet no rapid transit infrastructure is planned until after 2021.

- **Murdoch**: In view of the development of Fiona Stanley Hospital and high density mixed use, an east-west rapid transit connection from Murdoch is preferred prior to 2031, possibly to the Armadale line and Fremantle. Modelling carried out in 2010 of the development scenario shows that by 2031 Murdoch Drive, Main Street and South Street east of Murdoch Drive will all be at capacity.

- **Jandakot**: The development of Jandakot City will see the release of 500,000 square metres of leasable space. The development has already commenced, yet rapid transit is not planned until post 2021 (other than a connection between Canning Vale and Murdoch). There is no plan to connect the area to heavy rail until after 2031. Connection to the Armadale line should be advanced after 2031. Connection to the Armadale line should be advanced.

**Recommendation 6**

The time when important activity centres are connected to rapid transit services needs to be advanced and new public transport connections made. Connection of the five strategic centres and key employment nodes (greater than 5000 workers) to other centres via radial rapid transit services is a priority.
2.3.3 INTEGRATION WITH KEY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Decisions on major projects should not be made in isolation of associated public transport planning. The new Perth Stadium proposed for Burswood will require significant public transport infrastructure. Figures of around $300 million have already been floated. It is not clear in the Plan where this proposal fits. Similarly the role of public transport in the development of Jandakot City and other major developments is not covered.

Wanneroo is earmarked for development between 2011 and 2015 and under the Connected City Scenario could ultimately provide as many as 150,000 additional dwellings. Wanneroo is not featured on the network map. However, it appears BRT to Joondalup or the Northern light rail is not planned until 2031, or possibly later.

RECOMMENDATION 7

The Plan should detail proposed major development projects and how these will be connected to the current system.

2.4 Infrastructure

2.4.1 HEAVY RAIL EXPANSION

Given that the extension of the northern rail line to Butler will be completed in 2014, the only planned heavy rail line expansion between 2014 and 2021 is the extension of the Northern Rail Line to Yanchep.

The Plan indicates that, collectively, Perth residents will more than double their use of public transport by 2031. The train network had expanded from 66 km in the early 1990s to 173 km by 2010. Patronage has similarly increased over the past 10 years by 67 per cent - three times the rate of population growth over the same period.

The RAC would like the construction of heavy rail in the south brought forward at least prior to 2031, and possibly 2021. This would include the extension of the Thornlie line to Canning Vale, with a connection to the Mandurah Line at Cockburn Central and the extension of the Armadale Line to Byford. The need to advance construction of the 11.5 kilometre ‘Thornlie extension’ is further supported by the planned development of Canning Vale and Jandakot Airport.

Additionally, over the past seven years, the number of passengers travelling through Perth Airport has doubled, with 11.5 million passengers recorded in the last financial year, making Perth Airport the fastest growing capital city airport in Australia (Westralia Airports Corporation, 2011). Passenger movements are expected to reach at least 19 million by 2029 (EMRC, 2008). Both the passenger and commercial functions of the airport are expanding rapidly. Over 700 hectares is available for a wide range of non-aviation property development and a new domestic terminal will be built within the next three years as well as major expansion of the current international terminal (Westralia Airports Corporation, 2011).

An action of the Regional Integrated Transport Strategy for Perth’s Eastern Region (EMRC 2008) was to ‘ensure the current level of bus service to the Perth Airport does not deteriorate any further’ highlighting the general concern regarding public transport connections to and from Perth Airport.

The Strategy also reported that ‘a recent study of airport rail links (including Sydney and Brisbane) indicates that rail would not be a viable option for Perth Airport for reasons relating to urban density, low general public transport usage, proximity to the developed urban area, travel time and the low importance of a single (CBD) destination.’

The substantial increase in the amount of employment, with corresponding increase in passenger numbers at Perth Airport provides opportunities for improving...
public transport access. The RAC would welcome further immediate investigation around the timing of an airport rail link, which incorporates how the passenger catchment could be increased by attracting residents in the Hills community and south-eastern suburbs.

**RECOMMENDATION 8**

The construction of key heavy rail projects is pushed too far into the future and these should be brought forward, including construction of heavy rail brought forward at least prior to 2031, and possibly 2021 including:

- Extension of the Thornlie line to Canning Vale, with a connection to the Mandurah Line at Cockburn Central
- Extension of the Armadale Line to Byford
- Construction of the airport rail link.

**2.4.2 LONG-TERM PLANNING FOR NEW TRANSPORT CORRIDORS**

The Plan does not propose any new rail reserves, thus indicating that the current heavy rail network and associated extensions to Yanchep, Mundijong and Cockburn Central will be the ultimate network. Similarly, no new corridor reserves are indicated for the development of light rail after 2031. Although the primary intention of the Plan is to set out a network for 2031, there is a need to initiate longer term planning for when Perth’s population reaches 3.5 million people. According to State Government forecasts, this is most likely to occur around 2050.

**RECOMMENDATION 9**

In order to avoid expensive land purchase and retrofit costs, plans for future rail right-of-way reserves need to be detailed. This is particularly important for developing areas identified by the Urban Growth Monitor. It is essential that public transport infrastructure is planned to coincide with development rather than follow it, to avoid vehicle use becoming established as the main mode of transport in new communities.

**2.4.3 LONG-TERM PLANNING FOR TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT**

The Plan proposes few new transit orientated development priorities and in view of the ‘transformational projects’ – particularly light rail – there is a need to identify those nodes which will become key public transport interchanges as well as high density employment and residential locations.

**RECOMMENDATION 10**

In the same vein as long-term planning for new public transport corridors, a long-term plan for the identification and development of priority transit oriented development is needed.

**2.4.4 STATION ACCESS**

The RAC seeks more detail about how stations will be improved in terms of accessibility and for the purposes of achieving more streamlined interchange between modes. This is especially important given that more than 35 per cent of public transport journeys already use more than one public transport service vehicle and that travel will be even more dependent on transfers between local and regional services in the future. Ideally the improvement of stations would form the basis of a program that would see older stations such as those on the Midland line upgraded to improve access, amenity and security. London has a similar program in operation which has resulted in the upgrade of 165 stations with another 10 years still to run on the program.

Priority should be placed on the upgrade of bus connections and pedestrian access at Canning Bridge Station. The Plan indicates that this upgrade is needed in the next 5-10 years but pedestrian access to the Station is very poor and access within the whole pedestrian catchment needs to be looked at sooner.

**RECOMMENDATION 11**

A long-term program should be established to upgrade existing stations.

**2.4.5 REALLOCATION OF ROAD SPACE**

Both the light rail and BRT options will require motorists to give up road space. It is essential that the road space reallocation occurs on routes with high patronage levels, in line with the guidance outlined in the Plan.

**RECOMMENDATION 12**

Strong emphasis should be placed on ensuring commuter support for new public transport links to help reduce negative perceptions from loss of road space.

**2.4.6 UTILISING CAPACITY**

Passenger capacity was highlighted as a mounting problem when the State Government was criticised by the media regarding overcrowding the Northern Line trains. The reports resulted led to some services being doubled to six car sets.
The Plan should include a stocktake of unused capacity on the existing rail network and explore when this might be utilised. A summary of current and possible operating headways should also be included. Trains currently run at varying headways throughout the network.

Additionally, the Plan indicates that capacity to move trains through the CBD at frequencies of three minutes is limited and that currently 82 per cent of all rail passengers pass through the CBD. The RAC requests that the Plan be amended to detail when full utilisation of line capacity might occur.

**RECOMMENDATION 13**
Existing rail network capacity needs to be more thoroughly detailed including when this will be utilised and expended. A plan is needed for how trains will access or pass through the city centre once Perth Station reaches capacity.

**2.4.7 CAT SERVICES**
The Perth parking levy has been used to subsidise the free Central Area Transit (CAT) bus services within the City since the introduction of the Perth Parking Policy in 1999. The three CAT routes connect the major bus and rail stations and important business, education, medical and tourist precincts. Patronage on CAT services recorded an increase of 83 per cent between 2000 and 2008.

Little reference is made in the Plan regarding the future expansion of CAT services in terms of frequency and coverage.

**RECOMMENDATION 14**
More information is required about the future operation and potential expansion of CAT services. Additionally, consideration should be given to the provision of similar high frequency bus services in major activity centres and central area suburbs.

**2.4.8 MAPPING**
The schematic maps make it somewhat difficult to identify if and how smaller centres are linked to new routes. The RAC would prefer to see more detailed maps included in the Plan with a qualification that the routes are indicative.

**RECOMMENDATION 15**
More detailed route alignments are required to allow for a more rigorous assessment of the adequacy of the proposed projects.

2.5 Implementation

**2.5.1 GOVERNANCE**
The Plan notes that a particular issue is the current lack of power for the state transport authorities to influence local governments where regional services and infrastructure networks are concerned. Main Roads (MRWA) does not have the powers to direct the construction of public transport priority infrastructure on local roads. As an example the Northern Light Rail line along Alexander Drive will pass through numerous local government areas. The Plan contains minimal detail regarding the preferred governance arrangements.

**RECOMMENDATION 16**
A statement describing the preferred governance arrangements for developing projects would provide more clarity around implementation. Additionally there is merit in establishing an implementation committee through which stakeholders can stay informed and contribute to the implementation of the Plan.

**2.5.2 MONITORING**
There will be a need to review the Plan to ensure that it keeps pace with rapidly changing travel, land use, demographic and economic trends. Similarly, the Plan needs to be monitored to ensure that implementation is on-track and occurring in an effective and timely manner. Currently, the Plan contains limited detail regarding these elements.

**RECOMMENDATION 17**
Performance indicators are crucial to ensuring that outcomes are monitored. Performance indicators including an accessibility measure should be detailed in the Plan and monitored by an implementation committee.